IN SEPTEMBER 2018 we travelled to Kirkenes, a town on the Norwegian–Russian border, to attend the Barents Pride organized in collaboration between LGBTI+ activists from Russia and Norway (Liinason and Sasunkevich 2022). This Pride differed from what we knew about world famous Prides in cosmopolitan cities across the world, such as Sydney (Markwell 2022), Toronto (Kates & Belk 2021), or Johannesburg (Conway 2022). Kirkenes is a small, almost rural, Norwegian town on the coast of the Barents Sea, thirty kilometres from the border with Russia. Late September was sunny but crisp there. In line with dominant metronormative assumptions about Prides (Wasshede 2021), we thought it was an unconventional location for Pride activities: too small, too distant, and too cold. The Barents Pride was initiated in 2017 by LGBTI+ activists from Murmansk, a city in the Russian North-West. The Barents Pride was on the one hand a response to increasing state homophobia and violence against LGBTI+ people in Russia, on the other – being organized through a cross-border collaboration between Norwegian and Russian LGBTI+ organizations – a sign of mobilization and transnational solidarity among LGBTI+ activists. This special issue, and our general interest in Pride politics, partly stems from our attempt to grasp and conceptualize the ambivalences of the Barents
Pride (Liinason & Sasunkevich 2022). Like the authors in the issue, we consider Pride parades and Pride politics a phenomenon where local, national, and transnational contestations – but also solidarities – intersect, where unexpected alliances are built, and where political messages are sent, even though sometimes in the rather subtle form of “a party with politics” (Browne 2007).

For some scholars, Pride parades “are the most visible manifestations of LGBT movements” in various contexts (Peterson, Wahlström & Wennerhag 2018, 1). Others consider them as “the tip of an iceberg offering us insights into a complex geometry of social practices, forces, and interests, not all of which are […] necessarily compatible with the […] objective of advancing the LGBT cause” (Bilić 2016, 202). The articles included in this special issue span both these strands of scholarship. The contributions cover national contexts that belong to very diverse geopolitical regions – Ukraine in Eastern Europe, Israel, with its ambiguous positionality as the West in the Middle East, Portugal and the UK, and Trinidad and Tobago, located in the Caribbean. Yet, as we will highlight in this introduction, there are striking similarities in the analytical questions that our authors raise in relation to Pride politics in their specific contexts. In what follows we focus on several questions that are threading across the contributions to this special issue, namely, the ambivalences of Pride politics, their global repercussions, questions of public visibility and inclusion in Pride, and, importantly, the potential of Pride to offer a critical political agenda that is built on broader coalitions among marginalized groups.

**Ambivalences of Pride: politics, entertainment or “a party with politics”?**

The history of Pride is the history of radical resistance to state violence and police discrimination against gay people. The first Pride parades occurred in the US in 1970, in commemoration of the Stonewall riots, the protest of gay community members against police raids in New York the year before (Bruce 2016). Since then, the concept of Pride has travelled across the globe and become the epitome of progressive sexual
politics in the global West. Critical scholars have, however, raised critiques regarding the mainstreaming of Pride politics, their whitening, commercialization and depoliticization (Ammaturo 2016; Engebretsen 2021; Markwell 2002). The mainstreaming of Pride across the globe has pushed scholars to suggest that Pride parades and the rainbow flag have lost their radical potential, as they have become harmless, normalized, and mainstream. Or rather, as Cathrin Wasshede (2019) illustrates, Pride, with the rainbow flag as its strongest symbol, is today being used by market-driven corporations, organizations and municipalities to sell their products and services (Klapeer & Laskar 2018), by pinkwashing and homonationalist nations to wash away their homophobic image (Puar 2007), and by far-right and ethno-nationalist actors to dismiss migrants and Muslim populations as backward and intolerant (Farris 2017). Within nationally-bounded LGBTI+ movements, these emergent complexities give rise to deep tensions, which the authors in this special issue examine in detail from various national sites. Yet, in this special issue, we also attend to the ambivalences of Pride politics, arguing that the (de)politicization is space and time contingent. On the one hand, even the most mainstream Prides in the global North/West, such as those in the UK, covered by Eleanor Formby in this special issue, remain an important LGBTI+ space, maintaining a sense of community, belonging, safety, and freedom. In this sense, the entertainment, or even commercial activities, at Pride parades do not preclude their political significance; they can be what Browne (2007) calls “a party with politics”. On the other hand, as Formby argues, some participants feel alienated when Prides become explicitly political (for similar reflections, see Wasshede 2021). Yet, the same participants also admit that, from time to time, Prides need to be politicized in order for people “to be ‘reminded’ of what or why they are celebrating”. Thus, the political meaningfulness of Pride may fluctuate over time, which is why it is important to attend to the temporality of Pride politics.

The extent of Pride depoliticization is also dependent on the relations between mainstream LGBTI+ activists and the state. As Elisabeth Engebretsen (2021) argues in the context of the pieing of a far-right
politician at the 2016 Oslo Pride parade, the depoliticization of Pride occurs when the mainstream liberal LGBTI+ organizations arranging Pride events become too reliant on state protectionism and condemn radical forms of queer activism in favour of carceral state politics. Plakhotnik and Mayerchyk raise a similar critique of Kyiv Pride in Ukraine in this special issue. Although the conditions for queer people and LGBTI+ activism in post-Maidan Ukraine are less favourable than in Norway, the authors argue that NGOization and neoliberalization of LGBTI+ activism in the course of Europeanization in Ukraine strip pride politics of a radical potential for critique towards the state and its allies at the expense of the interests and even safety of queer people. Imagining the state and state institutions, in particular the police, as the main guarantors of LGBTI+ rights to public assembly can prevent solidarity within the LGBTI+ community (Engebretsen 2021; Holmes 2020; Plakhotnik & Mayerchyk in this special issue), but also between LGBTI+ organizations and their allies in civil society (Linander, Lauri & Lauri 2023). Reliance on state protectionism can also undermine the self-sustainability of Pride politics when, for instance, the state decides to withdraw its guarantees through changes in legislation or a re-prioritization of politics. As examples from less favourable contexts suggest (Gruszczynska 2009), the building of broader coalitions between LGBTI+ activists and other social groups can be important for challenging repressive state politics. In such contexts, Pride may acquire a very different political meaning, as in the case of the Poznan March of Equality in Poland, which, in Gruszczynska’s description, more resembled “the Solidarity rallies and marches and politically engaged demonstrations” with a broad agenda and a focus on human and democratic rights in general (Gruszczynska 2009, 321).

This context-based specificity and variability of Prides highlights the importance of spatial analysis of Pride politics. One important dimension of this analysis is the urban–rural axis. The manifestations and demonstrations for LGBTI+ rights we today refer to as a global phenomenon, located in diverse contexts, were already being arranged decades ago, long before what we today recognize as Pride (Norrmeh,
Rydström & Winkvist 2008). Nonetheless, with the emergence of Pride on a global scale, locally embedded instances of LGBTI+ struggles for rights were transformed or incorporated into the broader movement. Over the past few years, the number of Pride events have increased significantly. Let’s take the locatedness of the Swedish context, from which we, the editors, write, as an example. In Sweden, the number of Pride events increased from approximately 10 to over 70 between 2010 and 2018 (Olovsdotter Lööv 2020). Within this development, and situated in a critical regionality approach (Ammaturo 2019), scholars have recognized the great popularity of organizing Pride events in more sparsely populated areas and challenged the urban normativity that often characterizes debates about Pride (Sjöstedt 2019; Wasshede 2021). Scholars have highlighted how Prides in small towns and rural areas may potentially be less commercial and touristic than the more spectacular events in metropolitan cities (Johnston & Waitt 2015). Rural Prides, scholars find, represent a “paradoxical space’ where LGBTQ activism and Pride [are] de/constructed and re-worked” (Olovsdotter Lööv 2020, 90). Rather than being explicitly political, such Prides can still be significant for the LGBTI+ community by sustaining a spirit of community and a sense of belonging (Johnston & Waitt 2015). To recognize the political meaningfulness of community-based activities, a more inclusive notion of politics is needed (Arik et al. 2023). Here we draw on the feminist reconceptualization of “Politics” with a capital “P”, which decenter politics from state institutions and suggest that actions aimed at community building including support groups, sport, and entertaining activities have explicit political significance (Arik et al. 2023).

This expanded notion of politics brings attention to the entanglement of micro- and macro-politics. Researchers interested in problematizing constructions of belonging and place in queer scholarship also attend to the strategic, economic and organizational dimensions of queer politics and Pride events in various sites – an approach through which they are able to capture how the micro-politics of a region connect with the macro-scale of international relations (Weber 2016; Rao 2020; Kehl 2018; Akin 2018). From this perspective, the question of a
depoliticization of Pride appears in a different light, as scholars bring attention to international and global games of power. Below, we explain more in detail how the contributions to this special issue relate to such complex transnational dynamics from their situatedness in specific, locally embedded sites.

**Pride and global implications of sexual citizenship**

Pride as a profoundly Western idea has become implicated in a hegemonic progress narrative with postcolonial overtones. This narrative, which many illustrate through ILGA’s (The International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association) map dividing countries across the world into more and less progressive in terms of sexual rights (Rao 2020), reproduces the postcolonial construction of time and place – “one which positions some at the front and others as behind” (Wasshede 2021) and serves as a new marker “for an old divide between the civilized and the savage” (Rao 2020, 33). In this narrative, sexual rights, including the right to public assembly for LGBTI+ people, become a litmus test, “a barometer of a nation’s fitness for sovereignty” and “a metonym for other categories such as nationality, religiosity, race, class, and caste” (Rao 2020, 10–11).

This critique does not preclude the attention to cruel consequences of no less problematic state homophobia in countries like India, Uganda, or Russia (Moss 2014; Rao 2020). The case of Russia, where the anti-gay rhetoric became a ground for country’s anti-Western geopolitics and served as justification for military aggression against neighbouring Ukraine (Edenborg 2022), is a painful reminder that sexual rights matter for the liveability of queer and non-queer people alike. Therefore, the analytical disentanglement of queer politics from discourses of homocapitalism (Rao 2020) and homo- or heteronationalism (Puar 2007; Moss 2014) is an important task for scholarship and activism.

Two articles in this special issue engage with these questions. Olga Plakhotnik and Maria Mayerchyk analyze how Pride politics in post-Maidan Ukraine are shaped by the country’s peripheral location on the fringes of two imperial formations – namely, the global West and Rus-
sian imperialism – a position that the authors define as buffer periphery. They attend to the role of mainstream LGBTI+ organizations in maintaining the West-centred geopolitics of sexual liberation in the context of the military threat from Russia and post-Maidan neoliberalization of civil society in Ukraine. While Ukraine outscores some EU members in the progressiveness of its LGBTI+ politics, Plakhotnik and Mayerchyk scrutinize these developments. They show how memories of grassroots queer resistance are erased in mainstream LGBTI+ activism and how Pride loses its radical potential when LGBTI+ organizations align with the state and the police. Without denying the importance of Kyiv Pride for public visibility of LGBTI+ rights and empowerment of queer people, the authors show how implication of Pride politics into global coloniality and capitalism undermines this positive meaning.

Memories and forgetting are also a central theme in Roey J. Gafter’s and Tommaso M. Milani’s article about Pride politics in Israel. These authors conduct an in-depth analysis of Israeli documentary *hamahapexa hagea* (“The Pride Revolution”) to unpack how the documentary’s homonationalist narrative – a co-optation of successful LGBTI+ struggles into the nationalist project of the Israeli state – works for the audience within Israel. By analyzing omissions and forgettings in the linear historical narrative about progression of LGBTI+ rights in Israel that is represented in the documentary, the authors demonstrate how this cultural product contributes to the ideology of Israeli exceptionalism – a fantasy about Israel being the exceptionally civilized of the Middle East. This fantasy gets entangled with Israeli settler colonialism and militarism.

The profound and moving, yet conflicted and contradictory, experiences of the emergence of global-style Pride in Trinidad and Tobago is the topic of this issue’s We’re Here essay. Recognizing the long history of LGBTI+ organizing in Trinidad and Tobago, which set the foundation for a full-scale Pride event in the twin-islands in 2018, Keith E. McNeil illuminates the cultural politics of queer visibility and sexual citizenship by exploring the complicated history, politics, and practice of #PrideTT.
(In)visibility and inclusion/exclusion in Pride politics

Queer and feminist scholars have defined public visibility and coming out performances of previously hidden identities as the underlining script of Pride politics (Peterson et al. 2018, 6–7). Yet, as contributors to this special issue and other scholars show, visibility is a contested field: not all identities within the LGBTI+ spectrum receive equal recognition in Pride politics, as some forms of visibility are privileged while other groups, such as people of colour or people with disabilities, are marginalized during Pride parades. These discussions contribute to scholarly and activist trajectories anchored in the idea that public visibility provides a platform for raising awareness about social injustice and for challenging stereotypes. Indeed, as diverse movements have used visibility politics to liberate marginalized groups across the whole twentieth century (Edenborg 2020), visibility has long been a popular mode of political action in Western and West-inspired mobilizations. Phillip Ayoub (2016) has argued that increased visibility of sexual minorities and of liberal norms of sexual diversity, has been central for the possibility of LGBTI+ activists to demand their states strengthen LGBTI+ rights and protections and change attitudes.

Nonetheless, scholars have also problematized and challenged the legacy of Pride politics as oriented towards a specific form of visibility in urban space and towards legal recognition (Binnie & Klesse 2011; Göle 2011; Bilić & Stubbs 2015; Johnston & Waitt 2015). Situated in a critical engagement with notions of LGBTI+ (in)visibility in the global North/West, scholars have questioned the idea of visibility as liberating, by bringing forth how practices and discourses of (in)visibility interact with homonationalist agendas (Akin 2019; Edenborg 2019). In these dynamics, homotolerance is typically promoted as a national value, while homophobia is projected onto racialized people and migrant populations (Stubberud, Akin & Bang Svendsen 2019; Haritaworn 2015). These complexities give rise to “impossible and un-imaginable” subjects, such as non-heterosexual Muslim migrant women (Gopinath 2005, 16) – an unintelligible position which illustrates the problematic dynamics that make certain subjects simultaneously hyper-visible and
invisible (Liinason 2020). Moreover, in other contexts, such as Serbia (Bilić 2016) or Russia (Stella 2015), visibility may have negative consequences for the LGBTI+ community through increasing exposure to hate crime. Anti-gay and anti-trans campaigns in Russia and the US, as well as in Eastern and Southern Europe, are part of a broader global pattern in which homo- and transphobic states or regions increasingly attack sexual and gendered minorities and contest the rights of LGBTI+ people (Edenborg 2020; Suchland 2018).

As these complex discussions illuminate, notions of visibility are charged with ambivalence and loaded with both negative and positive connotations (Leinonen & Toivanen 2014). Shedding light on the dynamics of visibility for practices of inclusion and exclusion in Pride politics, in this special issue, Mafalda Esteves and Mara Pieri take departure in narratives emerging from bisexual activism and from the experiences of chronically ill people who also identify as LGBTI+. With the aim to critically engage with the limits of Pride politics in Portugal, their analysis focuses on the tensions and exclusions experienced during Pride. While Esteves and Pieri find instances of mobilization around bisexual visibility and recognition in LGBTI+ communities, such as informal groups for bisexuality and a BI Bloc in the 2018 Pride marches in Lisbon and Porto, the political agendas remain mostly oriented towards lesbian and gay people. Showing that bi+ people experience episodes of prejudice and discrimination and a devaluation of their voices, Esteves and Pieri illuminate a problematic phenomenon of double discrimination of bi+ people, both within the LGBTI+ community and in broader society. A similar kind of invisibility and exclusion, the authors highlight, is reflected in the narratives of chronically ill people. The growth of Pride marches has not corresponded with any growing interest in the politics of accessibility in LGBTI+ communities. The absence of collective mobilizations with a focus on chronic illness, the disconnect between disability rights and LGBTI+ rights, and the historically rooted idea of illness as an individual matter, are according to Esteves and Pieri the main factors explaining why disability and chronic illness are not considered as part of a politics of Pride.
Eleanor Formby’s research on Prides in UK cities distinguishes more aspects of exclusion and (in)visibility. Whilst for many queer people in the UK Pride remains an important community-building activity, maintaining a sense of belonging, safety, and acceptance, others perceive Pride events, or at least some of their aspects, as exclusionary and even alienating. The exclusions the author distinguishes in the empirical material relate to economic disadvantage and racism. Here, the commercialization of Pride prevents inclusivity – some of Formby’s research participants feel that Prides still primarily target wealthy white gay people. Another side-effect of visibility through commercialization and carnivalesque celebration of Prides is that some community members feel alienated from what they define as excessive representation of LGBTI+ identities. Furthermore, the celebratory nature of Pride events, including the excessive consumption of alcohol, also makes some Pride participants feel unwelcome. However, as Formby argues throughout the paper, such negative experiences of Pride are not univocal – what is alienating for some is simultaneously attractive and emancipatory for others.

Thus, the ambiguities that shape negotiations around inclusion and visibility suggest that visibility and invisibility and inclusion and exclusion co-exist in complicated ways in Pride politics, and are the result of tensions within the community (Stella 2012). Nonetheless, these and similar tensions are crucial points for political engagement, for expanding spaces of liveability and building pluralistic struggles. In this special issue, the contributions critically engage with this complicated legacy of Pride as a politics of visibility and inclusion and aspire to bring the discussion forward.

**Towards a new radical Pride politics in the Nordics?**

Admittedly, none of the articles included in this special issue cover Pride politics in the Nordic countries. In 2018, when we attended the Barents Pride, Norway and Norwegian LGBTI+ activists acted implicitly superior in relation to the Russian activists – as a role model for successful sexual politics, an ideal to strive towards (Liinason &
This observation is in line with what other scholars in the region have labelled as Nordic exceptionalism (Habel 2012; Griffin, Martinsson & Giritli Nygren 2017; Alm et al. 2021): a discourse around the progressiveness and tolerance of the Nordic countries, which many Nordic politicians have weaponized in their homonationalist arguments against non-European migrants. Yet in recent years, we have also been able to observe a crack in this narrative, and a painful awareness among LGBTI+ activists in the region that rights to public visibility or same-sex marriage do not guarantee that “the struggle is over” for queer people (Linander, Lauri & Lauri 2023, 62).

In 2022, two people were killed and more than twenty were injured during Oslo Pride in Norway. This attack has been treated as “Islamist terrorism” by the Norwegian police (bbc.com 2022), yet, as experts acknowledge, it falls within a wider trend of increasingly hateful rhetoric against LGBTI+ people from extremist groups in the Nordic countries and beyond (Paust 2022). There is a convergency in the increase of anti-feminist, homophobic and anti-trans online hate speech in the global alt-right manosphere, which bridges diverse and seemingly incompatible political contexts (Khosravi Ooryad 2023). In Sweden, the far-right has intensified its intimidation of LGBTI+ activists and attacks on Pride festivals (Linander, Lauri & Lauri 2023; Wasshede 2021). In their article, published in Lambda Nordica, Linander, Lauri and Lauri (2023) show how this hegemonic shift is experienced by LGBTI+ activists. Many of them express melancholy at having lost the privilege to focus on positive narratives (that things are going in the right direction), which have long contributed to femo- and homonationalist fantasies about the Nordics as progressive, (homo)tolerant and immune to anti-gender movements and state homophobia. This is what we define as uncertain times for Pride politics. However, instead of giving in to anger and grievance over the recent political developments in the Nordic region (see Lambda Nordica’s special issue on anti-gender), we, alongside many of our colleagues (Alm & Engebretsen 2023; Martinsson & Mulinari 2018, 2023) suggest thinking seriously about practices and spaces of resistance. Our own research about feminist and LGBTI+
activism in such contexts as Russia and Turkey (Çağatay, Liinason & Sasunkevich 2022) shows that there is plenty to learn about resistance from activists for whom authoritarianism, state violence, and militant imperialism/nationalism has been part of the everyday experience for a long time. What we argue is that in times like these, Pride politics can regain their radical political meaning through inclusion of and solidarity with other critical, yet marginalized, voices – people with disabilities, precarious workers, racialized/ethnicized groups, feminists, and anti-racists (Engebretsen 2021; Wasshede 2021). Yet, for this to happen, we need a systematic scrutiny of existing Pride politics. We hope that this special issue contributes to this.
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