

Originalni naučni rad
UDK 305-055.3

Jelisaveta Blagojević
The Faculty of Media and Communication, Belgrade

Slavcho Dimitrov
Institute for Social Sciences and Humanities "Euro-Balkan", Skopje

THE QUEER COMMON/S: POLITICS OF FRIENDSHIP, LOVE AND AFFECTS

Abstract: The paper examines the relations between class struggles, critique of capitalism, and queer struggles through the commodification of desire and identitarian mystification of social and political histories, genealogies, and inequalities, and brings forward the concept and practices of queer common/s as a critical tool for queer politics and intersectional struggles. With the queer common/s, we address multiple perspectives and problems related to the Common/s. The queer commons, in our paper, mark at the same time, the lived experiences, the sedimented forms of life, and habituated genres of feeling and orientations towards the world, as much as what is in excess coming from the virtual, the undecidable and undetermined, the potential coming from the future and the relation with otherness, as a gesture of openness towards the potentiality of being-otherwise, becoming and forming alternative worlds, relations, belonging and commons, starting precisely from the social relationality and exposure testified by the everyday and historical experiences of queer people. This understanding of the queer commons is investigated in particular through three forms of relations, sociality and sensibility – *friendship, love, and affects* – all of which, in the history of Western experience, play a constitutive role in the collective political imaginations of community, politics, the nation, sovereignty, the subject, and embodiment, on the one hand, and they are also locations of re-articulation of these categories throughout the history of queer politics, cultures, and intimacy, on the other hand.

Keywords: queer, commons, neoliberal capitalism, depoliticization, reification, desire, pleasure, love, friendship, affects, being-in-common, queer culture.

The normative reason and governing principle organizing neoliberal political rationality, which is the organization of political intelligibility and the contemporary landscape of the distribution of power, is not necessarily and

hegemonically regulated by the rationality of state sovereignty, but is shifted onto the rationality of those who are being governed in this new technology of power named governmentality. “To speak of the relentless and ubiquitous economization of all features of life by neoliberalism is thus not to claim that neoliberalism literally marketizes all spheres, even as such marketization is certainly one important effect of neoliberalism. Rather, the point is that neoliberal rationality disseminates the model of the market to all domains and activities – even where money is not at issue-and configures human beings exhaustively as market actors, always and everywhere as *homo economicus*” (Brown 2015, 31). That is to say, the principle organizing contemporary political rationality is disseminated among subjects defined by their status of being “*homo economicus*”, or as self-interested individuals deploying different measures in order to pursue and satisfy their interests, desires and needs. This rationality does not eliminate the principle based on the rationality of state sovereignty, but only supersedes it and conserves it, while operating in parallel fashion.

While classical liberalism declared market autonomy to be a specific space with its own rationality and particular efficacy, regulated by the principle of exchange between self-interested private individuals entitled to the right of private property, a principle proclaimed as the general matrix of society, neoliberalism, according to Michel Foucault (2004), amplifies this principle as a particular ‘anthropology’ of man and distributes it in the basis of the entire social and political field so that the economic subject becomes the core of political agency and participation. The important change made is the supplementation of the self-interested subject with the concept of competing subject, a concept which will mark our new era of socio-political existence and organization. The subject has become “human capital” – something that needs to be invested in, restricted, enforced, directed, controlled, reorganized, multiplied, increased in capacities, improved in skills, and heightened in force. New power technologies are required so that natural limits can be overcome and imported in the chain of calculated production and self-investment. Rights and juridical systems give the floor to investment, entrepreneurship, interest and competitiveness. This new technology and rationality of governmentality fosters a new regime of truth and a new apparatus of subject production. An entire technology of power relations, knowledge production and social mechanisms of subjectification has to be mobilized so that the *homo-economicus* can be fabricated, sustained and reproduced.¹

In this constellation Foucault traces the birth of biopolitics and all of its implications in regard to one’s “becoming subject” and its relations to truth and the exercise of power over the body, that is life, capacities for sensation, affects, pleasures and needs, as the main pillar of this new rationality of governmentality. It is precisely in this wider context that the question of the

1 See also: Bourdieu 2018, Harvey 2005.

political efficacy of sexual identity politics, that is practices of giving accounts of oneself, of individualizing, subjectivising and privatizing one's own desires, feelings, capacities for affecting and being affected, for relationality, sensations, needs, bodily existence and life in general, is about to be raised and critically investigated in this paper.

As a useful analytical tool we can use Wendy Brown's notion of *depoliticization*, a notion she uses in criticizing the implications of discourses of tolerance, identity politics, neo-liberal and neo-conservative rationalities for the critical and political engagement and participation of contemporary subjects. To be more precise, as Brown points out, depoliticization involves: "removing a political phenomenon from comprehension of its historical emergence and from recognition of the powers that produce and contour it. No matter its particular form and mechanics, depoliticization always eschews power and history in the representation of the subject. When these two constitutive sources of social relations and political conflict are elided, an ontological naturalness or essentialism almost inevitably takes up residence in our understanding and explanations" (Brown 2006, 15).² Identity politics positions the subject and relates it to a particular truth, marks a body with difference, structures meaning, organizes, regulates and normalizes identities. Difference is individuated and personalized, while identity and desire/orientation become naturalized and essentialized as the ultimate truth of the private individual. Identity politics substitutes personal and private vocabulary for political and social histories of subject formation and genealogies of inequality and thus overshadows these in favor of the former. Cloaked, in the neoliberal spirit, by the emancipatory ideal, and thus providing alibi to society, political-economy, culture and the symbolic order of its responsibility, while interpreting its structures as necessary, inevitable, universal and a-temporal, the notion of identity entraps the genealogies and power games in the private and individual ontogenesis of the psychic topography and, further, functions as a potential expansion of the hegemonic and homophobic discourses of pathologization and regulation of the marked homosexual Other, but also of the unmarked universal heterosexual identity, protecting it in its privileged unquestioned position. What pretends to be a political tool for making visible and audible what has been repressed, paradoxically seems to stabilize the hierarchically orchestrated power relations. Depoliticization is even more instantiated by the interference of these processes with liberalism, neoliberalism, individualism and market rationality as complementary discourses of power and technologies of governmentality. Politically construed conflicts and inequalities become more accentuated with the mark of personalization when identity claims are interweaved with notions of the subject as calculable, self-responsible, self-making and relentlessly rational. All of these discourses eliminate the histories of social relations invested in the subject and identity formation, privatize

2 See also Brown's earlier critique of identity politics in: Brown 1995.

identity, and fabricate and sustain the subject defined by his/ her particular desires, interests, life-style, individuality and self- sufficiency.

This grammar of reification of identity as depoliticization necessarily invokes Marx analysis of commodity fetishism in the first volume of *Capital*, when he argues that:

“A commodity is therefore a mysterious thing, simply because in it the social character of men’s labor appears to them as an objective character stamped upon the product of that labor; because the relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labor is presented to them as a social relation, existing not between themselves, but between the products of their labor. This is the reason why the products of labor become commodities, social things whose qualities are at the same time perceptible and imperceptible by the senses. [...] it is a definite social relation between men that assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of a relation between things.” (Marx 2013, 48)

Critically redeploying Lukács’ concept of reification, by bringing forward historical complexity, Kevin Floyd in “The Reification of Desire: Toward a Queer Marxism” joins a tradition of leftist feminist and queer theorists³ and tries to foster a possible dialogue between Foucauldian inspired queer theory and Marxism – Lukács in particular. Namely, Floyd brings and corrects Foucault’s famous analysis of the invention of the homosexual personage, and homo-hetero binary and sexual identity, as tightly intertwined with capital’s mystification of social and historical complexity through reification, whereby sexual identities and their emergence in the XX century are approached as capital’s reificatory regulation of the body’s capacities, needs, affects, sensations, pleasures (the later being reduced and enclosed in a fragmentary and abstract logic of identity, privatized desire, and determination in accordance to the model of the consumer, as linked to the object of desire and consumption) (Floyd 2009, 55). Setting at focus Foucault’s analysis of Freudian culmination of regulatory knowledges on sexuality and subjectivity, Floyd argues:

“...what Foucault identifies as the twentieth-century sexual knowledge regime exemplified by the psychoanalytic culmination, around the beginning of the twentieth century, of a longer-term historical “deployment of sexuality” should be understood as a product of reification... With the emergence of this regime of sexual knowledge, sexual desire is also reified: a bodily capacity is epistemologically abstracted in the form, for example, of qualitatively new heterosexual and homosexual subjectivities. This is an instance of objective social abstraction with historical repercussions far beyond the specific history of Freudianism... The term “queer,” I have suggested, refers to an abstract form of subjectivity, a vantage on social relations opened up by capital’s ongoing differentiation of those relations. It is now necessary to be more precise: this is a *reified* form of subjectivity, a subjectivity that begins

3 To name just few: Ferguson 1989, Chauncey 1994, D’Emilio and Freedman 1988, D’Emilio 1993, Faderman 1991, Berlant 1997, Hennessy 1996, Weeks 2011.

to disclose the limitations of the standard Marxian account of reification.”
(Floyd 2009, 24)

Following this analysis, we can say that non-normative sexual subjects' relation to capitalist forms of exploitation, commodification of social relations and production, and extraction of surplus time and surplus value, is not historically related only through different forms of cultural discourses of abjection that pave the way to normative social reproduction, gendered division of labor and production of a reserve army of bodies that bear the stigma of devaluation whose labor is devalued to lower price or no price/wage at all. But even more insidiously, through regulation practices that mobilize an apparatus of discourses, habits, norms, institutions, laws, and disciplinary and biopolitical strategies, queer bodies are reified and historically determined in a wider regime of the cultural logic of capitalism, and the attempts to solve the capital's crisis of accumulation and tensions of production and consumption, as subjects of desire, as subjects of consumption. As Rosemary Hennessy argues, “this reification of the erotic would prove vital to the development of commodity culture insofar as it helped consolidate forms of desire that would be crucial in the marketing and consumption of commodities” (2018, 100). We should note however, in order to escape from a simple and reductive economic determinism, that capital does not necessarily require heteronormativity as its condition of possibility and reproduction, which can be easily demonstrated by just throwing a glance at contemporary tolerance discourses and neoliberal cooption of queer consumers and self-investment industries. What capital requires, as Hennessy persuasively argues, is an unequal division of labor (Ibid.,105).

It is within this context of occlusion of deep relations between class struggles, critique of capitalism, and queer struggles through the commodification of desire and identity-related mystification of social and political histories, genealogies and inequalities, that we want to bring forward the common/s, as possible hegemonic concept, collective praxis and ethics, and potent empty signifier that can mobilize chains of equivalences and affinities, and forge “a form of social organization that recognizes that human needs are collectively produced” (Ibid., 106). Furthermore, this concept can redirect queer struggles from the “restrictive action potency” enclosed by privatizing and identitarian sexual reification towards thinking and strategies “that foster more comprehensive action potency” (Ibid., 220)

The Queer Commons

With the concept of the queer common/s we would like to address multiple perspectives and problems related to the Common/s, that is, what is common to gender and sexual minorities, and all those bodies marked as queer failures and less than human within the heteronormative, nationalistic, capitalist and racist

surround. These “commons” include the specific modes of sense-making, the non-normative sensibilities and embodiments, the specific affective orientations towards the world and others, the multiplicity of images, sounds, social genres, cultural practices, linguistic and communication genres and languages, subcultural subversions, aesthetic forms, counterpublics, and displacements of the mainstream and hegemonic discourses and representations, as well as the survival strategies – all of which emanate from and rework the experiences of trauma, oppression exclusion, discrimination and social suffering, and yet, express the collective forces of persistence, resistance, flourishing and world-building.

This mesh and multiplicity of ideas, values, practices, experiences, affects and strategies of resistance are performed and embodied in different ways in the cultures, struggles, and artistic production of queer people, and include the: anti-social political strategies of queers and defiant acceptance of the stigma and its re-evaluation and re-signifying; playing with, and parodying seriousness that is specific to the male epic history and the heterosexual sentimental world; the performances of social roles and gender, and the disclosure of the performative character of authenticity, as in the context of drag queen/king culture; self-irony, shading, and humorous “reading” of someone else’s arrogance and self-righteousness; the networks of support and care in the AIDS crisis that cross identity boundaries and class, age, ethnic, or gender hierarchies; or the openly acknowledged shame of sex and the democratizing urge to spread that shame; the anti-hierarchical inclusiveness of camp humor, its self-non-exclusion and its constant function in community building (Halperin 2012); the quotidian street queer choreographies of “feminized” gay boys, butch and mannish lesbians, trans bodies, or non-binary gender dramatizations of public space, as well as the ball culture of racial minorities and dance vogue competitions; the multitude of re-contextualizations and deconstructions; the discursive twisting of gender indicators in the language of queers, etc.

We do not, however, approach the commons that characterizes and derives from the specific socio-cultural, political, economic and historical experiences of queer people as isolated, naturalized, essentialist identity that emanates from some alleged queer substance. They are rather deeply engrained and historically determined by the relations and power vectors in the wider sphere of use, production, circulation and living and working in-the-common.

The queer common/s testify to the key ontological and political role of the common, as a socially shared resource (words, ideas, concepts, idioms, affects, emotions, habits, gestures, body styles, technologies, etc.), as a medium (communication, collaboration, sharing, imitation, etc.), and as a product, as the social life itself (society as a factory) which multiplies, instead of depleting the initial availability of shared resources, and increases the capacity, imagination, creativity, knowledge and capabilities of people, including queer people (Hardt and Negri 2004). The queer common testifies to the fact that the

commons in their circulation among the multitude of singularities are subject to transformation, playfulness, redefining and re-embodiment, rather than being a fixed and expendable resource of human (heterosexual?) nature.

Hence, the perspective of the queer common can also be seen as the “undercommons” (Harney and Morten 2013) of those who have historically been robbed of accessing and sharing the normatively determined and distributed commons, those that challenge the heteronormative, patriarchal, nationalist and capitalist organization of social life and belonging to community. Queer politics can thus become a detour, a line of flight, as a glamorous abdication of assimilation, decency, interest grouping, administrative recognition, representation, and inclusiveness. As an “ongoing attack on the common – the general and generative antagonism – from within the surround” (Harney and Morten 2013, 17–18) and at the same time as a desiring utopian arrow aimed at the future and otherness.

The queer commons refer to the multitude of queer worlds as effects and ongoing transformations of the being-in-relation, being-in-the-world and being-in-common, as mode of being that refuses and eludes the identitarian and essentialist closures, the individualist and transhistorical phantasms, while bringing forward the experience of singularity as constantly associated with plurality⁴. As José Esteban Muñoz argued, the challenge consists in approaching “queerness as a mode of “being-with” that defies social conventions and conformism and is innately heretical yet still desirous for the world, actively attempting to enact a commons that is not a pulverizing, hierarchical one bequeathed through logics and practices of exploitation” (2013, 96). Such forms of being-with are open to discord and irreconcilable difference, while at the same time embodying the utopian desire for the other, and the desire for something more, something different from the present.

Therefrom, the queer commons, in our proposal marks, at the same time, the lived experiences, the sedimented forms of life and habituated genres of feeling and orientations towards the world, as much as what is in excess coming from the virtual, the undecidable and undetermined, the potential coming from the future and the relation with otherness, as a gesture of openness towards the potentiality of being-otherwise, becoming and forming alternative worlds, relations, belonging and commons, starting precisely from the social relationality and exposure testified by the everyday and historical experiences of queer people.

More importantly for us, with the concept of the queer common/s we aim to critically engage a leftist and feminist genealogy and practice of commoning and thinking the common/s. This provisional genealogy traces the paths from Marx’s introduction of the productive and collective force of the general intellect

4 It goes without saying the concept of being-in-common, singularity, and singular plural that gives the background to our thinking of the common/s is unequivocally indebted to the work of Jean-Luc Nancy. See: Nancy 1991, and Nancy 2000.

in the *Grundrisse* (the 7th notebook in “The Fragment on Machines”), through the Italian autonomists’ theories of the immaterial, affective and cognitive labor, and the expropriation of the common as a contemporary form of exploitation within post-Fordist capitalism, as in the works of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, Paolo Virno, Maurizio Lazzarato and others. As an immanent critique of Marxist theory of value, Hardt and Negri bring under scrutinization the viability of the concept of value in Marxism for our contemporary world (Hardt and Negri 2004, 140–153). Namely, they argue that labor time, even the necessary social labor time understood with all immanent social dimensions, cannot be considered anymore as a source of value. There is a certain incommensurability, immeasurability in value that comes from the common, being both the source of any production that can never be measured into labor time units, and the result or the final product of the common production, as well as the term in between, the medium through which the production takes place. It’s not the question of time or of individual labor time which is being exploited or expropriated or even alienated. It is rather the matter of the common which is both the source, the immeasurable source of value, and what also dictates distribution and redistribution of that which is excessive and surplus in production, but which also makes us rethink these questions, especially in our contemporary neoliberal context, of ultimate privatization of all public goods and all the commons.

Significant break and extension in the genealogy of the common is introduced further with the socialist feminist investigations of the devaluation of reproductive unpaid labor and traditional commons governed and managed by women, as a historical rather than an essentialist practice, as in the work of Sylvia Federici (2012), all the way to the queer commitment to *General Sex* and the disarmament of pharmacopornocapitalism that possesses, controls and privatizes the orgasmic power (*potential gaudendi*) as a key labor force in modern capitalist production (see: Preciado 2013). As Preciado argues (Ibid., 272), we must abandon the heteronormative capitalist dreams and romances of innocent, non-public, non-political sexuality and the private body. Our bodies are embedded and materialized solely through the ecologies of biocodes, images, mediated excitations, drugs, molecules, chemical compositions in the pill form, discursive – material technologies, apparatus and prostheses – being the commons and common (post) human resources. These commons, through which our technobodies exist, extend throughout history and the present, and are being transformed with the coming of the future, via senses, exchange, innovation, contacts and mutual affections of the multitude of bodies. As much as being a possibility for extension, they are also subject to control and discipline of our subjectivities, as the ultimate goal of modern pharmacopornocapitalism, while it privatizes, patents, hierarchies and unequally distributes them along the axis of normal / abnormal, good / bad, black / white, hetero / homo, cis / trans, work / sex work, etc. In the planetary “porn factory” our political duty is to create different common, shared, collective,

unpatented forms of sexuality/sex that go beyond the hegemonic pornographic representation and standardized sexual consumption.

Whereas the theorists of post-Fordism employ the Marxist notion of *General Intellect* to speak about the communicative potential for cooperation among brains as a new platform of capitalist production, we theorists of the post-porn era are emphasizing the notion of *General Sex*, or “public sex,” to conceive of the cooperation between bodies, desires, impulses, organic fluxes, molecules, and pleasures mobilized by pharmacopornographic capitalism. Pharmacopornographic labor cultivates, exploits, and produces the sexual technobody of the multitude. (...) *General Sex* teaches us that masturbation and the fix are never solitary activities but are vibrations coming from cooperating bodies, effects of the collective practice of sexual or pharmacological labor on the living orgasmic body that squirts capital everywhere... When we speak of a pharmacopornographic economy, we must take into account the fact that the two tentacles (pharmaco and porno) are exploiting a common somato-political foundation: the toxicological dimension of pleasure. The pleasure (in its capacity as frustrating satisfaction) of the multitude is the ultimate source of the production of wealth. (Preciado 2013, 307–309).

Whether the commons are explored as a) natural common resources, b) common means of production and institutions, c) the commonings of those involved in the production and reproduction of the commons or as d) cultural, affective, biotechnological, social or digital goods, in the left thought of the common/s, one key premise survives. The premise that the category of the commons represents the shared resources that are produced, managed, represented and distributed through collective participation, in a way that nullifies the logic of both private-corporate and state-public ownership (Kioupiolis 2019, 24), sharply criticizing the threats to the commons that come from the predatory and privatizing forces of capital, corporations and the monopoly of state power.

In this line of thought, with the concept of the queer commons we would like to critically address the contemporary capitalist, entertainment, business, corporative and media profit-generating appropriations, commodification and fetishization of LGBTI identities (most paradigmatically embodied in the business franchise of RuPaul Drag Race, fashion industry, cosmetics industry and Hollywood mainstream cinematography). The a/expropriation of the queer commons, on the one hand, erases the collective, transgenerational, transnational histories of the queer commons, being both source for queer communities and subjectivity, and productive capacity that further produces, transforms and invents new queer common, precisely through processes of collaboration, collective work, support, creativity and care, which is to say through communication, cooperation, collaboration and community interaction in-common. On the other hand, the capitalist corporative and entertainment industry reduces the question of queerness to inner, private, autonomous, property-like identity and authenticity, a reified desire or sexual

orientation, extracted from the practices, communications, and relations in-the-common, both the queer commons and the wider commons of humanity. This contemporary intertwining of queerness, or rather one could better say LGBTIQ+ identities, and post Fordist, neoliberal, capitalist real subsumption of society and subjectivity, reflects the double articulation of production of subjectivity under capital, both as production and consumption, as “an increased exploitation of the transindividual and the commodification of the pre-individual.” As Jason Read argues: “in terms of production, there is a movement away from work as a solitary enterprise, the labour of a craftsman, whose individual effort organizes the labour process, to work that engages the knowledge and desire of humanity in general, while at the same time, on the side of consumption, there is a reduction of the world to what can be possessed, owned, viewed in the comfort of one’s home – a massive privatisation of desire” (Read 2010, 120).

Last but not least, with the queer commons we would like to contest the nationalistic, heteronormative, isolationist, identitarian logic of the common conceived as a communal essence, identity, property predicated and constituted always on the exclusion of certain bodies, such as queer bodies and desires, women, ethnic and racial minorities, the poor etc. In this line, we would like to queer, estrange, alienate and transform this logic of the common, not merely by including sexual, gender, racial or ethnic minorities in the existing frames of the common, or by redistributing the commons understood as social, public and natural resources, infrastructures or goods, but by radically undermining this metaphysical, communitarian, identity-based logic of the common, setting it both as collective source and effect/product, and environment for the being-in-common, open to temporality, relationality and transformation, and subject of collective, inclusive and common governance and distribution.

This understanding of the queer commons can be investigated in particular through three forms of relations, sociality and sensibility – *friendship, love and affects/emotions* – all of which, in the history of Western experience, play a constitutive role in the collective political imaginations on community, politics, the nation, sovereignty, the subject and embodiment, on the one hand, an of rearticulation of these categories throughout the history of queer politics, cultures and intimacy, on the other. Through queer practices and critiques of friendship, love and affects we also want to expose the non-sovereign, receptive, relational and corporeal constitution of queer subjectivity that can dismantle the capitalist and identitarian regulatory and disciplinary fantasies of virile and possessive subjects, and abstracted and privatized desires, needs, affectivity and sensibility. Finally, what we call queer friendship, love and affects offers non-normative understanding of the praxis and being-in-common, and the common/s as aspirational concept that can move us away from “desires for a social world unbound by structural antagonism,” ambivalence and inconvenience, and instead to revisceralize our practical being and “point to a way to view what’s broken in sociality, the difficulty of convening a world

conjointly, although it is inconvenient and hard, and to offer incitements to imagining a livable provisional life” (Berlant 2016, 395).

Queer Relationalities: Friendship, Love, Affects

Friendship

From Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus and stoicism, through Montaigne, Rousseau, the romantics, Nazism, fascism, and Carl Schmitt, all the way to the critical voices of Modernity and the post-modern such as Bataille, Blanchot, Derrida, Foucault and feminist scholarship, friendship is used as an idealized model for relationality of the grounds of which are being built visions of political living in-common, both in its conservative, organicist, homogenizing and masculinist versions, as well as in the radical-democratic variations. Despite the differences between different political thinkers and historical intersections, the hegemonic imagination of friendship in the West is organized around a homosocial masculine vision of continuity, identity, competitiveness, exchange of women, fraternity, familiarity, identity, binary opposition to the enemy, the privilege granted to activity as a virtue, and annulment of radical difference⁵. Given this phratocentric history of democracy and citizenship, which reflects friendship between men, in the spirit of Derrida we ask: “Is it possible to open up the ‘come’ of a certain democracy which is no longer an insult to the friendship we have striven to think beyond the homo-fraternal and phallogocentric schema?” (Derrida 1997, 306).

The possible rethinking of democracy, politics and the common we draw on Michel Foucault’s later work on “friendship as a way of life,” and as a transformative opportunity to rethink relations, the subject and politics, starting from the structurally marginalized position of queer people and their exclusion from dominant social and cultural institutions (marriage, civil partnerships, family, nation, citizenship, military, homosociality, etc.). As Foucault argued:

Rather than saying what we said at one time: “Let’s try to re-introduce homosexuality into the general norm of social relations,” let’s say the reverse: “No! Let’s escape as much as possible from the type of relations which society proposes for us and try to create an empty space where we are new relational possibilities.” The gay movement has a future which goes beyond gays themselves. . . . [I]t may include the possibility of a culture in the large sense, a culture which invents ways of relating, types of existence, types of values, types of exchanges between individuals that are really new and are neither the same as, nor superimposed on, existing cultural forms.” (Foucault 1994, 160)

5 See Derrida 1997, Stamp 2009, Webb 2003, Faderman 1981, Bray 2003, Gandhi 2005, Colebrook 2008.

Foucault's ethics of friendship focuses on the anti-confessional discourse of truth of the subject (the friend) and his sexuality, and thus forces us to think the problematics of relationality away from the logics of sexual desire and the reification of sexual subjectivity, as much as away from the prescribed, coded, institutionalized poverty of relationality and being-in-common. "We live in a legal, social, and institutional world where the only relations possible are extremely few, extremely simplified, and extremely poor" (Foucault 1994, 158). Foucault's call for friendship as queer relationality, as "the development towards which the problem homosexuality tends", interrupts the biopolitical regulatory mechanisms of subjectivization and identity as preemptive enclosures of bodily sensitivity, affectivity, becoming, and capacities for action and pleasure (Foucault 1990), and opens relational horizons for "multiple intensities, variable colors, imperceptible movements and changing forms" (Foucault 1996, 309), precisely at the gaps of institutional lack of available forms for homosexual intimacy, sociality, and commons. This "multiplicity of relationships" can bring forward "everything that can be uncomfortable in affection, tenderness, friendship" and foster "new alliances and the tying together of unforeseen lines of force" (Ibid.) through: a) what he calls "parrhesia" or the telling of discomfiting truth and the trace of betrayal and difference in friendship; b) the trace of enmity and difference in friendship; c) asceticism and the aesthetics of self and self-transformation through relations of friendship; d) impersonality as a potential for becoming unrecognizable through a friendly relationship beyond identity categories and historical regimes of knowledge, norms and a relationship with oneself; and e) shared estrangement as a productive force in friendship (Roach 2012).

Foucault thus completely radicalized his critique of sexuality and the regimes of truth wrapped around it. As he unambiguously claims in one of his late interviews, "it is not a question of affirming one's sexual identity, but of refusing to allow sexuality as well as the different forms of sexuality the right to identify you. The obligation to identify oneself through and by given type of sexuality must be refused" (Foucault 2014, 261). Foucault sees homosexuality as a social and historical opportunity for novelty, multiplication and the creation of new ways of life and modalities in relations to others and to oneself, "a historical opportunity to reopen affective and relational virtualities, not so much through the intrinsic qualities of the homosexual, but due to the biases against the position he occupies; in a certain sense diagonal lines that he can trace in the social fabric permit him to make these virtualities visible" (Foucault 1996, 311).

Making new connections with others, according to Foucault, inevitably requires the creation and discovery of new subjectivities. For Foucault, the discomfort that socially marks queer encounters and relations is a point of resistance, and thus transcends and disappoints the original intentions of heteronormative truth and the order of power. This inconvenience leads to processes of invention: smuggling, curves, unusual relationships, strange places,

silences, disidentifications, unnamed corporealities, etc., lines drawn from these social conditions that need to be subversively appropriated. Foucault's queering of friendship opposes a model to the dominant requirements of friendship based on similarity, shared values, common goals, social norms, masculinity, virility and virtue, autonomy and self-sufficiency, self-restraint and normalization. The emptiness lying under these contingent and totalizing systems of power relations carries the potential for invention and the creation of dynamic and unstable power relations, the invention of new ways of being together based on creativity, spontaneity, intimacy, uncertainty, discomfort, social experimentation, openness and self-creation in marginal spaces.

We can clearly trace here a localized resistance based in marginal spaces against normalization. But these local seats, as loci of resistance in the Foucauldian project, are connected to a large-scale political project that would contest and challenge the practices of normalization and regulation across the entire society. The demonstration of the contingency of our present conditions, demonstrated by the genealogical inquiry, as Foucault represents it in "What is Enlightenment", will not "deduce from the form of what we are what is impossible for us to do and to know; but it will separate out, from the contingency that has made us what we are, the possibility of no longer being, doing, or thinking what we are, do or think. It is seeking *to give new impetus, as far and wide as possible*, to the undefined work of freedom." These local resistances generated by flexible and negotiable relationships and friendships hail a wider recognition, in an institutional and juridical sense, of a demand for recognition which would not be compatible with the existing intelligible form of discursive, cultural, social and juridical recognition. Foucault even speaks in an interview of rights which would overcome the existing modes of entitlements of rights founded on individual, property and private prerogatives. He speaks of "relational rights" which would refer to a "right to gain recognition in an institutional sense for the relations of an individual to another individual" (Foucault 2013, 54).

The intrusion of these relationships in spaces such as schools, administration, bureaucracy, the army, workplaces, and political public, is a serious attack on the virility and disaffectedness of these institutions that minimize, sanitize and diminish all affective and relational intensities. And finally it quakes the heterosexual virility inscribed in a homosocial culture such as ours. This is where Foucault comes close to Derrida's later discussion on friendship. It is, however, still strange why Derrida, while deconstructing and criticizing virile homosocial systems of friendship, fraternity and democracy, does not take into consideration these already existing fractures, these unsayable fissures within the hegemonic order. This constitutive outside, as Foucault shows, is always within its order, on its very limits, and always already forces it to remake its demarcation. The Derridean temporal differential, which he calls the "experience of the impossible" and which displaces democracy in the futurity

to-come, is already inscribed in the marginal spaces, the ruptures and fissures as potentialities and virtualities of queer intensities doing violence—that is doing justice—to democracy by giving it the gift of death as the political demand for the birth and generation of new relational and subjective possibilities. These presences in their virtual possibility are already deferred towards the future of the whole, deconstructing it, forcing it by challenging it to reevaluate its limits and create a language, which is always non-language, for the present absence of the not-yet recognizable, the never to be recognizable.

Love

In the essay „L'Amour en éclats“ (Shattered Love) the French philosopher Jean-Luc Nancy argues that the idea of love requires generous restraint towards the multitude of possibilities for the manifestation of love and its boundless forms. Generosity “not to choose between loves, not to hierarchize, not to exclude,” as love cannot be framed in a common and general concept, or its substance and truth can be assumed. Its manifestations are always singular manifestations, and its singularity is “is itself perhaps nothing but the indefinite abundance of all possible loves, and an abandonment to their dissemination, indeed to the disorder of these explosions. The thinking of love should learn to yield to this abandon: to receive the prodigality, the collisions, and the contradictions of love, without subsuming them to an order that they essentially defy” (Nancy 1991, 83). Contrary to this assumption, the history of Western philosophy, when it does not exclude it as an unworthy object of thought, eschews love in the phantasmatic investments in idealized union of the two in the One, as the accomplishment, as the completion, fulfillment, and achievement of a certain goal, which offers access to fullness or harmony that should compensate for the lack of being, and overcome its tensions. The dialectical fantasy of the philosophy and poetry of love is, in fact, a step or image of the dialectic of the self-constitution of the subject, which passes through the other to negate the difference and the interval of otherness, and to return, i.e. to confirm self-identity without the otherness of the other. The idea of love is in dialectics, just as the idea of dialectics and being are in love. This dominant Western idea of love also defines the notions of being, subject, politics, common, and the state, as in Hegel's *Philosophy of Law*, where the development of the rational self-consciousness of the free subject as a vehicle of the Spirit is internally dialectically divided into three phases that defy each other: love / family, civil society and the state. Love enclosed in the family form is the initial moment of community and friendship that form the basis of corporate identity in civil society, as well as of patriotism in the Hegelian state.

The Western history of the thinking and writing on love is equally framed by the gendered, masculine and heteronormative morphologies and desires, as well as by the capitalist seduction of desire and consumerism, and

nationalist paranoia. One can trace these structures in: the opposition of love to the capitalist organization of work / production and politics; the masculine marking of love as inherent to the domain of the “feminine” and the private; the therapeutic sentimental Hollywood narratives of heterosexual romance and tragedy that draw the map for the normal subject and self; the binary divisions between the active subject of the one who loves and the passivity of the beloved who longs to be loved as a condition of possessing the symbolic Phallus; the legitimization of the dominant forms of love versus the pathologisation of many other non-normative forms of intimacy; the depoliticizing isolation of sentimental culture that constantly promises a safe haven beyond the conflicts of public life and social antagonisms; the capitalist circulation and consumption of goods and commodities, and the fetishism of commodities as the foundation of being in love, and the idyll of the couple⁶; as well as in the sharp boundaries of hatred embodied in imaginary identifications with the nation (Ahmed 2004). Therefore, the queer politics and critiques of heteronormative romantic love should take into account not only its exclusive and violent strategies towards other non-normative forms of intimacy, but also its understanding as a “collective arena within which social divisions and the cultural contradictions of capitalism are played out.” As Eva Illuz claims, „romantic love has become an intimate, indispensable part of the democratic ideal of affluence that has accompanied the emergence of the mass market, thereby offering a collective Utopia cutting across and transcending social divisions. Concomitantly with that process, however, romantic love has espoused as it were the mechanisms of economic and symbolic domination at work in American social structure”⁷ (Illuz 1997, 2).

We suggest that the queering, displacement, and estrangement of love can set radically different political lines of subjectivization through love, and a relation to otherness in love, a relation that will not be nullifying the incommensurability and the inconvenience of the other’s difference. A relation that, in the spirit of Derrida, will inform the lover not to pick up the phone the next time we call her (because her distance is a condition for proximity and being-in-common). In a similar direction, Jelisaveta Blagojević offers a non-normative proposal for *passive* (the still active historical stigma on women and gay men) *engagement* which, instead of confirming identity, will offer an ethics of hospitality for the „presence of the other in me who is in me even before the possibility of saying *I* – even the *I* in *I Love You*” (Blagojević 2006, 18).

The synaesthetic visual experiences offered by the performances of the UK based queer performance artist FRANKO B, which shamelessly evoke sublime and transcendental fantasies of love and longing for its form, expose such passive engagement with extreme, poignant, seductive, disturbing and

6 For a detailed analysis of these different aspects of the sentimentality of heteronormative love and its intertwining with capitalism, see Berlant 2012.

7 See also Illuz 2012.

shattering intensities. In his performance “I Miss You” the traces of otherness erupts like a punctuation from the veins of the body (which is whiter than white, just like blood that is redder than red), exposing the body irreversibly outwards to the other, to exhaustion, to displacement of the sovereign boundaries of the impermeable male body. The body that bleeds from and longs for love, brings out the contingencies, the vulnerability, the dispossession, and the powerlessness of the subject in love, beyond any possibility of salvation, fullness or sublime harmony and peace, and thus stands and (cat)walks like the body of queers (and women), like those who are politically and historically doomed to immanence, vulnerability, passivity and penetrability, as opposed to the white impenetrable, active male bodies with access to the transcendence of their own corporeality. Thus, in his performance, FRANKO B not only offers an alternative vision of subjectivity, corporeality and love, but also, specifically, parades on the catwalk the experiential history of those affected by the (post) AIDS crisis, and the violence of homophobic discourses and their paranoia about queer love. In such a body full of holes, exposed outwards without return, without salvation, without resurrection, and yet ruthlessly moved by the incoherent disorder of love, FRANKO B offers a different vision and opportunity for grounding singularity and the common. This singularity which through love is exposed to the “in” of the being-in-common, beyond any utopian common substance or individual fulfillment, pierces both the “viril autarchy” and the “virile virtue” of love and friendship that structures our Western experience of the political, which Derrida talks about, as much as it shatters the moral autonomy and sovereignty of the possessive individual that capitalism inherits from the mythology of romantic love, and which organize the problem of the self and identity in modernity, as the problem of “affective individualism” (Illouz 2012, 12).

Our proposal thus resonates with Hardt and Negri’s development of the revolutionary potential of love for the politics of the multitude and the production of being as being-in-common, that is the production of the common. “Every act of love, one might say, is an ontological event in that it marks a rupture with existing being and creates new being, from poverty through love to being. Being, after all, is just another way of saying what is ineluctably common, what refuses to be privatized or enclosed and remains constantly open to all. (There is no such thing as a private ontology.) To say that love is ontologically constitutive, then, simply means that it produces the common” (Hardt and Negri 2009, 181).

We find particularly invigorating the queer undertones in Hardt and Negri’s politics of love that refuses and transforms the identitarian, privatizing, individualistic, violent and exclusionary logic and affective dynamics of the romantic couple and marriage, and love for the race, nation, family, as corruptions of the common. The queer politicization of love could also, therefore, enact forms of life, intensities, attachments and relationality that

would resist biopolitical governmentality and subjectivity, especially if one takes into consideration that familial, romanticized and patriotic love represents crucial “mechanism of internal monitoring through which the subject replays desire as a plebiscite on the normal” and that it is a way of “defining the normativity of the modern self, much more than *sexuality* as a category does” (Berlant 2001, 438–440). Similarly to our proposal related to queer friendship, Hardt and Negri emphasize the radical potential of respect of difference and the incommensurability of the other and singularity, the relational self-transformation and becoming⁸, and the world-building and commoning potential of love outside the heteronormative confines of commodified desire, identity, the couple, the nation and the family.

“Love of the stranger, love of the farthest, and love of alterity can function as an antidote against the poison of identitarian love, which hinders and distorts love’s productivity by forcing it constantly to repeat the same. Here then is another meaning of love as a biopolitical event: not only does it mark rupture with the existent and creation of the new, but also it is the production of singularities and the composition of singularities in a common relationship.” (Hardt and Negri 2009, 183)

However, the model proposed by Hardt and Negri, despite its radical problematization and political mobilization of love in the production of the common, we would argue, is still not queer enough, and the subsequent envisioning of the common through the powers and force of love, reproduces the pastoral, joyous and sanitized dynamics and relationality of love they propose. Not only does love enact and bring forwards a certain ontological passivity and exposure of the subject that cannot be recuperated in the dialectical logic of the self-same and self-reflective active subject, but the political propriety of love is undercut and shattered by its incalculable risk and impropriety. This impropriety refers to the ambivalent, contradictory, unforeseen, messy, and incoherent affective charges and force vectors that love’s relationality involves, as well as the complex and multiple feeling that accompany it, beyond “the promise of clarity” (Berlant 2001, 436), and that prevent the subjective logic of completion, redemption, fulfillment, endurance and joyous optimism. As Berlant has argued, “incompatible needs and fantasies induce ambivalence. Internal chaos produces external chaos that expresses it without copying it. Any social theory worthy of its ambition requires a space for enigmatic, chaotic, incoherent, and structurally contradictory attachments; it needs a way to assess the attachment needs that put people in relation without promising to deliver “a life” that feels cushioned. There is no cure for ambivalence. This is what it means to move within an object world” (Berlant 2011, 685).

8 As Hardt argues: “a political love must transform us... it must designate a becoming such that in love, in our encounter with others we constantly become different.” (Hardt 2011, 678)

Political and queer love thus does not necessarily, or at least not only, involve the collective joy of the production of the common, but also the affective registers of jealousy, frustration, pain, fear, anger, territorialization, disappointment, ignorance, disinterestedness, discomfort, incoherence, inconvenience, conflict and the possibility of break of the relation as the necessary precondition for the relation itself. This intensive multiplicity does not negate love, nor its dimensions of care, warmth, compassion, support, non-violence, dedication, respect, trust, or open and honest and open communication, as crucial for the nourishment, healing and mental health of oneself and the other (hooks 2001). Rather, it underpins the affective complexity and precariousness of love, its queer registers that also open horizons for different political imaginaries and praxis of patience, attention and collective effort that do not dismiss the inconveniences, contingencies, multiple temporalities and the lack of guaranties of the being-in-common and the infrastructures that create, sustain and transform it. “Might the ambivalence of love allow us to better understand the incoherence of political life? Love rarely produces coherence, yet perhaps the ambiguity and unruliness of love is its most political strength” (Wilkinson 2017, 66).

*Queer Affects*⁹

As being both social and affective experiences, the Western attitude towards friendship and love builds on the paradigms of understanding affects/emotions as privatized, individual, internal-psychological, corporeally bounded, representational and categorical intensities. But also, as a political unconscious, affects are subject to constant intervention, regulation, control, discipline and manipulation for the goals and strategic interests of politics, gender, sexuality, racism, nationalism and capitalist organization and control of sensory environments and individualization. Affects are thus not only a subjective experience and response to stimuli, or events in the environment, but also as a force that shapes relationships, thus representing a key active component of social dynamics. Affects are integral part of embodied experience that is directly related to all other bodily and cognitive functions, and that plays a key role in making decisions and making sense of self and the world. In line with the transdisciplinary field of studies of affects¹⁰ and emotions, we approach affects as an expression, reflection, embodiment and transformative capacity of/for dynamic social relations and inequalities within specific relational configurations

9 For a detailed account of rethinking the figural status of queerness in hegemonic political spaces by the means of its constitutive experiences and relations with bodily, emotional and affective discourses and practices, see our text: Blagojević and Dimitrov 2012.

10 For detailed discussion in and on the “affective turn” see more in: Ahmed 2004, Clough and Halley 2007, Gregg and Seigworth 2010, Cvetkovich 2012, Slaby and Scheve 2019, Wetherell 2012.

and social structures. Affects, therefrom, are not simply private states of mind locked away in an individual's head. On the contrary, they are always mediated, both by social conditions, relations, opportunities and surroundings, and thus represent sensory and embodied indices of power relations in society, as well as by cognitive, evaluative and socio-culturally normed dimensions and signifiers (which in most cases are beyond the conscious reach of the subject), through which the subjects interpret themselves and orient themselves to the world around them. In the spirit of Spinoza, affects tell us stories about bodies and their worlds, about the ways in which embodied subjects are affected by and affect others and the world, and how the histories of these affection increase or decrease body's capacities for action and thought (Spinoza 1970, 103). That is, affects speak of the way queer bodies are formed with certain capacities, potentials and dispositions for action. By the same token, the affective life of power and inequality creates conditions for the formation of embodied subjects who, in different and variable nuances, can change and influence the surrounding world or else participate in the social and embodied reproduction of inequality (Slaby and Scheve 2019). Affects, or moods, as Heidegger notes, are an essential existential characteristic of man as the being-there (Dasein), and through them comes to the fore "the unreflecting devotion to the 'world' with which it is concerned and on which it expands itself. A mood assails us. It comes neither from 'outside' nor from 'inside,' but arises out of Being-in-the-world, as a way of such Being" (Heidegger 1962, 176).

The experiences of queer and LGBTI people are the experiences of loss of and failure (or refusal) to reproduce the normativity, loss/failure that marks all those individuals who fail to tune in in the group atmosphere and affective melody that is created as a result of shared, and accepted as common sense, values, interests, jokes and emotional investments. To smile, to laugh, to enjoy, to find comfort, to feel safe in the presence and gathering of objects, to turn towards, to notice, have in reach, and reach with attention towards certain objects implies to have your body and affective dispositions aligned, have them lined up, with the edges already formed by histories of handling, manipulation and touch of those certain objects, and to have a body whose surface, morphology and affectability is already choreographed in accordance to the normative and majoritarian notations. The affective experiences of queer people are a testament to the abstract power relations and structural inequality, the actions of ideology and the consequent system of values, imperatives and norms according to which social positioning and valorization are organized, followed by an appropriate historical sensorium, readable on the bodies of people and their everyday, embodied experiences. Queer communities, artists and queer theory exposes precisely the lived and unbearably painful inscriptions of power on the bodies of minoritarian subjects (ethnic, racial, sexual minority subjects), which are read in the unrecognized and insidious everyday experiences of trauma, and which delineate the closed and withdrawn intimate space of melancholy and depression, in other words, the „abyss

of sorrow, a noncommunicable grief that at times, and often on a long term basis, lays claims upon us to the extent of having us lose all interest in words, actions, and even life itself“ (Кристева 2005, 119). Even more importantly, these affective complexes move us outside the privatizing, psychological and pathological frameworks, as the effect of unequal social relations and power relations, discrimination and exclusion, as freeze-frames or openings of the being-in-common.

But queer artists and communities also mobilize the performative power of affect, transforming and reversing their wounding effects into affective alchemy and resistance, rooted in anger, rage, intransigence, ecstasy in shame, enjoyment, joy, happiness, curiosity and collective love. These failures in the stylized bodily citational practices that the normative gender performative is, these stumbling in performing the language of bodily gestures, while being simultaneously the source of queer shame and interiorized identity absorption, as Sedgwick (2003) has thought us, can also become the material for defiant and recalcitrant rearticulation, for turning inside-out the folded in shaming look coming from the policing other, through the open futurity of the performative itself, through the instability of the citational and iterative practice of embodied performance (Butler 1993). These failures can be transformed into a defiant, dramatized extroversion enacted into a performance/event, as affective gestures that remove “the blush from its terminal place as the betraying blazon of a ruptured narcissistic circuit, and instead put it into circulation” (Sedgwick 2003, 41), establishing a cathected, even eroticised relation with the form of life deemed as immoral, alien, monstrous and shaming. Queer affects through collective strategies and infrastructures of world-building, through ongoingness of exposure and action in-common are thus a “persistent proof of a body’s never less than ongoing immersion in and among the world’s obscurities and rhythms, its refusal as much as its invitations” (Gregg and Seigworth 2010, 1). Queer feelings (Ahmed 2004), gestures, movements, readings, everyday social performatives, and choreographies are precisely *counterfetishes* that reflexively mobilize the body and its affective histories, “elucidating the real condition of possibility of our desires and gender” (Muñoz 2019, 79). As Sara Ahmed rightly points out (2006), *queer* is a etymologically spatial term, signifying a twist, therefrom a twisted sexuality that doesn’t follow a straight line, a sexuality that is bent and crooked. And very often, queer bodies have the experience of disorientation in the world, while simultaneously bringing disorientation by their very presence amongst other bodies. The queer disorientation can thus become a sign of and a source for collectively sustaining and inventing queer choreographies and affective orientations that could make possible alternative projects of freedom, as choreographed manner of being-in-the-world and being-with-other-bodies that refuses to straighten up, to line up, to habituate and reproduce, and desires new bodily projects with others, as an utopian longing for the then and there (Muñoz 2019), for the potential ingrained in performativity and affectivity, for the otherwise of future becoming with others.

By taking into account that queer disorientation involves not the individual experience of single bodies, but drags a whole complex of relations, institutions, images, words, technologies, biocodes, pharmaceutical chemicals, animals, spaces, histories, kinship structures, orientations and approaching the world, all of which a body inhabits and is inhabited and impressed by, even genetically modified by, queer choreography would set and compose bodies as thresholds of intersections, points of contacts and stations of crossing vectors of relationality, reverberations of multiple temporalities, matters of plasticity and mutability, and further imply the rearrangement of multiple spatio-temporal coordinates, redefining the directions of actions while twisting movement and towardness.

In contrast to hegemonic Western positions, queer theory, culture, art, and social practices offer alternative visions of friendship, critical and dynamic understanding and investment in love, and transformative visions of affect. These lines are the aesthetic, critical, cultural and political investment of our text, with which we want to oppose the institutional impoverishment of the social factory, and to think and offer alternative forms of commoning, friendship, love and affective orientations beyond the assimilationist agendas and the privatization of pleasures, emotions and desires. Queers and other non-normative rebels and their histories of “criminal intimacy” teach us these possibilities. As Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner argued:

„Queer culture has learned not only how to sexualize these and other relations, but also to use them as a context for witnessing intense and personal affect while elaborating a public world of belonging and transformation. Making a queer world has required the development of kinds of intimacy that bear no necessary relation to domestic space, to kinship, to the couple form, to property, or to the nation. These intimacies do bear a necessary relation to a counterpublic – an indefinitely accessible world conscious of its subordinate relation. They are typical both of the inventiveness of queer world making and of the queer world’s fragility.“ (Berlant and Warner 1998, 558)

Bibliography:

- Ahmed, Sara. 2004. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge.
- Ahmed, Sara. 2006. *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Berlant, Lauren, and Michael Warner. 1998. “Sex in Public.” *Critical Inquiry* 24, no. 2: 547–566. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1344178>.
- Berlant, Lauren. 1997. *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Berlant, Lauren. 2001. “Love, A Queer Feeling.” In *Homosexuality and Psychoanalysis*, edited by Tim Dean and Christopher Lane, 438–440. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berlant, Lauren. 2011. “A properly political concept of love: Three approaches in ten pages.” *Cultural Anthropology* 26, no. 4: 683–691. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41336309>.

- Berlant, Lauren. 2012. *Desire/Love*. New York: Punctum Books.
- Berlant, Lauren. 2016. "The Commons: Infrastructures for Troubling Times." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 34, no. 3: 393–419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775816645989>.
- Blagojević, Jelisaveta. 2006. "Taking Place of Love: Borderlines of Subjectivity." In *Gender and Identity: Theories from/about Southeast Europe*, edited by Jelisaveta Blagojević, Katerina Kolozova, and Svetlana Slapsak, 17–25. Belgrade: KaktusPrint.
- Blagojević, Jelisaveta, and Slavco Dimitrov. 2012. "Unthinkable: Bodies-in-Common, Queerness, and the Ethico-Political Fiction in the Present." *Antropologija* 12, no. 2.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Essence of Neoliberalism." Accessed April 30, 2023. <http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/25/115.html>.
- Bray, Alan. 2003. *The Friend*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Brown, Wendy. 1995. *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brown, Wendy. 2006. *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brown, Wendy. 2015. *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. New York: Zone Books.
- Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chauncey, George. 1994. *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890–1940*. New York: Basic Books.
- Clough, Patricia Ticineto, and Jean Halley, eds. 2007. *The Affective Turn/Theorizing the Social*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Colebrook, Claire. 2008. "Friendship, Seduction and Text: Cixous and Derrida." *Angelaki* 13, no. 2: 109–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09697250802432229>.
- Cvetkovich, Ann. 2012. *Depression: A Public Feeling*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- D'Emilio, John, and Estelle Freedman. 1988. *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America*. New York: Harper and Row.
- D'Emilio, John. 1993. "Capitalism and Gay Identity." In *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, edited by Henry Abelove, Michèle Aina Barale, and David M. Halperin, 467–476. New York: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1997. *Politics of Friendship*. London: Verso.
- Illouz, Eva. 1997. *Consuming the Romantic Utopia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Illouz, Eva. 2012. *Why Love Hurts: A Sociological Explanation*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Faderman, Lillian. 1981. *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendship and Love between Women from the Renaissance to the Present*. New York: Quill.
- Faderman, Lillian. 1991. *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers: A History of Lesbian Life in Twentieth Century America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ferguson, Ann. 1989. *Blood at the Root: Motherhood, Sexuality and Male Dominance*. London: Pandora Press.
- Floyd, Kevin. 2009. *The Reification of Desire: Toward a Queer Marxism*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1990. *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Foucault, Michel. 1994. "The Social Triumph of the Sexual Will." In *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 133–153. New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1996. "Friendship as a Way of Life." In *Foucault Live: Collected Interviews, 1961–1984*, edited by Sylvère Lotringer, 135–140. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, Michel. 2003. "What is Enlightenment." In *The Essential Foucault*, edited by Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose, 239–252. New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 2004. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79*. New York: Picador.
- Foucault, Michel. 2014. "Interview with Jean François and John de Wit." In *Wrong–Doing, Truth–Telling: The Function of Avowal in Justice*, edited by Fabienne Brion and Bernard Harcourt, 27–37. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gandhi, Leela. 2005. *Affective Communities: Anti-Colonial Thought and the Politics of Friendship*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Gregg, Melissa, and Gregory J. Seigworth, eds. 2010. *The Affect Theory Reader*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Halperin, M. David. 2012. *How to Be Gay*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2001. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2004. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. London: Penguin.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2009. *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hardt, Michael. 2011. "For love or money." *Cultural Anthropology* 26, no. 4: 676–682. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41336308>.
- Harney, Stefano, and Fred Moten. 2013. *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Study*. New York: Minor Compositions.
- Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1962. *Being and Time*. New York: Harper One.
- Hennessy, Rosemary. 1996. "Queer Theory, Left Politics." In *Marxism Beyond Marxism*, edited by Saree Makdisi, Cesare Casarino, and Rebecca E. Karl, 95–112. New York: Routledge.
- Hennessy, Rosemary. 2018. *Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Кристева, Јулија. 2005. *Токаџи и фуји за друјосџа: зборник њексџови*. Скопје: Темплум.
- hooks, bell. 2001. *All for love: New Visions*. New York: William Morrow Paperbacks.
- Marx, Karl. 2013. *Capital, Vol. 1*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions.
- Muñoz, José Esteban. 2019. *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity*. New York: New York University Press.
- Muñoz, José Esteban. 2013. "Gimme Gimme This . . . Gimme Gimme That': Annihilation and Innovation in the Punk Rock Commons." *Social Text* 116, Vol. 31, No. 3: 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-2152855>.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. 1991. "Shattered Love." In *The Inoperative Community*, translated by Peter Connor, Lisa Garbus, Michael Holland, and Simona Sawhney, 111–126. Minneapolis and Oxford: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. 2000. *Being Singular Plural*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Preciado, B. Paul. 2013. *Testo Junkie: Sex, Drugs, and Biopolitics in the Pharmacopornographic Era*. New York: Feminist Press.
- Read, Jason. 2010. "The Production of Subjectivity: From Transindividuality to the Commons." *New Formations: A Journal of Culture/Theory/Politics* 70(1): 113–131. <https://doi.org/10.3898/NEWF70.07.2010>.
- Roach, Tom. 2012. *Friendship as a Way of Life: Foucault, AIDS, and the Politics of Shared Estrangement*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 2003. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Silvia Federici. 2012. *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*. Oakland: PM Press.
- Slaby, Jan, and Christian von Scheve. 2019. *Affective Societies: Key Concepts*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Spinoza, de Baruh. 1970. *Etika*. Beograd: Kultura.
- Stamp, Richard. 2009. "The Torsion of Politics and Friendship in Derrida, Foucault and Rancière." *Borderlands* 8, no. 2: 1–27.
- Virno, Paolo. 2004. *A Grammar of the Multitude*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Webb, David. 2003. "On Friendship: Derrida, Foucault, and the Practice of Becoming." *Research in Phenomenology* 33, no. 1: 119–140. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24660612>.
- Weeks, Kathi. 2011. *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Post-Work Imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Wetherell, Margaret. 2012. *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Wilkinson, Eleanor. 2017. "On love as an (im)properly political concept." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 35, no. 6: 57–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775816658887>.

Primljeno: 14.02. 2023.

Odobreno: 05.06. 2023.

Jelisaveta Blagojević

Slavčo Dimitrov

Kvir zajedničko: politika prijateljstva, ljubavi i afekata

Apstrakt: U ovom radu se preispituju relacije između klasnih borbi, kritike kapitalizma i kvir borbi kroz komodifikaciju želje i identitarne mistifikacije društvenih i političkih istorija, genealogija i nejednakosti, i iznosi koncept i praksa kvir zajedničkog kao kritički alat kvir politike i intersekcionalne borbe. Konceptom kvir zajedničkog upućujemo na višestruke perspektive i probleme u vezi sa zajedničkim. Kvir zajedničko u našem radu u isto vreme obeležava proživljena iskustva, nataložene oblike života, žanrove osećanja na koja smo naviknuti i orijentacije prema svetlu, kao i ono što kao višak dolazi iz

virtuelnog, neodlučivog i neodređenog, kao potencijal koji dolazi iz budućnosti i iz odnosa prema drugosti, kao gest otvorenosti prema potencijalnosti bivstvovanja-drugojačijim, postajanja i formiranja alternativnih svetova, odnosa, pripadnosti i zajedničkog, polazeći upravo od društvene relacije i izloženosti o kojoj svedoči svakodnevna i istorijska iskustva kvir osoba. Ovo shvatanje kvir zajedničkog istražuje se posebno preko tri vida odnosa, društvenosti i senzibilnosti – prijateljstva, ljubavi i afekata – koji u istoriji zapadnog iskustva igraju konstitutivnu ulogu u kolektivnim političkim imaginacijama zajednice, politika, nacija, suvereniteta, subjekta i otelovljenja, s jedne strane, a takođe su mesta reartikulacije ovih kategorija kroz istoriju kvir politike, kulture i intimnosti.

Ključne reči: kvir, zajedničko, neoliberalni kapitalizam, depolitizacija, reifikacija, želja, ljubav, prijateljstvo, afekti, bivstvovanje-u-zajedničkom.