

**Murray State University**

---

**From the Selected Works of Josh Adair**

---

2015

# Yes/No means No/Yes: (Non)Consensual Rhetoric

Paul Walker, *Murray State University*  
Joshua G Adair



Available at: <https://works.bepress.com/joshua-adair/29/>

## Yes/No Means No/Yes: (Non)Consensual Rhetoric

In preparing to present a paper at the 2014 Watson Conference at the University of Louisville, I wanted it to reflect some of the theoretical work that I was currently doing with queer theory and rhetoric. However, my accepted proposal was based on my article that was published in the *Kentucky English Bulletin* in 2012, a **staid, non-queer** response to what I saw as misguided notions in the implementation of the English Common Core State Standards. Thus, when I arrived in the room to present my paper, I was grouped with others who were speaking **against standardization in education**. As will be shown below, my paper and topic ostensibly fit this theme, but there was no indication in my title nor the title of the panel regarding the provocative piece I was planning to read.

Most everything seems staid once one discovers queer theory.

Did they know that stance is queer?

I was the last of 4 presenters, and through no fault of anyone in particular, but because of how panels go, I had only 10-12 minutes to give my presentation in order to leave time for questions afterwards, which caused me to be a little less relaxed and more rushed than I might have otherwise been. Here is my paper:

### Call and Response: (Re)Claiming the CCSS Definitions of Persuasion and Argument

In Appendix A of the Common Core State Standards, the authors of the document state, “the Standards place special emphasis on writing **logical** arguments as a particularly important form of college- and career-ready writing.” At the time of the CCSS release (the call), many in the rhetoric and composition discipline took issue (the response) with the differentiation between **persuasion and argument** on the basis that persuasion appeals to emotion and “selects” facts to support **opinion**, while argument is based on reason only, offering sound, valid evidence without **manipulation**. The commonwealth of Kentucky was

This doesn't exist.

I read this and think “seduction and forced sex.”

Why don't you just say “persuasion is feminine”? It's faster and more to the point.

the first to adopt the teaching of argument Toulmin as supportive

Insert penis here.

CCSS in full, and Kentucky's approach to the misrepresents George Hillocks and Stephen of this false distinction between argument and

Wait, is one of those Cs for conservatism?

**persuasion.**

As the CCSS continues to “call” across the country, and we continue to “**respond**” to the interpretations and implementations, we recognize that misrepresenting rhetoric and rhetorical instruction of writing, in particular oversimplifying its instruction and assessment in secondary schools, has direct implications at the university level. In this presentation, I briefly review the instructional and evaluative implications of the **template-driven, structure-based teaching** of logical argument that is advocated by the CCSS but contradictory to our field’s research and practices (e.g. Framework for Success in Post-Secondary Writing). Then I suggest **increased exploration** of an emerging response that reimagines rhetorical theory in a way that also reimagines the teaching of argument.

The separation of persuasion from argument on the basis that persuasion consists of ethos and pathos while argument consists of logos has no direct theoretical **foundation**; however, the derivation of the separation could arise from argumentation theory, which focuses developing logical arguments, and Aristotle’s stance that arguing through logos is the preferred method for **ethical persuasion**. But the highly situational nature of persuasion, which we know as kairos, prevents finding in rhetorical instruction a **hierarchical division** among the three audience appeals. No real argument is created in an idealistic space to an audience that is receptive only to logical claims. Despite the attention paid to logic, evidence, and **coherent cohesiveness**, the most prototypical arguments, effective or not, **blend logos, pathos, and ethos together in interesting and unusual ways.**

Unfortunately, the CCSS authors, in trying to help students increase **critical thinking**, undermine student engagement by eliminating the richness of persuasion in the writing of arguments. It is true that, as it says in the CCSS Appendix A, “when teachers ask students to consider two or more perspectives on a topic or issue, something far beyond surface knowledge is required: students must think critically and deeply, assess the validity of their own thinking, and anticipate counterclaims in opposition to their own **assertions.**” However, the

Without this phallusy, how would we cudgel others with the masculine imperative? Wouldn’t people just forget that we must delimit our lived experiences to binaries?

Like congregants? Is Pat Robertson behind this?

How very butch.

Ooh, touchy feely. Someone found his feminine side.

Neither does most contemporary political thought, yet we’re still mired in it.

Austen would have turned out a very different tome were she to have chosen this amended title.

Without hierarchies the proles start to get ideas.

This sounds like a terrifying new adhesive. Or the next show in the conservative radio talk line-up.

I think we can all agree that this sounds a bit fruity.

All at once and without a neural episode? Why not just demand that they levitate? There’s a clear justification here for simplifying the demands that teachers place on students and you’re obviously missing it.

consideration of perspectives must also include an understanding of how to appeal to **actual people** who make those counterclaims or question the writer’s assertions. While the core of an argument can be logical claim and evidence, the ethos of the writer and the way the writer utilizes pathos are not only necessary to get the audience to listen to the core appeal, but also part of the **fun.**

CCSS’s brief discussion leaves too much room for **misinterpretation** of the complexity of writing as both a process of inquiry and the shaping of one’s found knowledge into a persuasive or expository product for others. Kentucky’s approach to the teaching of **argument** illustrates this problem by misrepresenting George Hillocks and Stephen Toulmin as supportive of the false distinction between argument and persuasion. In an issue of the Kentucky Department of Education’s (KDE) newsletter (***Literacy Link***) for language arts teachers, a lead article pushes the distinction further than the CCSS Appendix A. One statement from that article intimates persuasion as lacking truth: “ Argument reveals a truth for a reader (or for a listener), while persuasion actively attempts to change the mind of the reader (or **listener**).” Further, teachers statewide are provided the following list of characteristics of both argument and persuasion:

**Argument**

- intends to provide insight offering a **verifiable** perspective for the audience
- offers sound, **logically-presented** reasoning to convince the audience
- supports reasoning with **valid evidence**
- considers opposing **viewpoints**
- provides rationale to clarify the relevance and validity of **evidence**

**Persuasion**

- intends to change the audience’s mind about an issue and/or to motivate the audience to take action
- is often based on the writer’s or speaker’s opinion
- attempts to influence the perspective of the audience by appealing to their emotions, their sense of right and wrong or to their sense of **who they are**
- selects facts and emotion to support **opinion**

Are you actually suggesting students belong in this category?

You heard this on NPR, didn’t you?

It could be a thousand pages long and we’d still willfully mis- or re-interpret it. I think it’s because of those made skills you describe in the preceding paragraphs. Well, that and, we’re impish.

It’s called the Bible. Please refer to it by name.

I nominate *Missing Link* as the publication’s name going forward.

C’mon baby...

I thought -ly words weren’t hyphenated.

Can it be evidence if it’s invalid?

If we start engaging other viewpoints, won’t that just lead to greater awareness and acceptance?

Are you telling me these discrete elements are actually inextricably intermingled? Have you told Rene D. this?

Maliciously, of course, woman-scorned style. It seems like that an infographic of a vagina dentata ought to appear here.

hehehe

Come again?

- may focus on the positive benefits or the potential negative outcomes that may result if the audience accepts the **call-to-action**

Coming from an authoritative source (KDE) to teachers around the state, the list has official credibility, and perhaps only a few teachers will question the pejorative characterization that persuasion “selects facts and emotion to support opinion.” In our field, we know that such a statement is true for the opposite reasons than this list expresses, for that is what invention requires, and we understand the selection, reflection, and deflection of reality in the Burkean terministic screen sense.

Further, the Kentucky *Literacy Link* quotes Hillocks as saying “... the process of working through an argument is the process of inquiry[, which] at its very beginning is the examination of data, not the invention of a thesis statement in a **vacuum**” – in the same breath, so to speak, as encouraging a strict Toulmin-based structure of an argument that begins with a clear claim and supports it with evidence, warrants, rebuttals and a conclusion. The problem with this is that Hillocks’ statement on inquiry is universally accepted but hardly practiced because of the seeming ease of Toulmin’s “template” for writing logical arguments. In reality, the so-called “Toulmin Method” emerged as a criticism of “rigidly deductive” formal arguments, not a template for writing an effective one. That doesn’t mean that he wouldn’t expect the elements he identifies to be present in an good argument, but he prefaced *The Uses of Argument* saying, “In no way had I set out to expound a theory of rhetoric or argumentation . . . still less had I in mind an analytical model like that which . . . came to be called ‘the Toulmin **model**’” (vii). **The biggest clue that Toulmin is misrepresented** is how frequently I hear teachers saying that students must make their claims and warrants clear to the reader. The *Literacy Link* states that a good argument must “include a **warrant**” explaining how the evidence supports the claim (the warrant helps the audience understand why the evidence supports the claim; it also helps them draw the intended conclusions).” However, we know Toulmin establishes that warrants are and should be implicit -- they are sometimes backed explicitly, but always left unsaid – in the same way that Aristotle defined the enthymeme as a syllogism with

Do you remember when W did this about the Middle East and WMDs? I’m so grateful for sound logic.

Doesn’t he mean “those who vacuum ought not create theses”?

Is he cherry-picking from his own brain? He might want to familiarize himself with those guidelines, ‘cause I’m pretty sure he’s in violation.

Aren’t you just relying on feelings here? Are you sure you’re not just being overly sensitive?

I’d like a hyperlink to a Warrant video.

its obvious premise left out. As we know, according to Toulmin, a warrant is what **the audience knows already** and therefore not necessary to include in writing. Warrants are useful to identify when one analyzes an argument, but to turn it around and ask students to explicitly state their warrants in their writing alters their very nature.

In the past 50 years or so since argument has been **taught in earnest** at the high school and university levels, the structure of an argument – based partly on Toulmin’s work – has been the most common strategy for the instruction of writing **arguments**. However, while university instruction has attempted to move beyond structural instruction –the five-paragraph form – K-12 writing instruction still relies on a structural approach to teaching academic writing, even while many teachers despise the form and grudgingly admit to using it because they are **told** to or because **other methods they’ve tried “don’t work.”** The real problem with the “argument/persuasion” distinction is the presumption that **a logical argument is structured in a certain correct way**, and deviations from that structure put at risk its logical, argumentative **“purity,”** which threatens, for one thing, its ability to be **assessed consistently**. I’d like a hyperlink to a purity ball site. Insert goose-stepping infographic here.

I am going to completely change the way I am talking about this –the purity of the structured argument is what makes Composition so **impervious to queer theory**; or, as Jonathan Alexander and Jacqueline Rhodes said – **queer is composition’s distinction made persuasion, as carried means that argument template that acts as paragraph structure is fuck it, or, don’t fuck we can’t keep these some point we know**

Ok, but isn’t the real issue here that once queer seeps into the composition classroom that it immediately become a *de facto* piercing parlor/BDSM dungeon? I mean I accidentally let it in once and within 24 hours there was a prod and a butcher’s apron awaiting me in my department mailbox. I was forced to change universities and start wearing team jerseys everywhere.

**impossible subject.** The between argument and out in secondary schools is structured as a strict **a chastity belt**; the five-pure and virginal, so don’t with it. However, we know **kids’ pants on**, and so at they will have **sex**, and so

By George, I’ve got it! The problem herein is that such missives make clear that we cannot assume our audiences know anything. I mean anything!

Earnestness is choking the life force out of this country. It’s unassailable and pervasive.

So the shadow puppets I’ve been using aren’t part of the “best practices” pantheon?

Teachers of the world unite!

The Rhythm Method hasn’t been universally successful.

Well, duh. Can you imagine the chaos that would ensue if we allowed for creative thought and free expression? What if started allowing students to submit essays with marginalia or potentially offensive hyperlinks? Are you trying to incite a riot?

Well, that and gatekeeping academics.

... BDSM dungeon uniform

What?!?!? Children and sex? Are you a pedophile?

Not if they pray hard enough and completely disregard the statistics about teen pregnancy and STIs in abstinence-only states.

sometime in **high school** or in first-year composition, we will deem them ready to break out of the five-paragraph essay, but still make sure make sure they fuck and write in the proper **argumentative way: heterosexually**, missionary style, absolutely nothing kinky or out of bounds.

[During my presentation, as I read the previous sentence, I recognize that there is a **young** Um, of course there was. **child** who kept covering her ears at any mention Just like “every time a bell rings and angel gets its wings,” every time you found out attempt to insert sexuality into rhet/comp discussions a “hear no evil” child daughter of manifests to chastise your grandmother accompanied just announce the absence of a Santa Claus? **grandmother** **directing** clear that the of what to **do**. I but I went **on**, though I paused at one point and looked at them in the back and sheepishly said, “**Sorry**.” But I didn’t change **anything**, and continued]:

Some things just can’t be taken back, ejaculating being one of them.

You’d found your rhythm.

I hope you don’t think I am out of bounds **here** – I am drawing on work in our discipline that rarely mentions sex as sex, yet is overlaid by notions that have been enervating in queer theory: ambience, attunement, subjectivity and objectivity, and **failure**. D. Diane Davis, for example, uses unpredictable laughter to break up the “rhetoric of spoke of earlier – structural, to maintain a **heterosexual**, that dismisses not only way that she suggests – a neither inserts or envelops, liberating laughter – like

Insert penis here.

totality,” which is the rhetoric that I rigid, and **erected** in place in order **masculine, capitalist order the feminine**, but also the third way of writing and speaking that but **erupts** in uncomfortable but the unpredictability of *jouissance* or

NOT THE CHILDREN!!!  
Insert: “masculine,” “manly,” “phallic” or “penisy” (that’s my neologism, you’re welcome).

I’d like some (explicit) examples here. Remember to provide evidence (preferably pictorial) for all claims.

I hope you were pleased with yourself, you monster.

So you’re offending youth and elder alike? Have you no decency?

Well of course. She was channeling the “sad women in the basement” while you metaphorically dry-humped the audience to completion.

Because weapons weren’t permitted at the conference venue? I’m confused.

Because you didn’t want to get blue balls?

Uncontrolled nose growth, Pinocchio.

Sexy time, all the time.

Why not just say “normal”?

We feminines are completely used to such treatment. It’s what we get for wielding emotion like a professor with a mouthful of profanity delivering a paper to a child and her grandmother at an academic conference.

I’m titillated and disgusted.

the unanticipated bodily pleasure in the **throes of orgasm**. That third way Davis mentions is related to what Victor Vitanza calls a “**radical passivity**,” refusing the assertion, or insertion, that totality rhetoric demands and expects. **The phallic**

**insertion of rhetorical intention** is at the center of argument – it acts with purpose, with desire, and with **power** to speak or write at the right moment. There is nothing radical about rhetorical argumentation, it sticks it in the audience because it is in the dominant position, presuming its own pleasure and orgasm merely by the space it occupies and knowing that the repetitive thrusting sameness leads to the eruption of knowing one has accomplished its part of the sex or rhetorical **Act**.

[At around this point in my reading, the young girl and her grandmother **left the room. I continued**]:

Of course you did.

But what we have learned from Davis’ breaking up has not led to better sex or more orgasms; rather, those who picked up her streams of thought and broken pieces of rhetoric have **ignored sex altogether** – they reject the missionary position in favor of **counter positions**, but never try kama sutra. Yes, scholars like Byron Hawk, Sid Dobrin, Krista Ratcliffe, Matthew Heard, Cheryl Glenn, and Thomas Rickert have taken up the kinky stuff, without saying **so**, calling for attunement, listening to alterity and posthumanist object oriented ontologies that constitute the ambience of our interactions. Rather than the **phallic certainty** of classical rhetorical theory and the linearity of the reproductive structurations of sex, the talk of ambience and attunement affords **the alternative positions**, positionalities, experiences, and attempts that Composition would call perverse, impure, and impossible. “**What do we do now?**” Paul Lynch asks, representative of all those **conventional compositionists** and graduate teaching assistants told to keep it **straight** – don’t veer away from the known, the normal, the teachable, the assessable, the purposeful.

I was once a straight teaching assistant. Then I found skinny black velvet pants at H&M. That was about a week before I accidentally late-admitted queer into my comp course.

You mean to say that orgasm carries more cultural meaning than avoiding the wet spot and feeling sleepy?

This sounds rapey.

Not to mention rock hard, throbbing rigidity. It’s intention is way girthier than other guys’.

Regardless of whether it was with a bismarck, a blow-up doll, or a *bona fide* blonde.

*Coitus interruptus* much?

Dear god. How boring.

Tell me more about these so-called “counter positions”? Kitchen counters? Store counters? What would you be wearing?

Ah, they’re non-verbals then? Is there grunting?

Who doesn’t miss the 1950s?

Reverse cowgirl? Green party?

Lay back and think of England.

Every other Saturday, after the kids are asleep and only for 10 minutes. I smell despair.

Thus, composition continues to be very **straight**. It takes itself very seriously, and its sex satisfies **those in charge**, or in the charge – orgasm likely occurs for the phallus, and perhaps, with a just **little hand stimulation, the receptor reaches orgasm also**. But the act is How deliciously clinical. It's almost like that vagina isn't attached to a human body. **so serious, taken so seriously, and so fraught with purpose and expectation, that it never affords FUN, let alone queer marginality and radicalism.**

**J. Jack Halberstam**, in *The Queer Art of Failure*, reminds us:

Being taken seriously means missing out on the chance to be frivolous, promiscuous, and **irrelevant**. The desire to be taken seriously is precisely what compels people to follow the tried and true paths of knowledge production around which I would like to map a few detours. Indeed terms like serious and rigorous tend to be code words, in academia as well as other contexts, for disciplinary correctness; they signal a form of training and learning that confirms what is already known according to approved methods of knowing, but they do not allow for visionary insights or flights of fancy.

(page)

The distinction set up by the CCSS between argument and persuasion is miles below any opportunities for “flights of fancy” – those **undisciplined** moments that Vitanza and others have called for over the years. I respond neither in favor of argument nor persuasion as a way **forward**, for both are **woefully inadequate** as either a call or response for writing instruction. **Speaking of which, why haven't you mentioned ED?** Instead, I find something satisfying in the proximate,

in the unknowable and unpredictable orgasmic **jouissance** of being-with; in the dancing turns that heed rhythms without predetermined **choreography**. By letting “what we do” occur because of “where we are,” I attempt to avoid shoe-horning

**queerness** into the current model of composition, which is impossible. Rather, What's this “shoe-horning” of which you speak, and how do I get it on it? **this response infuses the practice of teaching composition with queer, and accepts more than tolerates** the erupting incommensurabilities.

Yeah, like black socks left on during sex. Who will never admit they're actually in charge. They're not in the dominatrix industry, after all.

We queers understand that finishing oneself off isn't as undignified as it seems. Live a little.

Do you expect an academic audience to take a transgender person seriously?

Touche -

Insert audio of bullwhip snap here. Also considering inserting Mapplethorpe self-portrait. “Instead I propose to continue terrifying and sully the defenseless, young and old, with my perverse, profane pontifications.”

Ooh la la, Fancypants.

Even if it does look like a seizure.

This is starting to sound very multicultural education. Let's all join hands and appreciate, while ultimately ignoring, our differences.

In other words, we can resist trying to be purveyors of a foolproof, **always improving** classroom practice, to temper the championing of the politically correct **coming-out** story or the token LGBT text as cure-all **emblems** of diversity and acceptance achieved. These gestures foster no substantial difference; rather, they operate surprisingly as another **insertive masculine** and **capitalistic neoliberal multiculturalism** that prioritizes **lip service** over **critical engagement**. Mmm, tasty

As concerned as I was a few years ago when I first responded to Kentucky's calling out of argument and persuasion, I don't care anymore to overcome or skirt or erase the difficulties of learning (or teaching). Such is a **mastubatory dream** of ill-informed politicians and administrators. I refuse to center on student success because it is grounded in the classical rhetorical assertion of heterosexuality. I reject such an insistence of certain ejaculatory purpose at the expense of uncertain pleasure. **To pull out**, to refuse to focus on our own and

our students' upward progress and improvement is beneficially liberating and frustrating, but it comes from a Sherriff's Station. You've clearly violated all laws of manhood. **queer-inspired dismissal of YEAH! Screw the breeders!** **phallic futurity** enveloped

in a pure, receptive pedagogy. This is what queer theory elicits for composition, what happens **when sex and rhetoric speak to each other**, what happens when they aren't forced to hide behind the disciplinary and legitimating structures that prevent **fucking and writing with impropriety. Thank you.** No, thank you.

And I sat **down**. During the Q&A, an audience member said that he thought we should talk about what just happened because **he has never seen a situation like it, and it troubled him** that my presentation on inclusiveness -- his word -- ended up **excluding people** (no one knew who the girl and her grandmother were – I assumed it was another academic who brought **her** daughter). In response to the man's comment, another woman commented about the conference theme -- responsivity -- and said she didn't want to critique me,

Ha! You can smell the decomposition in my classroom. The DNC sponsored my coming out. My opponent won. Electro-shock therapy? Like a leather daddy? Size queens? Mom, is that you?

Tell me more, tell me more, tell me more...

A future filled with nothing but cocks? For only \$3.99 a minute, but like all conservative states, in extreme seclusion far from prying eyes. Or ears. Or latex novelties. Sounds messy. I'm guessing points will be deducted for penmanship.

“Rolled over, spent and wanting a cigarette...” “I've never done this before, be gentle...Not like THAT!”

So it wasn't an open group thing? The Child is the hottest new accessory for academics. Get with it. I have a striped one that goes with everything.

but at the same time thought I was interestingly **unresponsive** to the audience in the situation. I was **ready to respond**, but then another question was asked that addressed other presenter's **papers** and soon the time was up on our panel.

But after the session was over, several people remained to talk about what happened with me, saying, in essence, that a 6-year-old in a conference presentation is unexpected, and the demands of the situation are that one continues to present what one planned to present -- academic decorum, etc. My message was intended for the conference audience, and important for people to hear, therefore, the decision to continue with the presentation took precedence over everything else, including the **child**. I countered these generous comments by saying that I did exactly what my paper said: I overpowered the room with argumentative rhetoric and the message I wanted to **deliver**. If, to use my paper's frame, the situation were described by sex, I was the partner insistent on my own orgasm, and my partner was saying, "I'm not comfortable with what you are doing," but I just kept thrusting and doing it without attending to the expressed **concern**.

The reaction of my colleagues when I said this was their eyes growing wider and nodding their heads, saying, "Well, yes. That's true." They couldn't deny I was to **blame** if the sexual, but they **me**, not wanting to unusualness and unpredictability of the **situation**. I didn't allow them to absolve me, and I let them know that I was at fault; as a speaker I chose not to alter my language because I chose to prioritize what I thought the audience needed to hear over a **small part** of the audience's opposition to what I was saying, even though I knew it was happening. And, I failed to respond in a way that undermined or altered the **masculinity of rhetoric**. Which is why, I discussed with them, sex makes an interesting and enlightening lens for analysis of rhetoric and composition. I did not feel badly about how I acted, nor could I answer one of my colleague's inquiry as to what I would do if such a situation were to happen **again**.

So she didn't cum?

Uh, huh. "Sorry, babe, I'll getcha next time."

Oh, so her failed response was someone else's response?

Keep thrusting! Don't stop! Harder, deeper!

You sure did, you beast! What a stud!

IF this were sex...

Some lovers don't just look to get off.

"I swear, this has never happened to me before!"

She's a human being!

So rugged and intoxicating.

Carbon copy, dude. You nailed it.

There is no satisfactory **answer**, and that was the obstacle of most of my colleagues and created the response in them to **assuage** me. But I wouldn't be **assuaged**, even as I retold the story to others and – I recognized that I am ambivalent interpretations of the situation and neither **satisfied nor dissatisfied** in not leaping to some definitive action or rationalization. In recalling the situation, it was unbelievable, in my eyes, that by random chance one of the few things that could possibly disrupt my presentation occurred, and it perfectly illustrated, for me and others, the point that I was trying to make about rhetoric's **entitled power**, as well as its troubling imperative to ignore ambience, especially the unexpected and (purposefully) unnoticed.

There is another element to this, I think, which emerges from Lee Edelman's critique of reproductive futurity and the sacrosanct importance of protecting the Child, or protecting the world for the **Child's future**. My own parenting impulse was at play in my response: I don't shield my children from words and what many label as "objectionable" material. I do not sit them down in front of a pornographic video, but if they happen to be listening to music or watching something with me that contains grown-up material, they react to my reaction, which is nothing, hoping that by not reacting I can help them understand that these things are not "bad," but more for grown ups. I want them to be exposed to the situational nature of language rather than dictating what is categorically objectionable or bad.

Yet my parenting philosophy is not one I **force on anyone** of course, and when I had an opportunity later in the day to speak with the mother of the girl, I **apologized to her**. During our ensuing conversation she said she appreciated my apology and acknowledgement that something occurred that needed apologizing for, but she also said it wasn't necessary as her daughter and mother were fine leaving and just waiting outside. Yet in that conversation, which was very friendly and pleasant, I knew that contextually and culturally it was important to her that I **apologize**, but at the same time, I sensed, and I think she did also, that the

Okay, admitting that you wouldn't change a thing seems insensitive. Gotta think about the chicks. We know you'll just keep pounding away, but you don't have to tell the world. I got your back, bro.

Sure. Wink, wink, nudge, nudge.

Aw yeah, they all wanted you.

A future in which you won't be invited to participate, you child-hater.

Oh suddenly you're respectful of others?

Post-coital remorse?

It's poor form to ejaculate and not then follow the perfunctory niceties.

apology was perhaps not the best way to handle what happened. I am at a loss at explaining it sufficiently, but it seemed that my apology and her acceptance of it were simultaneously sincere and **insincere** – an odd duality. What occurred was on another level of discourse and understanding than simply an offense to be apologized **for**, but how beyond is unclear; or maybe it was simply a small infraction that was overdramatized in our minds given the situation, the confined room, the close-together desks, etc. Even though we had a lengthy, friendly conversation, there remained a sense of dissatisfaction between us – like we could not grasp or govern the thing that we were trying to talk about **together**.

“You’re the best I’ve ever had...”

“Not on my face! Never on my face!”

Everyone has a refractory period. You’ll be back at it in no time, slugger.

## Works Cited

Author.

Alexander, Jonathan and Jacqueline Rhodes. “Queer: An Impossible Subject for Composition.” *JAC* (2011) 31.1-2: 177-205. Print.

Common Core State Standards. Language Arts Appendix A. Web. 1 Oct 2011.

Davis, D. Diane. *Breaking Up (At) Totality: A Rhetoric of Laughter*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 2000. Print.

Dobrin, Sidney I. *Postcomposition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2011. Print.

Edelman, Lee. *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2004. Print.

Glenn, Cheryl. *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004. Print.

Halberstam, J. Jack. *The Queer Art of Failure*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2011. Print.

Hawk, Byron. *A Counter-History of Composition: Toward Methodologies of Complexity*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2007. Print.

Heard, Matthew M. “Tonality and Ethos.” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 46.1: 44-64. Print.

Hillocks, George. *Teaching Argument Writing, Grades 6-12*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2011. Print.

Kentucky Department of Education. *Kentucky Literacy Link 2.5* (September 2011), 3-5. Web. 29 Sep 2011.

Lynch, Paul. *After Pedagogy: The Experience of Teaching*. Urbana, IL: NCTE 2014. Print.

Ratcliffe, Krista. *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender, Whiteness*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2006. Print.

Rickert, Thomas. *Ambient Rhetoric: The Attunements of Rhetorical Being*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2013. Print.

Toulmin, Stephen E. *The Uses of Argument*. New York: Cambridge, 1958. Print.

Vitanza, Victor. “Three Countertheses: Or, A Critical In(ter)vention into Composition Theories and Pedagogies.” In Harkin, Pattie and John Schilb, eds. *Contending with Words: Composition and Rhetoric in a Postmodern Age*. New York: MLA, 1991. 139-72. Print.