On August 27, 2014, the 24-year-old Chilean sailor Mauricio Ruiz took a bold step, nervously speaking into a myriad of microphones at an overcrowded press conference in Santiago: “Personally, I hope that this is a contribution to non-discrimination in my society. I believe that we homosexuals have no need to hide. We can do anything, be marines or work in any branch. We can do whatever profession, and we deserve as much respect as anyone else.”[1]

Accompanied by activists of the Chilean LGBTIQ organization Movimiento de Integración y Liberación Homosexual (MOVILH), Socialist deputy Marcelo Schilling as well as representatives of the embassies of Finland and the EU, Mauricio Ruiz announced that he is gay, thus becoming the first active member of the Fuerzas Armadas (Armed Forces) to come out of the closet publicly. Ruiz was able to make this move with the official authorization of the Chilean Navy’s leadership, albeit only after a “long process” of dialogue.[3]

Mauricio Ruiz' announcement represents, quite accurately, the transformation of a country whose “supposedly exceptional economic and political status is constructed, often quite aggressively, in tandem with models of masculine, heterosexual comportment.”[4] Chile, traditionally associated with conservatism, catholicism and machismo, has become a nation in which many shifts and changes for the LGBTIQ-community and queer individuals have taken place within a fairly short time, thence evolving into a show stage for strongly disputed discourses around a certain ‘queer progress’. Indeed, it can hardly be denied that over the course of the last six years, legal and socio-political conditions for the community in Chile have gradually improved, going hand in hand with a wider range of opportunities to enhance queer visibility. While gliding across the Andes, the condors must have been baffled by the appearance of a particularly stubborn rainbow – a rainbow that just would not vanish.

In 2012, a disastrous event set the ball rolling: The brutal killing of Daniel Zamudio, a gay young man, induced heated public debates on homophobia in the country and resulted in a hate crime law which passed the Chilean congress after having languished for seven years.[5]

In 2013, a ban on blood donations by gay, lesbian and bisexual Chileans was lifted.[6] In 2015, the Civil Union Agreement law legally recognized same-sex couples and new policies of the Ministry of Education acknowledged the necessity of promoting LGBTQI-rights in classrooms.[7] In 2016, Chile outlawed non-consensual unnecessary surgical and other procedures on intersex new-borns and in the same year, three openly gay men and two transgender women were elected as council members in the municipal elections.[8] Currently, a gender identity law that would abrogate the requirement of any surgeries or judicial permission to change name and gender as well as a bill recognizing marriage equality in the country have been brought before the legislature.[9] This development is also reflected in the steadily rising numbers of attendees of the Marcha del Orgullo, the Chilean Pride Parade. With more than one-hundred thousand participants, the 2017 parade constituted the most attended LGBTQI-march in Chilean history.[10]

Advocates of the critical concept of homonormativity problematize this narrative of a linear, coherent and unstoppable ‘queer progress’. It is argued that so-called homonormative structures induce the depoliticization of the compliant majority within the sexual minority, thereby enforcing the stigmatization of queer people that do not represent the figurative picture of a normal, assimilated homosexual. From this critical perspective, ‘queer progress’ within the present system can never be truly progressive, as it will always occur under a homonormative guise more
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harmful than helpful for the overall goal of substantially improving the living conditions of all members of the LGBTIQ-community.

In this light, the case of Mauricio Ruiz is extraordinarily intriguing, as it contests both an overenthusiastic interpretation of its repercussions and an overly negative perception through critical homonormative lenses. I assert that the figuration of his person and the act of coming out as a sailor of the Chilean navy can be read in various ways, generating a certain multiplicity that defies the binary logic of 'either/or'. In fact, Ruiz "is constituted by and simultaneously embodies multiple, seemingly contradictory meanings." Having examined both Chilean and international media coverage, public opinion and political statements on the hitherto unique event as well as critical queer contributions to debates on gay soldiers in the military, I found that Mauricio Ruiz has been figured and can be read as a ground-breaking pioneer fighting for gay rights and/or a sexually dissident, pervert individual that constitutes a security risk for the Chilean nation-state and/or a queer subject that may evoke problematic homonormative structures. I argue that different attempts to engage with those tendencies ultimately lead to the fundamental area of tension between the ostensibly opposing approaches of ‘queering the system’ vs. ‘integrating the queer into the system’. From a queer perspective, as I will elucidate, this differentiation is highly questionable, if not detrimental.

Homonormativity

In his work "Fear of a Queer Planet" (1993), Michael Warner termed heteronormativity as the structural presupposition that all people are heterosexual, or that heterosexuality can be set as the ‘normal’ default of human being.[12] Alluding to this definition, Lisa Duggan introduced the critical concept of homonormativity, “a politics that does not contest dominant heteronormative assumptions and institutions but upholds and sustains them while promising the possibility of a demobilized gay constituency and a privatized, depoliticized gay culture anchored in domesticity and consumption.”[13] Hence, it is criticized that large sections of national and international LGBTIQ-movements have undergone a particular mainstreaming process through which “marketability, visibility, marriage, and the military”, i.e. “access to the institutions of domestic privacy, the ‘free’ market, and patriotism” have become subordinate reference points to determine whether or not equality has been fully achieved.

Gay and lesbian politics thus tend to prioritize certain strategies of assimilation entrenched in neoliberal structures and logics that lead to the exclusion and marginalization of the othered Other, queer bodies and identities that do not correspond to the trope of the socially integrated ‘good homosexual’ with a fixed sexual identity.[14] The latter is mostly figured as a white, cis-male, fervent patriot who contributes to the reproduction and welfare of the nation by pursuing a successful career, obediently subjecting himself to the rules and values of neoliberalism.[15] He is expected to have a privatized and monogamous relationship that ought to be – for goodness sake and with all due respect – lived out behind closed doors, please. As soon as he is allowed to marry his partner, the ‘good homosexual’ is satisfied and goes silent. What more could he want?

Consequently, “platforms that make visible differences among queer subjects, that challenge the entrenchment of the transparent White subject at the heart of lesbian and gay politics, or that tackle broader social forces like poverty or militarism, have been squeezed out of the picture.”[16] Referring to this, Lisa Duggan reminds of the historical origin of many LGBTIQ-movements and their primary goal to fight for “a zone of immunity from state regulation, surveillance, and harassment”, thereby employing “feminist, countercultural and antiracist rhetorics and strategies.”[17] She comes to the gloomy conclusion that “privacy-in-public claims and publicizing strategies of ‘the gay movement’ are rejected in favor of public recognition of a domesticated, depoliticized privacy.”[18]

Queer subjectivities that aspire to spend a life beyond the metaphorical “suburban neighbourhood with a white picket fence”[19] are doomed to face numerous structural challenges, since homonormativization induces, in a reciprocal manner, the visualization of the ‘good’ and the marginalization of the dissident queer subject. This marginalization is manifested in various forms, ranging from bullying in school and labour market discrimination to public victimization. Even within LGBTIQ-communities, non-White*, trans*, gender-variant, intersexual, pansexual, asexual, bisexual and other queer individuals are constantly stigmatized and/or rendered invisible.[20] Thus, the ‘good homosexual’ can only exist by defining him (and, albeit less frequently, also her) against the sexually dissident Other, who must stay
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outside the “doors of (...) national belonging.”[23] Referring to this, Randi Gressgård argues that a homonormative rhetoric of “individual freedom, rights and responsibility” often goes hand in hand with “displacement and containment of non-profitable, non-normative bodies configured as backward and stationary within a geo-temporal civilization frame.”[24] At this point, homonormativity and intersectionality converge, since closely intertwined social stratifications such as ethnicity, gender, milieu, disability and sexuality often determine who exactly is deemed the (ab)normal queer subject.

Against this background, homonormativization may also serve as a strategical instrument of a state’s foreign policy. Bearing on Jasbir Puar’s critical concept of homonationalism and controversial debates on Pinkwashing,[25] Gressgård finds that “when sexual minorities’ rights are taken as a measure of a country’s successful development and modernization, sexual diversity can be discursively deployed to mark a difference between civilized and non-civilized nations and internal minority populations – without tarring the ‘civilized’ status of the aggressor.”[26] Through the employment of queer-friendly rhetorics, the own country can thus be strategically placed in a better position. Not only does this juxtaposition bear the risk that national achievements concerning the integration and acceptance of the LGBTIQ-community are embellished and shortcomings are concealed, but also that queer activities within the othered countries remain unheard and marginalized.

Agathangelou, Bassichis and Spira voice their criticism of homonormativization in more drastic words, when they reproach gay- and lesbian movements for employing a “good feeling strategy” by spuriously prioritizing “gay marriage and penalty-enhancing hate crimes laws” while neglecting “the bloody, violent consequences of neoliberal privatization, the mass warehousing and liquidation of mostly brown and black bodies, and of imperial(ist) war.”[27] The queer IR-scholars agree with Jasbir Puar’s claim that some queer people are “rendered continually abject, unworthy or unable to be assimilated into either hetero – or homonormative citizenship.”[28]

This stance is remarkable, since a queer mode of critique traditionally aims at interrogating binary categories rather than enforcing them. By supporting Jasbir Puar’s assertion that the othered Other can never be “assimilated into either hetero – or homonormative citizenship”, Agathangelou, Bassichis and Spira propagate a certain notion of an unchangeable situation with an inevitable outcome. According to them, it is a pointless undertaking to integrate the ‘queer’ into the system, since its inherently hetero- or homonormative character will ultimately prevent the queering of the same. This is disputable, for it constitutes a knockout position that runs the risk of lumping together numerous LGBTQ-activists and their divergent approaches and strategies on how to queer the system, i.e. questioning hetero- and cisnormative presuppositions, calling attention to intersectional forms of discrimination within and beyond queer communities as well as adopting a critical stance on the privatization, instrumentalization and commercialization of the LGBTIQ label. It remains unclear why queering the system is deemed unfeasible from the system’s inside out.

Even though critical insights through homonormative lenses can provide a valuable change of perspective that complicates unreflected notions of a linear, rainbow-coloured progress, it simultaneously creates the aforementioned binary that is soaked in a problematic notion of futility. If it is our claim to embrace what Cynthia Weber has termed “a queer intellectual curiosity”[29], we clearly cannot stop there. I hence aim to complicate the complication that the critique of homonormativization affords, for one “should be able to demonstrate that where the carriers of a position see continuity, there is almost always change.”[30]

Equally important is the question to what extent the critique of homonormativity can be transferred to a South American country, since queer IR scholars have (not exclusively, but predominantly) examined and criticized homonormative structures and strategies of typical ‘Western’ actors such as the U.S. and Israel.[31] By carefully weighing benefits against possible drawbacks of Ruiz’ announcement, we can take a broader view, thereby widening the range of possible solutions to our given problem. Regarding thereto, a queer discourse analysis constitutes a valuable method to shed light on this matter.

**Conducting a Queer Discourse Analysis**

Although it is controversially discussed whether a method can be considered queer at all,[32] numerous queer IR scholars such as Cynthia Weber insist on and argue for the expediency of queer methodological approaches. Those
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approaches examine how purportedly mutually exclusive and binary categories disguise the ways that identities can be multiple instead of merely monolithic. Consequently, the ‘queer’ becomes an analytical category.\[53\] By investigating in how far people can be male and/or female, masculine and/or feminine, heterosexual and/or homosexual as well as neither/nor, our understanding of sexual orientation and identity can be expanded beyond dichotomous categories.\[34\] Queer methods then aim at unravelling processes by which “normative sexual and gendered identities, ordered along a heterosexual/homosexual binary, constitute social relations of exclusion and invisibility”\[35\] thereby sustaining formations of power and knowledge. Drawing on queer methods, certain figurations, defined as “shared meanings distilled into forms or images”\[36\] of the LGBTI, the queer, the homosexual or the typical (fe)male can be detected. Those figurations are collectively used “to imagine and purport to know for sure who people called homosexuals actually are, while we employ these unreliable understandings to map our social and political world.”\[37\] That, of course, also applies to queer IR scholars and their sometimes quite clear normative understanding of how a queer person should (not) be.

For my study, including queer perspectives does not only make sense in regard to my LGBTIQ-related problematique. Queer methods intersect with the way a discourse analysis is applied insofar as both aim at destabilizing constructed dichotomies that enable particular actions which might lead to the domination of certain groups and the marginalization of others. Including aspects of hetero-, homo- and cisnormativity helps to reveal latent dichotomies that would have remained undetected by more traditional methods. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, a queer discourse analysis induces a high level of critical self-reflection – for it does not even spare queer perspectives from interrogation.

The Case of Mauricio Ruiz

Mauricio Ruiz revealed some biographical information and background circumstances that finally led to the public disclosure when he was interviewed by El Mercurio three years after the press conference had taken place.\[38\] Due to the labour situation of Ruiz’ parents, seasonal workers in the agricultural sector in San Fernando, he was raised by his evangelical grandparents. Growing up with the conviction that homosexuality is an indecent vice, he considered his homophile inclinations as a “sort of demon that was trying to lure [him] into hell.”\[39\] Owing to ensuing family conflicts, Ruiz felt relieved when a soldier appeared at his school to promote the military service. As a 17-year-old, he needed “structure, order and discipline”, something he was “missing in a way.”\[40\] Therefore, Ruiz quickly decided to sign up for a military service in the Armada in 2008, where he specialized in the telecommunication sector in the years that followed.\[41\] After having experienced a romantic encounter with another grumete,\[42\] Ruiz broke up with his girlfriend and realized that it became increasingly difficult to disguise his sexuality, being confronted with derision coming from his colleagues.\[43\] When Ruiz told his family about the way he felt, the sailor initially encountered disapproval and incomprehension, a circumstance that further complicated his situation. Simultaneously, bullying and harassment in his Departamento de Telecomunicaciones continued, leading Ruiz to consult a psychologist of the Armada in 2013.\[44\]

One year later, he was humiliated in front of a group of colleagues by one of his sergeants. Ruiz got a reprimand for publicly walking arm in arm with another guy – the sergeant had seen the couple in the city of Viña del Mar, remarking that “the only thing missing was that you give him a saliva transfusion.”\[45\] In the light of this experience, Ruiz contacted MOVILH and met with two spokesmen of the organization, explaining them his precarious situation. Together, they discussed the possibility of giving a press conference as an effective awareness-raising measure. Eventually, they agreed on the necessity of obtaining authorization from Ruiz’ officials to such a step, not only for safety reasons, but also in view of the symbolic significance that a full backing of the Chilean Navy would have.\[46\] Subsequent to several meetings with officials of the Armada, in which Ruiz reported the discrimination he had experienced, the press conference was finally approved. According to Ruiz, he regarded the imminent announcement as his last chance to continue in the institution: “I was already taking antidepressants. If this failed to work, I would withdraw.”\[47\]

Mauricio Ruiz, a Ground-breaking Pioneer

Both Chilean and international media coverage accentuated the unique character of the event. La Tercera, El
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Mercurio (Chile), El Mundo (Spain) as well as El Diario Extra (Costa Rica) termed it a “milestone in the Fuerzas Armadas.” BBC (UK) and The Sydney Morning Herald (Australia) headlined “Chilean sailor makes history”, the Telegraph (UK) called it an “unprecedented public declaration”, Fox News (US) “a rare public disclosure” and El Telégrafo (Ecuador) as well as El Diario (Dominican Republic) an “occurrence without precedents.” The Independent (UK) regarded it as a “historic announcement” and the Handelsblatt (Germany) wrote about a “historical decision.”

The sensational character of Ruiz’ move was widely based on the notion of the Armed Forces as a strictly heteronormative institution and of Chile as a traditionally conservative country, thus constituting a “tough place for homosexuals.” Ruiz himself acknowledged in a subsequent interview with CNN Chile that he was “afraid of doing it”, since “it is not easy to say I’m homosexual and I’m a sailor.” Even though Ruiz solely adumbrated that he had to face uncomfortable circumstances concerning his sexual orientation which were only curbed through the intervention of his commander, this already clearly indicated his marginalized position within the Armada. Consequently, commentators, activists and politicians alike frequently applied terms around ‘courage’ and ‘bravery’ to emphasize the challenging nature of Ruiz’ undertaking. MOVILH’s spokesman, Oscar Rementeria, found that by questioning the hitherto common practice of ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’, “he took a pioneering decision, worthy of brave people who take the first step.” In another statement, MOVILH declared to “give standing ovations to a brave young man who has won a place in the heart of every person that values and fights for equality.” Marcelo Schilling, the deputy who had accompanied the sailor at the press conference, likewise wrote in a commentary for Cooperativa (Chile) that Ruiz’ step was “courageous, sincere and liberating”, relieving him of the “existential burden which historically determined that living out one’s homosexuality resulted in deep feelings of shame or fear.” In all those statements, Ruiz was figured as a selfless forerunner who breaks free from conventional, repressive structures not only out of personal interest, but also for the sake of the whole LGBTQI-community.

Furthermore, Ruiz’ disclosure was mostly contextualized as a symbolic event for Chile’s steady transformation towards social progressivity under the socialist Bachelet administration. El Universo (Ecuador), for instance, found against the background of Ruiz’ coming out that “it is only in recent years that Chile, a very conservative country in which the Catholic church exerts a strong influence, has gone through a cultural evolution that enabled homosexuals and lesbians to recognize their sexual preferences.” Similarly, Schilling saw in Ruiz’ announcement “a confirmation that today we witness a cultural change in this country (…)”, assessing that “slowly but surely, we move from yesterday’s hegemonic homophobia towards a greater respect for gender, cultural and sexual diversity.”

The same cultural change that was ascribed to the Chilean society was parallelly translated to the institutional heart of the Armed Forces. International and national media mostly echoed the assessment of Rolando Jimenez, president of MOVILH, that the “barracks begin to come out of the closet.” According to him, the navy was “telling the country and the members of the institution particularly that it is possible for gays and lesbians to be part of the Armed Forces and that they aren’t going to suffer discrimination because of their sexual orientation within these institutions.” In this light, the Armada’s authorization for Ruiz’ announcement was widely considered as a sign for good will and tolerance on the part of the institution. Consequently, Mauricio Ruiz’ announcement was read as a clear manifestation of the ongoing cultural change in both Chilean society and the Armada and simultaneously as a trigger moment that would accelerate this process in a “revolutionary” way. Ruiz himself, however, assessed that “we still have to go through many stages so that a gay can be Commander in Chief of the Fuerzas Armadas.”

Mauricio Ruiz, el ‘Maricón’

It is not for nothing that Ruiz made this disillusioning remark. Since a discourse is seldom (if ever) a closed one, the dominant representation of Ruiz as a ground-breaking pioneer did not remain unchallenged. A myriad of user comments on videos and online articles that dealt with Ruiz’ announcement discursively reflected similar homophobic attitudes and ‘preoccupations’. Mauricio Ruiz was frequently called a ‘maricón’, the Latin American equivalent to ‘faggot’, who is incapable of serving the country due to his lack of masculinity, strength and seriousness.

Probably the loudest voice of dissent came from Ignacio Urrutia, a deputy of the right-wing party Unión Demócrata Independiente (UDI) who had already provoked numerous polemics over the course of his political career. In 2012,
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for instance, he found that “if the Army accepts homosexuals, Peru and Bolivia will kick our ass.” This time, Urrutia claimed in response to Ruiz’ announcement that even though he is “not against one, two or three homosexuals [in the Armada], because they have always existed”, he opposes his public disclosure, for it “produces an inconvenience for the rest of the members of this branch, particularly for those who are fellow trainees, who have to work with this homosexual; it certainly won’t be easy for them to work with a person in those conditions.”

In line with the infamous motto “I’m not homophobic, but...” Urrutia nourishes the picture of the pervert homosexual, whose mere presence causes widespread “inconvenience” among his fellow grumetes. He thereby rearticulates the old cliché that homosexuals in the military would undermine the moral purity of the Armada, since, owing to his rampant promiscuity, the pervert homosexual cannot help but lay hands on his peers. Following that logic, working with “this” homosexual inevitably hinders the heterosexual majority from doing their job adequately. At this point, Urrutia does not only take for granted that all of Ruiz’ colleagues are both heterosexual and homophobic (something that may be termed homophonormativity); he also reveals his quite contradictory understanding of heterosexual masculinity. Apparently, someone who – at the sight of a homosexual person – would rather scream and run away, is considered a better candidate for defending the country than the homosexual sailor himself.

Urrutia, however, did not stand alone. In a radio interview, Pedro Veas, President of the Asociación de Oficiales de la Armada en Retiro, concurred with the right-wing deputy: “It is not good to have homosexuals inside the Fuerzas Armadas. You know why? Because there’s an authority problem. Imagine the impact a homosexual official will have.” His argument is premised on a logical vicious circle that ultimately leads to the perpetuation of the status quo: Due to an institutionalized homophobia, attempts to tackle homophobia will end up in homophobic reactions, thereby devastating unit cohesiveness. Constituting a classic marginalization strategy, the blame is not put on military actors reproducing those institutionalized homophobic patterns, but on the homosexual, who seriously dares to impose his Otherness on the institution.

The next statement, also made by Urrutia, follows the same consistency, albeit in a more drastic undertone. According to him, “it is one thing to have one, two or three homosexuals in a branch of the Fuerzas Armadas, but having a battalion of homosexuals inside is another.” A recruitment like that would “weaken the Fuerzas Armadas” significantly, thus constituting an act “against all logic.” Making use of a common populist tool, Urrutia constructs a doom and gloom scenario in which Ruiz’ announcement is only the first stage of an alleged homosexual invasion that will inevitably come up if no counter-measures are taken. Thus, Ruiz’ demand for equality and visibility is turned into a doom and gloom scenario in which Ruiz’ announcement is only the first stage of an alleged homosexual invasion that will inevitably come up if no counter-measures are taken. Thus, Ruiz’ demand for equality and visibility is turned into an act of imposition and domination. Since ‘the homosexual’ is figured as the counterpart of the ‘good soldier’, i.e. a strong, heterosexual and hypermasculine man, the recruitment of the first becomes an outrageousness “against all logic.” According to his logic, which equates homosexuality with weakness, integrating homosexuals in the Armada then induces an institutional effeminacy that would clearly impede an effective self-defence in the case of an attack. All of this is presented as common sense, something indisputable. Consequently, Ruiz who is wholly reduced to his stereotyped sexuality becomes the embodiment of a severe security threat for the Chilean nation-state. This corroborates V. Spike Peterson’s research on “nationalism as heterosexism”, i.e. the domination of hetero- and cisnormative mechanisms and conceptions when it comes to reproductive processes of state and nation formation, patriotism and border security.

Homonormatizing Ruiz

Let us now take a closer look at “this social group as a whole”, as Ruiz termed it, and the way he may have modified it. After having pointed out and contextualized two differing figurations of Mauricio Ruiz, the question arises to what extent the sailor’s announcement challenged heteronormative patterns within and beyond the Armada and/or reproduced and intensified certain problematic homonormativities. Recalling Duggan’s conclusion that public recognitions “of a domesticated, depoliticized privacy” have in many cases superseded “privacy-in-public claims”, one may wonder whether this also applies to the case of Mauricio Ruiz. Regarding thereto, illuminating the reaction of the Armed Forces towards Ruiz’ disclosure seems to be a promising starting point. As demonstrated above, the official authorization of the Chilean Navy for the press conference was mostly perceived as a sign of the Armada’s obligingness and tolerance, bringing about an institutional wind of change. Nonetheless, it stands to reason that statements like the one of MOVILH’s president Rolando Jimenez (“gays and lesbians aren’t going to suffer
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discrimination because of their sexual orientation within these institutions should be treated with caution. Why is that?

Firstly, it was clearly no coincidence that official representatives of the Armada avoided attending the press conference. When being asked about the slight, the Chilean Navy stated that it will not make any comment concerning the private life of one of its members. Secondly, one should not neglect the fact that Ruiz was not allowed to wear his uniform while making the announcement, suggesting that the Armada replaced its previous rule of thumb “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” with a new policy that may be termed “We Still Don’t Ask, So Why Are You Telling?”. Instead of actively and publicly supporting Ruiz’ decision, the institution solely tolerated the sailor’s coming out, and this only on one condition: He appears as a private individual, wearing private clothes, talking about a private matter.

From a queer perspective, the discursive construction of the dichotomous private/public frame is highly problematic, since it evokes the impression that ‘the public’ and ‘the private’ are two opposing, clearly distinguishable spheres. Ruiz himself, albeit also drawing a line between the two spheres, at least criticized the conception that they would not influence each other: “I came to realize that the personal life affects the working environment a lot. It is very important to have a calm personal, familial or private life.” – something he did not have, also due to the unpleasant occurrences at his workplace.

Whereas the public realm evolves into a socially recognized “space of state and citizenship”, one of “social production and recompense”, the excluded ‘private’ becomes something one should rather remain silent on, something piquant, something cherished but concealed from discourse. Consequently, constructing gender and/or sexuality as a merely private matter bears the risk that its interconnectedness with and its reconstitution of the overlying systemic dimension gets out of sight. Ruiz’ sexuality certainly constitutes more than a private issue, for it is inextricably linked with those performative opportunities and restrictions that determine his scope of action within the Chilean Navy. Privatizing Ruiz’ aspirations then transforms into trivializing the institution’s own accountability for taking affirmative actions that would efficaciously tackle homophobic patterns within the Armed Forces. The absence of his officials at the press conference conveys the picture of Ruiz as a misfit rather than a full member of the Armada, particularly against the background that the sailor was urged to wear his civilian clothes. This suggests that, in the officials’ eyes, the announcement did not really correspond to all those things that the Armada’s uniform traditionally represents: State authority, discipline, coherence, commitment and, after all, heterosexuality. Thus, the announcement did not only contribute to the visibility of Ruiz’ queerness, but also to the clear manifestation of the heteronormative nature of the Chilean Navy – a conjuncture that ostensibly remained unaffected, at least at first sight. Therefore, when looking closely at the Armada’s recognition of Ruiz’ domesticated and sexualized ‘privacy’, it stands to reason that we can speak of a prime example of homonormativization.

Mauricio Ruiz, a ‘Homonormatizer’ Himself?

The previous discoveries, however, have left one question largely unanswered: Did Ruiz’ announcement, regardless of whether it was embedded in a homonormative environment or not, contribute to the exclusion of the othered Others, i.e. queer bodies and identities that do not correspond to the figurative ‘good homosexual’? Since that would constitute another important facet of homonormativization, it will be examined in this section. In this respect, I will further illuminate some occurrences and statements around Ruiz’ press conference which might be problematic, at least through critical homonormative lenses.

As already outlined above, the medial staging of Ruiz’ disclosure was in line with a particular normalizing strategy. Those strategies aim at breaking certain taboos through the disclosure of one’s (more or less secret) stigma. The latter is then converted into a demonstratively unagitated ‘taken-for-grantedness’, at best resulting in its de-dramatization and/or dissolution. Even though it is beyond doubt that those strategies entail many benefits for the formerly stigmatized, they simultaneously bear the risk of creating new mechanisms of exclusion. In other words, the new ‘normal’ frequently generates new ‘abnormals’ and/or substantiates old ‘abnormals’ which the new ‘normal’ does not include.
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At the press conference, Ruiz and his companions ensured that he would appear as a completely ‘normal’ man, doing his job just like everyone else in the Armada, regardless of his homosexuality, and “looking for love within the framework of monogamous couplehood” with his then-partner.[76] Agathangelou, Bassichis, and Spira criticize normalizing depictions of such kind, since “the stress on monogamy, devotion, and a relationship constrained within the bonds of privacy and propriety” may lead to “the demonization of all other forms of sexual expression, practices, and relations.” Hence, “heteronormative logics are refuelled in the production of the good gay subject.”[77] Arguing similarly, King finds that those representations may “reinforce the notion that sexual identity is a fixed and essential component of the individual that must be acknowledged by that individual and revealed to others if one is to attain authentic self-knowledge and sexual freedom.”[78] It is of course debatable whether one can reproach Ruiz, whose desire it was to not lead a double life and to not conceal his partner anymore, for this matter. One might ask, for example, why he should be the one to tackle the notion of a fixed sexuality if he is convinced that he was born this way. One might additionally ask why he should not demonstrate his monogamous couplehood, if that is what makes him happy.

Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that Ruiz and his companions hardly mentioned the working conditions of Chilean soldiers and sailors falling in the categories of the remaining letters of the LGBTIQ. Although it was shortly stated that the announcement may improve the situation of lesbians and trans* people serving for the Armada, this was rather a side note. Thus, it could be argued that the one-sided dominant thematization of Ruiz’ homosexuality contributed to the squeezing out of other sexualities and queer individuals engaged in the Chilean military.

In this light, Ruiz’ answer to the query, whether his sexuality would be an impediment to his job as a sailor at the Armada, might be questionable, too. Ruiz asserted that “a homosexual will not run away, nor is he going to tear his hair out when there’s a war, nothing like that, he will do what he was taught.”[79] Of course, one has to consider that the provocative question already aimed at generating a controversial answer. His understandable endeavour to clarify that his sexuality has nothing do to with his level of competence as a sailor, however, ends up having an excluding character. By trying to dispel the cliché that gay people cannot be effective members of the Armada, Ruiz makes use of the same cliché – the effeminate, hysterical and jumpy homosexual. Employing a generalizing assertion (“a homosexual will not run away”), he lumps together numerous queer individuals and simultaneously marginalizes, for instance, gender-nonconforming people who refuse to embody the rational and hypermasculine ‘good homosexual’ who blindly obeys any order (“he will do what he was taught”).[80] This is also in line with the statement Ruiz published on his Twitter account: “Accepting myself means to know that I’ve got a heart. It’s good for myself and for my family to say I’m homosexual. The only thing that should be important is loving and serving our fatherland.”[81] Ruiz presents himself as a fervent patriot willing to fight and die for Chile, his “fatherland”, come what may. Although it is certainly the main task of a sailor in the Armada to “serve the country”, this is set in an overly patriotic frame that likewise runs the risk of causing excluding repercussions.

‘Creole patriotism’ had been a driving force in Chile’s struggle for independence, contributing to the notion of ‘Chile’s privileged position as the ‘model republic’ of Latin America.’[82] This patriotism traditionally resulted in a pronounced support and solidarity among Chileans, manifesting itself, until today, for instance through large-scale national charitable campaigns countering the effects of environmental disasters.[83] Unfortunately, Chilean social solidarity, intertwined with a strong patriotism, always had (and still has) its limitations. Patriotic demands for territorial expansion resulted in the “Pacification of Araucanía” (1861-1883), constituting a genocide of the indigenous Mapuche population, which thereby declined from approximately 1 million to 100.000.[84] Strong national feelings also played a major role during the War of the Pacific (1879-1884), which resulted in Chilean victory and the acquisition of large territories from both Peru and Bolivia, inducing the racial discourse of Chileans being more ‘white’, ‘virile’ and ‘civilized’” than the inhabitants of their neighbour countries.[85] Of course, those discourses did not just vanish, and of course, they did not spare the Chilean military. In 2013, an amateur video created a great stir, showing a group of Chilean soldiers running on a public street and repeating the cadence of their instructor: “Argentineans I will kill; Bolivians I will shoot; Peruvians I’ll behead.”[86] It is furthermore no secret that patriotism and racism often go hand in hand. As Chile has become a leading destination for dark-skinned migrants from Haiti and the Dominican Republic in recent years, racist attitudes come to light among large sections of the Chilean society, taking on “special characteristics (...) from the outright to the more nuanced violence or micro-aggressions.”[87] Hence, it stands to reason that overly patriotic statements such as the one of Ruiz further contribute to the perpetuation of racist...
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attitudes within the Chilean military and the marginalization of people with non-European background living in Chile, thus also of queer migrants from the Caribbean, queer Bolivians, queer Peruvians and queer Mapuche, amongst others. [88]

Integrating the Queer into the System

All these findings might stimulate the impression that Ruiz’ announcement and his attempts to normalize the situation of queer people in the Chilean military ultimately were in vain: Continuous marginalization despite visibility, exclusion of queer bodies not corresponding to the ‘good homosexual’, perpetuation of hetero- and homonormative structures – was it indeed, pursuant to Duggan, nothing but a “political sedative”? [69] In this last section, I will elucidate why this judgment would be certainly unjustified.

First of all, the homonormative narrative of the ‘good homosexual’ who squeezes out sexually dissident individuals from national belonging and societal participation does not fully apply to our case. As I have outlined, Ruiz has not only been figured as a gay-rights pioneer, but also as a pervert homosexual jeopardizing Chile’s national security. This suggests that he cannot be read in a dichotomous perpetrator vs. victim frame. The sole fact that the press conference induced numerous homophobic comments and humiliating incidents at his new base in Antofagasta clearly defies the singular figuration of him as a ‘homonormative perpetrator’. Ruiz, however, should not be seen as a mere victim without any agency, being constantly exposed to homonormative oppression. Ruiz himself remarked that when “deciding between living with this fear and attempting to take a step in favour of my sexuality, I think it’s much better to take things in hand, even though it can be hard sometimes. I could die tomorrow without having done anything, and the society will remain the same. It’s better to try.” [90] Three years later, the sailor stated in the interview with El Mercurio that he would make the announcement again, encouraging fellow colleagues to take similar steps if this “leads to an improvement in their lives.” [91] According to him, his working conditions have become better since then, enabling the development of social ties in the Armada, despite some inconveniences that still occur from time to time. [92] Consequently, the assertion that Ruiz’ disclosure did not ameliorate his situation at all is not supportable.

Three years after the announcement, Commander Leonardo Chávez, the Armada’s Director of Communications, finally took a stand concerning Ruiz’ undertaking which might actually indicate a tentative institutional opening: “We had to adapt our institutional regulations to the social changes that have taken place in our national society. A crucial lesson we have drawn is that we respect and assess him [Ruiz] not according to his sexual condition, but exclusively based on his professional skills.” [93] Moreover, the Ministry of National Defence established the Committee for Diversity and Non-Discrimination in 2014 which since then aims at preventing exclusionary processes within the Chilean Military, prohibiting discrimination based on sexuality or gender identity. [94] Anti-discrimination measures were further specified in 2015 through an Order of Command, stating that “the Chilean Army, as an institution that (...) belongs to all Chileans without exception, does not discriminate arbitrarily on the basis of race or ethnicity, socioeconomic status, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, affiliation, personal appearance or any other reason.” [95] The resulting consequence of violating this policy would be a “very serious offense, regardless of the rank hierarchy, category or type of contract.” [96]

We certainly cannot predict precisely whether this is just empty talk; the mere fact that MOVILH did not receive further reports on discrimination based on sexuality or gender in the Armada after the press conference does not preclude the possibility that such incidents simply have not been reported. [97] Besides, MOVILH stated that the organization has been approached by queer soldiers giving account of homophobic occurrences in other branches of the Chilean military. [98] These policies do not inhibit the exclusion of non-Chilean or non-Chilean looking (queer) subjectivities. Nonetheless, it can be assumed that the sole themalization of Ruiz’ situation in the Armada paved the way for further discussions and problematizations around LGBTQ-related matters in present-day Chile; the large media response towards the incidence illustrates this quite accurately. It cannot be ruled out that the press conference constituted the decisive trigger for a lesbian, trans*, inter- or bisexual person in the Chilean military to take a similar step, perhaps even in a less exclusive and patriarchic framework. It is also conceivable that the attention around Ruiz’ announcement created new spaces beyond the military sphere within the national discourse on sexual and gender diversity which may be useful for tackling “broader social forces” [99] causing intersectional inequalities.
Whether or not Chilean militarism as a whole constitutes one of those harmful social forces is another, albeit equally important question, which will not be addressed here. However, the persuasion that promoting LGBTIQ rights from the (military) system's inside out, inevitably induces hetero- and homonormative drawbacks which will ultimately shatter the undertaking, seems to be too short-sighted, for it neglects the contingent character of Ruiz' announcement.

While the examination of Ruiz' case revealed that his attempts to de-dramatize the presence of homosexuals and other LGBTIQ people within the Armed Forces indeed evoked numerous backlashes, the fact that his announcement shed light on hetero- and homonormative patterns cannot be used as an argument against his awareness-raising initiative. On the contrary, without their prior disclosure, those patterns cannot be adequately challenged. Besides, the impact of a societal taboo is often more hazardous than the headwind that emerges when trying to dissolve it. In this regard, one might consider alternate decisions Ruiz could have made. Although there are certainly more eventualities, two options immediately come to mind: Ignoring the bullying and harassment at his working environment, thus being exposed to continuous institutional marginalization that might be even worse than the one he suffered after the disclosure and/or turning his back on the Armada, accepting that the institution's heteronormative character is just too strong. From Ruiz' perspective, both options seem disadvantageous, for the sailor perceived and still perceives his job at the Navy as fulfilling.

Thus, it is understandable that Ruiz endeavoured to contribute to a slow and gentle institutional change, however unstable it might be, from the system's inside out: "There were two options: Excluding the high command from this historic process or bring it on board. As we wanted to contribute to the cultural change and prevent any victimization and qualms (...), it was logical to move forward with and not against the institution." Of course, this approach does not dissolve existing power relations, nor is it an attempt to create a 'subaltern counterpublic', which is fundamentally antagonistic and "at its heart contestatory." This is not to say, however, that Ruiz' announcement did not "bring to the fore issues that might have been overlooked, purposely ignored, or suppressed by dominant publics." Indeed, as I have argued, the opposite might be the case. Hence, the binary differentiation between 'queering the system', i.e. creating a kind of 'counterpublic', and 'integrating the queer into the system' becomes questionable, for it neglects that both approaches are not necessarily at odds but may actually effectuate the same. In this sense, demonstrating the conflation of this alleged dichotomy becomes an aspiration that can be considered profoundly queer.

Conclusion

Ruiz has managed to burst one of the outer walls of Chile's heteronormative stronghold. Arguably, he did not master the battering ram perfectly (after all, he is a sailor, not a soldier), yet he achieved to come closer to the core of the problem. Once broken through the first massive wall, new barriers emerge and resistance fighters swarm out, appearing in the form of homonormative and homophobic backlashes. Of course, the taboo is fiercely defended, and nasty power structures do their best to preserve the status quo. But Ruiz has led us to a new position that provides valuable insights which may help us find relevant answers to burning questions: What could be a more inclusive approach, enabling other queer individuals to follow Ruiz behind the wall? Considering that visibility alone proves important but insufficient, which additional awareness-raising measures should be undertaken to ameliorate the situation of LGBTIQ people in the Chilean military and, more generally, in Chilean society? How can homo- and heteronormative drawbacks be attenuated appropriately? Without Ruiz' partial breakthrough, those questions certainly would not have come up in the first place.

Through the examination of Chilean and international media coverage, public opinion and political statements on Ruiz' announcement, as well as critical queer considerations about normalizing strategies of queer military actors, I found that Mauricio Ruiz embodies various meanings which contest binary interpretive frameworks aiming to categorize him according to an either/or logic. I thereby demonstrated that the critique of homonormativity can for the most part be applied to a South American country like Chile, unveiling exclusionary mechanisms emerging in the light of Ruiz' coming out. I further argued that even though these critical considerations do provide a valuable change of perspective, they all too often convey the impression that approaches to ameliorate the situation of LGBTIQ people from the system’s inside out are inherently futile and thus obsolete. By weighing homonormative drawbacks of Ruiz'
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announcement against entailing benefits, I emphasized Ruiz’ active role in creating promising but highly competitive discursive spaces when it comes to defending and enhancing LGBTIQ rights in Chile. In this respect, I concluded that the ostensibly opposing approaches of ‘queering the system’ vs. ‘integrating the queer into the system’ actually run together. All in all, my findings suggest that questioning notions of ‘black and white’ around Ruiz’ announcement favorably contributed to the unveiling of grey areas – even within realms that are covered by the rainbow flag.
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