Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies
Vol. 7, No. 2, June 2010, pp. 156–175

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

PISSAR's Critically Queer and Disabled Politics

Isaac West

PISSAR (People in Search of Safe and Accessible Restrooms) offers an instructive example about the possibility for critically queer and disabled politics. Using public bathrooms as a site of activism, PISSAR, through the consubstantiality of shame, demonstrates the mutually constitutive and performative properties of bodies interacting in space. PISSAR's actions provide pedagogical insight into the negotiation of coalitional politics, especially those politics inflected with queer concerns.

Keywords: Space; Transgender/genderqueer; People with Disabilities; Queer Politics; Bathrooms

One of the most exciting and productive sites for queer coalitional politics may be, ironically enough, the linkage between the everyday concerns of lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transpeople (LGBTs), and people with disabilities.[1] I write "ironically enough" because many members of these communities, save those who live at the intersections of these identities, have labored to untangle the negative articulations of one with the other.[2] LGBT advocates have invested considerable time and energy in countering the medicalization and pathologization of their identities and desires, a struggle that continues today with campaigns against religiously based reparative therapies and the continued classification of transgender identifications as "gender identity disorder." As for people with disabilities, in ways different yet similar to LGBTs, they have been figured as asexual beings or hypersexual deviants. Therefore, to link the interests of people with disabilities and LGBTs may seem counterintuitive, regressive, and politically risky. Yet, in a liberal-democratic polity that only sometimes tolerates LGBTs and people with disabilities, the continued vitality and vibrancy of LGBT, queer, and disability politics is dependent largely upon the ability of these

Isaac West is Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Iowa. John Lucaites, Jeff Bennett, Phaedra Pezzullo and the faculty and students at Drake University, University of Iowa, and University of Pittsburgh strengthened this essay with their questions and suggestions. Correspondence to: Isaac West, 105 Becker Communication Studies Building, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242-1498, USA. E-mail: isaac-west@uiowa.edu

ISSN 1479-1420 (print)/ISSN 1479-4233 (online) © 2010 National Communication Association
DOI: 10.1080/14791421003759174

advocates to develop forms of coalitional politics that articulate their modalities of domination to the interests of other similarly situated groups. In a context where queer liberalism, a potentially oxymoronic strategy of uncritical inclusion, prevails over queer politics, the recognition, promotion, and adaptation of alternative strategies for resisting the suffocating grip of "hetero/homo-corporo-normativities" is urgently needed.[3]

Narrowing down the larger topic of LGBT and/or queer coalitional politics to transgender advocacy actions, my interest here is how transpeople and people with disabilities have found common cause through their shared experiences. Despite the obvious differences between transpeople and people with disabilities, generally speaking they negotiate a number of similar issues in their daily lives, and their explicit articulation may prove useful in forging political alliances. These common experiences include: difficulties, if not outright discrimination, in: securing an education, job, and/or housing; demonization and/or condemnation by religious officials; violence from perpetrators of hate crimes; and, familial and social rejection, and shame.[4] To this list I would add another issue which may at first glance seem trivial, yet, upon further consideration, is crucial for the living of meaningful lives: safe and accessible bathrooms.

Public bathrooms are far from a trivial concern given that face-to-face publicity is enabled and constrained in important ways by the availability of safe and accessible public bathrooms. First, the location and condition of public bathrooms provide explicit physical markers about the gendered and abled expectations of the bodies in that area. The differences between the lines for the men's and women's bathrooms, as well as the use of bathrooms designated for people with disabilities by people without disabilities, speak volumes about the infusion of cultural norms into architecture. Second, as critical geographers Rob Kitchin and Robin Law note, an individual's inability to find safe and accessible public bathrooms subjects them to "'the bladder's leash,' restricting how long they are able to stay in a place and thus constraining their participation."[5] The "bladder's leash" not only limits the amount of time that a person can spend in a public location, it can prevent someone from even attempting to participate in these publics. As a result, people with disabilities and transpeople must be uniquely mindful of the accommodations available in places such as restaurants, stores, airports, schools, and their places of employment.

Instead of atomizing the differences between people with disabilities and transpeople, and further participating in the dissimulation of the interdependent circuitries authorizing the able-bodied and bigendered normativities underwriting the regulation of public places, I suggest these struggles are two sides of the same coin in that members of these identity groups want to be free from their bladder's leashes, both of which are ultimately tethered to the pole of an idealized, mythic, and normative body. Thus, in the spirit of promoting and developing radical democratic coalitional politics interested in challenging intersecting modalities of domination, in this essay I explore how these seemingly disparate groups have articulated, negotiated, and managed their differences while practicing a coalitional politics that questions the safety and accessibility of public bathrooms.

This argument unfolds in the following manner. The following section makes a case for taking more seriously the mutually constitutive and rhetorical relationship between place, space, and identity. Communication scholars often treat place and space as the site of rhetorical practice, noting it as a material constraint without exploring the interpenetrating rhetorical relationship between individuals in place and space. In lieu of this two-dimensional flattening of place and space, one that treats them as inert and extra-discursive material realities, I mobilize these concepts as three-dimensional and dynamic elements integrally linked to the rhetorical production of identity and agency. More specifically, the examination of public bathrooms offers insight into the gendered and abled logics actively undergirding these seemingly banal places. Communication critics can offer interventions into these cultural practices by attending to the identity work negotiated in/through the materiality and performativity of these spaces.

The next section analyzes the actions of People in Search of Safe and Accessible Restrooms (PISSAR), a genderqueer and disability coalition composed of college students and staff dedicated to providing safe and accessible bathrooms.[6] With the goal of demonstrating the productive potential of coalitional politics informed by critical queerness and disability, I explore the inventional resources created by the interaction of genderqueer and disabled bodies in campus bathrooms. The members of PISSAR addressed multiple forms of shame directed at them, including the internalized shame of their own bodies, the shame associated with bathroom activities and politics, and the potential sources of shame created by the articulation of their stigmatized identities together. By surveying and actually meeting in campus bathrooms, PISSAR negotiated a spatially-based consubstantiality of shame to challenge the homo/hetero-corporo-normativity of public places and spaces. In the concluding section, I suggest that in their recognition of public bathrooms as a site of performative identity formation, PISSAR exemplifies a provocative model for theorizing and practicing critically queer politics outside of the hegemonic and increasingly ineffective logics of gay white male shame that guide much of contemporary GLBT and queer politics. To justify these conclusions, I first turn to a discussion of the relationship between rhetoric, place, space, and identity.

The Rhetoricity of Place, Space, and Identity

In the context of this essay, the concepts "space" and "place" are informed by Michel de Certeau's simple yet provocative maxim: "space is a practiced place."[7] Place and space, in Certeau's formulations of the terms, are given meaning by the practices employed in them creating a relationship between place and strategy, and space and tactics. The association of place with strategy signifies how locations are "circumscribed as *proper* and thus serve as the basis for generating relations with an exterior distinct from it."[8] To clarify, in an attempt to dictate the proper set of actions and relationships between members of a polity, the "strong" use strategies, or the recourse to naturalized hierarchies outside of the immediate physical relationship, to create places to manage the maneuvering of the "weak."[9] Public bathrooms, then, are places

in that they are designed and provided for a limited number of functions (urinating, defecating, changing a diaper, vomiting, washing our hands, fixing our hair and/or makeup, gaining our composure, and brushing our teeth), they are divided by the sexes through an appeal to a naturalized system of biological separation, and they are regulated and surveilled by the law to enforce these taken-as-given differences.

Of course, public bathrooms are used for a number of purposes unintended by their owners—some people fuck and suck in them, others use them to buy and use drugs, and individuals who are homeless may use them for hygienic purposes or as a respite from the elements and the violence directed toward them. In these ways, the place of the public bathroom becomes a space. To complete the explanation of the dialectical pairing, as opposed to places and strategies, spaces are associated with tactics or "calculated actions" that "play on and with a terrain imposed on it and organized by the law of a foreign power."[10] Remembering Certeau's interest in the rhetorical conditions of contingency and probability, those interested in turning places into spaces:

> must accept the chance offerings of the moment . . . and make use of the cracks that particular conjunctions open in the surveillance of the proprietary powers. It poaches in them. It creates surprises in them. It can be where it is least expected. It is a guileful ruse. In short, a tactic is an art of the weak.[11]

The spatiality of resistance, inherently wedded to timing, relies on fugitive power relations, and these relations create the conditions to reimagine the material worlds we inhabit. Steven Pile reminds us that while "spaces of resistance are multiple, dynamic, and weak (in their effectiveness, but also because resistance is also dangerous)," they are "only ever in part controlled by the practices of domination."[12] Therefore, challenges to cultural hegemonies are located primarily in the alterations of quotidian routines, and in spatializing the understanding of resistance, we can, as Pile and Michael Keith urge us to do, draw "attention not only to the myriad spaces of political struggles, but also to the politics of the everyday space, through which political identities constantly flow and fix."[13] This conceptualization of space and place, along with strategies and tactics, assists us in understanding the complex interaction between space, identity, and agency.

As should be clear, the concomitant construction of identity and space is inherently communicative, and it deserves further theorization. Communication critics are especially well-attuned at thinking through the constitutive symbolic conditions of a culture. However, these critiques tend to isolate and privilege symbolic action over the spaces in which they are enacted and, thus, we seldom take up the task of understanding their co-production.[14] Considerations of place and time are often taught as instrumental and normative guides to the proper response to or experience of a given exigency. The purchase of this epistemological certainty exacts a high opportunity cost in that its faith in the determining relationship between place/occasion and the rhetorical act comes at the expense of thinking in more complex ways about the constitutive nature of space *and* communication. In the words of communication scholar Raka Shome, critics interested in intervening in cultural

formations must forego the notion that space is “a mere setting or an innocent background in, over, or across which cultural activities and practices are seen to be occurring,” opting instead for a perspective that acknowledges “the role that space plays in the (re)production of social power.”[15] The implication of this move, according to Shome, is that we must account for the symbolicity of space as it “functions as a technology—a means and a medium—of power that is socially constituted through material relations that enable the communication of specific politics” while making others more difficult.[16]

Certeau’s perspective assists us in understanding Shome’s attention to the contextualized agentic effectivities of space and identity. While drawing attention to the spatial dimensions of power relations, Shome simultaneously problematizes acontextual understandings of identity to prevent the importation of stable subjectivites into the dynamic operations of space and identity.[17] As a result, agency is found in the localized interaction between subjects and the spaces in which they operate, which is to say in the performativity of identity and space. Nothing is guaranteed in advance as subjects necessarily work in between the constraining and enabling conditions found in the contingent and the probable, whether they recognize it or not.

With that said, the regulation of place presents formidable obstacles to practices of resistance, and critical attention must be paid to the contextualized nature of this dialectic. As Michel Foucault provocatively suggested “a whole history remains to be written of *spaces*—which would at the same time be the history of *powers* (both these terms in the plural)—from the great strategies of geo-politics to the little tactics of the habitat.”[18] In a lecture first presented in 1967, Foucault was particularly interested in the secularization of Western societies and the attendant spatial effectivities of these cultural transformations. Ever-concerned with the dispersion and dissimulation of power relations, he postulated space was in a period of partial desanctification, meaning that as the unilateral exercise of power and hence the determination of subjectivity had transferred from the centralized location of the church to the exercise of power from innumerable points, resistant subjects increasingly challenged the naturalness and centrally controlled meanings of places. The complete desanctification of places remains incomplete, however, because our cultural logics are arranged around “oppositions that remain inviolable, that our institutions and practices have not yet dared to break down,” including those spaces and places defined by the split between public and private matters.[19]

Cultural geographer David Sibley locates the limits of desanctification in micropolitical and biopolitical exercises of power. Sibley argues that in spite of the continual undoing of places into spaces, “there seems to me to be a continuing need for ritual practices to maintain the sanctity of space in a secular society . . . Today, however, the guardians of sacred spaces are more likely to be security guards, parents or judges rather than priests.”[20] In the case of public bathrooms, they are treated by many as places of gender regulation as they are policed in the both the figurative and literal senses of the word.[21] Transpeople often face the possibility of being treated as gender transgressors for using the “wrong” bathroom. In response to a survey taken

by the San Francisco Human Rights Commission, transpeople documented the negative reaction to their use of public restrooms. The stories ranged from having security guards harass them to losing jobs to "[getting] the shit kicked out of me for using the 'wrong bathroom.'" One respondent wrote that they "almost got killed."[22] "The bathroom problem," according to Judith Halberstam, "illustrates in remarkably clear ways the flourishing existence of gender binarism despite rumors of its demise."[23] In spite of increasingly fluid notions of gender, the binary logic of sex remains the dominant ideology of corporeal legibility, a legibility defined primarily by visual c(l)ues. Ironically enough, then, Halberstam contends, "gender's very flexibility and seeming fluidity is precisely what allows dimorphic gender to hold sway" as the "definitional boundaries of male and female are so elastic, there are very few people in any given public space who are completely unreadable in terms of their gender."[24] In turn, these codes of cultural legibility authorize the biopolitical practice of gender policing, thereby allowing anxious individuals to punish those who trouble the stability of sexual and gender categories. Thus, even with the malleability of gender codes, "the transphobic imagination," according to Richard Juang, allows the bathroom to "become an extension of a genital narcissism (which could be expressed, roughly, as 'my body is how sex should be defined for all other bodies' and 'the presence of other kinds of body violates the sex of my own body')."[25]

Anxieties about public bathrooms are heightened by the fact that, in using the bathroom, we perform a private act in a public place with strangers. Moreover, using the bathroom leaves us vulnerable. We are in compromised positions that limit our lines of sight, be it because of a stall or a urinal. We expose parts of our bodies that are otherwise hidden from view—parts of our bodies that we typically don't want strangers to see. We pass fluids and objects that make a mess, can be noisy, and smell. In order to allay some of our anxieties, we invoke state-based protections to ensure that public bathrooms are places regulated by a variety of legal technologies. Transgender individuals are especially prone to this violence because of the naturalized assumptions about bodies, genders, and sexuality. Kath Browne explains how transgender transgressions of public bathrooms are especially threatening "in part because the leakiness of bodies cannot be associated with the fluid possibilities of sexed bodies" for "where bodies are revealed as unstable and porous, flowing between the sexes may be more threatening; where one border (bodily) is contravened others (man/woman) may be more intensely protected."[26]

Of course, women's and men's restrooms are policed in similar yet different ways. According to Patricia Cooper and Ruth Oldenziel, for women, more than men, the bathroom is a space "where they take care of their bodies and where they might remove themselves from public scrutiny or surveillance, exercise some authority, or forge bonds of solidarity."[27] Public bathrooms for women are areas where non-excretory activities are more likely to take place—women may, among other things, go to the bathroom in groups to have private conversations, reapply makeup and fix their hair, or regroup after a confrontation. In contrast, men's public restrooms involve what Halberstam terms "an architecture of surveillance" where each man stands at his urinal and looks straight ahead at the wall for fear he might be spotted

sizing up the competition; talking at the urinals or between stalls is reserved only for the closest of friends and only when other men are not around. However, Halberstam continues, it is also a space for "homosocial interaction and of homoerotic interaction." Halberstam summarizes the distinction between men's and women's bathrooms in the following manner: while men's bathrooms "tend to operate as a highly charged sexual space in which sexual interactions are both encouraged and punished, women's rest rooms tend to operate as an arena for enforcement of gender conformity."[28] For transpeople, then, pissing and shitting always carries with it the chance for legal and physical violence.

Taken together, the works of the preceding theorists are useful heuristics for understanding the spatio-temporal modalities of power as well as the need to focus on the actions of specific bodies in particular spaces. As Tim Cresswell astutely notes, "the geographical ordering of society is founded on a multitude of acts of boundary making—of territorialization—whose ambiguity is to simultaneously open up the possibilities for transgression."[29] Attention to the communicative acts associated with space-making practices helps to bridge the practico-theoretical aporias identified by geographers in resistance scholarship. For example, Doreen Massey reads Certeau as offering too strict an opposition and distinction between place and time, privileging the latter while negating the dynamism of the former, which has the inadvertent effect of stabilizing the meaning of space and obscuring its constitutive political potential.[30] Massey interrogates this dualism as one complicit with feminizing space and masculinizing time, and thus connected to larger logics underwriting the naturalization of gender ideologies.[31] Similarly, Lise Nelson identifies the lack of spatial consideration in many invocations of performativity (a Butlerian concept indebted to Foucault), operative primarily in representational critique, as a limiting condition to effective political intervention.[32] With these criticisms in mind, I would like to suggest that an reinvigorated reading of Certeau and Foucault, one that mobilizes their work in relation to contextualized communicative acts in a spatio-temporal context, especially that of quotidian practices such as those associated with public bathrooms, addresses the concerns of geography scholars who are rightly worried about acontextualized understandings of space and identity. If we take seriously the notion, like Robyn Longhurst, that "bodies are also always in a state of becoming with places,"[33] and that practices of resistance are inaugurated by the fluidity of both bodies and places/spaces, we can comprehend more fully, as Lynn Stewart suggests, how "space [is] a *product* of the human body" where the "ability to *produce* space, rather than just to *conceive* space, is the means by which people can take back power in their everyday lives."[34] Accordingly, the histories of power, space, and place that remain to be written must be sensitive to the gender, racial, and able-bodied discourses (to name only a few categories of analysis) that animate these spaces. Using their perspectives to inform my reading of PISSAR's actions, I turn to such behavior to demonstrate how the performativity of identity is informed by and simultaneously informs spatial politics.

PISSAR Patrols and Politics

The students and staff that formed PISSAR met at the 2003 University of California Students of Color Conference hosted on the University of California-Santa Barbara (UCSB) campus. In a case of serendipitous scheduling, the conveners slated the transgender and disability caucuses at the same time in adjacent rooms. However, as each group noticed they had attracted only a few attendees, the two caucuses merged together to share their concerns about the campus. In the course of the meeting, the disability caucus disclosed their intention to survey the accessibility of campus bathrooms. Understanding the possible convergence of their interests, the disability caucus asked the transgender caucus if they would be interested in jointly undertaking the project. Given that transgender students are especially vulnerable to harassment and violence in and around public bathrooms, the members of the transgender caucus eagerly accepted the invitation.[35] In one recollection of the event, "everyone in the room suddenly began talking about the possibilities of a genderqueer/disability coalition, and PISSAR was born."[36] The choice of the name PISSAR was not merely an extension of the group's playful attitude; it also embraced and projected a queer attitude to challenge euphemistic discussions of bathrooms that impede the interrogation of what they termed "pee privilege."[37] Members of the group described the name as a "tool" that drew attention to the fact that all of us need to piss and shit and "warned" others that they were "about to talk about something 'crude.'"[38]

PISSAR soon discovered that another campus group with a blunt name meant to call attention to bodily functions was similarly interested in bathroom politics. "Aunt Flo and the Plug Patrol" had been voluntarily stocking tampon and pad machines on campus after the university failed to hire a new company to supply them. Stocking over 200 bathrooms on campus with tampons and pads bought from a wholesaler, Aunt Flo and the Plug Patrol made about $100 a month in profits which they funneled to student groups on campus.[39] Understanding the intimate connections of the gendered politics of bathrooms, PISSAR allied themselves with Aunt Flo and the Plug Patrol to make the campus a safe place to piss, shit, and bleed.[40] Aunt Flo and the Plug Patrol provided PISSAR with start-up funds to purchase the materials needed for their "PISSAR patrols" including gloves, tape measures, clipboards, and their signature bright yellow t-shirts with spray-painted stenciling: "PISSAR" on the front and "FREE 2 PEE" on the back. In return, PISSAR included information about tampon and pad machines on their checklist. When constructing their checklist, a member of PISSAR raised the issue of changing tables and they added this consideration to their list. As a result of this attitudinizing frame, one that in their own words "refuse[d] to accept a narrow definition of 'queer' that denie[d] the complexities of our bodies,"[41] PISSAR broadly defined themselves in their mission statement as a group dedicated to making the campus a space where "people with all sorts of bodies and all sorts of genders should be free to pee, free to shit, free to bleed, free to share a stall with an attendant or change a baby's diaper."[42]

PISSAR's actions invite further investigation given their practice of radical democratic politics concerned with bodies and identities in space. More specifically,

PISSAR enacted critically queer and disabled politics designed to counter the shame and stigma attached to their bodies. By directly confronting stigma and shame in the place of its inscription, PISSAR transformed campus bathrooms into a space of coalitional politics. PISSAR provides valuable lessons for LGBT, queer, and disabled advocates about how to challenge their own and others' attitudes about the safety and accessibility of campus bathrooms.

Consubstantial Spaces of Shame

PISSAR's members negotiated three interdependent levels of shame. First, they had to overcome the shame associated with the assertion that public bathrooms are a politically important issue. Of course, the disabled and genderqueer members faced similar yet different obstacles in overcoming this shame. Among the obstacles they shared, public bathrooms are easily branded as an unimportant or fringe concern when compared with "real" political issues such as access to medical care, equal employment, and housing opportunities, and lobbying for partnership rights. In addition, the disabled members had to contend with the mistaken perception that the Americans with Disabilities Act had already resolved the issue of bathroom accessibility. Like other protected classes before them, the disabled have felt the pain of formal equality's double-edged sword, repeatedly confronting those who assure them that they are treated equally in spite of their experiences to the contrary. Unlike the disabled, genderqueers are generally not afforded legal access to discourses of equality and must turn to their supposedly natural allies: gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. However, among other reasons, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals are often hesitant to lend their time and energy to bathroom politics as they do not want to associate themselves with the shameful subject of public sex in bathrooms.[43]

On a more personal level, PISSAR members dealt with a second source of shame when they confronted their feelings about their own bodies. The trans-identified members of the group harbored varying degrees of "internalized shame" generated by their "visible queerness" and "genderqueerness."[44] In a visual economy that tolerates LGBTs as long as they seamlessly assimilate or operate within "acceptable stereotypes of gay appearance," the trans members felt the gravitational pull of the politics of respectability practiced by a number of LGBTs.[45] When LGBTs align themselves with or adopt normative cultural markers of sex, gender, and sexuality, they further marginalize those who operate outside these dominant logics. As a result, the genderqueer-identified members reported a general sense of internalized shame that was compounded by the need to discuss their unique needs, as well as the private topic of bodily functions. According to PISSAR, this is an exceptionally difficult task as "we're trained from an early age not to talk publicly about what happens in the bathroom; we don't even have *language* for what happens in there; many of us still rely on the euphemisms our parents used when we were three."[46] In this way, the genderqueer members had to embrace their doubly stigmatized difference by publicly articulating themselves as pissing and shitting trans bodies.

The disabled members similarly negotiated their identities over and against the corporeal normativities and the discursive propriety associated with public bathrooms. As for the pressure to minimize their differences from the nondisabled, the members stated, "In striving to assimilate to nondisabled norms, many of us gloss over the need for the assistance some of us have in using the bathroom."[47] In a culture defined by ableist norms that can project shame onto disabled bodies, people with disabilities have an incentive to minimize their differences to prevent further stigmatization. For PISSAR's disabled members, these normalizing regimes are compounded by the fact that "particularly in mixed company (that is, in the presence of nondisabled folks), we are reluctant to talk about the odd ways we piss and shit." In the absence of these frank discussions, they felt that "this reticence has hindered our bathroom politics, often making it difficult for us to demand bathrooms that meet all of our needs."[48] These needs, identified on PISSAR's checklist, included: signs denoting the accessibility of the bathroom, stall doors wide enough for wheelchairs, toilets mounted at an accessible height with a generous amount of space around them, the presence of grab bars, accessible toilet paper dispensers, and sinks, soap dispensers, and mirrors placed at an accessible height.[49] Hence, like the genderqueer members, the disabled members had to place their own bodies at risk by publicly marking their difference as pissing and shitting beings.

Finally, the members had a third level of shame to deal with in relation to the mutual articulation of their struggles. In trumpeting PISSAR's coalition-building efforts, I do not mean to suggest that it was an easy endeavor. In the only published history of PISSAR, the members suggested that the shame and stigma associated with queerness and disability proved to be formidable obstacles in their alliance:

> our shame isn't always directed outward, toward the society and institutions that helped create it. It often drives a wedge between communities that might otherwise work together. And it is *precisely* this kind of embodied shame—the shame that we feel in our bodies and the shame that arises out of the experience and appearance of our bodies—that drives the divisions between queer and disability communities. PISSAR initially had trouble bridging this gap, in that some of our straight disabled members worried about the political (read: queer) implications of our bathroom-mapping work.[50]

As this quote evidences, instead of reading the hesitation of the straight-identified disabled members of PISSAR as markers of their fear or hatred of gender-transgressors, they might be better understood within the context of the shame produced by the nefarious intersections of compulsory heterosexuality and disability. As suggested by Alison Kafer, a queer feminist with disabilities who was a member of PISSAR, "compulsory heterosexuality accrues a particular urgency among some segments of the disability community" as "many have wanted to appear 'normal,' 'natural,' and 'healthy' in other aspects of their lives." Therefore, it should come as no surprise that "the larger culture's heterosexism and homophobia are thus reproduced within the disability community."[51] At the same time, the non-disabled genderqueer members of the group had to interrogate their abelist assumptions to overcome the divisions engendered by their desires to "distance themselves from disabled people in

an effort to assert their own normalcy and health."[52] Thus, the members of PISSAR encountered what Kenneth Burke would call the "characteristic invitation to rhetoric" in that they needed to bridge the symbolic divisions generated by these interpenetrating discursive constellations of shame.[53]

These internalized and projected discourses of shame produced division, yet they also contained the seeds of identification through the rhetorical construction of consubstantiality. Breaking down Burke's vocabulary, consubstantiality is achieved when the interests of two distinct individuals are articulated together through "common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, [and] attitudes," or what Burke would term the substance of rhetoric.[54] Importantly, especially for those interested in the politics of identity, consubstantiality requires constant renewal, for even as consubstantiality is an "*acting-together*," it is a temporary identification between those who are "joined and separate, at once a distinct substance and consubstantial with another."[55] Consubstantiality, then, is a fragile union, one in need of continual rhetorical renewal, as it negotiates the competing motives of the concerned parties. As an important addendum to Burke's work, we must consider how the spatial locations of consubstantiality constrain and enable the potential for identification. Contextualizing this discussion in PISSAR's spatial politics engages the problematic, while also demonstrating the possibilities of reanimating shame as a productive discursive element of critically queer and disabled politics.

Critical Queerness and Disability

According to the members of PISSAR, the act of coming together in the campus bathrooms and "repeatedly talking openly about people's need for a safe space to pee helps us break through some of the embodied shame and recognize our common needs."[56] When the disabled members patrolled with the genderqueer members, many of them reported a greater understanding of the fear and anxiety generated by sex-specific bathrooms. In one memorable case of consubstantiality, the members of PISSAR recounted the evolution of a straight-identified disabled man's attitudes toward gender-neutral bathrooms. Once skeptical and dismissive of the need to accommodate genderqueer students and staff, after going out on a few patrols he was able to link his own struggles with his trans counterparts through the language of accessibility.[57] This is not to say that he understood these accessibility issues as equal to one another. Instead, as they state, he was able to "make the connection between disability oppression and genderqueer oppression" which then created favorable conditions for his continued participation in coalitional politics.

Likewise, after the trans members of the group worked together with their disabled colleagues, they understood the spatial dynamics of campus bathrooms in a way that fostered connections between them. Using their checklist, the nondisabled together with the disabled members measured the width, height, and overall accessibility of numerous parts of the bathroom. As they describe it, the checklist operated as a "consciousness-raising tool" among their own members. Several trans/genderqueer members did not understand how inaccessible the campus bathrooms were for many

of the disabled students on campus. For one nondisabled member, "going through the PISSAR checklist caused her to view the entire built world through different eyes."[58] "Rather than focusing on the alleged failures and hardships of disabled bodies," the PISSAR members directed their attention to "the failures and omissions of the built environment—a too-narrow door, a too-high dispenser."[59] By reframing the issue as one of the architectural privileging of "the 'normal' body and its needs," the nondisabled members of PISSAR could start to understand how they and the disabled were both working against corporeal normativities. As they described it, "this switch in focus from the inability of the body to the inaccessibility of the space makes room for activism" between groups that may not initially notice their shared sources of struggle.[60] The nondisabled members realized that ability, like sex, is a naturalized, as opposed to a natural, condition, and the accommodation of ability is a choice that could be made differently to better account for bodies of different sizes, shapes, and mobility.

In this way, PISSAR, unlike many LGBT and queer advocates before them, effectively addressed *both* the shame and stigma directed at their bodies to bolster their coalition. Michael Warner demands that queer coalitions attend to the interrelated and divisive pressures of stigma and shame; otherwise, these coalitions will inevitably incorporate themselves into and thus strengthen, rather than weaken, the social hierarchies that authorize the violence directed at LGBTs. Drawing upon Erving Goffman's work, Warner explains the relationship between stigma and shame as one of identity (stigma) and acts (shame).[61] Unfortunately, too many LGBTs, in Warner's words, have dealt with "ambivalence of belonging to a stigmatized group" by "embrac[ing] the identity but disavow[ing] the act," meaning that LGBTs, with their rainbow flags and Human Rights Commission bumper stickers, latch onto pride in their identity as *the* countervailing affect to the shame directed at their sexual and corporeal practices.[62] However, LGBT investment in pride in their identity often involves a distancing of themselves from the shameful acts that define their identities, which then manifests itself in divisions between "normal" and "deviant" LGBTs. As a result, Warner suggests, the "incoherence and weakness" of LGBT politics are rooted in the decision to "challenge the stigma on identity, but only be reinforcing the shame of sex" and thereby choosing to "articulate the politics of identity rather than become a broader movement targeting the politics of sexual shame."[63] In response to these normalizing pressures, Warner offers an ethics of queer life that embraces shame and abjection as that which binds together and hence should guide queer politics: "Queers can be abusive, insulting, and vile toward one another but because abjection is understood to be the shared condition, they also know how to communicate through such camaraderie a moving and unexpected form of generosity." Warner further states, "no one is beneath its reach, not because it prides itself on generosity, but because it prides itself on nothing. The rule is: Get over yourself . . . At its best, this ethic cuts against every form of hierarchy you could bring into the room."[64] PISSAR's simultaneous challenging of the stigma and shame of disabled and trans pissing and shitting bodies provides an instructive example for

how we can initiate coalitional politics that trouble the sexual and corporeal normativities of public spaces.

By articulating their coalitional work in the particular space of campus bathrooms, PISSAR avoided the potential pitfalls associated with single-issue identity politics, namely allowing the differences between similarly situated individuals to overwhelm their synergistic merger. When crafting their mission statement, the members of PISSAR, composed primarily of graduate students with an interest in queer and/or disability studies, explicitly stated their commitment to "multi-identity organizing" as well as "working in tandem with other interest groups on campus and elsewhere."[65] Explicitly identifying themselves elsewhere as a queer organization, they further clarified their investment in a "*queer* queerness" that "encompasses both sexually and medically queer bodies, that embraces a diversity of appearances and disabilities and needs." PISSAR translated this critical attitude into their checklist which they described as "a manifesto of sorts" that "models *queer* coalition-building by incorporating disability, genderqueer, childcare, and menstruation issues into one document, refusing single-issue analysis."[66]

PISSAR, a self-described "coalition group of disability and genderqueer activists," may be best understood then as the fusion of critically queer and disabled politics. First advanced by Butler, the concept of critical queerness is meant to highlight the fact that queer, as a category of identity and site of cultural agency, must "remain that which is, in the present, never fully owned, but always and only redeployed, twisted, queered from a prior usage and in the direction of urgent and expanding political purposes."[67] Seeing it as a necessary precondition for the radical democratization of queer politics, Butler asks us to resist the temptation to circumscribe queerness by embracing and "affirm[ing] the contingency of the term: to let it be vanquished by those who are excluded by the term but who justifiably expect representation by it" and "to let it take on meanings that cannot now be anticipated by a younger generation whose political vocabulary may well carry a very different set of investments."[68] Embracing a critically queer attitude, PISSAR's mobilization of queerness refused to define it narrowly along identical lines of sexuality, choosing instead to inaugurate an interrogation of the bigendered and abled normativities associated with public bathrooms.

Of course, assigning temporal and spatial fluidity and contingency to queerness is not meant to render it a completely empty signifier. Rather, the emphasis here is on resisting the stable noun form of "queer" in favor of its usage as a contextual adjective and active verb.[69] Crip theorist (crip theory is to disability studies what queer theory is to LGBT studies) Robert McRuer further differentiates between virtual and critical queerness, a distinction based on the actions of the queer subject. As McRuer argues, "a virtually queer identity" can be "experienced by anyone who fail[s] to perform heterosexuality without contradiction and incoherence (i.e., everyone)" while a "critically queer perspective [would] presumably mobilize the inevitable failure to approximate the norm, collectively 'working the weakness in the norm.'"[70] McRuer's interest in these terms rests primarily in their translation to disability contexts to differentiate between living a disabled life (virtual disability) and acts where disabled

individuals and groups "have resisted the demands of compulsory able-bodiedness and have demanded access to a newly imagined and newly configured public sphere where full participation is not contingent on an able body" (critical disability).[71] These distinctions prevent the all-too-easy equivocations made in the declarations that everyone is queer, and, if they live long enough, disabled—a move meant to universalize these identities while simultaneously neutralizing their radical potential to unsettle unquestioned institutional, corporeal, and spatial normativities.

In this particular case, PISSAR's attention to the material effectivities of the spatial normativities that failed to account for disabled and gender-transgressive bodies provided the inventional resources necessary to animate a critically queer and disabled politics. Composed primarily of educators, the members of PISSAR identified their activism as "a teaching model in and of itself" by "combin[ing] education with social change," and we would be well-served by further investigating how they embodied a critical corrective that challenges the devaluation or ignorance of material space in radical democratic theory.[72] As outlined above, I understand critical queerness and critical disability to be radical democratic projects. With that said, as critical geographer Michael Brown rightly notes, the theorization of radical democracy generally "lacks any sort of geographical imagination" as it often fails "to consider that citizens are always engaging in politics in actual locations."[73] Like Shome, Brown finds the use of spatial metaphors (e.g. "creating space" for a practice or group) especially irksome as its risks "import[ing] fixed, essentialized notions of space into the geographical imagination of political theory (to the extent that it actually has one)."[74] Figurative or discursive space alone could not solve the issue of safe and accessible campus bathrooms. Therefore, out of logistical and political necessity, PISSAR's enactment of radical democracy had to take place in the actual space of the campus bathrooms.

The PISSAR patrols provide a potent rejoinder to those who dismiss queer and disability studies' potential for praxis. Situated on a university campus and composed largely of graduate students with an interest in queer and/or disability studies, PISSAR actively articulated their theoretical training to their political activities. In their description of the PISSAR patrols, one group of members framed the connections in the following way: "Because the bathroom is our site, and the body in search of a bathroom is our motivation, we recognized early on the need to be concerned with the body and theory together. PISSAR's work is an attempt at embodying theory, at theorizing from the body."[75] PISSAR patrol members armed with rubber gloves and tape measures utilized a checklist that covered disability accessibility and gender safety issues as well as the accessibility and supply of tampons and pads, and the presence of a changing table. Fully aware of the risks associated with their actions, yet still wanting to gather the necessary information in an "unapologetically public way," PISSAR established guidelines to reduce the risk of harassment and violence, including working during the day in groups of three, at least one person would wear PISSAR's bright yellow t-shirt to raise awareness of the group while also establishing a justification for their spatial transgression, and, finally, making an effort to include persons of varying gender identities.[76] By coming

together and working together in bathrooms, the different members of PISSAR placed their own bodies at risk while also experiencing the discomfort and anxieties experienced by others. In this way, PISSAR members enacted a radical democratic politics that utilized space as a generative locus for critically queer and disabled politics built upon the appropriation of shame.

Pissing Off Power

At the conclusion of their patrols, PISSAR confirmed their suspicion that their campus bathrooms presented serious obstacles for disabled and trans students and staff. With regard to disabled accessibility, PISSAR reported that of the "approximately 50 single-stall restrooms identified by UCSB as both accessible *and* gender-neutral . . . a majority of restrooms (including those at Health Services) [were] not fully wheelchair accessible and up to ADA codes."[77] PISSAR also found the gender-neutral bathrooms to be riddled with problems as "many 'gender-neutral' bathrooms were incorrectly marked with poor signage, and most [were] functioning as de facto men's rooms because of their placement directly next to specifically marked women's rooms;" these bathrooms were far from safe in that the created "embarrassing and dangerous" situations for genderqueers.[78] Armed with these results, PISSAR met with university administrators, including the Chancellor of the University of California system, to demand a solution to these problems. In response to PISSAR's arguments, the Transgender Law and Policy Institute reported UCSB recently "converted 17 single-occupancy restrooms from gendered to gender-neutral and are investigating the feasibility of converting an additional 17."[79] In addition, all future major construction on the UCSB campus will include gender-neutral bathrooms.[80]

In the end, PISSAR seems to have been a temporary coalition, one that withered away once their rhetorical exigencies were addressed by the university administration. Their website is defunct, and many of the members have moved on to other campuses. However, they undoubtedly learned valuable lessons about how to participate in coalitional politics.

Reconsidering Time, Space, and Resistance

PISSAR's particular practice of coalitional politics, one motivated by the overcoming of stigma and shame and emphasizing the rhetoricity of place, space, and identity, brings to light three important issues about the effectivities of critically queer and disabled politics. First, public bathrooms reflect cultural biases that erect potential barriers for individuals who prefer to participate in public life. For genderqueers and people with disabilities, the seemingly natural system of sexual segregation creates limiting and dangerous places hostile to extended public engagement. Rather than accept these conditions as unfortunate realities, PISSAR used their bodies and voices to remind us that these architectural choices are precisely that—choices to conform to hetero-corporo-normativities and therein accommodate the mythic norms of sex, gender, and able-bodiedness. More importantly, PISSAR called attention to other

ways of arranging, marking, constructing, and equipping public bathrooms to lessen the already incredible stigma and shame associated with pissing and shitting in public. While the disabled have some avenues of legal recourse to address issues of accessibility, assuming of course that they can afford the legal representation needed to initiate such challenges, trans people generally do not enjoy comparable legal status as a protected class. If legal scholar Lisa Mottet is correct in her assertion that the courts will generally treat bathroom access for transpeople "as just a minor inconvenience that they do not want to micromanage," we will need to continue this work in venues outside of the courts.[81] It is my hope that this essay makes a compelling case for why all of us should be willing to examine our own pee privilege and thus support efforts like PISSAR's in the name of securing safe and accessible spaces for everyone to piss and shit in peace.

PISSAR's embodied politics raise a second set of issues concerning the rhetorical undoing of place, space, and identity. Rhetorical scholars often treat the space/place of rhetoric's enactment as an inert material reality that serves as an innocent backdrop to the reception of the spoken word. Or, on the other end of the spectrum, the occasion is seen as a determining factor in how the rhetor responds to the rhetorical situation. What I would like to suggest is that neither of these perspectives fully captures the ways place/space relate to the rhetorical production of identity and agency. PISSAR's activism, including the choice to meet in their members' campus bathrooms to confront their shared and different forms of shame, demonstrates Certeau's principle that space is a practiced place where individuals can challenge the power relations meant to exclude them from creating publics more hospitable to their needs. Also, in line with Foucault's theorization of space, PISSAR's embodied resistance to the hetero-corporo-normativities governing public places reminds us that spaces are given meaning through the contestation of identity in those spaces.

Finally, PISSAR's negotiation of stigma and shame provides an instructive example of the kinds of correctives needed to energize critically queer politics and resist the normalizing pressures of liberalism. LGBT investment in pride as the antidote to sexual shame often results in the normalization of LGBT politics. However, instead of trying to rid ourselves of shame, might we mobilize it instead as the nodal point for a broader-based critique that refracts social processes and projections of shame. As Eve Sedgwick eloquently argues, shame cannot be quarantined as stigmatized individuals and groups cannot escape the "permanent, structuring fact of identity" performed by shame, but they can, as Sedgwick suggests, explore the "powerfully productive and powerfully social metamorphic possibilities" of its affect.[82] PISSAR's explicit articulation of the needs of genderqueer and disabled bodies negotiated, through the idioms of shame, spatially-based identifications as a necessary component of political coalition.

PISSAR's explicit declaration of their intentions to animate a "queer queerness" that addressed the various ways in which bodies are disciplined and regulated in public bathrooms provides a useful model for countering the logics of shame that dominate GLBT and queer politics. Queer studies and activism, on Halberstam's reading, must divest itself from "white gay male identity politics," motivated by white

gay male shame, "that focuses its libidinal and other energies on simply rebuilding the self that shame dismantled rather than taking apart the social processes that project shame onto queer subjects in the first place."[83] She continues: "If queer studies is to survive gay shame, and it will, we all need to move far beyond the limited scope of white gay male concerns and interests." Echoing Butler's commentary on critical queerness, Halberstam suggests that queer theorists and activists must be willing to learn from and adopt the intersectional critiques forwarded by those steeped in feminist, ethnic studies, and I would add crip theory/disability studies to the list.[84] Critically queer groups such as PISSAR that define themselves broadly as coalitions countering related forms of domination provide a provocative model for thinking outside of the logics of gay white male shame. And in a rhetorical culture where normalcy is the dominant trope, this is an urgent task indeed.

Notes

[1] I consciously employ "people with disabilities" and "disability" over other terms because these are the terms preferred by the majority, if not all, of the authors I cite. As with all identity categories, we must be attentive to linguistic self-determination and the cultural-political work performed by these identity markers. Unfortunately, according to Simi Linton, many terms meant to mark the agency of those with disabilities (such as "differently-abled" or "physically challenged") "convey the boosterism and do-gooder mentality endemic to the paternalistic agencies that control many disabled people's lives." *Claiming Disability: Knowledge and Identity* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 14.

[2] As Robert McRuer explains, LGBTs and people with disabilities often serve as metaphors for the other through "conflation and stereotype: people with disabilities are often understood as somehow queer (as paradoxical stereotypes of the asexual or oversexual person with disabilities would suggest), while queers are often understood as somehow disabled (as an ongoing medicalization of identity, similar to what people with disabilities more generally encounter, would suggest)." "Compulsory Able-Bodiedness and Queer/Disabled Existence," in *Disability Studies: Enabling the Humanities*, ed. Sharon Snyder, Brenda Jo Brueggemann, and Rosemarie Garland-Thomson (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 2002), 94.

[3] For more on the anxieties generated by queer liberalism, see David Eng, Judith Halberstam, and José Esteban Muñoz, "What's Queer About Queer Studies Now?," *Social Text* 23 (2005): 1–17. Like Santiago Solis, I use "hetero-corporo-normativity" to highlight the interrelated logics of able-bodiedness and heterosexuality. "Snow White and the Seven 'Dwarfs'—Queercripped," *Hypatia* 22 (2007): 129. I add "homo" to this term to mark the potential for sexual minorities to participate in these normativities.

[4] This list is adapted from one generated by Carrie Sandahl, "Queering the Crip or Cripping the Queer? Intersections of Queer and Crip Identities in Solo Autobiographical Performances," *GLQ* 9 (2003): 26. There are, of course, important differences between these two populations. As Ellen Samuels notes, the commonalities are strained when issues such as visibility and coming out are factored into the analogy for there are a number of disabilities that are not optically obvious. "My Body, My Closet: Invisible Disability and the Limits of Coming-out Discourse," *GLQ* 9 (2003): 233–55. Thus, while many of the disability issues discussed here involve physical impediments created by human-designed architecture, I understand "disability" as a category of identification that encompasses more than physical impairment.

[5] Rob Kitchin and Robin Law, "The Socio-Spatial Construction of (In)Accessible Public Toilets," *Urban Studies* 38 (2001): 289.
[6] "Genderqueer" often refers to individuals who refuse traditional sexual and gender markers such as "woman" or "man," and the attendant gender expectation with these categories.
[7] Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984), 117.
[8] Ibid., xix.
[9] Ibid., 36.
[10] Ibid., 35.
[11] Certeau, *Everyday Life*, 35.
[12] Steve Pile, "Introduction: Opposition, Political Identities and Spaces of Resistance," in *Geographies of Resistance*, ed. Steve Pile and Michael Keith (London: Routledge, 1997), 16.
[13] Steve Pile and Michael Keith, "Preface," in *Geographies of Resistance*, ed. Steve Pile and Michael Keith (London: Routledge), xi.
[14] While not considered in the text, two strands of inquiry in communication studies are notable exceptions to this rule. First, numerous essays have dealt with the connection of memory, identity, and place/space in venues such as museums and memorial sites. Second, critics concerned with counterpublics have taken up the issues of rhetoric and space in a sustained fashion. Most notably, Phaedra Pezzullo's ethnographic study of toxic tours poignantly captures the transformative possibilities of cultural performances in the spaces of corporate pollution. *Toxic Tourism: Rhetorics of Pollution, Travel, and Environmental Justice* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2007). My essay complements this work by attending to the mundane production of identity in the unremarkable spaces of everyday life.
[15] Raka Shome, "Space Matters: The Power and Practice of Space," *Communication Theory* 13 (2003): 40.
[16] Ibid., 40.
[17] Ibid., 43.
[18] Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings, 1972–1977* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 149.
[19] Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," *Diacritics* 16 (1986): 23.
[20] David Sibley, *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West* (London: Routledge, 1995), 72.
[21] Ruth Holliday and John Hassard, "Contested Bodies: An Introduction," in *Contested Bodies*, ed. Ruth Holliday and John Hassard (London: Routledge, 2001), 13.
[22] Jodie Marksamer and Dylan Vade, *Gender Neutral Bathroom Survey* (San Francisco: San Francisco Human Rights Commission, 2002), n.p.
[23] Judith Halberstam, *Female Masculinity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998), 22.
[24] Ibid., 20.
[25] Richard M. Juang, "Transgendering the Politics of Recognition," in *Transgender Rights*, ed. Paisley Currah, Richard Juang, and Shannon Price Minter (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), 247.
[26] Kath Browne, "Genderism and the Bathroom Problem: (Re)Materialising Sexed Sites, (Re)Creating Sexed Bodies," *Gender, Place and Culture* 11 (2004): 338.
[27] Patricia Cooper and Ruth Oldenziel, "Cherished Classifications: Bathrooms and the Construction of Gender/Race on the Pennsylvania Railroad During World War II," *Feminist Studies* 25 (1999): 15.
[28] Halberstam, *Female Masculinity*, 24.
[29] Tim Cresswell, *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 149.
[30] Doreen Massey, "Entanglements of Power: Reflections," in *Entaglements of Power: Geographies of Domination/Resistance* (London: Routledge, 2000), 282. See also, Massey, *For Space* (London: Sage, 2005), 25–30, 45–8.

[31] Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 7.
[32] Lise Nelson, "Bodies (and Spaces) Do Matter: The Limits of Performativity," *Gender, Place and Culture* 6 (1999): 331–53.
[33] Robyn Longhurst, *Bodies: Exploring Fluid Boundaries* (London: Routledge, 2001), 5.
[34] Lynn Stewart, "Bodies, Visions, and Spatial Politics: A Review Essay on Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space*," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 13 (1995): 610.
[35] Brett Genny Beemyn, "Making Campuses More Inclusive of Transgender Students," *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education* 3 (2005): 81–2.
[36] Simone Chess, Alison Kafer, Jessi Quizar, and Mattie Udora Richardson, "Calling all Bathroom Revolutionaries," in *That's Revolting: Queer Strategies for Resisting Assimilation*, ed. Mattilda (Brooklyn, NY: Soft Skull Press, 2004), 190.
[37] Ibid., 189.
[38] Ibid., 192.
[39] Twyla Ilyne Johnson, "Aunt Flo Faces Unending Flow," *Daily Nexus*, January 23, 2003, http://www.dailynexus.com/article.php?a=4255 (accessed June 15, 2007).
[40] Chess et al., "Calling all Bathroom," 191.
[41] Chess et al., "Calling all Bathroom," 193.
[42] "PISSAR Mission and Goals," http://www.uweb.ucsb.edu/~schess/organizations/pissar/mission.html (accessed June 15, 2007).
[43] Chess et al., "Calling all Bathroom," 194.
[44] Ibid.,194.
[45] Ibid., 193.
[46] Ibid., 193.
[47] Ibid., 194.
[48] Ibid, 194.
[49] "PISSAR Patrol Checklist," http://www.uweb.ucsb.edu/~schess/organizations/pissar/checklist.htm (accessed June 15, 2007).
[50] Chess et al., "Calling all Bathroom," 196.
[51] Alison Kafer, "Compulsory Bodies: Reflections on Heterosexuality and Able-Bodiedness," *Journal of Women's History* 15, (2003): 82–3.
[52] Chess et al., "Calling all Bathroom," 197.
[53] Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950), 25.
[54] Ibid., 21.
[55] Ibid., 21.
[56] Chess, et al., "Calling all Bathroom," 197.
[57] Ibid., 201.
[58] Ibid., 201.
[59] Ibid., 200.
[60] Ibid., 200.
[61] Michael Warner, *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 28.
[62] Ibid., 33.
[63] Ibid., 31.
[64] Ibid., 35.
[65] "PISSAR Mission and Goals."
[66] Chess et al., "Calling all Bathrooms," 197.
[67] Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits Of "Sex"* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 228.
[68] Ibid., 230.
[69] Janet Jakobsen, "Queer Is? Queer Does? Normativity and the Problem of Resistance," *GLQ* 4 (1998): 511–36.

[70] Robert McRuer, *Crip Theory: Cultural Signs of Queerness and Disability* (New York: New York University Press, 2006), 30.
[71] Ibid., 30.
[72] "PISSAR Mission and Goals."
[73] Michael Brown, *Replacing Citizenship: AIDS Activism & Radical Democracy* (New York: Guilford Press, 1997), 15–14.
[74] Ibid., 184.
[75] Chess et al., "Calling all Bathrooms," 192.
[76] Ibid., 191, 201.
[77] "Minutes from Eucalyptus Meeting," July 23, 2003, http://www.uweb.ucsb.edu/~schess/organizations/pissar/Eucalyptus%20Meeting.htm (accessed June 15, 2007).
[78] Ibid.
[79] Transgender Law and Policy Institute, "College/Universities and K-12 Schools," http://www.transgenderlaw.org/college/index.htm (accessed June 15, 2007).
[80] Patricia Leigh Brown, "A Quest for a Restroom That's Neither Men's Room or Female's Room," *New York Times*, March 4, 2005, http://www.nytimes.com/2005/03/04/national/04bathroom.html?ex=1184212800&en=80c1b6e99582ed3c&ei=5070 (accessed June 15, 2007).
[81] Lisa Mottet, "Access to Gender-Appropriate Bathrooms: A Frustrating Diversion on the Path to Transgender Equality," *Georgetown Journal of Gender and the Law* 4 (2003): 744.
[82] Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, "Queer Performativity: Henry James's *the Art of the Novel*." *GLQ* 1 (1993): 14.
[83] Judith Halberstam, "Shame and White Gay Masculinity," *Social Text* 23 (2005): 220, 224.
[84] Ibid.," 224.

Copyright of Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies is the property of National Communication Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.