

# LGBTQ Issues in Philosophy



FALL 2016

VOLUME 16 | NUMBER 1

## FROM THE EDITOR

Kory Schaff

## POEMS

Felicia Nimue Ackerman

*Great New World*

Felicia Nimue Ackerman

*November Song*

## ARTICLES

Michael Goerger

*Reflections on the Pulse Nightclub Shooting*

Shelley M. Park

*A Virtual Pulse: Cautionary Notes about Public Mourning in the Digital Age*

## ANNOUNCEMENT

## CALL FOR PAPERS



APA NEWSLETTER ON

# LGBTQ Issues in Philosophy

---

KORY SCHAFF, EDITOR

VOLUME 16 | NUMBER 1 | FALL 2016

---

---

## FROM THE EDITOR

Kory Schaff

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

The fall 2017 newsletter of the APA Committee on LGBTQ People in the Profession includes two reflective contributions on the tragic mass shooting that unfolded in the early morning hours of June 12, 2016, at Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, Florida. We dedicate this issue to the 49 individuals who lost their lives in the most brutal hate crime ever perpetrated against members of the LGBTQ community in U.S. history, as well as to the survivors, friends and families, and queer communities everywhere who all too frequently confront violence in their daily lives.

---

## POEMS

### *Great New World*

Felicia Nimue Ackerman

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Heather has two mommies,  
And Sabrina has two dads.  
David has two sisters  
Who some years ago were lads.  
Kerry changed his gender  
But retained her former name.  
Isn't it delightful  
How we each pursue our aim?

---

### *November Song*

Felicia Nimue Ackerman

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Oh, we'd surely be happy and gay  
If the homophobes withered away,  
But it's hardly enough to emote —  
Let's get up off our keisters and vote!!

---

---

## ARTICLES

### *Reflections on the Pulse Nightclub Shooting*

Michael Goerger

CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

The afternoon prior to the shooting at Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, my university, like many, celebrated commencement. For the last several years, self-identified LGBT faculty, students, and staff have worn rainbow sashes to the event, and this year three members of the platform party—a member of the board of trustees, the keynote speaker, and the student body president—sport sashes proudly. I graduated college a little over ten years ago, and the climate toward LGBT persons on college campuses has changed immensely. At that time openly identifying as gay was a small act of defiance, and very few people chose to do so at public events like commencement. Today, dozens of students on my campus proudly claim this identity as they walk across the stage. No one, so far as I know, complains.

Within this context, hearing about the shooting at Pulse early the next morning was particularly jarring. The attack was initially reported as a hate crime, but reporting quickly came to focus on Omar Mateen's "allegiance" to the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant. Though the subsequent investigation turned up no connection between the attacker and any international terrorist organization, the incident remains identified with Islamic terrorism in the public mind. Reporting about the attack also focused on the possibility that Mateen was himself gay and closeted. Several patrons at Pulse told police that they had seen the attacker at the bar prior to the shooting, some men claimed to have dated him, and many reported interacting with him on popular gay dating and hook-up apps. The FBI was unable to substantiate any of these claims.

What is known is that the shooter had a deep-seated hatred of LGBT persons along with many other groups. We should thus resist the view that this attack was an attack on the United States by an international terrorist organization. The massacre at the Pulse Nightclub was the largest and most significant hate crime committed against LGBT persons in American history. This fact, sadly, has been overshadowed in much of the subsequent reporting. The shooting lives on in the American mindset as a terrorist act rather than a crime motivated by hatred and bias against a specific community.

---

With a clearer view of Omar Mateen’s motives in hand, however, we might take some time to reflect on the attack and what this act of violence means for LGBT persons, their friends, and allies. Those of us like myself, who possess some degree of privilege and authority, often take our safety and comfort for granted. We grew up and came out during a time when bricks crashed through the windows of gay bars, patrons were accosted in the streets, and physical violence was common. We fought against this violence, enlisted the help of police and politicians, and slowly carved out spaces in which we could live our lives without fear of assault. For many of us—and here again I speak to those like myself who spend most of their lives on or near university campuses—we no longer feel vulnerable, at least not in the ways we did twenty years ago. The shooting at Pulse calls that comfort into question and challenges us to reconsider the extent to which we are safe even in bars that cater to people like us.

Much of our comfort and security can be attributed to vast changes in attitudes toward lesbian, gay, bisexual, and, to some extent, transgendered persons over the past two decades. In many parts of the country, acceptance of sexual and gender diversity is encountered more often than not. These gains should not be underestimated, nor should the significant sacrifices of those who crafted them be ignored. However, I do not think that social acceptance fully accounts for the sense of comfort and security many of us feel.

A critical part of the LGBT movement has involved the creation, purposefully or not, of enclaves of acceptance, safe spaces in which we feel comfortable and free to express who we are. Nightclubs like Pulse—sweat-drenched rooms dominated by pounding music, stripped down bodies, and strobe lights—are one kind of safe space. Liberal urban centers, university campuses, gay-straight alliances in high schools, and “gay” ghettos, churches, and sports leagues are others. These spaces are carved out of the public sphere, claimed as our own, and defended. They have been under attack for nearly as long as they have existed, and our community defines itself partly in terms of the defense of one such space, a bar called Stonewall where a ragtag group refused to submit to a police raid.

The shooting at Pulse is not a new kind of violence against LGBT individuals. It is notable only because of its scale. Recently, however, I think we’ve come under attack in a new way. In the past, one got the impression that our critics were out to destroy us. Usually they didn’t use guns, but they constructed laws that were designed to hinder our social progress in any way possible. To contrast, new laws and the justifications that are given for them are different in that many of their supporters admit that LGBT individuals deserve space to live their lives, but demand that we stay within that space. We can act as we want in our enclaves, but any penetration into the public sphere need not be tolerated. Two men should be free to dance together at clubs that tolerate that sort of thing, they say, but not at bars where the patrons and proprietors forbid it.

In this climate, if we focus solely on defending safe spaces at the cost of pushing further into the public sphere, we run the risk of creating incredibly safe and accepting prisons.

Our safe spaces will serve those who live within them extremely well so long as they remain inside, but they won’t do much for those who find themselves on the outside. It is thus increasingly important for those in positions of power, authority, and influence to maintain visible lives not only in our safe spaces, but in spaces where visibility is uncomfortable and disorienting. If we retreat into our corners, living open lives among our friends and avoiding or passing among our enemies, we won’t change much. At best, we will maintain the status quo under which identifying as LGBT is extraordinarily easy for some and extraordinarily hard for others.

For me, the shooting in Orlando raised questions about the comfort and security that I take for granted not just as a gay man, but as a stereotypically masculine white man who passes easily, as a man who lives in a very liberal state and who grew up with accepting parents and friends. Also, ironically, I think of these questions as a man who has worked hard to create and defend the safe spaces that I now find myself questioning.

Why devote so much time, energy, and resources to creating “safe spaces” on our campuses? Why not create campuses that are safe, full stop? The Seattle Police Department recently began to identify businesses in which LGBT crime victims will be offered refuge while they await a police response. A noble and understandable program, but shouldn’t the ultimate goal be to ensure that every business in every city is safe? I do not question the motivation behind “safe space” programs or the fact that these programs genuinely help those who utilize them. Instead, I question the ambition of our goals.

After Orlando, we should celebrate our progress, but we should also critically evaluate our current position. As I engage in this process, three points seem relevant to me:

First, spaces that are safe and comfortable are rare in many cities, states, and regions of our country. Much of our progress has been limited by geography, socio-economic status, and race. Life is pretty good for a lot of gay professionals, but our comfort is not an excuse for complacency. If anything, it places a greater burden on us to help change those spaces and minds that are not accepting of LGBT persons.

Second, the safety and comfort many of us feel is limited and illusory. When we live primarily within our own enclaves and safe spaces, we become blind to the amount of anti-LGBT bias, violence, and discrimination that surrounds us. If we step outside of those spaces, we experience fear and vulnerability, and so, for many, we simply choose not to leave “our” space.

Third, the really hard work is ahead of us. Changing laws is much easier than changing minds. With our legal rights nearly guaranteed (I admit that some significant legal hurdles remain), we find ourselves fighting for access to restrooms, to donate blood, and to buy wedding cakes. These issues are complex and not easily addressed by the courts. They will require new paradigms, new discourse, and new ways of thinking.

After the tragedy in Orlando, we shouldn't forget that it was an isolated incident, stunning because of its severity and the relative rarity of this kind of violence (though violence against transgender individuals remains common). We should celebrate the growing visibility of LGBT athletes, student body presidents, state Supreme Court justices, and members on boards of trustees. At the same time there is room to reflect on the work that remains. One need not exclude the other.

---

## *A Virtual Pulse: Cautionary Notes about Public Mourning in the Digital Age*

Shelley M. Park  
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

In the hours and days after Omar Mateen shot over one hundred Pulse patrons and workers and was himself shot down, Orlando residents, like everyone else following the tragedy, were glued to social media. We checked in as "safe" on Facebook to assure our loved ones that we had not been among the casualties and we checked in on others—friends, co-workers, students, lovers, and other family members—via phone calls, texts, e-mails, instant messaging, and other means to ensure their safety. We watched the news as the names of dead were released and the narrative details of the tragedy unfolded.

Orlando residents also turned to social media to figure out how to help (give blood, make donations, offer specialized skills, etc.) and to invite one another to a steady stream of vigils, fundraisers, and other memorial events. I was and am grateful for the rapid circulation of information that helped us to quickly locate loved ones and participate in processes of helping and healing so desperately needed in the aftermath of tragedy. What prompts these reflections, however, is my discomfort with common responses to the Pulse tragedy on social media. As it has been little more than a month since the Pulse tragedy at time of this writing, I have not yet worked through this discomfort. Hence, I share my concerns here in the hope that the questions I raise might provoke further thinking together about a queer politics of grief in the digital era. My concerns center on how to grieve queer losses while avoiding grief tourism<sup>1</sup> and conspicuous compassion.<sup>2</sup> My own answers to these questions are tentative at best.

### **GRIEF IN A DIGITAL AGE**

Speaking of the proliferation of looped empathy ribbons, public weeping over tragedies, and the signing of web petitions to stop wars and other atrocities at the turn of the century, Patrick West critiqued the West's "culture of ostentatious caring" that, he argued, did little to help the needy, injured, or bereaved but instead showcased our own egos, informing others how deeply caring we were.<sup>3</sup> Social media encourages performative displays of mourning at the same time as it allows wider audiences to pay their respects.<sup>4</sup> Moreover it enables these public displays of grief to be instantaneously shared and seems

to demand an equally immediate response from those whose proximity to events may leave them less than ready to receive and respond to the sympathies sent.

As I and those around me checked Facebook for news, we were inundated with messages by those sharing their prayers, their heartbreak, and, very shortly thereafter, their moral and political outrage. While I recognize that both friends and strangers were making well-intentioned gestures of support, the admonitions to remember that "We are all Orlando" and to take various kinds of political action to demonstrate that "We all share one Pulse" seemed strangely out of place (and of questionable timing) to those of us living in a city where the losses and the grief over such losses were still palpable. Moreover, the royal "we" featured in these and other proclamations about "One world, one heart, and one Pulse" was often irritating (especially when uttered by straight cisgender white folk), as was the presumption of shared grief. Expressions of heartbreak by those who did not walk in the same—or even similar—shoes seemed somehow insincere, inauthentic, unseemly. Prayers often felt uninvited and trite. And the political outrage that quickly linked events in Orlando to the need to ban assault weapons (by some Democrats) or the need to combat "radical Islamic terrorism" (by some Republicans) seemed insensitive. As Enria notes, "keyboard warriors that latch onto tragedy to make it into a social media political campaign or to amplify their opinions" often forget the human aspect of a tragedy.<sup>5</sup> Many of my LGBTQ friends and allies were among these keyboard warriors.

Accusing those who share and tweet their reactions to a tragedy of inappropriate behavior may seem ungenerous. And perhaps it is. Everyone reacts to tragedy in their own manner, and I do not wish to legislate how someone *ought* to feel in the aftermath of tragic events. Nor do I wish to suggest that those who are geographically, biologically, or socially closer to those whose lives were lost have a monopoly on either suffering or caring. We can be hurt at distance. We can be moved at a distance. And we can (and should) care about those who are different from us. Yet in the digital age where self-branding is ubiquitous, performative displays of mourning are expected, and the lines between personal suffering and political causes are often blurred, the personal, cultural, and political appropriation of others' grief is something to which we need to pay close attention. Many who would be reluctant to attend—much less speak at—the funeral of someone whom they did not know well do not hesitate to post a status indicating their profound sadness or outrage at the death of persons they have never met. To what extent do we claim for ourselves or for our own purposes grief that is not ours?

### **WHOSE TRAGEDY? WHOSE GRIEF?**

I do think that social media facilitates a form of cultural appropriation that we might rightly term the appropriation of grief. As Ahmed notes, when we transform loss into "our" loss or convert loss into a political object, we take those losses away from others.<sup>6</sup> Yet the suggestion that some folk may "appropriate" other people's grief is not unproblematic. In particular, it presumes that a tragedy is, in fact, someone's (or some group's) rightful property. So

who does the Pulse tragedy belong to? Can we, in fact, say it *belongs* to anyone?

There are no easy answers to these questions. On the one hand, it seems wrong to suggest that any one person or group of people has a monopoly on grief when tragedy occurs. There are several axes of loss and suffering occasioned by the shooting at Pulse. There is the suffering of those who were killed and those who miss them—including, although not often noted, the suffering of Omar Mateen and his family. There is the suffering of survivors who were physically injured and/or emotionally traumatized on June 12. The owners and employees of Pulse, whether present or not that night, have lost friends, co-workers, and livelihood in a tragedy that took place in an establishment many called home. First responders are haunted by what they saw and heard the night of the tragedy and by thoughts about what they could (or could not) have done differently. Many of the residents of Orlando—especially but not exclusively those who are LGBTQ and/or Latinx—suffer a sense of heightened vulnerability whether or not they lost people to whom they were close (as many did). Orlando itself suffers as it seeks to reestablish itself as “the city beautiful”—a home and tourist destination for heteronormative families and LGBTQ travelers alike. LGBTQ communities and Latinx communities extending far beyond Orlando itself are affected by a hate crime targeting members of their community. Given the number of young Puerto Ricans who were killed that night and given the vexed relation of Puerto Rico to the U.S., a unique suffering is occasioned there as well.

This list could go on indefinitely. Proximity to suffering is marked in many different ways—through geographical proximity; civic kinship ties; shared racial and ethnic, gender, and sexual and other identities; shared experiences of victimization, trauma, or vulnerability; and much more. Thus, it is no easy matter to determine the relative distance people bear to a tragedy.

Yet, as much as we may wish to refrain from imposing a strict hierarchy of suffering, it seems disingenuous to deny that some people *do* suffer more than others when tragedy occurs. I am brought closer to this particular tragedy by virtue of my geographical proximity to it, by being a member of the LGBTQ community in Orlando, and by virtue of regularly teaching queer young adults, including many young queers of color to whom I have grown close. On the other hand, I am a white Anglo, several decades older than most Pulse patrons and workers, and I am not among the bereaved: those killed or injured in the attack did not include my friends, my family, or my students. This tragedy is, thus, both mine and yet not mine at all. I volunteered to write this piece because I hoped I might have some insights due to my positioning as a queer philosopher who lives in Orlando. Yet writing is a struggle because, in many regards, the story of events here is not mine to tell, nor even, perhaps, to analyze. I find myself wanting to share the haunting stories and images that have been shared with me so that you too might get a glimpse of how things felt at “ground zero” during the Pulse tragedy. But I am suspicious of this desire—both yours and mine—to participate in an economy of grief tourism, an economy

that traffics in feelings as a commodity and, in the process, exploits and devalues the suffering of those living the immediacy of loss. Hence all I have to offer you are these misgivings.

I think these suspicions are legitimate. And yet . . . if the story of Pulse is not my story to tell, then whose story is it? It is tempting to say that the Pulse tragedy belongs first and foremost to the victims and their families who have suffered more directly and more intensely than others. And, indeed, when my daughter called me to see if I was safe (I was) and whether I had heard the news (I had not yet) on the morning of June 12, my first reaction was gratitude that my own young adult children were safe, followed quickly by imagining how awful this must be for the young adults who were at Pulse and for *their* families. This prioritizing of “victims and their families” is a normative response to tragedy about which we should also be suspicious. Orlando Mayor Buddy Dyer, President Obama, and many others speaking on the occasion of the Pulse tragedy began their speeches with phrases such as “Our hearts go out to the victims and their families”; this was also a common response on social media. The “One Orlando” fund—established by the city and joined in its efforts by Equality Florida and the National Compassion fund—has raised millions of dollars to support “victims and their families.” But to say that those who have suffered the most and are thus most deserving of our compassion, support, and attention are “victims and their families” seems to privatize grief in a way that threatens to exclude the very forms of queer kinship and counter-publics historically central to LGBTQ life. How, then, do we refrain from appropriating stories and feelings that are not our own while simultaneously resisting heteronormative privatizations of loss and suffering?

### A QUEER POLITICS OF GRIEF

As queer theorists have noted, “queer activism has . . . been bound up with the politics of grief, with the question of what losses are counted as grievable.”<sup>77</sup> The lives lost at Pulse—an LGBTQ nightclub itself dedicated to the memory of an AIDS victim—were queer lives. A queer politics of grief will remember these lives as *queer losses*. This means we do not permit the straightening of their narratives. We resist the reduction of the Pulse tragedy to a generic “terrorist attack”; we resist the narrowing of the circle of loss to bereaved parents who may or may not have known or accepted their children’s non-normative loves and lives.

At the same time, a queer politics of grief will recognize an ethical and political obligation to remember these queer lives as *queer losses of color*. Most of the victims at Pulse were Latinx; it was Latinx Night at Pulse when the shooting occurred. This means we cannot permit the whitewashing of victim narratives. Insisting that we remember the specificity of these lives, John Paul Brammer wrote a moving eulogy in *Slate* two days after the Pulse shooting:

Us. They killed us.

They killed us while we were holding our drinks and dancing bachata. They killed us while we were smiling, while we were slapping each other on the asses and calling each other “perra” and “guapa.”

They killed us where we meet each other, where we ask where our families are from, and where we crack playful jokes about Mexico or Puerto Rico or Venezuela. They killed us in our sanctuary, where we are at our most free. Not just free to be queer. Not just free to be Latino. But free to be both at the same time. That's where they killed us.<sup>8</sup>

As Brammer also notes, the lives lost at Pulse were especially precarious lives; Latinx subjects are seldom the focus of public mourning; moreover, Latinx subjects are frequently harassed, assaulted, raped, killed, deported, and "ripp[ed] from [their] homes and [their] families." White, Anglo LGBTQ folk must take care not to grieve these lives in ways that replicate this injury by disrespecting the importance of *la familia* to those whose lives were lost; we must not erase or belittle the grief of bereaved parents (and other biological kin), even when those parents did not know or accept the queer orientations of their children's lives. A queer politics of grief resists privatizing queer losses. At the same time, it must take seriously the need to give others—especially others whose grief in not often legitimated or supported—the time and space to grieve.<sup>9</sup> These others who, as griever, require our support include both the friends and lovers whose losses are erased by heteronormative kinship narratives and the mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters whose losses are exacerbated by racialized narratives of belonging and citizenship.

Caring for others who grieve by making the time and space for them to grieve is often easier on the material ground. In Orlando, immigration lawyers provided pro bono services to expedite kin's entry into the U.S. and to facilitate the transfer of dead bodies back to their homelands. The arts community offered space for reflection in the form of music, dance, literature, and theater; they also created angels to protect funeral goers from anti-gay protestors. Grief counselors were deployed to hospitals and throughout the city. At public vigils, citizens affected by the tragedy in different ways were given time to reflect and the opportunity to embrace one another. Makeshift public memorials arose at the Pulse site, at various vigil sites, at hospitals, and elsewhere, creating public spaces to remember and to grieve. These memorials acknowledged the specificity of the lives lost. In addition to containing the names and photos of, and personalized notes to, those whose lives had been lost, the memorials took on the aesthetic qualities of Hispanic graveyards with an LGBTQ twist: crosses were laced with Mardi Gras beads, vigil candles were left behind in holders emblazoned with the Virgin of Guadalupe, Puerto Rican flags were interspersed with rainbow flags, and sea shells were arranged around Pulse signs. In all of these ways and many others, citizens on the ground worked toward what Sosa advocates as a "more inclusive idea of 'us,' one in which loss can become the condition and necessity for a new sense of community."<sup>10</sup> This work is, to be certain, incomplete and imperfect. It is a work in progress and it remains to be seen whether the work will be sustained. But what it illustrates is the notion of "One Orlando" as an *aspiration* rather than a given. The "we" in "We are Orlando" does not precede the loss of fifty lives on June 12, but is instead a possibility created by that loss. In transforming abject (queer, brown, black, colonized,

and/or undocumented) bodies into grievable lives and in making room for other abject subjects to grieve those lives, we begin to move away from questionable presumptions of the shared ownership of grief and toward the generation of a public who engages the work of solidarity.

Whether we can do this solidarity work in virtual locales is an open question. Without foreclosing such a possibility, I am simply noting here that the virtual context presents special challenges to those who seek an ethical response to tragedy. These challenges include social media's demand for instantaneous response to tragedy; the scripting of grief through emoticons, profile filters, and hashtags; and the felt need to curate our own digital persona. Social media does enable the generation of publics and counter-publics that, at their best, can become organized networks of care that support griever and networks of solidarity that ensure queer losses of color are *not* excluded from public cultures of grief. In reflecting on the shortcomings of social media responses to Pulse, thus, I am not suggesting we never employ digital tools in responding to tragedy. I am simply suggesting that we use these tools differently than many of us have to date. Updating our status to "sad" or tweeting at #OneOrlando or #OnePulse does not comprise a queer politics of grief and may, in fact, compromise such an effort.

NOTES

1. Alice Marick and N. Elison, "There Isn't Wifi in Heaven! Negotiating Visibility on Facebook Memorial Pages," *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 56, no. (2012): 378–400.
2. Patrick West, *Conspicuous Compassion: Why Sometimes It Really Is Cruel to Be Kind* (London: Civitas, 2004).
3. Ibid.
4. Marick and Elison, "There Isn't Wifi in Heaven! Negotiating Visibility on Facebook Memorial Pages."
5. Nicoletta Enria, "How to React to Tragedy," *Europe and Me Magazine*, No. 33. <http://www.europeandme.eu/1735-how-to-react-to-tragedy>. Accessed July 10, 2016.
6. Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 161.
7. Ibid., 156. See also David Eng, "The Value of Silence," *Theatre Journal* 54, no. 1 (2002): 85–94; David Eng and D. Kazanjian, *Loss: The Politics of Mourning* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); Ann Cvetkovich, *An Archive of Feelings: Trauma, Sexuality, and Lesbian Public Cultures* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003); Judith Butler, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (London: Verso, 2004).
8. John Paul Brammer, "Why It Matters That It Was Latin Night at Pulse," *Slate*, June 14, 2016, [http://www.slate.com/blogs/outward/2016/06/14/it\\_was\\_latin\\_night\\_at\\_the\\_pulse\\_orlando\\_gay\\_bar\\_here\\_s\\_why\\_that\\_matters.html](http://www.slate.com/blogs/outward/2016/06/14/it_was_latin_night_at_the_pulse_orlando_gay_bar_here_s_why_that_matters.html). Accessed July 4, 2016.
9. Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, 161.
10. Cecilia Sosa, "Queering Acts of Mourning in the Aftermath of Argentina's Dictatorship: The Mothers of Plaza de Mayo and Los Rubios," in *The Memory of State Terrorism in the Southern Cone: Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay*, edited by V. Durliolle and F. Less (New York: Palgrave, 2011), 69.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Brammer, John Paul. "Why It Matters That It Was Latin Night at Pulse." *Slate*. June 14, 2016. [http://www.slate.com/blogs/outward/2016/06/14/it\\_was\\_latin\\_night\\_at\\_the\\_pulse\\_orlando\\_gay\\_bar\\_here\\_s\\_why\\_that\\_matters.html](http://www.slate.com/blogs/outward/2016/06/14/it_was_latin_night_at_the_pulse_orlando_gay_bar_here_s_why_that_matters.html). Accessed July 4, 2016.

Butler, Judith. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso, 2004.

———. *Frames of War, When is Life Grievable?* London: Verso, 2009.

Cvetkovich, Ann. *An Archive of Feelings: Trauma, Sexuality, and Lesbian Public Cultures*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Eng, David. "The Value of Silence." *Theatre Journal* 54, no. 1 (2002): 85–94.

Eng, David, and D. Kazanjian, eds. *Loss: The Politics of Mourning*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Enria, Nicoletta. "How to React to Tragedy." *Europe and Me Magazine*, No. 33. <http://www.europeandme.eu/1735-how-to-react-to-tragedy>. Accessed July 10, 2016.

Love, Heather. *Feeling Backward: Loss and the Politics of Queer History*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Marick, Alice, and N. Elison. "There Isn't Wifi in Heaven! Negotiating Visibility on Facebook Memorial Pages." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 56, no. 3 (2012): 378–400.

Sosa, Cecilia. "Queering Acts of Mourning in the Aftermath of Argentina's Dictatorship: The Mothers of Plaza de Mayo and Los Rubios." In *The Memory of State Terrorism in the Southern Cone: Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay*, edited by V. Durliolle and F. Less, 63–85. New York: Palgrave, 2011.

West, Patrick. *Conspicuous Compassion: Why Sometimes It Really Is Cruel to Be Kind*. London: Civitas, 2004.

---

## ANNOUNCEMENT

The APA Committee on LGBTQ People in the Profession is searching for a new editor for its biannual newsletter. Responsibilities include soliciting essays, reviews, and other contributions from members to be published online in the spring and fall issues for two years (four issues total). Editors do not have to be current or past members of the committee, but should be APA members in good standing. Please email the current editor, Kory P. Schaff, at [kschaff@calstatela.edu](mailto:kschaff@calstatela.edu) for more information, and circulate this notice widely among potential applicants.

---

## CALL FOR PAPERS

The *APA Newsletter on LGBTQ Issues in Philosophy* invites members to submit papers, book reviews, and professional notes for publication in the spring 2017 edition. Submissions can address issues in the areas of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, gender, and sexuality studies, as well as issues of concern for LGBTQ people in the profession. The newsletter seeks quality paper submissions for anonymous review. Reviews and notes should address recent books, current events, or emerging trends. Members who give papers at APA divisional meetings, in particular, are encouraged to submit their work by the appropriate deadlines.

### DEADLINE

The deadline for submission of manuscripts for the spring edition is January 1, 2017.

### FORMAT

Papers should be in the range of 5,000–7,500 words. Reviews and notes should not exceed 3,000 words. All submissions must use endnotes and should be prepared for anonymous review.

### CONTACT

Submit all manuscripts electronically (in MS Word format), and direct questions to Kory Schaff, editor, *APA Newsletter on LGBTQ Issues in Philosophy*, at [kschaff@calstatela.edu](mailto:kschaff@calstatela.edu).