Suffering Difference: The Ethics and Politics of Modifying Bodies

by

Jessica Robyn Cadwallader

BA(Hons) Macq.

Department of Critical and Cultural Studies

Division of Society, Culture, Media and Philosophy

This thesis is presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Critical and Cultural Studies)



Tabl	le of	Conte	ents
I ULV	ic or	Contec	

Abstractvii		
Statement of Candidateviii		
Acknowledgementsix		
Dedicationxi		
A Note on Languagexiii		
Introduction1		
The Pathology of Suffering: Medicine Face to Face with the Suffering Other9		
Introduction9		
Diagnostics: the Subjective Symptom12		
Asserting Objectivity14		
The "Nature" of Suffering		
The Construction of Personhood		
Socratic Ethics and Surgical Shaping		
Ethics		
Suffering: Call and Response		
Empathy, Compassion, and the Risk of Theodicy		
Conclusion		
Transgressing Tolerances: The Politics of Embodiment		
Introduction		
The Political Shaping of Ethics: a Critique of Lévinas		
Constructing Subjects: Bodily Being and Syncretic Sociability		
Sedimentary Being-in-the-World and the Production of Bodily Tolerances		
The Politics of Specifying Embodiment103		
Perceptual Practices		
The Specific Constitution of Suffering 116		
Conclusion		
Embodying Normalcy: A Question of Tolerance		
Institutions and Bodies, Biopower and the Norm		
Experience Matters		
Mis-match: Embodying Normalcy in/as an Abnormal Body		

Idealisation and Suffering146
Making Suffering Bodies Pathological149
The Recalcitrance of the Body157
Querying the Materialisation of the Body159
Conclusion165
Modifying Bodies: Memorialising and Forgetting in/as the Flesh
Introduction167
Corporeal Generosity
Memorialising and Forgetting; or, the Problem with Derrida
Memorialising and Forgetting in/as Flesh186
Ethics and Politics of Body Modification
Memorialising the Superracial
Lengthening Limbs, Building Proportional Bodies
Memorialising the Unmemorialisable: Self-Demand Amputation
Memorialising the Other: Modern Primitivism and Questionable Politics
Conclusion
Gift Matters: The Alterability of Responsible Being-in-the-World
Introduction
Memorialising and the Production of Normal Intolerance215
The Theft of Memorialising and Forgetting217
Alteration and Modification
Thieving Traces
Traces of Forgetting
Responsibility Without Recognition; or a Forgetting-that-Matters
The Non-Totality of the Norm and the Space for Responsibility
Max's Gift, Alexander's Alteration, and the Role of Responsibility
Stirring Up the Sediment: The Constitution of Responsible Being-in-the-World248
Conclusion: the Question of Politics
Conclusion
Bibliography

Abstract

Suffering Difference: The Ethics and Politics of Modifying Bodies takes as its provocation the apparently inevitable dovetailing of suffering and difference in contemporary Western culture, and the modification of bodies that this justifies. Through an examination of a variety of modificatory technologies, including the use of human growth hormone, limb-lengthening, cosmetic and intersex "corrective" surgeries, self-demand amputation and modern primitive practices, I demonstrate that suffering plays a key role in the (re)production of not only the norm, but of existing social injustices.

I deploy a Lévinasian ethics to consider our responsibilities to suffering, and the inadequacy of contemporary medical science in providing such a response. I draw on Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology, along with a variety of feminist and critical race approaches to his work, to explore the formation of sedimentary styles of being in the world, and the attendant production of 'bodily tolerances,' the transgression of which causes suffering. These tolerances, I argue, are a technique of what Foucault identifies as biopower, focussed on the normalisation of bodies. I contrast normalising practices with those considered deviant, using Rosalyn Diprose's concept of 'corporeal generosity' to examine practices of body modification, showing that whilst it has an ethical character, these corporeal gifts cannot be unbound from the political (and economic) valuation of bodies. I argue, therefore, that practices of body modification function as a means of visibly memorialising, in and as the flesh, the gifts of *normal* others, and simultaneously as a way of *forgetting* the gifts of bodies that are othered. Finally, I explore the aneconomic, ethical effects that generosity has upon embodiment, contrasting the memorialising and forgetting involved in modification with the ethical response of alteration, a forgetting-that-matters. The responsible styles of being-in-the-world this forgetting produces challenge the asymmetries in the political valuing of bodies, and permit a response to suffering which reshapes subjectivity, sociality, ethics and politics.

Statement of Candidate

I certify that the work in this thesis entitled *Suffering Difference: The Ethics and Politics of Modifying Bodies* has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree to any other university or institution other than Macquarie University.

I also certify that the thesis is an original piece of research and it has been written by me. Any help and assistance that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself have been appropriately acknowledged.

In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Jubalisallade

Jessica Robyn Cadwallader

30585376

Acknowledgements

If there is one thing that this thesis has clearly demonstrated to me, it is the impossibility of recognising the various gifts that have gone into this thesis (not to mention the questionable ethics of attempting to do so). Nonetheless, there are some whose generosity has so altered me that I know without them this thesis could not have been:

My supervisor, Nikki Sullivan, for her warm support, generous intellect and her unwavering belief that this thesis was worth writing.

My friends, who put up with me when I could think of nothing but the thesis, and who sustained me with cups of coffee and tea, red wine at Madame Fling Flong's, ludicrous numbers of hours spent cheering Buffy and other superheroes on, chatting, laughing, frowning and furious at the world and of course eating good, good food; and with their demonstration of the belief that there was, all evidence to the contrary, more to me than the thesis! And so especially: Sophie, David, Beth, Kirstin, Matthew, Marita, Nicole, Elaine, Obelia, Sam, Holly, Craig, Patrick, Hilary, and the little Holly; much loving gratitude.

My online interlocutors, for their ideas, patience and willingness to interact, but most of all for their *difference*; especially to Nate, Az, Fido and, again, the ever-astonishing Nicole.

My family: my siblings, Myf, Dan and Demelza; our gorgeous-in-every-waypossible and dearly missed dog, Megan; and especially my parents, Alan and Robyn; who gave me a curiosity about the tapestry of the world, the desire to tug on threads, weave, unravel, knot and splice, and a sense of wonder at the possibilities of patterns new, old and other.

Special extra thanks go to those who read bits and pieces for me, offered feedback and spotted flaws: to Elaine, to Nikki, to Nicole, whose generosity in this matter still makes my jaw drop; and to my parents, whose readings were warm and incisive, and opened my work back out in ways I'd forgotten it could.

And always, and still, Greg, whose gifts continue to resonate and alter, even after he is gone.

Dedication

For my parents, Robyn and Alan,

whose remarkable generosity still provokes wonder.

A Note on Language

As with most feminists engaging with texts, the use of the masculine to designate the universal is not only a continual irritation, but it raises problems for my own theoretical engagements, particularly my representations of the work of other thinkers. In relation to "inherited sexism" in the language of quotations and similar from other theorists, I have selected to retain the author's words. There are a number of reasons for this, but perhaps most significant is this: I do not wish to allow the presumption that all other identities can be subsumed under the alleged "generality" of "man." To "correct" conceals the sexism that arose either from earlier works or their translation; the erasure of a sexist history is not its undoing. Thus whilst I do not have the space to address this issue each and every time it is raised, or to play through the consequences of universalising in each case in anything like an adequate manner, I hope that my use of [*sic*] to mark the first use of the male as universal in each quote may create sufficient critical distance that some sense of que(e)ry is sustained. what freedom's not some under's mere above but breathing yes which fear will never no? measureless our pure living complete love whose doom is beauty and its fate to grow

shall hate confound the wise?doubt blind the brave? does mask wear face?have singings gone to say? here youngest selves yet younger selves conceive here's music's music and the day of the day

are worlds collapsing?any was a glove but I'm and you are actual either hand is when for sale?forever is to give and on forever's very now we stand

nor a first rose explodes but shall increase whole truthful infinite immediate us

e.e. cummings