

Queer world-view: a reconceptualisation of citizenship?

Iakovos Sachinis



December, 2020

Last Name - Επίθετο	Sachinis - Σαχίνης
First Name - Όνομα	Iakovos - Ιάκωβος
University - Πανεπιστήμιο	National and Kapodistrian University of Athens - Εθνικό και Καποδιστριακό Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών
Department - Τμήμα	Political Science and Public Administration - Πολιτική Επιστήμη και Δημόσια Διοίκηση
Master Program - Μεταπτυχιακό Πρόγραμμα Σπουδών	Political Science and Sociology - Πολιτική Επιστήμη και Κοινωνιολογία
R.N. - A. M.	18516
Field - Κατεύθυνση	Social Theory and Research - Κοινωνική Θεωρία και Έρευνα
Title - Τίτλος	Queer world-view: a reconceptualisation of citizenship?
Supervisor - Επιβλέπουσα	Prof. Maro Pantelidou Maloutas - Καθ. Μάρω Παντελίδου Μαλούτα
2 nd Member - 2 ^ο Μέλος	Assistant Prof. Yannis Tsirbas - Επίκ. Καθ. Γιάννης Τσίρμπας
3 rd Member - 3 ^ο Μέλος	Prof. Athena Athanasiou - Καθ. Αθηνά Αθανασίου

Abstract

This thesis aims towards analyzing the concepts of citizenship, queer utopian thinking, and democracy. Citizenship, despite promising otherwise, does not remain indifferent to gender, race, sexual orientation, etc. Citizens because of their sex, origin and / or sexual orientation are either *de facto* or *de jure* excluded from a participatory and active citizenship. Of course, the inequalities and exclusions raise a broader issue of collective coexistence, hence democracy. Democracy cannot conform with inequalities and hierarchical differentiations. Queer utopian thinking is a way for queer subjects to visualise new ways of social coexistence. At the same time, queer utopian thinking is a way of questioning and criticising the here and now, in which queer subjects are not safe.

Through the analysis of an event entitled ‘The Queer Museum 2068’, which was used as a case study, and through a qualitative research with queer subjects, this thesis is concerned with ‘whether or not and to what extent there is a queer world-view and, subsequently, what its content is’. I also raise the question of whether queer performance constitutes the ideal type of citizen for a radical and participatory democracy. Queer subjects develop a utopian thinking that helps them escape the present and seek new social realities; however, they fail to outline a structured queer world-view.

The challenge that arises is how one or many queer world-views will be convened to propose potential outcomes in which there will be substantial democracy at all levels of personal and social life. In other words, the issue is to come up with an active and democratic citizenship of the citizen, indifferent to identities and hierarchies through which the subjects will enter the public space.

Keywords

citizenship, democracy, queer, utopian thinking, world-view

Table of contents

Acknowledgements.....	5
1. Introduction.....	6
2. Theoretical framework.....	8
2.1. Citizenship and democracy through a queer perspective	8
2.1.1. Queering Citizenship.....	8
2.1.2. Democracy on the horizon?.....	13
2.2. Queer world-view: a way to envision radically different societies.....	16
2.2.1. Utopian thinking.....	16
2.2.2. Queer utopia.....	18
2.2.3. Trigger point.....	22
2.2.4. Queer world-view.....	24
3. Methodological design and research.....	26
3.1. Methodology.....	26
3.1.1. Sampling.....	26
3.1.2. Questionnaire.....	27
3.1.3. Data processing.....	27
3.1.4. Principle of validity and reliability.....	27
3.2. Case study: The Queer Museum 2068.....	28
3.3. Queer subject of democracy.....	34
4. Conclusion.....	43
References.....	46
Appendix.....	49

Acknowledgements

I fulfilled this master thesis with a lot of love, effort, and stubbornness. Unfortunately, the pandemic of Covid-19 and the two quarantines have made my access to the university library difficult, and have caused me incredible psychological pressure. My project has now come to an end and I must acknowledge that it would not have been completed without the help of specific people who I have to thank by name.

First of all, I would like to thank the supervisor of my master thesis, Professor M. Pantelidou Maloutas, for her prompt response and useful directions. Above all I want to thank her for the love she conveyed to me for my studies; she is my mentor. In addition, I would like to thank Professor A. Athanassiou, whose course was decisive for my interest in queer theory, and Assistant Professor Y. Tsirbas for his contribution in matters of methodology and research.

Also, I want to thank the interviewees for our fruitful discussions.

Moreover, I would like to thank my family and my friends for their love and support. By name I feel the need to thank Lina for our endless constructive discussions and my monologues for my dissertation, Niko for his help in language revision and my partner Taxiarchis who pressured me to concentrate on my goal.

Last but not least, I want to thank you, the reader.

1. Introduction

This master thesis aims to examine the concepts of queer world-vision, utopian thinking, and democracy. Queer theory provides us with a different understanding of social reality and is a new horizon and method of social analysis; another perspective in which social relations can be analysed and elaborated. It is a different attempt for research and theoretical interaction with the present. At the same time, the creation of queer world-views enables us to claim completely different societies, in which queer subjectivations will have space and will not be displaced. Misogyny, sexism, transphobia, homophobia, ableism and racism, are fairly widespread problems for anyone that does not fit into the stereotypical model of citizenship, raising issues of coexistence, i.e. democracy.

In the first chapter, I deal with the impossibility of democracy to coincide with the existing gender and sexual regimes and the cisgendered character of Citizenship. I suggest that a completely alternative perception of social coexistence and citizenship is of absolute necessity. I thus, suggest - from a queer perspective - the understanding of citizenship in terms of performativity. At the same time, I contend that the queer theory offers a refreshing view of the gendered system of power, focusing not only on gendered subjects, but also on democracy itself. In the second chapter, bringing into the discussion the concept of queer utopian thinking, I attempt to theoretically convey how the creation of queer utopias is a way to envision a future society in which queer subjects will not be displaced and marginalised by the dominant heteronormal expectations, by the existing authoritarian patriarchal system; on the contrary, they will be active subjects who do not carry the burden of readymade identities. In the third chapter, I provide and analyse a queer world-view example, the 'Queer Museum 2068' event. Simultaneously, based on interviews of queer subjects, which I conducted myself, I attempt to identify how the queer world-views fit into a wider problem, for democracy itself in the age of late capitalism. My main concern is whether or not a queer world-view exists, to what extent it is present in our lives, and, subsequently, what its content is. I also raise the question of whether queer performance constitutes the ideal type of citizen for a radical and participatory democracy. I presume that queer world-views that look forward to radical social changes, alternative plans of social organisation which introduce different systems of morals, power, body perception, gender, sexuality, etc., actually exist.

Furthermore, I assume that these queer performances, which are indifferent to gender, race, etc., and are formed as common only on the basis of human condition are essentially the ideal performances of citizenship and the actual/real subjects of a democratic democracy, indifferent to boundaries, hierarchies and restrictions; a social status that is enjoyed by all subjects, who share the common characteristic of being a human and they are indifferent to any other identity and property. Obviously, these subjectivations are potential and possible realisations of an ideal citizenship to the extent where the queer signifies something fluid/uncertain, and does not obey to categorisations and prescribed identities.

I consider, a conceptual clarification about queer to be necessary. There is no commonly accepted definition of the queer in the literature, nor is such an issue my intention and subject of this paper. Queer has many different connotations related to the strange, the ab-normal, the creepy, 'but so much more' (The Mary Nardini Gang, 2013, p. 256); it is also related to the alternative forms of sexuality and gender expression. Thus, the word 'queer' is associated with derogatory and offensive concepts. The usage of this term in a level of cinematic action and theoretical discourse is a strategic attempt to reclaim an abusive term and to radically reinterpret it. Therefore, Spargo points out that if queer as an adjective rejects the previous markings and categorisations, then queer as a verb - theoretically - upsets the normal, the dominant rules, whether it concerns heterosexuality or gay/lesbian identity (1999, p. 40). Simultaneously, Dean draws queer as a part of the society that is excluded from the general population because of their sexual orientation, race, class, or nationality; hence, queer defines those who do not share a white, middle-class, cisgender status (Dean, 2003, 240). So, Dean perceives queer as that which is radically strange and opposite to society's forces of (hetero)normalisation.

Consequently, I understand queer as eccentric and unique and that is why we do not need to place it in a semantic shape but, instead, I urge us, to just leave it as a fluidity between the categorisations; after all fluidity, multiplicity and rejection of the categorisation is one of its main characteristics. For me, the queer is not a static, coherent and irrevocable identity but serves as a reminder that gender identity, is not a fixed signifier of a substantive category. It is a field for simultaneous re-claiming and deconstruction. I argue that the queer subject poses a challenge to the dominant gendered, patriarchal dichotomy, and implies radical revisions in the understanding and reception of central conceptual tools, such as sexuality, desire, body, affect, experience, truth etc.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1 Citizenship and democracy through a queer perspective

My approach on this topic promotes an interrogation concerning citizenship and its relation to democracy, but also democracy itself, as a political ideal and a conceptual framework of what it means to be a citizen today.

2.1.1 Queering Citizenship

Citizenship is the status of a subject recognised under the law of a state as its member. Furthermore, citizenship as a status is institutionalised by law, which provides the regulatory framework and sets out the procedures for who meets the criteria to be included in the body of citizens and who does not. The integration of a citizen in the political community automatically provides an advantage over the others and therefore citizenship is considered as a privilege. The status of citizenship is based on the liberal concept of an independent subject. Each subject approaches the political, economic, and cultural spheres of society as an independent unit (Kymlicka, 1989, p.141). In pre-mode societies only property-owned men had the right to vote or participate in politics (Phelan 2001, p.13). Today, citizenship does not take into consideration the citizen's gender, race, etc., and it is accompanied by rights and duties (Phelan 2001, p.13).

Moreover, freedom - in Berlin's conception (1969) - is a necessary condition for a democratic citizenship, and vice versa (Pettit 1997, p.36). In other words, the freedom of the citizen is a necessary condition, but at the same time it is ensured through the legal dimension of citizenship, i.e. an organised legal system that protects the citizens from interventions and despotism. The principle of non-domination in republicans' thinking is a necessary requirement for a democratic decision-making (Honohan, 2002, p.161, p.205). Furthermore, republican theory clearly supports an active citizenship, in which each citizen is strongly involved in the decision-making of social/political issues, aiming for the common good (Honohan 2002, p.5). This essentially means that political participation is received as the highest human virtue.

Additionally, citizenship is not just a legal status that provides citizens with rights and duties, but it is also assigned with ensuring equality amongst the members of the community. The social dimension of citizenship is quite crucial, since whoever is under the umbrella of these rights and duties is, consequently, socially accepted.

The most popular analysis of citizenship belongs to T.H. Marshall (1977) and refers to the social position attributed to all full-members of a community. According to his theory, being a 'subject of rights' means that you have the capacity to enjoy rights (civil, political and social) and obligations (Marshall, 1977). While the addition of social rights by Marshall (1977) is quite significant, this does not mean that negative criticism on his theory is impossible to find.¹

Defining citizenship has been a controversial topic among theorists and this is exactly because it stems from a crucial question, that being: which citizen is allowed to possess those rights? According to liberal theorists, the right to citizenship is considered gender blind, so that it can guarantee equality within society (Kymlicka 1989, p.141). However, Orloff suggests that the working man is hiding behind Marshall's citizen (1993, p. 308). Feminist theory also finds, that there is an inextricable link between citizenship and the production regulations of gendered and sexual regimes (Stoler, 1995), while at the same time, the state power itself produces citizens (Foucault, 1982) who are excluded from the ideal standard of citizenship and make unequal use of that capacity. Last but not least, citizenship is inherently masculine, and the citizen is always gendered and sexed (Pateman, 1989, chapter 8; Phillips, 1993, chapter 4; Pantelidou Maloutas, 2006, chapter 3.2). It should be noted that feminist thinking places emphasis on the value of a participatory and active citizenship of the citizen, unlike a passive one (Lister, 1997, p. 24 ff.; Phillips, 1991; 1993) In addition, citizenship within the framework of radical democracy must be active and participatory (Mouffe, 1992).

Hence, one must wonder about queers who live in the margins; especially if citizenship, according to Marshall (1977), can only be given to subjects that are actively involved members of a community. It is clear from the above feminist critique that the social category of 'citizen' in late modern societies does not accept diversity. After all, as Young (1989) points out, in every society there is a specific social group, whose particular characteristics

¹ See the feminist critique which I mention in the next paragraph. For a sociological critique in Marshall's theory cf. the essay by T. Bottomore in Marshall, T. H., Bottomore, T. (1992). *Citizenship and social class*. Pluto Press.

are considered dominant and universal. If one recognises that in modernity the nation state has become the dominant form of social/political organisation, it is necessary to study those who are perceived as non-citizens. Moreover, a citizen – as possessing a status - can only come to exist through continuous practice (Marshall, 1977); while Mikdashi points out that citizenship can only be a status if the non-citizen exists as well (2013, p. 350). Conversely, the particular characteristics of a specific social group, such as the male, the cisgender, the white, the bourgeois, the Christian, the heterosexual, and the capable body are the dominant world characteristics. Obviously, these dominant characteristics are not everyone's prerogative, because the modern state, through the technologies of biopower (Foucault, 1976, p. 140), thanatopolitics (Αθανασίου, 2007; Avramopoulou, 2017) and necropolitics (Mbembe, Meintjes, 2001; Haritaworn, Kuntsman, Posocco, 2015) produces, quantifies, and regulates subjects, with the result of producing, in turn, social groups that do not have the same rights as poors, women, blacks, non-Christian ethnic minorities, queers and people with disabilities.

The 'subject of democracy' in modernity has never been truly 'neutral', a bearer of knowledge as promised by the Enlightenment (Χορκχάιμερ & Αντόρνο, 1996, p. 29-88), but is, instead, invested with specific gender, class, race, sexuality, and other characteristics. My purpose here is not to deconstruct the meaning of the subject, but to criticize the dominant male, cisgender, heteronormative, white, and full-fledged subject. The myth of the political subject of the Enlightenment (Hall, 1992, p. 275) - with a stable gender identity - has collapsed through the lacanian theory of the fragmented subject (Lacan, 1966) and by the feminist and queer critique. Gender identity is the dominant way of organising the political/social/cultural realities and the dominant and primary way of conveying meaning to power relations (Σκοτ, 1997). According to foucauldian theory, sexuality is a regulatory ideal of modernity and it is understood as a point of intersection for body discipline and population control (Foucault, 1978). Gender in modernity is a matter of social coercion, far from an ontological necessity (Butler, 2006). It functions, therefore, as an additional and dominant organizational social principles' (Pantelidou Maloutas, 2006) and technology of understanding the relations of power and social discipline (Αθανασίου, 2006, p. 89). Each subject experiences their gender in a different way, while any deviation from the stereotypical bipolar expression of gender can lead to marginalisation and racism (Connell, 2006). As is evident, the dominant conceptions claim which genders performances have a place in what is culturally, legally, socially, and politically recognised as human (Αθανασίου, 2006, p. 101).

It is also worth mentioning that in modernity, gender dictates the corresponding heterosexuality (Αθανασίου, 2006, p. 87) and it achieves discipline of the body and the control of the population (Foucault, 2011). Furthermore, these dominant gender patterns and forced heterosexuality are the result of a socialising process that leads to pre-planned realities and mutually exclusive gender expressions (Παντελίδου Μαλούτα, 2015). Moreover, given the perception that gender is a social construct, like any other reality that surrounds us, it is potentially reversible (Παντελίδου Μαλούτα, 2012).

Queer theory challenges the essentialist conception of gender, avoiding to place the subjects in gender or sexual categories, and perceiving gender in all of its fluidity (Λαχανιώτη, 2012, pp. 103-104). Every attempt to ‘de-naturalise’ gender and to understand it as an authoritarian mechanism - that intersects and prioritises subjects into two unequal categories - is based on an anti-essentialist approach to subjectivity (Foucault, 1988). After all, the study of citizenship from the point of view of non-equal-citizens, the queer subjects in this case, is an attempt to study the composition of the natural/normal subject and therefore the citizen. Specifically, by queering our perception of the autonomous, abstract and universal citizen we can break the regulatory limits of citizenship (Mikdashi, 2013, p. 352).

The abstract concept of citizenship is a controversial conceptual tool (Lister, 1997) and contemporary theorists who deal with it do not focus on the universal dimension of it, but rather choose to deal with the gap that exists between the ideology of citizenship and its day-to-day performance of citizenship (Brown, 1995; Brubaker, 1996). For this reason one must examine citizenship not only in terms of official norms - such as constitutions, laws, jurisprudence -, but also include the unofficial norms, that affect access and exercise of the status of citizen (Vink, 2017, p. 223). Thus, I argue that the status of citizenship needs not to be abandoned, but, on the contrary, to be reconceptualised through queer criticism.

In this attempt to reconceptualise citizenship, I find it useful to read citizenship not just as a legal status, but rather in terms of performativity.² According to Isin (2017, p. 4), ‘performative citizenship’ enables us to perceive it not as a fixed identity, but as a continuous process, through which the subjects creatively transform its meanings and functions (Andrijasevic, 2013, pp. 47-65; Arabau & Huysmans, 2014, pp. 596-619). Thus, the decision

² The term ‘performative’ was first used by J. L. Austin in Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press. Since then a particular approach in social sciences concerning the way how people perform their subjectivity. For an overview on this particular term see Loxley, J. (2007). *Performativity*. Routledge.

of which subject can and cannot hold these rights equally, is made by an ongoing political and social struggle that concerns not only the content and quality of these rights but also the subjects who have equal access to them. In other words, ‘performative citizenship’ has a crucial role to play as far as the contest and reconceptualisation of citizenship is concerned, because it reveals the creative and transformative possibilities that are inherent in citizenship.

Citizenship according to a performative logic is not only exercised by possession, but also by claiming to be a bearer of its status (Butler, Spivak, 2007).³ This perception of citizenship echoes back to Hannah Arendt’s well-known thought of ‘the right to have right’, namely that everybody ideally has a right to be part of a political community – without discrimination – and that one can be judged only by one’s actions and ideas (1973, pp. 296-297). The issue of the ‘right to have a right’ stems from the experience of expropriation of the right to political inclusion. It is precisely the risk of falling short, being violated, or losing the right to have rights that makes us claim these rights (DeGooyer et. al., 2019). Before and beyond the right to citizenship, lies the necessary political condition to having rights. Without this condition, rights remain potentially expropriable. In the possibility of this invalidity of ‘the right to have a right’ lies the executive power of performative citizenship, a status not guaranteed for all.

The concept of ‘performative citizenship’ allows us to perceive citizens and non-(equal-)citizens as serendipitous and relational positions (Isin, 2017, p. 8). Therefore, ‘performative citizenship’ is helpful in perceiving the citizen as a status that contains many different identities - which, in their turn, determine the possibilities and potentialities of the subjects - and possibly one that is a citizen and a non-(equal-)citizen at the same time. In conclusion, it helps perceive citizenship as a vague and constantly redefined status.

Citizenship is essential for the proper function of democracy, as without a firm understanding of who is considered a citizen and who participates in democratic processes, social organisation would be impossible (Vink, 2017, p. 221-222). In other words, the question I want to raise is how the concepts of citizenship and democracy can be redefined today, in order to include not only the subjects who are *de jure* excluded, but also the ones that are *de facto* excluded (Παντελίδου Μαλούτα, 2017). After all, by understanding citizenship in more queer terms we can think in a completely different way, unattached to normative values (Halberstam, 2011).

³ See for this topic the dialogue between J. Butler and A. Athanasiou in Butler, J., Athanasiou, A. (2013). *Dispossession: the performative in the political*. Polity Press, pp. 140-148.

2.1.2 *Democracy on the horizon?*

I perceive democracy as a combination of state/political institutions and as a space of social coexistence. At the same time, democracy presupposes equal and free citizens and even if democracy is conceived merely within the narrow limits of politics, a marginalised queer subject is rather difficult to be considered a citizen of equal worth. Simultaneously, gender functions as one of the many forms of institutionalised hierarchy of subjects and what is, eventually, made apparent is the bourgeois, heteronormative and cisgender nature of democracy that instantly renders it distorted (Pantelidou Malouta, 2006, p. 3).⁴ Let us consider, then, what the coexistence of categorical forms of inequality can mean for the nature and quality of democracy.

Today, more than ever, theorists claim that democracy has been transformed to a simple process and a rational governance technique. Rancière (1999) argues that democracy has become ‘post-democratic’ in the sense that it has diverted its attention from the people and their democratic coexistence. Meanwhile, according to Mouffe (2005), democracy as a form of social coexistence has lost its affective dimension and the gap that is created gives room for the development of an extreme right-wing discourse. At the same time, Brown (2010) proposes that the ‘waning sovereignty’ of liberal democracy constitutes the current state of affairs; this is, because democracy remains vulnerable to de-democratisation by the dominance of neoliberalism and the subordination of democratic politics to politically autonomous economic/corporate actors who undermine equality policies (Crouch, 2004; Brown, 2015). Thus, Butler and Athanassiou (2013) deal with the consequences of alienation in the context of modern neoliberal cybernetics and question the practical limits of the self, the construction and deconstruction of identities, the vulnerability in a period of liquidity, economic violence, and neoliberal cybernology. Their book is an epistemological attempt to understand the ‘you’ (Butler & Athanassiou, 2013, pp. 81-82), especially when the crucial question today is what brings subjects together to claim a substantial democracy at all levels of their social and political life (Braidotti, Hanafin and Blaagaard, 2013). How can people be shaped in terms of affect (Ahmed, 2004) and form a ‘we’ (Mouffe, 1996, pp. 8-9), which at the same time guarantees ‘the rights of others’ (Benhabid, 2004)? For Butler, the starting

⁴ Cf. Παντελίδου Μαλούτα, Μ. (2017). Τι μάθαμε για την έμφυλη ισότητα: από τη θεωρία στη πολιτική. In Ντ. Βαΐου, Α. Ψαρρά, (Eds.), *Εννοιολογήσεις και πρακτικές του φεμινισμού: Μεταπολίτευση και «μετά»* [Πρακτικά ημερίδας]. Ίδρυμα της Βουλής των Ελλήνων, p. 45, where the author expresses the position of the impossibility of coexistence of real democracy and neoliberalism.

point for the formation of a radical or revolutionary alliance policy today against the neoliberal nullification of life, is the concept of precariousness (2015).

The authentic democratic coexistence can only take place where all subjects meet under conditions of absolute equality. In a sense, there is absolute acceptance of the multiplicity and diversity of the human condition, based on the assumption that the subjects' uniqueness renders them all different from one another in multiple aspects. Therefore, we must understand democracy as a belief, namely a goal, towards which one leans (or does not ...); as a stake and a conflict field for all forms of inequality, but also as a political program, since it establishes a way of organisation in all fields. My mind resonates with a reading of democracy, such as Derrida's figure for 'the democracy to come' (1992a, 1997, 2005). Derrida (2005, p. 90) uses Blochian terms (see chapter 3.1) in order to distinguish the current democracy from the democratic futurity that is visible on the horizon. The essence of the philosopher's thought is that democracy is not a promise that will be fulfilled in the future, an idea with which Habermas' (2001) reading about democracy concurs; on the contrary, the democratic promise remains a persistent critique of the here and now (Derrida, 1992a, 1997, 2005). Under this light, he aims to criticise the teleological views of democracy, deconstruct Fukuyama's (1992) position on the end of history and show that democratic futurity already exists here as a permanent promise that haunts the past, present and future (Derrida, 1992b, p. 78; 1996, p. 68). This particular view of democracy paves the way for a democratic policy that strives for radical futurity (Fritsch, 2002, p. 592).

The neoliberal democratic regime is now challenged by a queer political movement, by the imaging of a completely alternative society (see chapter 3). In my reading, the queer movement can be seen as a persistent critique of liberal democracy as well as a demand for its radicalisation and, possibly, a 'subaltern' position (Spivak, 1988) with prospects of real resistance to hegemonic power. In the face of neoliberal reality, queer theory is reactivating the revolutionary dynamics of democracy, emphasising that racial hierarchy and reproductive heteronormativity are not secondary dimensions, but, instead, fundamental norms of world capitalism and racism. Queer theory, as I understand it, can provide a new horizon of affect,⁵

⁵ Concerning the problematic around affect and the conceptualization that I used, see Massumi, B. (2002). *Movement, affect, sensation: Parables for the virtual*. NC: Duke; Athanasiou, A., Hantzaroula P. & Yannakopoulos, K. (2008). Towards a new epistemology: the 'affective turn'. *Historien* 8, 5-16; Αβραμοπούλου, Ε. (2018). Πολιτικές εγγραφές του συν-αισθήματος. In Ε. Αβραμοπούλου (Ed.), *Το Συν-αίσθημα στο Πολιτικό: Υποκειμενικότητες, εξουσίες και ανισότητες στο σύγχρονο κόσμο*. Νήσος.

morality, knowledge, power and unlock completely new regimes of truth - that accept human plurality, vulnerability, self-determination - through which social relations are approached and processed by equal subjects. In other words, it is a theory of analysis and understanding of social reality in a different way, a potentiality for a new epistemological example, research as well as theoretical interaction with the present (Eng, Halberstam and Muñoz, 2005). It is an attempt to democratise democracy, in the case of accepting the assumption that democracy is impossible to coexist with a system of gender relations that divides subjects into two unequal and opposite bipolarities.

The redefinition of the gender dimension of subjectivity now emerges as a necessity, and is a vital condition for substantial democracy in all areas of social and political life, in order to stop defining lives through identities - gender, sexual, racial, class, age - and hierarchies. Nevertheless, yet another perception of the body, desire, morality, gender, and sexual identity is crucial for a redefinition of subjectivity. After all, in the democratisation of democracy itself the democratisation of interpersonal relations is crucial (Pantelidou Maloutas, 2006, pp. 99-100); this is, because the way in which the definition of subjectivity and the private/public sphere takes place (Okin, 1991) is closely linked to the outcome of the prospective societies and political communities.

Nowadays, the essential question for the theory of democracy, but also for democracy as a system of social organisation, is how the status of the citizen will be formed as the only identity by which the public sphere is approached. There would be a necessity for a tremendous turmoil between the boundaries of the public and private spheres. The queer theory has a subversive effect on the existing conception of gender and provokes us to cross the boundaries of - culturally conceivable - gender and sexual categories. Similarly, the queer subject perhaps constitutes a challenge to the dominant gender dichotomy and implies radical revisions in the understanding and reception of core conceptual tools, such as sexuality, body, gender, etc. This perception about the queer subject might lead to utopian thinking; a space of radical critique where new fields of conceptualisation are possible; a space where new, radically alternative ways of coexistence can be imagined (Sargisson, 1996, p. 21).

2.2 *Queer world-view: a way to envision radically different societies*

Creating queer utopias is a way of envisioning a future society in which queer subjects will not be displaced and marginalised by the dominant heteronormative expectations, namely the existing authoritarian patriarchal system.

2.2.1 *Utopian thinking*

Utopian thinking is not something imaginary and/or unrealized - in contrast to classical utopian approaches such as the theories of Th. Moore or P. J. Proudhon⁶ - rather a way to envision a brighter future, to mobilize and assert the right to a sustainable present. In order to avoid confusion with classical utopian approaches or the negative connotations of utopia as being naive and passé, some scholars (Halberstam, 2011, p. 10; Jones, 2009, 2013, p. 3) suggest the use of the Foucauldian term *Heterotopia* (Foucault, 1984) which refers to places that exist, thus, avoiding confusion with the imaginary utopia of Sir Thomas Moore. As Foucault mentions 'where there is power, there is resistance' (Foucault, 1978, p. 95); a promise that heterotopic spaces occur in all dominant spaces. Foucault elaborates:

‘Heterotopias are disturbing, probably because they secretly undermine language, because they make it impossible to name this and that, because they shatter or tangle common names, because they destroy “syntax” in advance, and not only the syntax with which we construct sentences but also that less apparent syntax which causes words and things (next to and also opposite one another) to “hold together”’ (Foucault, 2005, p. XIX).

Foucaultian *Heterotopias* are, thus, places that function deconstructively for the dominant truth regimes and ideologies. At the same time *Heterotopias* rewrite the concept of space. Through this deconstruction, it is revealed that these spaces are social constructions embedded in language. According to Jones, heterotopic places are real and especially queer heterotopic places can exist in opposition to heteronormativity and destabilise gender and sexual normalities (2009, p. 2).

⁶ The classical utopian approaches such as those of Th. Moore or P. J. Proudhon are associated with abundance, constant fun, eternal youth, etc. For early utopias see Haug, F. (1999). On the necessity of conceiving the utopian in a feminist fashion. In L. Panitch & C. Leys, (Eds.) *Necessary and unnecessary utopias*. (pp. 53-66). Merlin Press.

However, utopia, as Ernst Bloch suggests, is not a fictional place nor a space, rather a method to critique the present. According to his approach, ‘the essential function of utopia is a critique of what is present. If we had not already gone beyond the barriers, we could not even perceive them as barriers’ (cited in Muñoz, 2009, p. 37). Similarly, for Weigel utopia is not an irrational way out, but, instead, a position between what cannot be any longer tolerated and what has not yet arrived (cited in Varikas, 1993, p. 83.).

Indeed, utopias - which germinate out of an unsatisfactory reality - presuppose a possible future reality and consist a radical⁷ vision through which society can imagine its viable developments. Utopian thinking can express what ‘we need to invent’ (Bloch, 1996 pp.114-117). Cornell also notes that we do not know what is possible in advance, and our inability not to know, renders the social change and the pursuit of a new reality - that is not yet visible -, as an unpredictable topic (Cornell, 1992). It is critical to point out that the possible and not possible changes depend on the actions of the parties involved, who alter during the process of social change (Cornell, 1998, pp. 182-186). Utopia is not an idealistic fantasy, exactly because imagining any different living conditions is an actual realistic view (Pantelidou Maloutas, 2006 p. 108). In fact, Eagleton argues that the opposite of utopia is not realism; the opposition of Marxism towards utopia concerns the rejection of the view which claims that utopia comes in a metaphysical way (Eagleton, 1999, pp. 12-13).

⁷ On the concept of radicalism as a way of viewing at political and social reality that refers to a world-view radically different at all levels and manifestations of the private and public spheres, see Παντελίδου Μαλούτα, Μ. (2017). Ριζοσπαστισμός, ριζοσπαστικοποίηση, ασάφεια και ιδεολογία. *Χρόνος* 8. <https://chronos.fairead.net/pantelidou-malouta-rizospastismos>

2.2.2 *Queer utopia*

There are two antithetical readings of queer utopia in the literature. On the one hand, Edelman's (2004) and Halberstam's (2011) rather pessimistic approaches to the future of queer subjects and on the other hand, a critically optimistic approach such as those of Muñoz (2009) or Snediker (2009).

In Edelman's figure of the queer, utopia is impossible, as the way we envision the future is one, dominant, and identical to heteronormativity and reproduction. As Caserio notices, Edelman describes supporters of queer utopia as 'delightfully drugged by the harmony, the freedom from harm, that their harmonies promise' (Caserio et al., 2006, p. 821). He rejects the idea that the current social and political structure systems could be the ground for future emancipatory opportunities (Jones, 2013, p. 2). Edelman claims that queer/ lesbian/gay activists and the LGBTQIA+ community espouses and advocates a homogeneous policy agenda based on respect, monogamy, parenthood etc. (Edelman, 2004), in order to become "normal" and accepted by the heterosexual society.

Furthermore, he uses the fairy tale *A Christmas Carol* by Dickens to introduce us to the devastating concept of *reproductive futurism*, namely that there is a better future to be achieved - a concept based on the principles of the Enlightenment -, one that is based on constructing and ensuring a future for the children [manifested in the symbol of a child] (Edelman, 2004, pp. 42-66). He therefore, contends that the necessity for a better future for the children is a trap for queer politics, especially when the idea of *reproductive futurism* underpins conservative movements (Jones, 2013, p. 4).

Another interesting critique is that the continuous pursuit for a queer identity - one that is dominated by homonormativity - leads to stability (Edelman, 2004). However, fluidity, multiplicity and rejection of categorization are central features of queer theory. Beyond liquidity, Edelman (2004) suggests that queer subjects should embrace both negativity and death.⁸

⁸ *Negativity*, here, is meant as a disbelief in pinning one's hopes for a better future, an urge to generally neglect the strive for 'the better'. *Death* refers to the risk of queer sex, cruising, and, especially, bareback due to HIV/AIDS.

Edelman urges us to reject the need for a future, to let ourselves loose in our desires, and as Halberstam points out:

‘[n]o future for Edelman means: outing our desires around the eternal shine of the spotless child and finding the shady side of political imaginaries in the proudly sterile and antireproductive logics of queer realition’ (2011, p. 108).

At the same time, based on the work of Freud *Civilisation and its Discontents*, he considers that the demand for compassion between queer subjects is oppressive (Edelman, 2004, pp.67-109). So, by the theoretical assumption of *sinthomosexuality*, Edelman seeks the negative, destructive dynamics that exist in queerness, as a guarantee for the real experience of lacanian *jouissance*, while stating that:

‘[s]inthomosexuality, by contrast, scorns such belief in a final signifier, reducing every signifier to the status of the letter and insisting on access to *jouissance* in place of access to sense, on identification with one’s *sinthome* instead of belief in its meaning [...] I am calling *sinthomosexuality*, then, the site where the fantasy of futurism confronts the insistence of a *jouissance* that renders it precisely by rendering it in relation to that drive’ (Edelman, 2004, pp. 37-38).

Edelman's theory has rightly received a profusion of negative criticism; according to Dean ‘Edelman’s account offers a too monochromatic vision of the symbolic; it furnishes too narrow a conception of the social; and it paints an unimaginative picture of the future’ (Caserio et al., 2006, p. 827). Halberstam notices that if the queer subject and queer sex are associated with the death drive, there is a risk for women to be associated directly - via motherhood - with the heteronormativity (2011, 118). Similarly, Jones notes that ‘Edelman imagines no future, no ethics, no justice, no compassion, and certainly no hope’ (Jones, 2013, p. 10).

From my point of view it seems that queerness primarily presages a sense of hope, which, in its turn, is a key point in utopian reasoning (Bloch, 1996), as it functions as an interpretive scheme and response to political pessimism. In this context, Muñoz, in his work *Cruising Utopia: The There and Then of Queer Theory* (2009), borrows the notion of hope from Bloch (1996).

While Edelman adopts a pessimistic view about the future of queer subjects, Muñoz takes a critically optimistic approach, in order to remind us that there is indeed a future for queer subjects. In this sense, Malatino argued that '[i]n place of the future-negating sinthomosexual, we have instead an epistemologically uncertain queerness a venir that refuses fixity without sacrificing futural hope' (2013, p. 210). In Muñoz's work one finds a rich reflection on how queerness becomes the path to envision a state of being beyond the power of hierarchical controls and regulations.

Muñoz contends:

'Queerness is not yet here. Queerness is an ideality. Put another way, we are not yet queer. We may never touch queerness, but we can feel it as the warm illumination of a horizon imbued with potentiality. We have never been queer, yet queerness exists for us as an ideality that can be distilled from the past and used to imagine a future. The future is queerness's domain. Queerness is a structuring and educated mode of desiring that allows us to see and feel beyond the quagmire of the present' (2009, p.1).

His statement that 'queerness is not yet here', makes his approach subversive. In fact, Muñoz insists that 'queerness is essentially about the rejection of a here and now and an insistence on potentiality or concrete possibility for another world' (2009, 1). Furthermore, it is particularly interesting that Muñoz - drawing inspiration from Warner's conceptualization of queerness as an identity without identity, based on fluidity (Warner, 1993, pp. 13-14) - suggests a reading of queerness that functions as a methodological context that will allow us to have a different impact on the world around us and the present that we live in. Thus, queerness, as proposed by Muñoz, is a new epistemological, research and theoretical proposition on how radically various societies and alternative forms of gender expression can exist. For Jones, Muñoz perceives queerness as 'a refusal; it is a dismissal of binaries, categorical, and essentialist modalities of thought and living. Queerness is always being made, remade, being done, being redone, and being undone' (Jones, 2013, p. 12).

Additionally, Muñoz understands utopia as a critique of here and now, instead of a predetermined and/or prescribed vision of future, i.e. a *telos* (Jones, 2013, p. 12). Furthermore, Bloch's figure borrows the distinction between concrete and abstract utopia (Bloch, 1996, pp. 145-147). In this case, queer utopia seems to be part of concrete utopias (Lepp, 2019, 61), as it provides us with a horizon for future possibilities, an image of a world extremely different from the one we live in, a hope for a brighter future and an exciting political challenge for the queer political movement.

Further, Snediker (2009) embraces theoretically the negativity aspect of Edelman's *no future*, but attends to the present, like Muñoz does. It is worthy to mention that queer optimism suggested by Snediker points out that queer optimism does not simply concern the hope for a better queer future; instead it operates as a completely different way of understanding the bright side (2009). Basically, Snediker (2009) examines the lyric poetry in order to propose a version of queer optimism, which combines pessimistic and optimistic critique.

2.2.3 Trigger point

The pitfall that seems to be inherent in a queer perception of the world and, as a matter of fact, collides with it, is exactly an essentialist impulse, deriving by the idea of creating and imagining a world of totality; a dominant utopia. On the grounds of this, Bloch's (1996) *not yet conscious* preserves us for a future that is open to various social realities, instead of a single utopia that involves an already authoritarian element in its essence. Thus, queerness offers us a subversive re-enactment of the past into the spectrum of an unpredictable future, including failures (Halberstam, 2011) and without any guarantee of progress and success.

Halberstam explicate why we need failures:

‘[t]he concept of practicing failure perhaps prompts us to discover our inner dweeb, to be underachievers, to fall short, to be distracted, to take a detour, to find a limit, to lose our way, to forget, to avoid mastery [...]. All losers are the heirs of those who lost before them. Failure loves company’ (2011, pp. 120-121).

Halberstam's work on straight time is quite helpful in further understanding Muñoz's reasoning; despite literature considering it as contrasted, I argue that this is not the case. Specifically, Halberstam agrees with Edelman, that the future is associated with heteronormal reproduction and queer subjects as precarious are called to survive in the present rather than dream of the future (2005). However, the queer temporality⁹ suggested by Halberstam (2005) helps my understanding of queer utopia, exactly because it emphasizes on the here and now, in the same way the queer utopian thinking does. For queers, utopian thinking is a way to radicalise themselves in the present and as Muñoz argues:

‘Cruising Utopia can ultimately be read as an invitation, a performative provocation. Manifesto-like and ardent, it is a call to think about our lives and times differently, to look beyond a narrow version of the here and now on which so many around us who are bent on the normative count’ (2009, p. 189).

⁹ Queer temporality is linked to the experience of HIV/AIDS and the loss of loved ones. Cf. Barber, St. & Clark, D. (2002). *Queer moments: The performative temporalities of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick*. In St. Barber & D. Clark (Eds.). *Regarding Sedgwick: Essays on queer culture and theory*. (pp. 1-53). Routledge; Cvetkovich, A. (2003). *An archive of feelings: Trauma, sexuality and lesbian public cultures*. NC: Duke University Press; Freccero, C. (2007). *Queer times. South Atlantic Quarterly*, 106(3), 485-494; Freeman, E. (2010). *Time binds: Queer temporalities, queer histories*. Duke University Press; Love, H. (2007). *Feeling backward: Loss and the politics of queer history*. Harvard University Press; Dinshaw, C. (2012). *How soon is now? Medieval texts, amateur readers, and the queerness of time*. Duke University Press.

However, it should be worth highlighting the danger that Berlant points out: *cruel optimism* is a constant problem to the utopia because, it is possible to forget what we have already gained (2011) and in the end, ‘the realization of the good life feels further and further out of reach’ (Cram, 2014 p. 371). Additionally, Berlant contends that the hunt for a ‘good life’ is motivated by a neoliberal context to ‘become somebody’ (2011, pp. 23-49), necessarily ‘normal’, in the pursuit of happiness. What is more, let us dare to consider Ahmed's theory of happiness (2010), according to which the promise of happiness is a provocative cultural requirement to be happy; let us consider that queer utopian thinking is not ‘cruising’ for an ideal life, but a vision for a just and tolerable life for unhappy queers in the present. Moreover, as she contends

‘[w]e need to think more about the relationship between the queer struggle for a bearable life and aspirational hopes for a good life. Maybe the point is that it is hard to struggle without aspirations, and aspirations are hard to have without giving them some form. We could remember that the Latin root of the word aspiration means “to breathe.” I think the struggle for a bearable life is the struggle for queers to have space to breathe. [...] With breath comes imagination. With breath comes possibility. If queer politics is about freedom, it might simply mean the freedom to breathe’ (Ahmed, 2010, pp. 120).

It is of utmost importance not to forget that a part of the queer community does not query the dominant heteronormal culture, but is instead assimilated into the economic and political system of late capitalism (Duggan, 2003); seeking a place in the patriarchal homonormality. Duggan describes the homonormative agenda of the LGBTQIA+ community as

‘[...] politics that does not contest dominant heteronormative assumptions and institutions, but upholds and sustains them, while promising the possibility of a demobilized gay constituency and a privatized, depoliticized gay culture anchored in domesticity and consumption’ (2003, p. 50).

2.2.4 *Queer world-view*

Muñoz's perspective focalises in heterosexual societies such as the one we live in, but not as aptly as Edelman does. Edelman (2004) mainly criticizes the elite of the LGBTQIA+ community, who has a specific cisgender, class and racial characteristics. Muñoz, on the other hand, focuses on the most vulnerable members of the community, these being queer bodies of color, trans folk, gender nonconforming queers, poor queers, disabled bodies, etc., who do not enjoy the 'privilege' to embrace *reproductive futurism* (Malatino, 2013, p. 209). Simultaneously, gender and sexuality models often keep queer subjects 'in the closet'¹⁰ and this is a triggering point for criticism and rejection – throughout queer communities - of the heteronormative social context. Following Foucault's work, queerness can be read as a 'hope for resistance' and as an inevitable part of (queer) humanity (Jones, 2013, p. 10). In fact, Foucault vividly writes, that 'there are no societies which do not regulate sex, and thus all societies create the hope of escaping from such regulations' (Foucault, 1996, p. 101). The interesting thing about this comparison is that according to Foucault, the biopolitics of sex and the population control simultaneously presuppose places of resistance, while Muñoz suggests that these places of resistance and hope are queer sex, queer art and disidentification performance (1999, 2009).

In the literature, queer world-view¹¹ is captured and attributed to quotidian practices (Muñoz, 1999; 2009, Jones, 2013) like art, desire, language, sexuality, public sex¹², etc. Queer world-view, as portrayed by Muñoz in disidentification performances and daily rituals, referring to the perceived world in a completely different way; it is creating spaces that are not dominated by the heterogeneous and patriarchal reception of gender, power and sexuality. He also contends that:

'The concept of worldmaking delineates the ways in which performances-- both theatrical and everyday rituals-- have the ability to establish alternative views of the world. These alternative vistas are more than simply views or perspective; they are oppositional ideologies that function as critiques of oppressive regimes of "truth" that subjugate minoritarian people' (Muñoz, 1999, 195).

¹⁰ For the term 'in the closet' see Sedgwick, E. K. (1990). *Epistemology of the Closet*. Harvester Wheatsheaf.

¹¹ Muñoz uses the term world-making. I prefer the term world-view.

¹² See Berlant, L. & Warner, M. (1998) Sex in public. *Critical inquiry* 24(2), 547-566.

This queer world-view proposes the creation of a completely different world from the one that already exists and it may as well be the queer utopia in practice. Disidentification performances, rituals and queer art – that are against the heteronormal and the hierarchical cities that we live in - are subversive practices and behaviours of queers, in which Butler sees a hope for the future (Butler, 2014, pp. 169-183). As a consequence, it seems that queer utopian thinking is a potentiality¹³ for queers to think and explore alternative social relationships and ways of living. Specifically, unpredictable futurity is the key to realise queer utopian thinking, a state in which the no longer conscious [past] collides with the not yet conscious [future], thus, creating an opportunity on the horizon for which we are persistently striving (Muñoz, 2009, 30).

Queer utopian acts frequently happen on a personal level or an inter-personal level among a small group of people. These acts interrupt straight time and try to capture some aspects of a preferable society in which queerness tends toward. Queer performance, queer theatre¹⁴, queer art etc. are ‘performative acts of conjuring that deform and re-form the world’ (Muñoz, 1999, p. 196). Conclusively, through this means we are given the chance to imagine a completely different world and we are able to resist dominant, normative conceptions of straightness and cisgenderness.

¹³ It is important to refer to a crucial distinction, which Muñoz makes between potentialities and possibilities. As he mentions ‘Possibilities exist, or more nearly, they exist within a logical realm, the possible, which is within the present and is linked to presence. Potentialities are different in that although they are present, they do not exist in present things. Thus, potentialities have a temporality that is not in the present but, more nearly, in the horizon, which we can understand as futurity’ (Muñoz, 2009, p. 99).

¹⁴ See Dolan, J. (2008). *Utopia in Performance: Finding Hope at the Theater*. University of Michigan Press.

3. Methodological design and research

3.1 Methodology

My main concern is *whether and to what extent there is a queer world-view, what is its content and its relation to democratic coexistence*. In order to answer these questions I used a combination of research methods. At a first level, I carried out a case study (Babbie, 2010, pp. 309-311), that being the event entitled ‘The Queer Museum 2068’, which took place in 2018 and which I visited for an on-site observation. The field research helped me to better comprehend the content and goals of the queer world-view, especially through the performances and rituals. At the same time, I did a qualitative research, in order to further understand the perspective of queer subjects on this issue and to study it in depth. Qualitative research process was the effective way to collect and understand research data, as it examines social phenomena and social life through the perspective of the interviewees and through emphasising their own semantic reference frames (Τσιώλης, 2014, pp. 45- 46). In addition, it creates close communication relationships between the researcher and the interviewees (Τσιώλης, 2014, p. 33). It would also be important to notice that regarding the issue of ‘preconception’ - which arises in both of my research methods - the researcher is not in a social vacuum but, instead, brings with them their socialising experiences, their attitudes, their views, which affect both the management of the interviews at that time, as well as the analysis of data (Τσιώλης, 2014, p. 36).

3.1.1 Sampling

The selection of the interviewees was carried out through a mixture of purposive/judgmental (Babbie, 2010, p. 193) and snowball sampling (Babbie, 2010, p. 193). Both methods fall into the category of nonprobability sampling (Babbie, 2010, p. 192) and are not representative samplings (Babbie, 2010, p. 198) So, I gathered a sample of 10 in depth interviews in Greek¹⁵ with queer subjects (mainly non-binary or gender fluid subjects, people with alternative gender expression and sexual orientation, queer performers and transgender subjects), inhabitants of Greece, in the period 12/10/2020-19/10/2020. Due to measures to reduce transmission of COVID-19 all the interviews took place on-line. These non-structured interviews aim at unearthing new visions, ideas, representations, and societal visions of queer

¹⁵ I have translated into English the literary excerpts which I quote in chapter 3.3

subjects. All the people I approached for the purposes of this research have shown great interest and willingness to get involved in this study and our discussions were very productive. After being briefly informed about the context and the structure of the questionnaire, they agreed to participate and be recorded. Their participation was voluntary, and I observed all the ethical issues for the protection and anonymity of the participants (Babbie, 2010, pp. 64-71).

3.1.2 Questionnaire

For this research I wrote and used a semi-structured questionnaire with open-ended questions. The open-ended questions are offered for the study of sensitive issues and give the interviewees the opportunity to analyse and develop their own thoughts freely (Υφαντόπουλος & Νικολαΐδου, 2008, p. 42). In more detail, the questionnaire is divided into three distinct sections. In the first part, I recorded mainly biographical information which may help us in the analysis of the data e.g. gender identity with which they identify themselves, age, monthly income, etc. In the second part, the questions concern issues of political interest and political participation. In the third part, the discussion focused on the queer world-view, radicalism, and self-image issues.

3.1.3 Data processing

At the end of the interviews, I transcribed each interview and recorded the questions and answers in a Microsoft word program document for better editing.

3.1.4 Principle of validity and reliability

In this research process, I must note that the 'principle of validity' has been observed, as it reliably measures the research question. Concerning the 'principle of reliability', according to which in any repetition of the same social phenomenon the same or similar results will appear, the issue of close relationship between the researcher and the interviewees, as well as the importance of the period during which the research was conducted, are variables that may affect the results. At the same time, the experience of Covid-19, for the impact of which we do not yet have data from the perspective of social sciences, may influence the views of the interviewees.

3.2 Case study: *Queer Museum 2068*

I perceive queer world-view in quotidian events as evidence of a becoming-queer reality, a kernel of tipper for the heterosexual present. The ‘Queer Museum 2068’¹⁶ was an event, which took place two years ago in Communitism,¹⁷ a self-organised place and a state where community power and sense-full business are in a stable equilibrium, located in Metaxourgio area of Athens.



Event poster

The ‘Queer Museum 2068’ was an imaginary museum, taking place 50 years from 2018. In this event we travelled to a future where many of the problems that preoccupied us in 2018 - such as racism, homophobia, and transphobia - were, 50 years later, no more than outdated words.

According to the event’s description, 2068 is the year that the queer subjects become free and live their lives as equal members of the society. Furthermore, it implied that Russia becomes the ideal tourist destination for queer subjects and that the 90-year-old Lady Gaga takes over as President of the United States of America. This event provoked us to wonder if the reality that we supposedly experienced in 2068 has always been like this and made us think about the reality of 2018, through performances, visual arts and exhibits. The museum was divided into 4 different rooms and each one told a story of a certain topic that was related to the specific spectrum.

¹⁶ The “Queer Museum 2068” is a follow-up Activity of the Power Action project that was completed in the Olde Vechte Foundation in the Netherlands in January 2018 regarding the lgbtqia+ community, the creation and implementation of workshops and events of non-formal education.

¹⁷ For more information about this space visit: <https://communitism.space/> or <https://www.facebook.com/communitism/>

It is worth mentioning that Parvus Princeps was at the reception of the museum and the tour was conducted by Kangela, both of whom are well-known drag performers in Athens.



Photography | Credits: © Cathy Mk, Active Rainbow

While entering the museum Kangela provided a short introduction to the idea behind this event and gave us a small taste of what we were about to experience.



Photography | Credits: © Cathy Mk, Active Rainbow

The first room had the title *'working 9 to 5'* and was about a drag queen named Vanessa Cardui, who managed to find a job in a public service that respects her gender expression and appearance in late 2068. Vanessa - with a great taste of humour - recounted her work difficulties and exclusions that queer subjects faced back in 2018.



Photography | Credits: © Cathy Mk, Active Rainbow

The second room had the title *'The world of Lee Fleeting'* and was about what it means to be a trans artist in 2018, presented by a live hologram of trans artist Lee Fleeting, with whom you could not communicate. An interesting way to reflect, I assume, the marginalisation and obscurity that trans subjects and trans artists in particular, experience. All this, creating an antithesis with the 2068 reality where we see a trans artist to have his own section in a museum.



Photography | Credits: © Cathy Mk, Active Rainbow

In the third room entitled *'Fat & Naked'* Irene Palmou and Avraam Vrohidis presented the abusive treatment of fat bodies. Specifically, while displaying body shaming comments on the wall from social networking pages of 2018, two proud fat people were undressing in front of us and were inviting us to enjoy the beauty of their bodies, a beauty recognized in 2068.



Photography | Credits: © Cathy Mk, Active Rainbow

Room number 4 entitled *'Spitting sinners'* by Stelios Troulakis was a ritual in response to a well-known hate speech by a member of the Greek Orthodox Church back in 2018. Specifically, one by one we entered a silent space, where through a symbolic interactive process we spat into a glass looking like a Holy Grail.



Photography | Credits: © Cathy Mk, Active Rainbow

From my point of view these queer world-views - as reflected in performances, daily rituals and events such as the 'QM2068' - are about understanding the world in a completely different way. The 'QM2068' was based on the conception and creation of a space in which the heteronormal and patriarchal reception of gender, power, and sexuality, not only does not prevail, but is, instead, defused. Simultaneously, it challenged the heteronormal Greek society of 2018, in the presence of a small amount of visitors, highlighting that misogyny, sexism, transphobia, homophobia and racism experienced by any of us that do not fit into the stereotypical patterns of gender, sexuality, beauty, etc.; a widespread problem that raises issues of collective coexistence; a matter of democracy after all. Therefore, I see the 'QM2068' as an attempt to imagine life without racist, sexist, class, colonial, regulatory boundaries.

The 'QM2068' did not describe a completely different world; in the first room it dealt with the work of a drag queen in the State, a reasonably very petit bourgeois matter. However at the same time, it did not portray a future society technologically advanced, as we usually imagine 2068 would look like; instead, the whole concept took place in an almost abandoned space with a rather old-fashioned design. These are expected remarks but if we recall Muñoz's theory about queer utopia and queer world-views (2009) we are able to realize that this event did not intend to capture the society of 2068. I did not choose this event because I think that it offers us a glimpse of how a queer future could be, neither because I believe it functions as a recipe for a queer society; the 'QM2068' called us to impugn about the here and now and exhorted us to claim a different future in which even a drag queen can be a State employee; today it is still unthinkable.

In addition, I find the vision for an alternative society, as proposed, and formulated by the 'QM2068', to come to life through three crucial characteristics: performativity, affect and interaction. The performances and the ritual in the last room of the museum are these small daily performances, which for Muñoz are considered as the realisation of the queer world-view since they are 'performative acts of conjuring that deform and re-form the world' (1999, p. 196). Indeed, queer utopia, as captured in this event, has an executive character for us all, because it is not only limited to imagining a better future, but it pointed out the problems and dangers that were a reality for queer bodies in 2018. Queer utopia comes to rewrite the performativity of queer bodies and our desires.

At the same time, the relationship that developed between performers and subjects was based on affect and interaction. The affect is relational and interpersonal and the performances in this museum tried to create relativities and interpersonal relationships between performers and guests, by creating a queer microcosm designed by more than one subject, in co-configuration. Therefore, this idea helped me to think of this event as quite interactive, flexible and collective, since social interaction and communication - through links between the subjects - were set as necessary conditions. Moreover, the ritual did not have a utilitarian and conclusive final way, it did not reverse the existing reality, but, instead left its mark and remained open to be continued somewhere else, by other subjects, for different causes.

As a consequence, it seems that queer performances and rituals are modalities of decentralisation and redefinition of power, recurring processes of deconstruction of the heteronormal, patriarchal and (neo)liberal world. There are potentialities to think and explore alternative social relationships and ways of living. Therefore, queer world-view is essentially an flawed process, which creates bonds and affects through its vulnerability; a process we must constantly protect from the dominant cultural mechanisms.

3.3 Queer subject of democracy

In this chapter I quote, comment on and analyse the interviews with queer subjects, which I conducted as part of my research for this thesis. The first thing to be said is that, the interviewees understand 'queer' as eccentric and unique. Following the question on their perception of the concept of queer, some of the answers were the following: '[queer] is a big umbrella that contains a lot of terms inside it and for me it signifies acceptance of the other sexualities and entities around me and how I can adapt myself to coexist without offending or threatening them'; 'very fluid, I do not know, I have somewhat stopped trying to define it. Many times I used to do what I perceive as queer because I feel that if I come to a conclusion of what I perceive as queer it will not offer me anything because it is different for each person'; 'as an umbrella of identities, sexualities and practices that fight patriarchy and this whole system of oppression based on gender and sexuality and tend to demand liberation from these oppressions'.

According to Pan., 'queer' signifies 'a way of expression, a way of behaviour, a way of life, it is a term that includes a lot of expressions and can contain a multitude of identities, sub-identities, subgroups of people as they are expressed'; transgender woman V. points out that queer is 'anything that deviates from the normality in which we are trained at birth, sex-fluidity, in general all LGBTQI individuals are queer without this necessarily means that they are, but also straight people can be queer'. After all, the fluidity, the multiplicity, and the rejection of the categorisation are some of its central characteristics.

Moreover, fluidity, multiplicity, and rejection of categorisation are central features of queer theory as well. That is the reason why there is no need to place the 'queer' in a semantic shape, but, instead, leave it as a fluidity between the categorisations and as Th. mentions 'queer' serves as a possibility in order for the 'identity divisions and labels to stop existing'. According to their view, queer is a fluid term, by which one defines oneself as one who does not fit into this heteronormal society, a society that is made only for certain types of subjects. In fact, F., who identifies as gender fluid, notes that 'it is queer when you are in danger on the road'.

Furthermore, the ‘queer’ is a concept that constantly overturns itself, a condition of constant questioning, both tangible and theoretical about things and ourselves, that challenges compulsory heterosexuality and monogamy. All the subjects who participated in this research feel comfortable identifying themselves as queer, answering this question¹⁸ in the affirmative.

Indeed, the queer is not a static, coherent and irrevocable identity; it serves as a reminder that gender identity is not a fixed signifier of a substantive category but, instead, a field for a simultaneous re-claiming and deconstruction, and as Th. underlines: ‘it has mainly a political connotation although it may have lost it, it has a correspondence with political claims historically and it still continues’. This is exactly the reason why I believe that by defending fluidity, we avoid the risk of queer subjectification to become just another identity among others, defined by the heteronormal framework. As a result, queer world-views and queer utopias are necessities but, in combination with a circumspect attitude towards *reproductive futurism* (Edelman, 2004) would be beneficial - especially for the queer political movement – concerning the regulatory standards of the future and the desire of a homonormative life. Even more so when the queer political movement is threatened to be assimilated by the dominant cultural mechanisms, and as F. mentions, ‘it bothers me a lot, however, that this political movement [...] is being denounced by various institutions. All the cultural institutions, mainly Stegi’.¹⁹

Nevertheless, I argue that the queer subject provides a challenge to the dominant, gendered, patriarchal dichotomy, and implies radical revisions in the understanding and reception of central conceptual tools, such as sexuality, desire, body, truth, ethics, etc. After all, most of my interviewees point out that the goal of queer political movement in Greece today is to bring together oppressed groups, according to which gender oppression is intertwined with other forms of oppression.²⁰ According to B., the queer political movement ‘tries to bring into the conversation the discussion with other oppressed groups such as disabled persons, people of color, the workers when it succeeds, but the point is that it does not succeed, it goes to do this but the queer political movement has not succeeded yet’.

¹⁸ Q. 21: Θα αυτοπροσδιορίζοσασταν ως queer υποκείμενο; [Would you identify yourself as a queer subject?]

¹⁹ Stegi of the Onassis Foundation is a cultural center in Athens. For more information visit the website: <http://www.onassis.org/>

²⁰ This perception of political mobilisation with emphasis on the mutually reinforcing effect of gender, race, sexuality and class position is called ‘Intersectionality’. See Puar, J. (2012). I would rather be a cyborg than a goddess: Becoming-intersectional in assemblage theory. *philoSOPHIA*, 2,1, 49-66, who has objected to the deleuzian term ‘Assemblage’, according to which multiple identities are not merely additive combinations but, instead, they are contrasted and replicated in a continuous manner.

Additionally, G. thinks that the aim of the queer political movement today is ‘exactly the connection of multiple oppressions and the struggle against them, namely, the radical today is to hold an analysis that views the subjects as carriers of multiple identities and, therefore, as subjects who have many battles to fight and not to ignore other characteristics of them, such as their financial position, their producing position etc’.

At the same time, queer political movement seeks to bring to the fore discussions about drag, sex toys, BDSM, consensus, the performance of gender and, generally, a wider range of identities and sexualities that the LGBTQIA+ movement does not vigorously promote. In addition, the subjects I interviewed directly make a distinction between the queer political movement and the institutional LGBTQIA+ organisations which the interviewees do not consider that they can bring about a reversal and change in the daily homophobia on the streets. For instance, B. states that the queer political movement tries to ‘overthrow the traditional agenda of the LGBTQI movement that concerns the normally self-evident part of the institutional claims that argues about marriage, civil partnership, adoption, acknowledgement of gender identity’, claims which it does not consider to be wrong in principle. However, the queer political movement tries to bring to the fore other issues and as B. notes again ‘the LGBTQI movement does not bring so much warmth and also deals with marginalised subjects who may be in danger or have lost their lives, see the case of ZAK²¹, but also see the many efforts made to support trans people in their surgeries’. These critiques remind of Edelman's (2004) remarks on the homonormativity agenda of the LGBTQIA+ community.

The queer political movement is considered to be at the beginning of its journey, and as one of the interviewees points out ‘it has started quite strongly’ and aims ‘to overthrow the traditional agenda of the LGBTQI movement’. However, for Th., queer subjects focus a lot ‘on opposing the institutional LGBTQI organizations rather than drawing up their own vision and a reading of what their world would be like’.

²¹ B. refers to the murder of queer activist and drag performer Zak Kostopoulos, known as Zackie oh, who was brutally murdered in the center of Athens on 21/09/2018. The case has not yet been tried with the indictment weighing on 2 shop owners and 4 police officers. See: <https://forensic-architecture.org/investigation/the-killing-of-zak-kostopoulos> [WARNING: this content may be disturbing to some viewers]

The murders of queer subjects such as Zackie oh/Zak Kostopoulos and Vaggelis Giakoumakis²² played a key role in the flourishing of this movement and were events that motivated some of the interviewees to become more interested in politics and, eventually, become more participatory and politically active.

The subjects of this research largely believe that radical social and political change is possible, feasible and necessary in order to have a greater involvement in public life and to share an active citizenship among other subjects, equally. However, they have limited expectations for the future, which include the restoration of the rule of law, their safety on the road, the safeguarding of their rights; very important problems of course. Answering my question ‘what would be the content of a radical queer policy?’ some of the interviewees respond as follows: ‘projection of paradigms completely foreign and different and shocking from the average paradigm of the Greek man and woman’, ‘I think the simplest thing that could be done, women and queer people in positions of power’ and ‘very important for me are those that fall within the category of gender inequalities, namely those in relation to gender, too much daily difficulty in terms of survival, safety, work, etc.’. Projecting the whole problematic from my point of view, what I certainly consider to be noteworthy is the lack of reference to a more comprehensive social transformation, where a different model of organisation of society, politics, and economy, with the aim of social equality, solidarity, and subjective autonomy, is clearly proposed.

An exception to the aforementioned statement would probably be Th.’s perspective who looks forward to a utopia of ‘automatically queer communism’ in which ‘everyone will have what they want, we will have equal access to goods, everyone will be able to live together in houses, children will be raised by a community of 10 people, there will be no identities, there will be no borders, there will be no gender barriers and gender dipole, we will all be human, there will be no religion with the power that exists today, that is, there will be religious belief but there will be no religious power; you can do whatever profession you want and if you want to change it and contribute differently to the society you will live in, you will be able to do it easily’.

²² Vaggelis Giakoumakis was a student at Dairy Vocational School of Ioannina who had been continuously tortured by some of his classmates and eventually killed in March 2015. All 5 of his classmates accused of the crime, were found guilty and sentenced to 3 years in prison.

Indeed, the idea of queer Communism developed by Th. concerns a different model of social organisation, without hierarchies, without parenthood, but, instead, based on respect for human desire and expression. Obviously, the reaching out of each citizen in society is necessary, but only in terms of individual will and without prescribed life paths. However, as far as the dimension of automation concerns, I am quite cautious, since I believe that an automated social organisation has the element of an already authoritarian ideology.

However, the general impression of the response towards major social changes was slightly different, as some of the interviewees expressed fear, anxiety, or hesitance. As stated by Per., 'I am a little scared by great visions because over the years there have been various disappointments [...]. What I expect is that people share with each other different things that concern them and give them a hard time and on a smaller level that change comes, that is, I do not trust and do not believe, because there is so much at stake, that they will somehow let the changes come'. However, the fact that they do not form subversive visions towards the oppressive societies in which they live in, does not mean that they are not concerned or are idle on these matters. B. reflects on this position: 'inasmuch the great narratives have collapsed, I think that would be what I want, me and my friends try to do the best we can in the present with constant reflections and questioning of our certainties around our own realities and those of the others and on who we are but also in what is happening outside of us'. I believe that this last observation partly explains their inability to construct radical queer world-views that are oriented to a more traditional point of view, but it proves, however, that they are highly concerned with the situation, they are sharing their thoughts, developing affect with people who feel comfortable around and focusing on the here and now. (Muñoz, 2009).

Maybe neo-liberal social anthropology does not allow queer utopian thinking? Queer utopian thinking as a condition of the present makes sense to have limitations, as the language of their imagination may be limited by the neo-liberal social normality, that surrounds them. Indeed, the subjects of this research seek subversive visions of a society in which its gendered performances will have a place in what is culturally understood as human, but they fail to clearly record a different model of organisation of social and political life. However, their involvement in politics is a self-evident choice, as it is an activity that concerns and determines every aspect of their lives.

Further, they are politically active, participate in collective agitations, political collectives and position themselves on the left and anarchy on the left / right axis, as they believe that the visions of society they outline can only be part of a left or anarchist ideology.

I might be signifying the agency of the queer political movement in Athens with a logic of participatory and subversive actions and demands, without this meaning that I ignore the events of queer memory and queer mourning, following the murder of Zackie oh that were decisive for the formation of the queer political movement.²³ At the same time constant self-reflection is needed; who is represented and who is excluded? Which political claims are being promoted and which are being set aside? These are very critical questions that we must constantly keep in mind.²⁴

The queer subjects of this research argue that democracy does not satisfy them, they do not enjoy equal use of citizenship with cisgender subjects and they are constantly in a state of insecurity. For instance, Tz. says that ‘democracy is not handled by the people themselves but is essentially handled and distorted and fomented by people who are in the best interest of the leaders, the elite, the cis straight men’, while Ol. states that ‘by learning to think democratically, to think in terms of the principles of democracy, you learn to listen a little more and to understand that your own existence can help without being imposed on others’, a perspective that seems to have been lost. It is clear from the above insightful remarks that they identify certain weaknesses not only in democracy as a system of governance, but also in the very essence of democracy itself. Hence, they seem to think that there is a lack of democracy, while, at the same time, being unable to outline a structured queer world-view, where true democracy in all areas exists. This lack of articulation/loss of a queer world-view is a critical political problem/demand.

Responding to my question concerning what the social/political problems in Greece today are, they mentioned patriarchy, conservatism, political cynicism, and the strict and established gender identity and sexuality that oppresses them. All these matters are strongly related to the function of democracy. In addition, their gender identity (especially the way of

²³ See Αθανασίου, Α., Γκουγκούσης, Γ., Παπανικολάου, Δ. (2020). *Κοινή πολιτική/Δημόσια μνήμη*. Ίδρυμα Ρόζα Λούξεμβουργκ/Παράρτημά Ελλάδας: <https://www.openbook.gr/queer-politiki-dimosia-mnimi/>

²⁴ See Butler, J. (1993). *Critically Queer*. *GLQ*, 1 (1), p. 19. For greek reality cf. Papanikolaou, D. (2018). *Critically queer and haunted: Greek identity, crisis capes and doing queer history in the present*. *Journal of Greek Media and Culture* 4(2), 167-186.

expressing it) and their social status²⁵ directly affects all the aspects of their life and in many circumstances they have experienced an inability of accomplishing their aspirations because of it.

At the same time, they highlight various other strongly oppressive elements that affect them as a generation (especially those aged 22-29) such as the economic crisis, corruption in politics, and the impunity of politicians responsible for the country's economic situation.²⁶ Indeed, the general insecurity that exists seems to act as a limiting factor to their goals and dreams. Most of the interviewees express a sense of oppression by the 'climate' of insecurity²⁷ and uncertainty, while at the same time they feel motivated by precariousness; Ol. states that 'many times it (precariousness) holds me back because it makes me feel afraid of the opposite but at the same time it makes me stubborn'. In contrast, Th. argues that precariousness does not affect them because 'the less you have, the less you have to lose'.

What is it, however, that can instigate people to an alternative world-view, to construct a radical politics of alliances, an orchestrated 'we' against the neoliberal governmentality? According to Butler and Athanasiou (2013), 'precariousness' could function as the point of departure for a political struggle and as a 'place' of alliance between subjects that might differ, but, nevertheless, lay claim to a future where they are able to develop new social ways of (co)existence, resistance and sentiment, rejecting a future of politically imposed precariousness.

Indeed, queer subjects are and self-identify as precarious. However, in my opinion, the precariousness of subjects does not necessarily imply that they share a subversive vision for a radical democracy. I believe that this can only be achieved through a completely different perception of democracy and the subject of democracy. The dominant perception of gender is inherently sexist and that is why it is morally, ideologically, and politically not acceptable, but also it is completely dysfunctional socially and in great opposition towards democracy.

²⁵ Almost none of the interviewees have a fixed income, and do not even receive the basic salary, i.e. 550€. Of course, social status (class) does not only depend only on income.

²⁶ Cf. for this topic Παντελίδου Μαλούτα, Μ., Ζηργάνου Καζολέα, Λ. (2020). Νεολαία, αριστερή ψήφος και ριζοσπαστισμός τη δεύτερη δεκαετία του 2000. *Επιθεώρηση Πολιτικής Επιστήμης*, 46, 148-182.

²⁷ On this issue the recent experience of the health and financial crisis due to Covid-19 may have strongly influenced the interviewees

Politics have historically been a predominantly male field of human activity and even today the political process has a male and cisgender character. Gender differences are sexist, they hinder the self-realisation of the subjects and remain a myth that allows gender inequality to perpetuate through the years. Democracy, however, requires equal and free citizens and is incompatible with hierarchies and old fashioned/established identities. The redefinition of the subject in democracy, emerges as a new necessity, making it clear that a different perspective of gender, sexuality and the body is needed (Pantelidou Maloutas, 2006, p. 18). Thus, I believe that this completely different perception of the subject of democracy is embodied in the queer subject, which remains in its fluidity, without fixed identities, and sets foot in the public space possessing its only attribute, that of the human, who thus, becomes citizen.

The queer subject is potentially indifferent to established identities, hierarchies, and bipolarities. It is not a subject that is subordinated by categorisations, but only highlights as a prerequisite the human condition, without implying that it is anthropocentric. Therefore, from one point of view, it can be stipulated that queer subjectivation can potentially be the key for an ideal type of citizen who participates in politics with the citizenship they exercise, which in its turn remaining indifferent to any conditions other than the human, indifferent to identity or position of the subject. The challenge that remains is obviously, how this different perception of democracy could be pursued, an imperative that could only be achieved through radical and utopian thinking and policies that serve them.

The queer movement's goal is to compose a queer utopian thinking that provides with a new horizon of empathy, morality, knowledge, power, and social organisation. A social organisation that accepts human plurality, vulnerability, and self-determination. Queer utopian thinking, therefore, can be a tool of analysis and critique of the present, a new way of rendering into a present fuelled by anti-hegemonic practices, to create a more sustainable world for marginalised groups, and, therefore, for all. I argue, then, that queer world-views, as outlined through queer performances and rituals, seem to articulate the demands of oppressed groups and project another potentially more democratic world into the now. What now seems to be an imperative is considering to what extent the subversive critique is adequate to succeed in smashing patriarchy, authoritarianism, and austerity.

However, since the discussion concerns queer utopian thinking, we should refer to queer utopias', multiple potential realisations that will not be confined to hegemonic regimes of truth (Φουκώ, 2020, p. 199), but will project human vulnerability and trauma, thus, introducing us to a new bond between solidarity and vulnerability.²⁸

I do not believe that a universal queer world-view and a concrete queer utopian thinking exist, but what certainly exists is an experienced reality, which pushes us to envision a different future and confront the present in a critical manner, even if we eventually fail to make a difference. Besides,

‘[q]ueer utopias are ways of constructing a fantasy of what is possible through a recursive reference to counter histories, to near-forgotten or obscured modes of being and acts of resistance, as well a way of sourcing and elaborating already existing forms-of-life that signify—or rather, don’t signify—as unintelligible, illegal, or unworkable according to hegemonic logics’ (Malatino, 2013, p. 211).

To sum up, I consider queer utopias to be motivating points of reference for oppressed groups in order to establish a fecund environment for them to endure and hope. For oppressed social groups – such as queers –, utopias come as tools to critique the present, to form oppositions, to challenge the pre-existing reality, and confrontationally as weapons against their opponents. I argue that queer world-views are way outs to escape the existing oppressive reality, to forge a path towards a queer utopia, to help citizens understand democracy not as a given, but as an endeavour to be undertaken. I argue for a radical democracy,²⁹ attainable through performative citizenship that is based on queer world-view(s), providing alternative ways of social living. The goal of queer citizenship is the emergence of a new imaginative political thinking and democratic coexistence.

²⁸ For the concept of vulnerability see Αθανασίου, Α. Επιτελέσεις της τρωτότητας και του κοινωνικού τραύματος. In Α. Αθανασίου (Ed.), *Βιοκοινωνικότητες. Θεωρήσεις στην ανθρωπολογία της υγείας*. (pp. 13-88). Νήσος; Butler, J. (2016) Rethinking Vulnerability and Resistance. In J. Butler, Z. Gambetti & L. Sabsay (Eds.), *Vulnerability in Resistance*. (pp. 12-27). Duke University Press.

²⁹ For radical democracy see Mouffe, Ch. (1992), *Dimensions of radical democracy*. Verso; Trend, D. (1996). *Radical democracy: Identity, citizenship and the state*. Routledge

4. Conclusions

The aim of this work was to provide the key theoretical aspect of the concepts of study of citizenship, queer world-view, and, last but not least, democracy. Not being a solely theoretical study of the above mentioned concepts, this thesis also includes a case study, the purpose of which is to not only give an example of the practical appliance of the notions discussed, but furtherly contribute a number of conceptual remarks concerning the topic.

In the theoretical part of the paper I tried to highlight the problems arising due to the marginalisation of queer subjects from a participatory citizenship, and to emphasise that gender inequalities and the hierarchical structure of gender are incompatible with democracy. At the same time, I addressed the dimension of queer utopian thinking as a way of rejecting and criticising the oppressive present; as a hope for a more democratic future for all.

In the research part of the work, my goal was to analyse whether or not a queer world-view exists and, if it does, what its content is. I also dealt with the question whether a queer subjectivation constitutes the ideal type of citizen for a radical and participatory democracy. In relation to the case study of the 'Queer Museum 2068', as previously presented, there is a very interesting reflection on the cisgender character of society, the exclusions and the injustice that exists. Indeed, 'QM2068' is an example of a queer utopian and queer world-view, whose aim is not to literally depict the future society of 2068 as convincingly as possible, but rather to prod the spectators and critically present the inequalities and exclusions experienced by queer subjects in the here and now. Through queer performances and rituals the artists were able to outline their problems and highlight different social perspectives; societies where the citizens are willing to share affection, solidarity and the essential meaning of democracy required in every level of creating queer world-views.

At the same time, the interviewees of this research wish for radical changes in which gender identities do not entrap subjects in prescribed roles, but challenge the established gender dichotomy. Their utopian thinking reflects the radical way in which these social subjects imagine the future, as long as their identity is unacceptable in the present. That is exactly the reason why one could also argue that these utopias, as a matter of fact, the dystopias of other subjects, carriers of a dominant discourse on gendered performance and of how they perceive gender. They suggest a gender perception that differs from the existing gender perceptions, but - yet - fail to compose a comprehensive world-view. Their subversive critique rests on a

utopian realm that provides space for the development of an intensely critical discourse of dominant gender identities, but no roadmap for getting there.

What concerns the interviewees' perception of the possibilities realising a queer utopia, reservations were expressed about whether the subversive world-views are feasible or if these visions are actually achievable. From my point of view on this topic, I am influenced by Halberstam's (2011) work on how I perceive queer utopias, and this includes necessities, possibilities, and, simultaneously, impossibilities. In other words, I believe that the possibility of queer utopias failing or not having a pragmatic ground, a problematic which may concern queer subjects is not an inhibitory factor in queer utopian thinking. On the contrary, utopian plans, even if they fail, create affect and interaction for us, that is, they bring us closer and help to develop a critical discourse and bonds of trust between members of the queer community.

Furthermore, I see queer utopias as motivating points of reference for other oppressed social groups in order for them to endure and hope. Besides, what first of all, the queer brings forward, even before contestation, is hope. In addition, oppressed social groups - such as queers - could use utopias as tools to critique the present and as weapons against their opponents. So, I argue that queer world-views are plans to escape the existing oppressive reality and help anyone understand democracy not as a given, but as an endeavor to be undertaken. What I have in mind is a conception of radical democracy, possible through performative citizenship. By the term performative citizenship, I mean a participatory citizenship where no structural exclusions are at play, while it is the only quality we bear on public space. Moreover, queer citizenship actualised in performative terms does not concern a static and coherent identity, but rather it enables the possibility of de-identification as a critical attitude, as well as the potentiality for the political subject to be politicised.

The necessary condition of the queer political movement is the emergence of new imaginative political thinking and democratic coexistence. That is, to inspire and imagine new courses of action of more democratic ways of social coexistence and to propose multiple queer world-views, multiple potential social realisations that respect self-determination and self-expression. At the core of these visions, therefore, is democracy itself and its deepening in all areas so that there is social equality and liberation from the shackles of gender and patriarchy.

Obviously, the road one needs to take to a more democratic social coexistence is huge, especially today in the era of neoliberalism, secularisation, and growing precariousness. In short, nowadays we may be witnesses of a capitalist manoeuvre- in Foucault's terms - that seeks to maintain patriarchy and capitalism through a liberal policy on gender and sexual issues,³⁰ which, in their turn, are not considered as a threat for the capitalist system. However, the purpose of queer political movement is not to gain a little space in power and for a few queer subjects to take positions of power and assimilate into ruling elites. On the contrary, the goal of the movement is to disorganise and dismantle hierarchical societies through constant queer utopian thinking. Queer utopian thinking and the 'dystopia of normality'³¹ collide head-on as two completely contradictory world-views and opposite versions of human coexistence, in the hope that the former will prevail.

³⁰ An attempt to answer what is aptly asked by R. Horrocks in Horrocks, R. (1997). *An Introduction to the study of sexuality*. MacMillan, p. 155.

³¹ I am referring to the ideological narrative of the ruling right-wing party of 'New Democracy' for a 'return to normality' [επιστροφή στην κανονικότητα]

References

1. Ahmed, S. (2004). Affective economies. *Social Text*, 22(2), 117–139.
2. Ahmed, S. (2010). *The Promise of Happiness*. Duke University Press.
3. Andrijasevic, R. (2013). Acts of Citizenship as Methodology. In E. F. Isin and M. Saward (Eds.), *Enacting European Citizenship* (pp. 47–65). Cambridge University Press.
4. Aradau, C. & Huysmans, J. (2014) Critical Methods in International Relations: The Politics of Techniques, Devices and Acts. *European Journal of International Relations* 20, 3, 596–619.
5. Avramopoulou, E. (2017). Claims of existence between biopolitics and thanatopolitics. In M. Gragnolati & C. Holzhey (Eds.), *De/Constituting wholes: Towards partiality without parts*. Verlag Turia.
6. Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research*. Wadsworth, Cengage learning.
7. Benhabib, S. (2004). *The rights of others: Aliens, residents, and citizens*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Berlant, L. (2011) *Cruel optimism*. Duke University Press.
9. Berlin, I. (1969). *Four essays on liberty*. Oxford library press.
10. Bloch, E. (1996). *The principle of hope*. MIT Press.
11. Braidotti, R., Hanafin, P. & Blaagaard, B. (Eds.). (2013). *After cosmopolitanism*. Routledge.
12. Brown, W. (1995). *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton University Press.
13. Brown, W. (2010). *Walled states, waning sovereignty*. Zone Books.
14. Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution*. Zone Books.
15. Brubaker, R. (1996). *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National the New Europe*. University of California.
16. Butler, J. & Athanasiou, A. (2013). *Dispossession: The performative in the political*. John Wiley & Sons.
17. Butler, J. & Spivak G. C. (2007), *Who Sings the Nation-State? Language, Politics, Belonging*, Seagull Books.
18. Butler, J. (2006). Παραστασιακές επιτελέσεις και συγκρότηση φύλου: δοκίμιο πάνω στη φαινομενολογία και τη φεμινιστική θεωρία. In A. Αθανασίου (Ed.), *Φεμινιστική θεωρία και πολιτισμική κριτική* (pp. 381-407). Νήσος.
19. Butler, J. (2014). *Αναταραχή φύλου: ο φεμινισμός και η ανατροπή της ταυτότητας*. Πλέθρον.
20. Butler, J. (2015). *Notes toward a performative theory of assembly*. Harvard university Press.
21. Caserio, R. L., Edelman, L., Halberstam, J., Muñoz, J. E. & Dean, T. (2006). The Antisocial Thesis in Queer Theory. *PMLA*, 121(3), 819-828.
22. Connell, R. W. (2006). *Το κοινωνικό φύλο*. Επίκεντρο
23. Cornell, D. (1992). *The philosophy of the limit*. Routledge.
24. Cornell, D. (1998). *At the heart of freedom: Feminism, sex & equality*. Princeton University Press.
25. Cram, E. D. (2014). *Cruel Optimism* by Lauren Berlant (review). *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 17, 371-374.
26. Crouch, C. (2004). *Post-democracy*. Polity.
27. Dean, T. (2003) Lacan and Queer Theory. In J. M. Rabaté (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Lacan*. Cambridge University Press.
28. DeGooyer, St., Hunt, A., Maxwell, L. & Moyn, S. (2019). *Το δικαίωμα να έχουμε δικαιώματα*. Εκδόσεις του εικοστού πρώτου.
29. Derrida, J. (1992a). *The other heading: Reflections on today's Europe*. Indiana University Press.
30. Derrida, J. (1992b). *The Other Heading: Reflections on Today's Europe*. Indiana University Press.
31. Derrida, J. (1997). *Of grammatology*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
32. Derrida, J. (2005). *Rogues: Two essays on reason*. Stanford University Press.
33. Duggan, L. (2003). *The Twilight of Equality: Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics and the Attack on Democracy*. Beacon Press.
34. Eagleton, T. (1999). Utopia and its opposites. In L. Panitch, C. Leys (eds.), *Necessary and unnecessary utopias*. (pp.31–40). Merlin Press.
35. Edelman, L. (2004). *No future: Queer theory and the death drive*. Duke University Press.
36. Eng D. L., Halberstam, J., Muñoz, J. E. (2005). What's Queer About Queer Studies Now?. *Social text*, 23(3–4), 1-17.
37. Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction*. Random House.

38. Foucault, M. (1982) The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8, 777-95.
39. Foucault, M. (1984). Of other spaces, heterotopias. *Architecture, mouvement, continuité*, 5, 46-49.
40. Foucault, M. (1988). *Τι είναι διαφωτισμός*. Έρασμος.
41. Foucault, M. (1996). *Foucault Live: Interviews, 1961–84*. CA:Semiotex.
42. Foucault, M. (2011). Η ιστορία της σεξουαλικότητας: Η βούληση για γνώση (Πρώτος Τόμος). Πλέθρον.
43. Fritsch, M. (2002). Derrida's democracy to come. *Constellations*, 9(4), 575–597.
44. Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. The Free Press/Macmillan.
45. Habermas, J. (2001). The postnational constellation and the future of democracy. In J. Habermas (Ed.), *The postnational constellation: Political essays, Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought*. (pp. 58–112). MA: MIT Press.
46. Halberstam, J. (2005). *In a queer time and place: Transgender bodies, subcultural lives*. New York University Press.
47. Halberstam, J. (2011). *The queer art of failure*. Duke University Press.
48. Hall, S. (1992) The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held, T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures* (pp.273–326). Polity Press.
49. Hannah, A. (1973). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973.
50. Haritaworn, J., Kuntsman, A. & Posocco S. (Eds.). (2015). *Queer necropolitics*. Routledge.
51. Honohan, I. (2002). *Civic Republicanism*. Routledge.
52. Isin, E. (2017). Performative citizenship. In A. Shachar, R. Bauböck, I. Bloemraad & M. Vink (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of citizenship*. Oxford University Press.
53. Jones, A. (2009) Queer Heterotopias: Homonormativity and the Future of Queerness. *Interalia: A Journal of Queer Studies*, 4, 1–20.
54. Jones, A. (2013). Introduction: Queer Utopias, Queer Futurity, and Potentiality in Quotidian Practice. In A. Jones, (ed.), *A critical inquiry into queer utopias*. (pp. 1-17). Palgrave Macmillan.
55. Kymlicka, W. (1989). *Liberalism, Community and Culture*. Clarendon Press.
56. Lacan, J. (1966). *Ecrits, I, II*. Seuil.
57. Lepp, N. (2019). *Queering Utopia: ACT UP and the Disruption of Heteronormativity*. (Publication: No. 3642) [UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones].
58. Lister, R. (1997). *Citizenship: Feminist perspectives*. MacMillan.
59. Malatino, H. (2013). Utopian Pragmatics: Bash Back! and the Temporality of Radical Queer Action. In A. Jones, (ed.), *A critical inquiry into queer utopias*. (pp. 205-237). Palgrave Macmillan.
60. Marshall, T. H. (1977). *Class, citizenship and social development*. University of Chicago Press.
61. Mbembe, J. A. & Meintjes, L. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, 15(1), 11–40.
62. Mikdashi, M. (2013). Queering citizenship, queering Middle East studies. *International journal of Middle East studies*, 45(2), 350-352.
63. Mouffe, Ch. (1992). Feminism, citizenship and radical democratic politics. In J. Butler, J. W. Scott, (eds.), *Feminists theorize the political* (pp.369–384). Routledge.
64. Mouffe, Ch. (1996). *Deconstruction and pragmatism*. Routledge.
65. Mouffe, Ch. (2005). *On the political*. Routledge.
66. Muñoz, J. E. (1999). *Disidentifications: Queers of color and the performance of politics*. University of Minnesota Press.
67. Muñoz, J. E. (2009). *Cruising Utopia: The There and Then of Queer Theory*. New York University Press.
68. Okin, S. M. (1991). Gender, the public, and the private. In D. Held (ed.), *Political theory today* (pp.67–90). Blackwell.
69. Orloff, A. S. (1993). Gender and the social rights of citizenship. *American Sociological Review*, 58, 303–328.
70. Pantelidou Maloutas, M. (2006). *The gender of democracy: Citizenship and gendered subjectivity*. Routledge.
71. Pateman, C. (1989). *The disorder of women*. Polity Press.
72. Pettit, Ph. (1997). *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*. Oxford.
73. Phelan, Sh. (2001). *Sexual Strangers: Gays, Lesbians and Dilemmas of Citizenship*. Temple University Press.

74. Phillips, A. (1991). *Engendering democracy*. Polity Press.
75. Phillips, A. (1993). *Democracy and difference*. Polity Press.
- Rancière, J. (1999). *Disagreement: Politics and philosophy*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Sargisson, L. (1996). *Contemporary feminist utopianism*. Routledge.
76. Snediker, M. D. (2009). *Queer optimism: Lyric personhood and other felicitous persuasions*. University of Minnesota Press.
77. Spargo, T. (1999). *Foucault and Queer Theory*. Icon Books Ltd.
78. Spivak, G. Ch. (1988). Can the subaltern speak?. In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.) *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. University of Illinois Press.
79. Stoler, A. L. (1995). *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality Order of Things*. N.C.: Duke University Press.
80. The Mary Nardini Gang. (2013). Towards the Queerest Insurrection. In F. Baroque & T. Eanelli (eds.), *Queer UltraViolence: Abridged BASH BACK!*. Little Black Cart.
81. Varikas, E. (1993). Féminisme, modernité, postmodernité: pour un dialogue des deux côtés de l'océan. In *Futur Antérieur* (supplément), *Féminismes au présent*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
82. Vink, M. (2017). Comparing citizenship regimes. In A. Shachar, R. Bauböck, I. Bloemraad & M. Vink (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of citizenship*. (pp. 221-244). Oxford University Press.
83. Warner, M. (1993). *Fear of a queer planet: Queer politics and social theory*. University of Minnesota Press.
84. Young, I. M. (1989). Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship. *Ethics* 99, 2, 250–274.
85. Αθανασίου, Α. (2007). *Ζωή στο όριο*. Εκκρεμές.
86. Αθανασίου, Α. (2006). Εισαγωγή: Φύλο, εξουσία και υποκειμενικότητα μετά το “δεύτερο κύμα”. In Α. Αθανασίου (Ed.), *Φεμινιστική θεωρία και πολιτισμική κριτική* (pp.13-138). Νήσος.
87. Λαχανιώτη, Λ. (2012). Από τη λεσβιακή θεματική στο κουίρ: η διαδρομή μιας εμπειρικής έρευνας. In Α. Αποστολέλλη & Α. Χαλκία (Eds.), *Σώμα, φύλο, σεξουαλικότητα: ΛΟΑΤΚ πολιτικές στην Ελλάδα*. Πλέθρον.
88. Παντελίδου Μαλούτα, Μ. (2017). Τι μάθαμε για την έμφυλη ισότητα: από τη θεωρία στη πολιτική. In Ντ. Βαΐου, Α. Ψαρρά, (Eds.), *Εννοιολογήσεις και πρακτικές του φεμινισμού: Μεταπολίτευση και «μετά»* [Πρακτικά ημερίδας]. Ίδρυμα της Βουλής των Ελλήνων.
89. Παντελίδου Μαλούτα, Μ. (2012). *Πολιτική συμπεριφορά: θεωρία, έρευνα και ελληνική πολιτική*. Σαββάλας
90. Παντελίδου Μαλούτα, Μ. (2015). *Πολιτισμικές συνιστώσες της πολιτικής διαδικασίας: Πολιτική κοινωνικοποίηση και ελληνική πολιτική κουλτούρα*. Κάλλιπος, Ελληνικά ακαδημαϊκά συγγράμματα και βοηθήματα.
91. Σκοτ, Τζ. Ου. (1997). *Το φύλο: μια χρήσιμη κατηγορία της ιστορικής ανάλυσης*. In Ε. Αβδελά, Α. Ψαρρά (Eds.), *Σιωπηρές ιστορίες: γυναίκες και φύλο στην ιστορική αφήγηση* (pp. 285-327). Αλεξάνδρεια.
92. Τσιώλης, Γ. (2014). *Μέθοδοι και τεχνικές ανάλυσης στην ποιοτική κοινωνική έρευνα*. Κριτική.
93. Υφαντόπουλος, Γ., Νικολαΐδου, Κ. (2008). *Η στατιστική στην κοινωνική έρευνα*. Gutenberg.
94. Φουκώ, Μ. (2020). *Για την κυβέρνηση των ζωντανών: Μαθήματα στο κολέγιο της Γαλλίας, 1979-1980*. Βιβλιοπωλείον της «Εστίας».
95. Χορκχάιμερ, Μ., Αντόρνο, Τ. Β. (1996). *Η διαλεκτική του διαφωτισμού*. Νήσος.

Appendix

[Questionnaire in greek] ΟΔΗΓΟΣ ΣΥΝΕΝΤΕΥΞΗΣ με στόχο τη διερεύνηση του queer οράματος κοινωνίας;

A' Μέρος: Γενικές πληροφορίες

1. Επιλέγετε να αυτοπροσδιορίζεστε με κάποια έμφυλη ταυτότητα/κάποιες έμφυλες ταυτότητες; Αν ναι με ποιά/ποιές;
2. Ποιά είναι η ηλικία σας;
3. Θα δίνετε κάποιον συγκεκριμένο χαρακτηρισμό στον σεξουαλικό σας προσανατολισμό; Αν ναι ποιον;
4. Ποιά είναι η παρούσα απασχόλησή σας;
5. Ποιό είναι το μηνιαίο εισόδημά σας; Είστε ικανοποιημένος/η ;
6. Ποιό είναι το ανώτατο εκπαιδευτικό επίπεδο που έχετε ολοκληρώσει/που βρίσκεστε;
7. Πού κατοικείτε;
8. Μένετε μόνοι/ες σας; [ή γονείς/σχέση/συγκάτοικο;]

B' Μέρος: Πολιτική

9. Γενικά θα λέγατε ότι ενδιαφέρεστε για την πολιτική πολύ-αρκετά-λίγο-καθόλου Γιατί;
10. Από πότε; Υπήρξε κάποιο γεγονός καθοριστικό για το ενδιαφέρον σας;
11. Πώς αντιλαμβάνεστε την έννοια της πολιτικής;
12. Πώς αντιλαμβάνεστε την έννοια της δημοκρατίας;
13. Αν έπρεπε να τοποθετηθείτε σε αυτόν τον άξονα, όπου το 0 είναι Αριστερά και το 10 Δεξιά, που θα τοποθετούσατε τον εαυτό σας;
14. Άρα είστε αριστερός/δεξιός/ κεντροαριστερός...; Τι σας επιτρέπει να χαρακτηρίσετε τον εαυτό σας έτσι;
15. Ψηφίσατε στις κοινοβουλευτικές εκλογές του 2019;
16. Με ποιούς από τους παρακάτω τρόπους συμμετέχετε κυρίως στην πολιτική:
 - ανταλλαγή απόψεων
 - έκφραση απόψεων στα social media (σχολιασμός σε ποστ ή κοινοποίηση σχετικού περιεχομένου)
 - συμμετοχή σε άλλη πολιτική συλλογικότητα
 - συμμετοχή σε κόμμα
 - ακτιβισμός
17. Έχετε πάρει μέρος σε συλλογικές κινητοποιήσεις; Τι είδους; Πόσο τακτικά;
18. Ποιά νομίζετε ότι είναι τα κεντρικά πολιτικά/κοινωνικά προβλήματα στην Ελλάδα σήμερα;
19. Πώς θα επιλυθούν;

Γ' ΜΕΡΟΣ:

Γ.1. Queer όραμα κοινωνίας

20. Πώς αντιλαμβάνεστε την έννοια queer;
21. Θα αυτοπροσδιορίζασταν ως queer υποκείμενο;
22. Ποιά είναι η άποψη σας για το queer πολιτικό κίνημα σήμερα στην Ελλάδα; (υπάρχει; περιεχόμενο, είναι αναγκαίο;)
23. Προσβλέπετε σε ριζικές κοινωνικές αλλαγές;
24. Αν ναι, τι είδους;
25. Θεωρείτε τις ριζικές κοινωνικές αλλαγές πραγματοποιήσιμες;
26. Αν ναι, πώς θα επιτευχθούν; Αν όχι, γιατί;
27. Ποιό θα ήταν το περιεχόμενο μιας ριζοσπαστική queer πολιτική; Εσείς θα επιθυμούσατε να θεσμοθετηθούν τέτοια μέτρα;
28. Συνδέεται με κάποιο τρόπο η δημοκρατία με την δική σας ταυτότητα/υποκειμενικότητα; Γενικά θα λέγατε ότι στην Ελλάδα πχ, λειτουργεί η δημοκρατία ; Γιατί; Αν όχι: Τι προβλήματα εντοπίζετε εσείς στο πεδίο της δημοκρατίας;
29. Πώς θα λειτουργήσει καλύτερα η δημοκρατία;

Γ.2. Θέματα αυτοεικόνας

30. Θεωρείτε πώς η έμφυλη ταυτότητά σας και ο τρόπος που την εκφράζετε (gender expression) παίζει σημαντικό ρόλο στη ζωή σας;
31. Πιστεύετε ότι η πολιτική/οι πολιτικές αποφάσεις επηρεάζουν τη ζωή σας/την καθημερινότητά σας;
32. Πιστεύετε ότι η δική σας συμμετοχή ασκεί επιρροή την πολιτική διαδικασία/στη λήψη αποφάσεων;
33. Τι ρόλο παίζει για την επίτευξη των ονείρων σας και των επιδιώξεών σας η γενικότερη κοινωνική επισφάλεια;
34. Εσείς προσωπικά, θα λέγατε ότι έχετε νιώσει ποτέ ότι δεν μπορείτε να κάνετε κάτι λόγω κάποιου χαρακτηριστικού ή ιδιότητάς σας;

-Της ταξικής σας προέλευσης

-Του φύλου ή της έκφρασης φύλου

-Του σεξουαλικού σας προσανατολισμού

Ποιό είναι πιο καθοριστικό για εσάς;