

Queer Theory and the Construction of Social Reality

Luca Trappolin

Università degli Studi di Padova

Editorial

This third issue of “About Gender” contains a monograph on queer theory and research inspired by it. The six contributions making up the monograph were selected by means of a call for papers, inaugurated with this issue. The topics they cover involve a substantial part of the debate aroused by queer theory which, preliminarily, we could define as a field for reflection and research on the deconstruction of sexual identities and gender, whether mainstream or peripheral, with the aim of revealing the power mechanisms which reproduce heterosexual hegemony.

Vincenzo Romania illustrates the intellectual debt of this body of theory – which appeared in the United States in the late 1980s and early 1990s – in that branch of sociology and social psychology which preceded it in questioning gender and sexuality, at the same time announcing a possible and desirable convergence. Lorenzo Bernini

discusses the political dimension of queer radicalism represented by Lee Edelman and his analysis of the incompatibility between homosexual desire and the symbolic heteronormative order, following the path opened up thirty years before by Guy Hocquenghem. Giacomo Viggiani starts from the perspective of the philosophy of law to discuss the hypothesis of the production of alternative versions of marriage through its availability to homosexual couples, offering a less orthodox interpretation than the anti-assimilation theory prevalent in queer analyses (e.g., Warner 1999). Daniela Crocetti questions the relation between the materiality of bodies – represented by the use of genitals – and their genderization, emphasizing the outcry when the transgender Vladimir Luxuria entered the Italian Parliament and the whole debate regarding intersex persons. Giorgia Aiello analyses the normalization of the eccentricity and abjection of the female body as shown in the world-wide market of commercialized images, which gives rise to practices of subversion and reappropriation by those involved. Anna Lisa Amodeo and Cristiano Scandurra examine the phases of a European project against gender-based and homophobic violence, to show how the effort to categorize bodies and identities within the homosexual/heterosexual dualism produces high levels of cognitive anxiety, which are translated into stigmatizing treatment against the victims.

The monograph is accompanied by two empirical research contributions which, although for different reasons, show similarities with the queer theory approach. The article by Daniela Danna on Icelandic policies regarding the sex market and trafficking in women questions the elective field of research of queer studies, i.e., how sexuality is regulated. Leslie J. Nichols discusses the gender aspects of policies supporting employment in Canada by developing a deconstructive and intersectional view which lies at the center of the epistemology and methodology of queer criticism.

1. The constructive effect of queer deconstructionism

This is not the place to introduce the six original contributions with an overview of

queer theory, or to present its state-of-the-art little more than twenty years after its original appearance. It would be extremely complex, in view of the internal heterogeneity of this sphere of thinking and its allergy toward any form of systematization (Turner 2000, 9). Rather – more simply, and without the pretext of exploring all of it – we present a criterion for interpreting the queer approach and thus the articles in the monographic section devoted to it.

We propose questioning this approach and its results by asking how they represent social reality, its dynamics of genderization and sexualization, and the people involved. One part of the international debate on queer theory involves the different conceptualization of social reality which distinguishes this theoretical *corpus* from other approaches to gender and sexuality (see, e.g., Jackson 2006; Green 2007). The decision to ask this question also followed the post-modern approach of queer thinking and practice, since “postmodern justifications shift the debate from that of Truth and abstract rationality to that of social and intellectual consequences” (Seidman 1991, 137).

We can assume that society is also constructed from the way in which queer theory represents it, and in particular the relationship between gender and sexuality. This is the hypothesis which explains the title of this editorial and the whole monographic section. Two aspects support it. The first regards the interpretation of the symbolic and material reality of gender and sexuality as products of institutionalized discursive strategies, which require criteria allowing people to “experience” these realities¹. In particular, we refer here to the approach of Teresa De Lauretis (1987) which involves the intellectual work of gender deconstruction – *undoing gender*, as Judith Butler calls it (2004) – in the process of social construction of gender itself², thus extending the ethno-methodological concept of *doing gender* (West and Zimmerman 1987) beyond the confines of everyday routine. In other words, any discourse on gender – and, we would add, on sexuality – affects the social construction of its reality, even in the case in which discourses, like

¹ The bibliography on this topic, from American pragmatism (see Romania’s article in this issue) and Foucault’s thinking until Butler’s *performance approach* is extensive. We mention here a useful analysis by Samuel Chambers (2007) on the relationship between the materialism of bodies and their textual dimension in the works of Judith Butler.

² This analysis was suggested by Pustianaz (2000, 108-112).

queer theory, derive from the intention to reveal the mechanisms of social technology which conceal the arbitrariness of power.

The second aspect supporting the interpretation of queer theory in terms of construction of social reality regards collocating this field of study within the production mechanisms of knowledge of the context from which it emerged. Very soon after the formulation of queer language, in the early 1990s – thanks mainly to the work of Judith Butler (1990), Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (1990), Teresa De Lauretis (1991) and Michael Warner (1993) – external commentators clearly saw that “queer theory represents a powerful force in rethinking homosexuality as a culture and politics” (Seidman, 1996a, 118). This force was explained by the pre-eminent position which the supporters of queer theory occupied within the American academic environment, unlike the preceding generations of gay and lesbian scholars (see also Stein and Plummer 1994). This approach had an immediate effect, conditioning gay and lesbian intellectual culture, replacing the academic élites which had already emancipated gay and lesbian studies in American universities, and setting the topic of sexual differences at the center of debate in many disciplines such as anthropology, literary studies and cultural studies.

However, we can also go beyond academic representations in defining the force of queer theory. For example, both queer theory and queer studies may have not only followed but also increased the abandon of the language of identity politics in conflicts associated with sexuality, mainly by minorities inside LGBT communities. As Stein and Plummer (1994, 137) wrote:

before these intellectual and political challenges emerged, the solution to cultural exclusion seemed to be the construction of social groups whose taken-for-granted identities simply needed to be made visible. Today, things appear to be a great deal more complicated (...). Rather than simply devising a politics which privileges one identity over others, it has become more apparent that different oppressions are differently structured and intersecting. It is impossible to separate one's sexuality from one's class, one's gender, and so forth.

However, the more recent debate on the normalization of queer theory, precisely because of its institutionalization (see, e.g., Halperin 2003) does lead to questions on the hegemony of such an approach. Which of the characteristics of queer theory managed to impose the way in which gender and sexuality are observed and thus constructed? The six articles in the monograph suggest various replies, from the choice of what to study to the way of questioning it. In the international debate, the critical point lies in the distinction between the theoretical refinement of queer analysis and its propensity to transform the ways in which knowledge on sexuality and gender are produced³. The former certainly redefined the way in which social sciences consider homosexuality: no longer in terms of an identity shaping a sexual minority whose exclusion mechanisms are to be emphasized, but as the product of a system of knowledge based on polarization between heterosexuality and homosexuality and between male and female (Seidman 1996b; Gamson 2000; Valocchi 2005). Instead, the aim of transforming knowledge by annulling the normative power of identity categories was not successful, so that the inclusion of queer theory within several disciplinary practices did not question their epistemological bases.

The topic of change, already looming in the early days of queer theory – independently of its effectiveness – now allows us to return to the main question: how is social reality represented?

The propensity to change which queer theory expressed in the late 1980s and early 1990s derived mainly from the dissatisfaction of some American feminist researchers with the monolithic conceptualization of “woman” and homosexual identity, both considered unsuitable for representing the specificity of their lesbian orientation. More generally, their views were considered inadequate to represent the various intersections among gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity and class, according to which social actors

³ Note that, from a theoretical standpoint, the interpretation of transformation has nothing to do with the action of organizations which, like “Queer Nation” did not follow the approach typical of *identity politics*. It is interesting to read note 2 of Teresa De Lauretis’ famous text which gave rise to the name *queer theory*: «My “queer”, however, had no relation to the Queer nation group (...). There is in fact very little in common between Queer Nation and this queer theory» (1991, xvii). However, the reaction to queer studies produced an overlap between theory and political action: see Mary McIntosh criticism of the gender blindness of the queer approach (1993).

create their images of the world.

The urgent need for a new theory to decipher the impact of sexual politics on the structures of social injustice had already been formulated by the American anthropologist Gayle Rubin in her *Thinking Sex* (1984), in which she condemned the mystifications of feminist thinking, which could not emancipate the interpretation of sexuality from either analysis of female subordination or the tendency to render it essential. Rubin's proposal to focus her new theory on Michel Foucault's work on the history of sexuality was based on the already acquired historiographic sensitivity of the lesbo-feminist deconstruction of "woman", cultivated in the early 1970s in research on love between women (see also Turner 2000, 85 *et seq.*).

Shortly after Rubin's appeal, queer theory took shape as a new theory of sexuality. It united scepticism toward feminism with criticism of social studies on gay and lesbian identities, accused of overshadowing the lesbian perspective (see De Lauretis 1991) and reproducing the heterosexual domain through normalization of the gay minority (see Warner 1993).

In the wake of this definitely critical position toward available models of interpretation at that time, we can try to reduce the internal complexity of queer theory by identifying the three aspects central to its representation of the social world.

The first regards interpreting the binary distinction between heterosexuality and homosexuality as the main system upholding the social world. In the famous words of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (1990, 1):

an understanding of virtually any aspect of modern Western culture must be, not merely incomplete, but damaged in its central substance to the degree that it does not incorporate a critical analysis of modern homo/heterosexual definition.

Thus understood, the theory of homosexuality is transformed into a theory of society. The organization of the various areas of social life – not only those directly linked with the sexual sphere – depends on the productive power of heterosexual hegemony, which dominates on the symbolic and material dimension of institutions and everyday life.

This hegemony is closely connected with the normative definition of gender structures, to the extent that the two systems of knowledge of sexuality and gender are implicit in each other. However, they are viewed as separate⁴.

The second aspect of the representation of the social world according to queer theory lies in interpreting social transformations through the concept of symbolic violence, applied not only to relations between men and women (see Bourdieu 1998) but also to those between gays and lesbians and the heteronormative context⁵. From this viewpoint, the symbolic codes of the heterosexual domain can impose themselves on the everyday strategies of “normal” gays and lesbians – in the sense of being gender-conventional and respecting the polarization of sexual orientation – and in the identity politics of their movements. On both these levels, symbolic violence is visible in the implicit confirmation of gender duality which subordinates women to men (there is no distinction between gay or lesbian without accepting the social differences between men and women) and in the distinction between homosexuality and heterosexuality, which considers the latter as a criterion of evaluation for the former.

The third and last aspect of the queer approach to social reality concerns the hypothesis of the huge distance separating categories of sexual identity and people’s true sexual orientation, be it homo or heterosexual. Going back to the cultural climate of generalized scepticism regarding the true reality of any social category (see, for instance, post-modern criticism of the concept of objectivity in Gamson 2000), queer theory does highlight the topic of the fluidity of desire and the relation systems to which it gives rise. From this viewpoint, the unquestioned use of identity categories, like the adaptations to expectations which define them, have a considerable effect in terms of regulation and discipline of bodies.

How did the social sciences react to this type of conceptualization of their field of analysis? The impact of queer theory was not univocal, especially considering the epistemology of sociology which queer criticism accused to essentialize homosexual

⁴ The definition of the relationship between sexuality and gender of queer theorists is not one-sided. Analytical distinction in the analysis of women in this field is ideally opposed to that which considers gender as an effect of the hegemonic system of sexuality.

⁵ The association of Bourdieu’s sociology and queer theory must still be fully explored.

identities. International sociological research accepted the request to focus more on the construction of homo-heterosexual duality, not to limit itself to study gays and lesbians in terms of a sexual minority, and to be less ingenuous in using the categories of sexual identities, also in research on the lives of heterosexual people⁶.

The most negative reactions mainly involved two points. One regards the “novelty” of the queer approach, highlighting its continuity with the tradition of social constructionism (as Vincenzo Romania does in this issue). Paradoxically, this type of criticism confirmed the capacity of queer theory to impose its “order of discourse”: sociology had to prove that it had been queer even before queer theory appeared (Weeks 1998). Other negative criticism focused on how social research would not accept an interpretation of sexuality separated from the social structures of gender (Brickell 2000; Jackson 2006), which denies social actors’ agency or does not give due weight to the social variables of the contexts in which narrations on sexuality are produced.

A propos of this, particular interest was aroused by Adam Green’s (2002) proposal to go beyond the internal contradictions of queer theory by means of a sort of “sociologization” of its deconstructive approach, thus creating a new perspective of post-queer studies.

2. Queer studies in Italy

The decision to devote a monograph to queer theory was the direct consequence of the position which “About Gender” proposed to occupy within the Italian and international scientific community. In the editorial to the first issue (Abbatecola, Fanlo Cortés and Stagi 2012), the spread of queer studies in Italy – like those of gays and lesbians, from whom and against whom queer theory emerged – was commented upon in very disappointing terms. According to the authors, this was the most serious delay, of all those which still remain to be made up, before Italian gender studies can approach

⁶ On this last point, see Roseneil (2000; 2005).

international standards.

We agree with the harshness of this comment. Yet, as Lorenzo Bernini shows in his article, Italy was involved in the cultural climate which, between the 1960s and 1970s, associated homosexual liberation with radical criticism of the system of sexuality, in anticipation of queer theory which was to develop two decades later (see also Bernini 2010). However, from this viewpoint, the theoretical views which Mario Mieli (1977) proposed in those years of mobilization did not leave a significant mark, whereas those of Hocquenghem had important results, both in France and worldwide.

In any case, the problem of the marginality of queer theory in Italy does not refer to the quality of the work of those who have already faced it. As regards this aspect, the recent work on queer theory in Italy, edited by Marco Pustianaz (2011) – one of the first Italian scholars who used queer theory to study the close links between sexuality and gender, proposing their collocation in cultural studies (Pustianaz 2004) – is appreciated for its quality and awareness of the use of concepts and for their translation in terms of political action. Negative criticism refers rather to the marginal collocation of this approach – and partly also to those agreeing with it – in the production of knowledge on social reality.

Many factors go toward explaining the lack of success of queer theory in Italy. Apart from problems related to the relationship between categories of analysis and the variables of the local contexts in which they were measured, which means that it is difficult to “export”⁷, we mention here the factors which seem to be the most important, at least for social studies.

From the research viewpoint, the fact that gay and lesbian studies have not been important on the Italian academic scene has been aggravated by the development of a mainly male-oriented and thus gender-blind approach to the interpretation of phenomena of sexual orientation. In this case, the problem is that, as already mentioned, one of the main impulses which established queer theory was the intent to deconstruct

⁷ On the different impact of queer theory in the US and Europe regarding gay and lesbian politics and the framework of movements, see Duyvendak (1996), Adam, Duyvendak and Krouwel (1999) and Beger (2004).

the hegemony of gay and lesbian studies, starting from the intersection between sexual orientation and other identity determinants, mainly gender. The words of Marco Pustianaz in 2000 are still actual (2000, 112, *author's translation*):

The relative poverty of gay male theory in Italy, and the fact that its urgency has not been recognised, means that the crucial topic of how gender differences at various levels give rise to feminine and masculine norms, which are completely internal to modern sexual identities (including homosexual identity), has not been perceived.

Considering sexuality as the research field of queer theory, a second factor to be borne in mind is the absence of a tradition of studies behind recent works which, sometimes explicitly recalling queer theory, have studied various dimensions of the social organization of erotic pleasure and sexual desire (Bertone and Ferrero Camoletto 2009a; 2009b; Barbagli, Dalla Zuanna and Garelli 2010; Bernini 2010; Monceri 2010; Inghilleri and Ruspini 2011; Antosa 2012a). As Isabella Crowhurst and Chiara Bertone noted in their introduction to the special issue which the journal “Modern Italy” devoted to sexual politics in contemporary Italy (2012, 2):

sexuality has been a peripheral area of investigation in Italian academic research – both in terms of its institutional recognition and epistemological status and in relation to the positioning of those who have been identified as the target population of these very studies.

A third factor perhaps explaining the poor reception of queer theory in Italy was the prevalence in Italian social research of models which, like functionalism and Marxism, hindered the spread of symbolic interaction and ethno-methodology (e.g., Romania 2012, 2)⁸. As Vincenzo Romania shows in this issue, the latter is an approach which anticipated queer studies in questioning sexed bodies, whereas research practices

⁸ For the use of ethno-methodology in recent research on gender topics, see Poggio (2009).

excessively focused on social structures tended to take them for granted.

Lastly, a fourth determining factor – related to social dynamics – may be identified in the fact that in Italy “there was a lack of the conflict experience of racial multiculturalism which occurred in the US and more recently in the UK and France” (Pustianaz 2000, 104, *author’s translation*). This gave rise to schism within feminism and gay and lesbian theories⁹. Questioning the representation of identity categories such as “woman”, “gay” and “lesbian” as univocal and internally consistent is widely known to be essential for the development of those intellectual phenomena – like post-structuralism and post-modern criticism – which nourished the anti-identity scepticism of queer theory.

As already mentioned, little more than a year after the first editorial of this journal, we cannot definitely state that there has been a change in the collocation of queer studies in Italy, although some signs of effervescence, perhaps of ongoing change, are still to be verified. This more optimistic evaluation is based on some significant works appeared in the Italian market between the second half of 2011 and the end of 2012, which throw a different light on the “underground” which preceded them.

The first Italian anthology on queer theory, edited by Elisa Arfini and Cristian Lo Iacono (2012) and the fundamental work by Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (1990), translated by Federico Zappino in 2011, are precious resources flanking the already translated works of Judith Butler – mainly *Gender Trouble* (1990), which only appeared in 2004 – in the appreciation of the new queer cultural phenomenon which was about to emerge in the USA at the end of the 1980s¹⁰.

From concepts to the definition of research aims and hypotheses, two collections of essays in which the queer approach ranges from literary criticism to social analysis, were published in 2012, mainly by Italian authors. These are *Inquietudini queer*, by Saveria Chemotti and Davide Susanetti (2012) and *Queer Crossings*, published in

⁹ On the production of alternative narratives to the *white* hegemony of the LGBT community, see Johnson and Henderson’s anthology (2005); for the viewpoints of lesbian women and women with different ethnic cultures in feminist thought, see De Lauretis (1990) and Hirsh and Fox Keller (1991).

¹⁰ We do not consider here the translation of Foucault’s work on the history of sexuality and gay and lesbian political action which greatly influenced queer theory (in Italian see, for instance, Abbatecola 2002 and Bernini 2008).

English by Silvia Antosa (2012). Antosa also edited a previous volume discussing the ways in which sexuality contributes toward organizing physical and symbolic spaces from various disciplinary angles (Antosa 2007).

From the more circumscribed plane of the Italian sociological debate, the adoption of a queer approach to the study of homosexuality – and the relative change of perspective – is very recent, after early attempts at the beginning of the new century (Abbatecola 2002). The first anthologies on the sociology of homosexuality appearing since late 2008 (Trappolin 2008; Rinaldi 2012a) discuss the sociological aspects of the queer debate at length, both conceptually (see also Bertone 2009, 106-110) and from the viewpoint of translating for the benefit of the Italian public the research of scholars such as Steven Seidman and James J. Dean, prolific in this field.

Instead, the queer attitude in sociological research on homosexuality has been adopted, albeit to various extents, in questioning the meanings of the mobilization of Italian LGBT groups (Trappolin 2009) and, above all, in the interpretation of homophobia. In the latter case, deconstructive analysis has covered a wide range of topics, from the development of homophobic discourse (Rinaldi 2012b), to the hidden implications in mainstream policies contrasting homophobia (Pustianaz 2012)¹¹ to knowledge systems according to which men and women of various sexual orientations give practical meaning to discrimination against gays and lesbians (Trappolin and Motterle 2012; see also article by Anna Lisa Amodeo and Cristiano Scandurra in the monographic section). In this context, the articles by Daniela Crocetti and Giorgia Aiello, published in this issue, definitely widen the horizons of sociological research.

Taken all together, the contributions of the monographic section probably supply a good example – in Italy too – of the scenario of post-queer studies hypothesized by Adam Green in 2002.

¹¹ Including Marco Pustianaz in this short review of sociological research inspired by queer theory is only apparently incorrect. According to its textual interpretation of social processes (see, for instance, Seidman 1994), queer studies tend to blur the distinction between social sciences and humanistic studies. The analysis of Pustianaz (see references) is also available in an extended version in English edited in the same year by Silvia Antosa (2012b).

References

- Abbatecola, E. (2002), "L'identità in questione. L'omosessualità da Foucault alla *Queer Theory*", in C. Leccardi (ed.), *Tra i generi. Rileggendo le differenze di genere, di generazione, di orientamento sessuale*, Milano, Guerini, pp. 225-248.
- Abbatecola, E., Fanlo Cortés, I. and Stagi, L. (2012), *About Genders. Lgbtqi, Queer, Masculinities, Feminism, and Other Boundaries*, in «AG About Gender», vol. 1, n. 1, pp. i-xv.
- Adam, B., Duyvendak, J.W. and Krouwel, A. (eds.) (1999), *The Global Emergence of Gay and Lesbian Politics. National Imprints of a Worldwide Movement*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press.
- Antosa, S. (ed.) (2007), *Spazi e identità queer. Omosapiens.2*, Roma, Carocci.
- Antosa, S. (ed.) (2012a), *Gender and Sexuality: Rights, Language and Performativity*, Roma, Aracne Editrice.
- Antosa, S. (ed.) (2012b), *Queer Crossings. Theories, Bodies, Texts*, Milano-Udine, Mimesis.
- Arfini, E.A.G. and Lo Iacono, C. (eds.) (2012), *Canone inverso. Antologia di teoria queer*, Pisa, Edizioni ETS.
- Barbagli, M., Dalla Zuanna, G. and Garelli F. (2010), *La sessualità degli italiani*, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- Beger, N.J. (2004), *Tensions in the Struggle for Sexual Minority Rights in Europe. Que(e)rying Political Practices*, Manchester-NewYork, Manchester University Press.
- Bernini, L. (2008), *Le pecore e il pastore. Critica, politica, etica nel pensiero di Michel Foucault*, Napoli, Liguori.
- Bernini, L. (2010), *Maschio e femmina Dio li creò!? Il sabotaggio transmodernista del binarismo sessuale*, Milano, Il Dito e La Luna.
- Bertone, C. (2009), *Le omosessualità*, Roma, Carocci.
- Bertone, C. and Ferrero Camoletto, R. (2009a), "Like a sex machine? La

- naturalizzazione della sessualità maschile”, in E. Ruspini (ed.), *Uomini e corpi. Una riflessione sui travestimenti della maschilità*, Milano, Franco Angeli, pp. 133-150.
- Bertone, C. and Ferrero Camoletto, R. (2009b), *Beyond the Sex Machine? Sexual Practices and Masculinity in Adult Men’s Heterosexual Accounts*, in «Journal of Gender Studies», vol. 18, n.4, pp. 369-386.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998), *La domination masculine*, Paris, Édition du Seuil; English translation: *Masculine Domination*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Brickell, C. (2006), *The Social Construction of Gender and Sexuality*, in «The Sociological Review», vol. 54, n. 1, pp. 87-113.
- Butler, J. (1990), *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, London-New York, Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2004), *Undoing Gender*, New York-London, Routledge.
- Chambers, S.A. (2007), “Sex” and the Problem of the Body: *Reconstructing Judith Butler’s Theory of Sex/Gender*, in «Body & Society», vol. 13, n. 4, pp. 47-75.
- Chemotti, S. and Susanetti, D. (eds.) (2012), *Inquietudini queer. Desiderio, performance, scrittura*, Padova, Il Poligrafo.
- Crowhurst, I. and Bertone, C. (2012), *Introduction: The Politics of Sexuality in Contemporary Italy*, in «Modern Italy», vol. 17, n. 4, pp. 1-6.
- De Lauretis, T. (1987), *Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film, and Fiction*, Bloomington-Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.
- De Lauretis, T. (1990), “Feminism and Its Differences”, «Pacific Coast Philology», vol. 25, n. 1-2, pp. 24-30.
- De Lauretis, T. (1991), *Queer Theory: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities. An Introduction*, in «differences», vol. 3, n. 2, pp. iii-xviii.
- Duyvendak, J.W. (1996), “The Depoliticization of the Dutch Gay Identity, or Why Dutch Gays Aren’t Queer”, in Seidman (1996b, 421-438).
- Gamson, J. (2000), *Sexuality, Queer Theory, and Qualitative Research*, in N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research. Second Edition*, Thousand Oaks, Sage, pp. 347-364.
- Green, A.I. (2002), *Gay but Not Queer: Toward a Post-Queer Study of Sexuality*, in

- «Theory & Society», vol. 31, n. 4, pp. 521-545.
- Green, A.I. (2007), *Queer Theory and Sociology: Locating the Subject and the Self in Sexuality Studies*, in «Sociological Theory», vol. 25, n. 1, pp. 26-45.
- Halperin, D.M. (2003), *The Normalization of Queer Theory*, in «Journal of Homosexuality», vol. 45, n. 2/3/4, pp. 339-343.
- Hirsh, M. and Fox Keller, E. (eds.) (1991), *Conflicts in Feminism*, New York, Routledge.
- Inghilleri, M. and Ruspini, E. (eds.) (2011), *Sessualità narrate. Esperienze di intimità a confronto*, Milano, Franco Angeli.
- Jackson, S. (2006), *Gender, Sexuality and Heterosexuality: The Complexity (and Limits) of Heteronormativity*, in «Feminist Theory», vol. 7, n. 1, pp. 105-121.
- Johnson, E.P. and Henderson, M.G. (eds.) (2005), *Black Queer Studies: A Critical Anthology*, Durham-London, Duke University Press.
- McIntosh, M. (1993), “Queer Theory and the War of the Sexes”, in J. Bristow and A.R. Wilson (eds.), *Activating Theory: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Politics*, London, Lawrence & Wishart, pp. 30-52.
- Mieli, M. (1977), *Elementi di critica omosessuale*, Torino, Einaudi; English translation: *Homosexuality and Liberation: Elements of a Gay Critique*, London, Gay Men's Press, 1980.
- Monceri, F. (2010) *Oltre l'identità sessuale. Teorie queer e corpi transgender*, Pisa, Edizioni ETS.
- Poggio, B. (ed.) (2009), *Ai confini del genere. Prospettive emergenti di riflessione e ricerca*, Trento, Edizioni31.
- Pustianaz, M. (2000), “Genere intransitivo e transitivo, ovvero gli abissi della performance queer”, in A. Bellagamba, P. Di Cori and M. Pustianaz (eds.), *Generi di traverso: culture, storie e narrazioni attraverso i confini delle discipline*, Vercelli, Mercurio, pp. 103-150.
- Pustianaz, M. (2004), “Studi queer”, in M. Cometa, R. Coglitore and F. Mazzara (eds.), *Dizionario degli studi culturali*, Roma, Meltemi Editore, pp. 441-448.
- Pustianaz, M. (ed.) (2011), *Queer in Italia. Differenze in movimento*, Pisa, Edizioni

ETS.

- Rinaldi, C. (ed.) (2012a), *Alterazioni. Introduzione alle sociologie dell'omosessualità*, Milano-Udine, Mimesis Edizioni.
- Rinaldi, C. (2012b), "Analizzare ed interpretare l'omofobia: eterosessualizzazione costruzione delle maschilità e violenza anti-omosessuale", in Rinaldi (2012a, 121-164).
- Roseneil, S. (2000), *Queer Frameworks and Queer Tendencies: Towards an Understanding of Postmodern Transformations of Sexualities*, in «Sociological Research Online», vol. 5, n. 3.
- Roseneil, S. (2005), *Living and Loving beyond the Boundaries of the Heteronorm: Personal Relationship in the 21st Century*, in L. McKie and S. Cunningham-Burley (eds.), *Families in Society: Boundaries and Relationship*, Bristol, Policy Press, pp. 241-258.
- Rubin, G.S. (1984), "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality", in C. Vance (ed.), *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, London-New York, Routledge & K. Paul, pp. 143-178.
- Sedgwick, E.K. (1990), *Epistemology of the Closet*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Seidman, S. (1991), *The End of Sociological Theory: The Postmodern Hope*, in «Sociological Theory», vol. 9, n. 2, pp. 131-146.
- Seidman, S. (1993), "Identity and Politics in a Postmodern Gay Culture: Some Historical and Conceptual Notes", in Warner (1993, 105-142).
- Seidman, S. (ed.) (1994), *The Postmodern Turn: New Perspectives on Social Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Seidman, S. (1996a), "Deconstructing Queer Theory or the Under-Theorization of the Social and the Ethical", in L. Nicholson and S. Seidman (eds.), *Social Postmodernism: Beyond Identity Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 116-141.
- Seidman, S. (ed.) (1996b), *Queer Theory/Sociology*, Cambridge-Oxford, Blackwell.
- Stein, A. and Plummer, K. (1994), "I Can't even Think Straight". *Queer and the*

- Missing Sexual Revolution in Sociology*, in «Sociological Theory», vol. 12, n. 2, pp. 178-187.
- Trappolin, L. (2009), *Lotte per il riconoscimento e ruolo dei mass media. I significati del "Gay Pride"*, in «Partecipazione e conflitto», n. 1, pp. 123-146.
- Trappolin, L. (ed.) (2008), *Per una sociologia dell'omosessualità. Omosapiens.3*, Roma, Carocci.
- Trappolin, L. and Motterle, T. (2012), "One Step Beyond: Researching Homophobia in Italian Society", in L. Trappolin, A. Gasparini and R. Wintemute (eds.), *Confronting Homophobia in Europe: Social and Legal Perspectives*, Oxford, Hart Publishing, pp. 21-50.
- Turner, W.B. (2000), *A Genealogy of Queer Theory*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press.
- Valocchi, S. (2005), *Not Yet Queer Enough. The Lessons of Queer Theory for the Sociology of Gender and Sexuality*, in «Gender & Society», vol. 19, n. 6, pp. 750-770.
- Warner, M. (1999), *Normal and Normaller: Beyond Gay Marriage*, in «GLQ», vol. 5, n. 2, pp. 119-171.
- Warner, M. (ed.) (1993), *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*, Minneapolis-London, University of Minnesota Press.
- Weeks, J. (1998), *The "Homosexual Role" after 30 Years: An Appreciation of the Work of Mary McIntosh*, in «Sexualities», vol. 1, n. 2, pp. 131-152.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D.H. (1987), *Doing Gender*, in «Gender & Society», vol. 1, n. 2, pp. 125-151.