(Insider's) Perspective on LGBT Pride:
Budapest Pride Case Study

By
Edward Cuneo

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of Gender Studies

In partial fulfillment for the degree of Masters of Arts in Gender Studies

Supervisor: Professor Hadley Z. Renkin
Second Reader: Postdoctoral Fellow Eszter Timar

Budapest, Hungary
2010

Abstract

With Budapest Pride parades as the main focus, the intent of this thesis is to hint at newer ways to evaluating the discourses which surround the event. First, by avoiding instinctive hetero/homo social divide on the topic, I framed the conflicting discourses with broad distinctions of social bodies. Specifically, the "grotesque" (Bakhtin 1984) and the "gothic" (Hurley 1997) help with the separation of supporting and opposing perspectives on Pride. However, this clear supporting/opposing social group divide merge through discursive particularities of Pride. In this sense, the interviewing process of Budapest locals emphasized some of the internalized debates on Pride's aim, necessity, and effectiveness. Lastly, through the emergence of inter LGBT community debates, the emphasis remains on reevaluating such discourses beyond the political/social (hetero/homo) social normatives. Therefore, this emphasis on Pride allows its discourses to merge with differentiating approaches on (sexual) minority organizational struggles.

Acknowledgements

I would like to give thanks to my informants for giving up some of their time and for all the information they gave out. Also, thanks to all my colleagues and faculty for their support and assistance

Table of Contents

iii

Introduction

My first involvement with an official LGBT Pride parade was at the Christopher Street Day (CSD) Parade 2008 in Berlin, Germany. Previously, public and LGBT media coverage was my main source of the parade's perspective. I was always inspired by the lavish decorations, loud music, and immense group participation portrayed in both mainstream and LGBT focused media. The rumors of public nudity, exaggerated sexuality, and non-stop celebrations reinforced the images portrayed on television and LGBT magazines of Pride occurring in major cities worldwide. So, not only did these representations of Pride build my mental expectation of the event, but it also motivated me to attend CSD in Berlin as soon as I had the opportunity. Thereafter, I realized many of the rumors were true, regarding lavish disco trucks, never-ending parties and public exaggerations of sexuality. I was fascinated by the affect the parade had on the city, its widespread appeal and tolerant attention, by which it appeared the entire city became a participant. Additionally, the length of the festivities was not limited to one single day. There were smaller events organized up to a week in advance in preparation for the main Pride parade. So, with this form of personal experience with Pride, I believed for a moment that any labeled Pride parade would be very much similar to those displayed on these past references.

Therefore, I grew very intrigued when I noticed the extreme differences in comparison to my Budapest Pride 2009 experience, which has developed into the basis of my argumentation for this paper. The most obvious difference was the physical fenced boundaries built to assure the marchers from violent attacks, which in recent (Pride) history has been prevalent. In this case, the parade's path was fenced off from any adjacent neighborhood streets. Therefore, the only entrance and exit from the parade were placed at the official start and end of the march's path. In addition to the large police presence in full

1

riot gear, these physical boarders created a clear distinction between participant/performer and public audience. This physical separation actualizes the metaphorical (hetero/homo; nation/other) distinctions placed within the discourses surrounding Budapest Pride.

LGBT Pride parades hold a significant expectation or model towards the representation of the LGBT community, in general. More specifically, this parade is a source for publicly integrating an otherwise marginalized society, whether through physical imagery or discourses. In addition to this, the festivities resemble a symbolic celebratory escape from social marginality. In the case of Budapest Pride, the forced intrusion into hegemonic standardized spaces reinforces the recognition of a constructed identity or body. In terms of discourse, Pride develops a supporting/opposing social division. Therefore, with Pride's (physical) involvement with (national) normative spaces, this social division is disrupted both symbolically and discursively. However, depending on intercommunity social (supporting/opposing) alliances, there is a variation of understood and implied meanings of this specific event. In this sense, Pride broadens the intercommunity debate of its intention, efficiency, and importance. This debate then is founded by the underlying historical aims of the event; ranging from its (activist) organizational methods up to the (target) participatory field of involvement.

Although these types of expectations vary from region to region, the goal for public visibility through Pride specifically is stimulated by the historical content it provides. In this sense, it is Pride's associations with transnational/national belonging and "demand for recognition" (Taylor, 1992), which inspires and orientates the supporting social group. Nevertheless, (transnational/national) social spheres' orientation of specified cultural history insinuates variant intercommunity discourses. Therefore, the universal formation of Pride's historicized relationship with the (hetero) public community creates a disconnection between activist and non-activist members within LGBT community. Additionally, based on non-

2

governmental organizations' (NGOs') initiatives, the disconnection is conceptualized through different interpretations of visibility and encouraged participation.

The objective of my argument is to demonstrate the complexities of the discourses surrounding Pride's interpretation within the LGBT community. This will demonstrate the limitations of its community building initiative; particularly in Budapest, but also with reference to the Eastern European region. Structurally, I will conceive this type of community complexity through formulating Pride as a conceptual body, regarding the supporting/opposing social units of Pride discussions. Through the bodily concept of Pride, I will be able to highlight the reinforcement of the event as a spectacle through the views of both the organizers and the opponents of the march. Additionally, this spectacle becomes the basis for intercommunity debates regarding visibility, tolerance and assimilation necessity; through external (hetero, political) influences on conflicting community interpretations. Throughout my analysis, these types of debates will be related to the notion of "coming-out" and public standards of social lifestyle or behavior. This will be regarding (hetero) cultural assimilation debates involving the oppositional views of Pride. Ultimately, challenging Pride's hetero/homo dichotomies, the focus of intercommunity debates allows for broadening perspectives built within the LGBT community.

Theoretical Framework

In order to focus on the structure and aim of this paper, the body of this text will proceed with the intersection of bodily canons and theories of (queer) identities regarding public visibility and cultural assimilation. First, through the conception of bodily canons, I will be able to construct a semi-fixed division of social bodies representing (inter)community debates of Pride. Specifically, Bakhtin's (1984) "grotesque" bodily concept will configure the generalized 'supporting' perception of Pride as a unifying social group with universal

3

meanings; especially, on how it formulates interplay of exaggeration and "caricatures the negative" (p. 306) with satirical laughter as social critique. In doing so, "specific social phenomena are berated" (p. 305) in an indirect way with acknowledged understanding of the satire, in contrast to direct and naïve (*'clownery'*) or ironic (*'burlesque'*) laughter (p. 305). Hence, unity is formed by the specificity of the publicized satire and satisfaction is reached by the visualization of "exaggeration within reality" (p. 306).

Therefore, producing the general perception of Pride's idealized positive motives, gives basis for the supporting social group's common understanding for Pride's public importance, regarding visibility growth. In contrast to a biological body's infusion with the historic progress (evolution) of mankind, Pride formulates "not abstract thought about the future but the living sense that each man belongs to the immortal people who create history" (p. 367). Therefore, the 'grotesque' body generates social unification through exaggerated caricatures, celebrates the birth of the multiple merging bodies, and immortalizes universal meaning through generational continuation.

Additionally, this bodily construction of Pride will function to centralize the critical perception directed from differentiating binary poles, such as the supporters and the opposition of Pride lying outside and within the LGBT community. As a foundation, the "supporting/opposing" binary is primarily focused on the actuality of the Pride parade. In contrast to the 'grotesque', the public (opposing) discourse surrounding Budapest Pride is correlated to Hurley's (1997) "gothic" bodily concept. Therefore, as the physical borders of Budapest Pride 2009 separated public space, these two bodily concepts will represent the metaphorical extremes presented on each side of the "fence" (supporting/opposing).

Therefore, forming the unified bodily concept will continue the underlying LGBT organizational aim for public visibility through the dilemma of cultural assimilation. Though I will mainly use Bakhtin's (1984) notion of 'grotesque' to formulate the embodiment of

Pride as a collective force of participants and organizers, this conceptual body turns into a (factual) threat to hegemonic standardization of society. Therefore, going beyond the limitations of Bakhtin's grotesque bodily concept, analyzing the 'unified' body displays (inter)community complexities of social interaction and hegemonic expectations. In this sense, national identity becomes an idealized body which continually strives to retain hierarchical social power. As a continuation to Pride's bodily concept, the "gothicized Nature" (Hurley, 1997, p. 61) within the political debate about its social meaning, or interpretation, reflects the discursive undertones of homophobia, as a form of xenophobia regarding societal power. Therefore, this metaphorical distancing of social bodies highlights Pride's spectacle as an inter-cultural division, also reflective of intercommunity debates.

As a bodily concept, the 'gothic' body includes evolutionary theory in the (hetero) social regulatory process. Therefore, the replacement of human centrality gives potential for extreme conceptual references to Darwinian narrative on evolution, regarding the human body being placed onto a singular and linear process. In this manner, with fears of regulatory deviation, Pride opposing social groups focus on continuously reevaluating, or reconsidering, the human progression towards (intellectual and moral) perfection (p. 56). Thus, as a cause for logically opposing Pride, the 'gothic' bodily canon focuses on the terrors which affect humanity, in terms of longevity and progress. In the case of Budapest Pride, the national (hetero-hegemony) fear of false (global) association connects Pride opposition with self (identity) protection/progression.

In relation to the possibility of human devolution, Pride disturbs society and develops "beastliness" (p. 63). Therefore, the threat of (Hungarian) inferiority transcends into the characterization of Pride as a cause of such a threat and hostility becomes a major role in the reality of "a gothicized Nature". In this sense, within the analyzed literature by Hurley (1997), it is the nonhuman species which are the ultimate threat and "motif of human

5

devolution" (p. 63). Thus, these metaphors are continually and effectively used in opposition to diversifying hegemonic standards, such as LGBT Pride. In this sense, the LGBT community continually gets represented as the "Nation's Other" (Renkin, 2009, p. 23).

While exploring the varying critical perception of Pride, there is a formation of a spectacle relationship between the event, its participants, and the surrounding (inter)community debate. In conceptualizing a social body, the general publicized interaction thereof emerges through a "spectacle", in terms of developing "sight lines and distance" (Russo, 1995, p. 79). Therefore during Pride, a relationship between the audience and performer is created, which not only objectifies the event as a product of abnormal evolution, but as a possible contaminant towards hegemonic "normalcy". Theoretically, with the acceptance or appreciation of the "freak" identity, the participants are capable of creating their own internal forms of community, or social groups (p. 84).

Referring back to the fences outlining and inclosing the Budapest Pride path, the addition of extreme police presence actualizes the "spectacle" separation of performer/audience; in this case, supporting/opposing social groups. Throughout the Internet (YouTube, Budapest Pride websites, national media, etc), there is rarely an image without the police or the barrier in the background (Appendix I-VI). Even during my interviewing process these images were mentioned; however, not always referring to (hetero) national Pride opposition.

"[The fences] trying to protect those who are taking part in the march, and of course it causes you to be totally invisible again, because members of the society (straight people) will not be able to join or to see what's going on..." (Interview with D)

Along with the fences built in Budapest Pride 2009, this statement portrays the complexities within the visible distancing of public interaction from the event. Therefore, the participants in the march became contagious "freaks" threatening (Hungarian) society. However, there remains the possibility for the participants to gain cultural independence and internal cohesion for further progression towards their specified LGBT community interests.

Literature Review

This complex form of a (inter)community spectacle relationship, directed at Pride parade, will be used to specify some of the (hetero) hegemonic political notions placed on the LGBT community. Especially, in Eastern European regions, the march itself takes on a complex political dimension, which exposes the paradigmatic position this march has for LGBT visibility. Therefore, consisting with the argument of inter-LGBT community discourses on Pride, I will first focus on a corpus of academic responses to the political connections of Eastern European Pride parades.

As a consensus coming from academic research within the Eastern European region, Pride's opposition creates the homophobic nationalist agenda generally coming from the members of right-wing extremism regarding political (national) transition. Specifically, with the case of Budapest Pride 2007 (Renkin, 2009), when the most evident attacks towards the marchers began, the development of an embodied Pride originated in the perception of a threatened national identity by LGBT activists' "'queering' of belonging" (p. 22). In this specific instance for the opposing group, Pride became a symbolic intrusion of foreign ideology and governmental democracy following from Hungary's membership into the European Union. This symbolic transformation becomes a source of both unification and diversity of Pride as a single entity, in terms of the opposition's generalization of the event and the intercommunity debate of its cultural significance. Transferable to the concept of

"sexual citizenship" (Waitt, 2005) as a state regulation regarding (hetero) normative belonging, the formation of Pride's body adds to these given debates by displaying (inter)societal struggles of sexual minority visibility beyond fixed (hetero/homo) binaries of state politics.

Consequently, morality plays a key role as protection for the nation and its citizens through reiterating the nation's reproductive needs, which through the nationalist perspective are threatened by Pride's alliance with "transnational enemies" (Renkin, 2009, p. 23). Specifically, I am using relevant material on the explicit examples of marginalizing the LGBT community, such as the use of anti-Semitic historical context for homophobic slogans through the "Gay/Jew Analogy" (Graff, 2006). This analogy helps explain the rise of discursive hostility in the Pride political and social environment, which also challenges the notion of a "united front" (Schwartz, 2005). Rather than a growth of LGBT support, varying xenophobic (Pride opposing) social groups conveniently formed an "'integrated' scene… 'against a common enemy'" in Latvia (p. 4). Therefore, with this clarified positioning of Pride supporting/opposing social groups, each group gains member commonality but also internal conflicts. In this sense, these conflicts are exposed through the visible hostility presented at Pride marches, such as in Latvia and the building of physical barriers in Budapest.

Therefore, by unpacking the complexities of this atmosphere, I am able to distinctively construct hegemonic separation of Pride through "stigmatization of non-normative sexuality" (Wallace-Lorencova, 2003) regarding a "gothicized Nature" (Hurley, 1997). However, this hostility also causes various forms of solidarity through diversified unison of social groups (Gruszczynska, 2009); focusing on the initiator of the discourse, the Pride parade. Thus, referring back to the Bahktin's and Hurley's bodily canons, with the formation of one imagined bodily concept (grotesque) another (gothic) appears through its

8

developed (public/internal) discourse. Therfore, the internalized debates found within each specified social group (body) allow for continuous (re)constructions of specific dichotomies, such as hetero/homonormatives (Browne, 2006). In this sense, it is necessary to build these differentiating perspectives, in order to explore their intersection of (inter)community interpretations, regarding the specifications of an individualized identity.

Methods

The clarified distinction between community and organizational interpretations related to Pride, link the symbolic/physical, composed imagery constructed with the interactive approaches perceived by public visibility. This connection is grounded by Pride's socially distinctive bodily conception and further the intercommunity debates on the effectiveness and necessity of the event in relation to (hetero) hegemonic understandings thereof.

Academically, Eastern European Pride research contextualizes the political arena surrounding the LGBT events. However, most related texts (Graff, 2006, Schwartz, 2005, Wallace-Lorencova, 2003) end or begin with the notion that there is a lack of research done in this field. I agree, but most absent are the discourses amongst the LGBT/sexual minority group itself, in terms of their association to identity and sexual citizenship within these Pride spaces. Specifically, the varying interpretations regarding the expected violent nature from Pride opposition, exposes these (nation/identity) conflicts of belonging. Generally, focusing on the causes and aims of counter-Pride reactions, or physical violence, the texts remain in the (hetero/homo) normative dichotomy rather than "emphasizing fluidity and the slippages of queer" (Browne, 2006, p. 886). Therefore, I am focusing this project on expanding the conceptual bodily distinction to explore the intercommunity complexities emerging from Pride discourses.

In order to achieve a cohesive understanding of inter-communal debates of Pride, I have conducted semi-structured interviews with Budapest locals, who identified themselves as part of the LGBT community with, or without, participation of public activism. Not necessarily oriented towards the construction of a specified group, the interview process opened up the possibility to encounter varying perceptions of Pride and LGBT (activist) organizations, in connection with general (hetero) public understandings. Therefore, no matter where the interviewee positioned themselves, connections between the supporting/opposing divide was attainable.

As for the questions themselves, I aimed for broad, open-ended questions to initiate the discussion starting from the interviewee's preference. Nevertheless, the main objective was to gain a general (personal or political) perception of Pride, regarding its historical progression, political/social implications, and effectiveness. Therefore, with, or without, actual Pride participation the interviewees were encouraged to portray their understanding of Pride's political/social situation through either supporting, or opposing, point of view. Additionally, all informants did pertain to the LGBT community, in regards to being lesbian, gay, bi, or transsexual/gender. However, their association with the LGBT community varied, which reflected the interpretations of the current LGBT/Pride issues.

According to Diamond (2006), interpersonal engagements can be intensified with topics that are personally meaningful to the participants of in-depth qualitative interviews, which then "tends to engender reflexivity, or bidirectional influence, between researcher and participant" (p. 479). Although I do not perceive these interviews to hold any in-depth characteristics, this type of influence might become apparent throughout the text. Since LGBT issues of visibility and discrimination are personally meaningful to me and my involvement with Budapest Pride 2009, I, intentionally, distance myself from the analysis of the interviewees' statements. In this sense, I refrained from merging my own experience with

the informants' interpretations, or experiences. However, the intersection of differentiating perspectives of Pride will be focused through the comprehensive analysis of the interviews held, in order to dissect the complexities found within these discourses on public LGBT visibility. Therefore, going beyond Pride's bodily division (grotesque/gothic), I will expose the internal debates and contradictions on necessary public visibility, in terms of resisting (hetero) dominating systems.

In a micro-level, the responses from the interview process produce a basic understanding of the macro-historical implications of Pride marches in Budapest. Though the major limitation might be the sample size (8 total), the proportion between activist and non-activist identified informants was practically balanced. The difficulty of producing an exact statistical figure lies in the vagueness of the informants' political association with LGBT activism. In this sense, some stated their complete affiliation with supporting, or opposing, the Pride parade; either figuratively or officially (group membership). However, many noticed, or stated, similarities between their own and certain LGBT supporting or opposing point of views, but did not want to complete identify with either.

Since statements used in my analysis will not be limited to the interviewees' involvement with Pride, claims of Pride's political/social implications will encapsulate varying interpretations of (hetero) public social interactions. Therefore, the semi-structured interviews will produce the meta-level of the inter-community debates over the signification of public visibility in relation to the national/activist narrative of Pride. In this sense, the varying claims on Pride will expand on cultural assimilation in part from the LGBT organizations, in order to gain an accepted form of visibility.

11

Conclusion

Additionally, during this case study research on Budapest Pride 2009, I will continue my argument on the basis of sexual minority visibility and the implications (hetero) assimilation has on the collective identity of the LGBT/queer community.

Lastly, through the debates based on public visibility, or community recognition, inter-communal discourses will uncover internalized issues on cultural assimilation. Through this discourse, I will be focusing on perceived differences of Pride as a source for community building. Thus, interconnecting the constructed imagery and personal/organizational interpretations of Pride, the societal polarity (supporting/opposing) will be implemented within the LGBT community. Therefore, I will be exploring the complexities based on these discussions of cultural assimilation, and integration, through the composed imagery and analyzed interviews, in order to uncover the limitations of the identity politics within Pride. Therefore, to finalize my argument of Pride's bodily complexity, I will continue these intercommunity debates on visibility to explore academic "queering" of Pride's (hetero/homo) normative dichotomies (Browne, 2006).

Furthermore, expanding Pride's position as "the Nation's Other" (Renkin, 2009, p. 23) with the term queer, allows for radical challenges beyond the set (supporting/opposing) binary. Relative to Warner's (1993) notions of queer theory's motives of deliberate distancing from standardized norms, I will impose this concept on both the presented bodily concept of Pride and the intercommunity debates. Additionally, developing the notion of resisting "compulsory heterosexuality" (Rich, 1980) through the framework of cultural assimilation, allows for a bidirectional view (supporting/opposing) on tolerance in a complex intercommunity perception of a specific historical event. Therefore, without completely focusing on the heterosexual impulses on sexuality (p. 183), I will attempt to perceive Pride centrally as a LGBT issue through the perceptions of the LGBT community.

12

In conclusion, this paper will not only question the uses and interpretations of Pride as a political factor, but also as an intercommunity dilemma on publicized identities and individual willingness in Budapest, and elsewhere. In a sense, this is intended to allow new ways to perceive inter-LGBT community debates. Therefore, I will attempt and encourage the development of transcending queer theory to describe multiple factors of social movements.

Pride[ful] Body

In general terms, this chapter will focus on constructing the supporting/opposing binary connected to the discussions about Budapest Pride. Specifically, the participants and organizers supporting Pride are grouped as a specified body framing the LGBT community. In contrast, the social group (body) associated with the oppositional perspective, will be framed by conflicts of Pride meanings, as a source of identity specification/division. However, this social division will merge through discourse and impose the event itself. This way, group distinction will be based on the personal or organizational position of Pride's social/political significance for the (Hungarian) nation.

Additionally, the supporting/opposing group distinction will be referred to separate unifying body concepts; however, displaying plausible intersections between reasons and meanings through intercommunity debates. Specifically, using the "grotesque" (supporting) and "gothic" (opposing) bodily canons will frame the (inter)community distinctions of Pride discourses. The supporting/opposing distinction became most apparent during my observation of Budapest Pride 2009, regarding physical barriers. However, this division does occur elsewhere, as explained by relating academic research focusing on LGBT pride in neighboring countries. I will focus on the links between these differentiating perceptions of Pride, by reflecting onto different social/political reactions.

In explaining the same event, or reaction, through different perspectives, the boundaries placed between supporting/opposing social groups will become both clarified and potentially disrupted ("queered"). Therefore, I will start by clarifying the distinction between these groups throughout this chapter by relating their generalized position towards Pride to different theoretical body concepts. This will be necessary in order to continue with the challenges perceived among these social divisions.

14

Supporting Social Group

From an organizers (supporting) point of view, Pride is regarded as positively effective for widening public discourse and participation. Referring back to the CSD Berlin 2008 example, there were no clear (physical) distinction between participant and audience. Except for the dancers/performers atop the party-trucks, people freely walked into, along with, and away from the parade's path. In this sense, the performer/audience divide was blurred and the event became 'one body' of merged diversity. In compliance with my previous Pride knowledge from public/LGBT media, the physical appearance of CSD Berlin 2008 actualized the LGBT activist possibilities for blurring lines of (sexual/gender) distinction. However, at the same time, it was encouraged to parade with specified markers of individual lifestyle, such as rainbow/bear/leather pride flags, stickers or full body costumes. Nevertheless, it is the merger of all these differences, which highlights the event's aim to portray one unifying social body.

Therefore, I argue that in this respect the parade develops a universal meaning for its participants and its goals for the broader audience. In this sense, the merging of social bodies creates exaggerated affirmations of life in a positive manner. So, the positive views of the Pride supporting social group correlate with Bakhtin's (1984) "grotesque body" canon. In this case, oppositional (hetero-normative) views are included and displayed through fantastical caricatures, such as the sarcastic use of religious (priest/nun) or military (army/navy) uniforms. This combination then highlights Pride's "grotesque" nature with satirical comedy of (hetero) social norms or expectations. Therefore, with possible (political/social) limitations to the expansion of Pride's acceptability, this bodily canon allows for hegemonic realization of absurdity found amongst social normalization; thus, leading to a fused body between the participants and audience. Partially, this 'fused body' makes it possible for diversified

15

commonality regarding understood satire. However, this also allows for (inter) community misunderstanding and emergent new conflicts.

To focus on the Eastern European context, Poznan March of Equality implements this capability for unifying supporting and opposing views on equality in order to gain both political acceptance and broadened awareness. Although focusing on the political/legal struggles of LGBT issues (in comparison to CSD Berlin), this ('grotesque') march does create a collective meaning and action towards political mobilization regarding democracy (Gruszczynska, 2009). This is achieved through unifying other political/activist organizations on basis of overall (political/legal) equality. Therefore, through a generational connection of "the fight for freedom" (p. 324) in Poland, this interplay between the initiating struggles of the march can be inferred as the combination of meanings on the "remembrance of solidarity" (p. 322) merging into a universal political/activist (social) body symbolizing public democratic rights towards organized demonstrations. Thus, this merge of meanings does not only unify different organizations, but also the perceptions of the march in resistance to the opposing political agenda.

In comparison to Budapest Pride 2009, the website slogan resembles similar (political) attributes: "Rise up for diversity and human rights" (Appendix I). Additionally, the website continues with references to various supporting social groups, both nationally and internationally. In this sense, social unity is formed through commonality and awareness of LGBT issues, which, in this example, is focused on previous attacks. In 2008, "ultra right wing nationalist" attacked Pride participants by throwing rocks, eggs, etc, as presented in the current webpage for Budapest Pride 2010 (Appendix II). Although social criticisms do not appear as "satirical laughter" in Budapest, the constant reminder of a 'call for action' directs group members towards their aim through sarcasm of what has been done to them. In this sense, satire/sarcasm has nothing to do with comedic laughter, but encourages group

16

members to have no fear. Therefore, the YouTube link of Budapest Pride 2008 (Appendix III) is used as a source for worldwide support and it unifies local action.

In general, the "grotesque" capabilities of Pride function to challenge (hetero) social norms politically and socially, through direct public exposure. Additionally, there is a moral satisfaction found through the characterization of the grotesque body; "since sharp criticism and mockery have dealt a blow to these vices" (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 306). For example, the exaggerated costumes, the absurdity, or portrayals of diverse sexualities, gain authoritative power over the marginalization of the LGBT community. In this sense, as an internal effectiveness of Pride's body, members gain moral authority through their public criticism and mockery of the hegemonic (sexual/behavioral) expectations. Therefore, contrary to heterosexual normative regulations on morality and naturalness, ('grotesque') Pride allows exploitation of (hetero) social phenomena through absurdity and sharp criticism by the materiality of the open/disturbed body (p. 305).

Furthermore, these acts ignite the inter-LGBT community universal meaning of Pride through open discourse and continuing connections. Thereby, Pride continues with its interplay of merging bodies and exaggerated social criticism with the emergence of new members, attained by understood satire. In the case of Budapest Pride, these types of mergers are apparent as aims of LGBT organizations through their websites. However, such radical social/sexual exaggeration as part of Pride participation is usually avoided. As I was informed by a member of *Szimpozion Egyesület* (Association Symposium), the main priority of Pride is human rights and not a carnivalesque provocation for scandal. Therefore, I argue that the fundamentals of Pride remain similar, in terms of aiming for diversity and visibility, as stated on Association Symposium's website (Appendix IV).

Nevertheless, Pride gives the possibility for social criticism through which absurdity challenges (hetero) hegemonic images, which then are "not only uncrowned, they are

17

renewed" (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 309). Through this renewed image of public social norms, Pride gains a widened acceptability of the publicized (hetero) criticism with a sense of authority, regarding broadened social inclusion. However, this would suggest that all, who understood or acknowledged the universalized transgression of bodies, have developed a sense of collective participation, in terms of enjoying the satisfaction/laughter produced by these metaphors in unison or similar to one another.

Although a collective satisfaction/understanding of the social critique is debatable, the continuity of Pride's organization creates a historical comprehension of the correlated discourses of the event and their performed criticisms. Thus, this Pride body concept furthers the intercommunity meanings, in terms of the generational process of the renewed image's connection to the collective. Eventually, this development creates an immortalizing fused (public/social) body. Therefore, including the images, these bodies remain in relation with one another discursively; although in conflicting point of views. For example, Budapest Pride's produced images (internet/media) are a basis for the progress of its interpretation through intercommunity discourse. For instance, the fusion of "national and transnational meanings" (Renkin, 2009, p. 29) is continually embodied in both supporting and opposing discourses of the march; thus, blending itself into the social hegemony. In this manner, supporting/opposing social group membership only affects interpretation, but not the image/performance which blends itself by being included in public discourse.

Therefore, such as the combination of national belonging with transnational bonds uses nationally recognized statements (p. 29), a connection is formed and it establishes a unified perspective (body); however, variable in interpretation. Before my participation in Budapest Pride 2009, I was advised in personal security tactics, such as remaining a part of a group. These suggestions appeared unnecessary with my initial understanding of Pride's inclusive objectives, but with an explanation of the recent violent history of Budapest Pride I

understood the concern. Nevertheless, these violent images gained historical importance for a multitude of perspectives, but for the supporting social group this meant better security, generally.

Lastly, with the immortalization of these images through continual performance, "cosmic fear (as any other fear) is defeated through laughter" (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 336), this is mainly recognizable during popular festivals/carnivals. Therefore, adding to the absurdity of social criticism, the challenges towards (hetero) hegemonic produced terrors, such as throwing objects at participants, reinforce the supporting group's authority for criticism. Additionally, the combination of bodies through exaggerated satire becomes a central force without fear, which translates to acknowledgement of participation. Similar to Budapest Pride website's reminders of public violence, both supporting and opposing perspectives are joined displaying both activist cause and their capabilities for reaction. Eventually, this combination infers that the supporting groups are focusing on these caricatures and their capabilities in order to broaden the notion of having nothing to fear. As a community and a collective action against fear and terror, the 'grotesque' both (re)unifies its original members and creates a symbolic renewal of the hegemonic norms. Therefore, it allows raised awareness for the public and generalized group inclusion.

Thus, Pride's mimicry of hetero/national normative regulated behaviors, such as public slogans and displays of affection actualizes the mergence of the heterosexual (opposing) and homosexual (supporting) bodies. As portrayed by the Hungarian parody of Lily Allen's "Fuck you (very very much)" (Appendix V), the universal understanding of social phenomena both broadens LGBT awareness and centralizes their connections to hegemonic public norms. In this sense, the organizers can successfully unite the two conflicting bodies and radically spread awareness of their symbolic connections, while gaining authority through historicizing the event.

Opposing Social Group

However, though these mentioned concepts of the body benefit the organization of Pride, there are also contradicting concepts which then would be useful for the explanation of the oppositional critique. Specifically, this critique will derive from the opposing social group which directly does not associate with Pride or their social/political aim. Overall, Bakhtin explores the uses and connections of the grotesque in contrary to a 'new' concept of the closed body, which "convey a merely individual meaning of the life of one single, limited body" (1984, p. 321) thus acquiring exclusiveness. In this sense, diversity can turn into a threat to the individual, regarding the link between social and 'natural' regulation of (hetero) hegemony.

Therefore, the social body loses its ability to merge with others and becomes limited to its own specifications. Furthermore, human (social/political) specificity becomes the focus for the opposing social group through a linear hierarchy of natural-selection, as a form of evolution. Therefore, regarding the opposing perspective of Pride, the event conflicts with the nation's (body) regulated aim for stability. Thus, the national/transnational combination endangers the Hungarian specificity, in terms of the focus on cultural stability.

In reference to the conflict of cosmic fears woven into standardized society, this 'closed body' (opposing group) develops the need for individual distancing from a merging body through the creation of symbolic threats, or fears. Such fears, or specificities, are strongly recognizable in most of the post-socialist, and –communist, regions regarding opposing social groups. Specifically, the situation in Slovakia (Schwartz, 2003) and Latvia (Wallace-Lorencova, 2005), there is a combination of social cosmic fears towards publicizing the LGBT community through religion and national politics regarding sexual deviances. In this sense, homophobia continues through being both regulated and reinforced through the insertion of Catholicism/Christianity into the political culture (Wallace-Lorencova, 2005, p.

20

2). Additionally, homophobia develops the importance of a social norm focusing on sexuality by producing homosexual behavior as deviant, or sinful (Schwartz, 2003, p. 2).

In the case of Budapest Pride 2007, this type of social regulation translated into street violence, such as throwing eggs, bottles, rocks and physical assaults (Renkin, 2009, p. 20). Accompanied by escalating homophobic rhetoric by major public figures (p. 21), the literal interpretations of stabilizing societal standards and expectations are publicly clarified. Thus, Hurley's (1997) notion of the "gothic body" (opposing social group) develops, in terms of its replacement of "human centrality in the universe … with one of human ephemerality, relativity, and potential "degradation" (to use Well's term)" (p. 56).

Therefore, the opposing social ("gothic") group of Pride, reinforces their concepts of the 'natural' through cultural traditions as scientific facts for broadened acceptability of hegemonic reasoning, such as "Christian family values" (Schwartz, 2005, p. 2). Similarly, referring back to the Eastern European region, though religious understanding of nature is the basis for scientific fact, the goal to remain culturally traditional, or humanly perfected, with statements such as "homosexuality is contrary to nature" (Graff 2006), the 'human evolutionary' focus correlates to the 'gothic'.

Therefore, with the located goal for a perfected human through the biological process of natural evolution "the human" loses both its particularity and meaningfulness (Hurley, 1997, p. 61). Through the opposition perspective of Budapest Pride 2007, the participants and organizers of such events turn into the "other", regarding the source for possible (hetero) hegemonic "degradation". However, according to Darwinian theories, "natural selection was a scenario within which any morphic configuration, however implausible, was a plausible one, for Nature rewarded variety and changefulness rather than inflexibility of form" (p. 60); thus, contradicting the opposing group's notions of formality against the threat of degradation.

21

Nevertheless, these "gothic" images and metaphors are aimed to form a cause for (hetero) hegemonic reasoning for (social deviance) threat prevention. The broader perspective of the opposing social group rely on rejecting such activities, in the manner that these publicized behaviors diminish the quality of social standards and ultimately degrade human nature. Therefore, the Eastern European Pride opposition's use of anti-Semitism through the "Gay/Jew Analogy" (Graff, 2006) uses historical images of racism to continue the possibility of devolution. In this sense, references to the Nazi regime and concentration camps, turns the homosexual into "extra-terrestrial" (p. 443) and nonhuman. So, this distinction gives (opposing) reason for possible devolution. This connection lends itself to the clarification of 'offensive' imagery towards cultural sensibility. Such was the case of the "counterdemonstrators" at Budapest Pride 2007, where skinheads and neo-Nazis combined homophobic and anti-Semitic phrases to erase LGBT agency in connection to national history (Renkin, 2009, p. 25-26).

Furthermore, Hurley's (1997) "gothicized Nature" is actualized through Pride's participatory group transformation into the nonhuman (societal) threat. Therefore, as a unified body, supporters are located into social marginality through the critiques by the dominating regulations of the opposing social group. Therefore, the importance of keeping these strong distinctions stable through "artificial" (civilizing/political) devices (p. 64) plays a significant role in the hierarchal progression of being "fully human/evolved" (p. 56), under the conservative oppositional perspective. In addition, (Pride opposing groups) statements rejecting participation and societal approval of Pride can be inferred as not only objectifying the event as a product of abnormal evolution, but as a possible contaminator of hegemonic normalcy (Russo, 1995).

Conclusion

Noticeably, these (supporting/opposing) social bodies remain separated through the identity politics of the individual citizen and through its relation to the societal standards. In this sense, the 'gothic' body remains focused on (cultural) self-sufficiency, as opposed to 'grotesque' merging bodies and inclusion of diversity. However, potential for disrupting these clear distinctions is possible through the emphasis on internal group debates.

For instance, the "freak" identity, Pride challenges the boundaries set in hegemonic standards beyond the exaggeration of satirical comedy. However, this internal form of community specification does encounter public risks for modifications through spectacle and media commodification, which at the same time does expose the trope as an "externalized, 'out there', hypervisible" and a portrayal of a "phantasmatic experience" (Russo, 1995, p. 85). Therefore, the expansion of public awareness to social diversity within the hegemonic regulations remains a possibility, with Pride's satirical social criticism, but with certain risks.

In the case of Budapest Pride, media coverage becomes an essential topic for both (supporting/opposing) social groups. Typically used as a direct representation of the social/sexual practices during the event, public (supporting/opposing) interpretations diverge into either being necessary, or evident of social deviance. These rather distinctive views are proportionally presented in both social groups; supporting groups find media necessary for widened visibility, but fear misrepresentation; while opposing groups clearly connect the deviant nature, but do not depend on media coverage. Therefore, similar to the differentiating notions perceived by Pride, a single image of the event develops a multitude of interpretations, regarding the "externalized", "hypervisibile", and "phantasmatic experience" imagery of the "freaks".

Under the pretenses of becoming hypervisible, as a social abnormality, the imagery correlates to the oppositional perspective on the fear of contamination. Therefore, the spatial

23

separation of both perspectives, and bodily canons, modifies their interaction in terms of spectacle, and of the meaning of visibility. Such is the case with Budapest Pride 2009, where the resistance towards "contamination" of national historical traditions is most forcibly visible, by building barriers. In contrary to that, Pride challenges national (hetero) hegemony by becoming socially exposed as an aspect of contemporary (media) culture (p. 85). Nevertheless, (hetero) hegemony reinforces the need to reclaim their control and reject the alternate hypervisibility of Pride participants, the "freaks".

Therefore, the questionable notion of the Pride's cultural contamination arises with the oppositional control over their generational image, which in this case requires the separation of explicit, or radical, diversity. However, Pride expands their criticism towards the illogical insinuation of evolutionary threat. Partially, by inferring that the variations found in Pride would actually be rewarded by natural selection through the challenges placed onto the "inflexibility of form" or normalization (Hurley, 1997, p. 60). Thus, turning Pride participation into a monstrous image is both positive and negative depending on the interpretation of it. Furthermore, also acknowledged within the Darwinian theories of nature, natural selection is both unpredictable and "has no favorites"; therefore, environmental adaptability is central to progressive success rather than human values or self-interest (p. 64). Ultimately, this unpredictability puts both the inflexibility of hetero-normative expectations and Pride's (bodily/imagery) evolution into question.

Though the organizers' initiative usually is to raise awareness against general LGBT discrimination, this initiative remains limited regarding public media attention and interpretation thereof. Such discourses concerning different bodies, or social groups, in relation to the hegemonic social expectation usually are correlated to ideas on conflicts of social identity boundaries. Using Pride as a prime example, the similarities between conflicts of bodies and (queer) identity are present, in terms of hierarchy and social normalcy. In the

case of Budapest Pride 2009, the physical boundaries gave an insight into the political/social affirmation of the supporting/opposing divide. In addition to that, intercommunity debates highlight the internal divide of group (activist) identity.

Therefore, 'queering' these distinctions will displace (hetero/homo) hegemonic controlling roles of marginalization. Additionally, it produces centrality for marginalized ('queer') identities by expanding the social limitations of this divide. Nevertheless, renewing the image of centrality, such as that amongst Pride participants, does not change the meaning or struggles which are being presented, or performed. In this case, the (hetero) hegemonic norms remain in control of regulating public sexuality, regarding clear distinctions. Therefore, though these different bodily canons do challenge the hegemonic hierarchy, the effectiveness of these criticisms is debatable. However, with the lack of a complete revision of social hegemony, these canons do raise and expose embedded contradictions, which in turn do infuse a diversified perspective on certain issues.

With the case of Budapest Pride, these discourses create social complexity when specified within a given social group. Fundamentally, the supporting group's perspective focuses on diversity, in order to broaden their cultural awareness. To the contrary, this perspective is confronted by the opposing group's use of 'natural' facts, and various interplay with the role of the spectacle. Nevertheless, as a continuation, it will become apparent that these distinction sometimes overlap among individual conflicting interpretations; especially, when presiding with intercommunity debates. In this sense, these distinctive interpretations of Pride are found within each (supporting/opposing) social group respectively.

In conclusion, these bodily canons formulate the progression and connection between the concept of the body and political/societal discourses on a particular event. In terms of Pride, these canons have showed the diversified capabilities an event can create for a broadened audience; however, its effectiveness remains suspicious. Specifically with social

25

hierarchy, (hetero) hegemony remain constantly challenged or in need for control. Therefore, such plausible connections for criticisms may cause a wider perspective on Eastern European's approach to Pride, such as the organizers of the Poznan March of Equality inclusive definition of democratic demonstrations. Nonetheless, these conceptualized bodies (supporting/opposing) require a unified meaning for their ability to spread. However, beyond this division, I am able to portray these contradictory perspectives relative to the inter-LGBT community debates.

Visibility

Through the singular force of Pride as a bodily concept, I will continue by attempting to disrupt the simplified generalization formed from the (supporting/opposing) binary set through discourses surrounding Pride. Therefore, I will focus on the internal debates of the LGBT community in Budapest concerning Pride, through the sample of semi-structured interviews held. In reference to Pride 2009 participation, the argument continues towards the disassociation between (LGBT) community and (activist) organizations over visibility. Therefore, Pride visibility will be central to this chapter in discussing Pride's (cultural) benefits and conflicts. These differentiating statements from the interview process will give perspective to the underlying conflicts based on Pride. Initially, by constituting the supporting social groups'/individuals' demand for political/public recognition (Taylor, 1992), this intercommunity conflict emerges with varying interpretations on this demand.

First, I will make a connection to new social movement theories on collective identity as a source for public mobilization through common interest (Taylor & Whittier, 1992). Therefore, an analysis on a collective perspective on visibility will assist on expanding the group individuality, through interpretative variations. Then leading to the complexities of the intercommunity debates over social group commonality, these variations introduce the organizational dilemmas of widening inclusive activism. Lastly, these complexities and dilemmas disrupt the clear supporting/opposing social group distinction by exposing internal disharmony, which blurs specified (group) membership.

Specifically, the key concepts in this chapter surrounding visibility will be focused on the cause, reaction, and interpretations connected to it. In this sense, through varying interviewee perspectives, the visibility framework of cause and effects concerning Pride introduces the merging of interpretations. In this sense, the effectiveness of Pride is

challenged internally. Therefore, visibility expands the "grotesque" understanding that "identity is partly shaped by recognition" (Taylor, 1992, p. 25) through the inclusion of multiple merged bodies. Mainly, the merger of social bodies does not focus only on public visibility, but includes intercommunity complexities regarding "identity negotiations" (Taylor & Whittier, 1992). In terms of social reactions, awareness is not limited as externally (hetero) associated, but also internally (LGBT) focused regarding activism/individual capabilities. Therefore, the supporting/opposing division becomes part of the intercommunity debates on Pride's function.

> "It seems teenagers these days have much more knowledge about LGBT people. So, they don't ask these very naïve, very basic questions, but they ask more about, for example, families, adoption rights and stuff like that. So, I think, in general, in Hungarian society there is higher visibility of LGBT people." (Interview with Rita)

One of the first statements repeated by various interviewees is the increasing development of general (public) visibility, or recognition, of the LGBT community. Basically, my understanding of this development is that the terms (LGBT/gay/lesbian) have become (hetero) publicly recognized. Therefore, as stated above, the younger generation, especially, have increased knowledge of LGBT issues and (personal/public) interpretations thereof. However, the debates remain focused on the necessity to broaden the spectrum of public tolerance and the effectiveness of current methods, such as Pride. In this sense, tolerance relates to visibility and recognition as a (hetero) public/political acceptance for allowing public methods (Pride) of raising awareness. Nevertheless, indirectly connected to complete (hetero) tolerance, the goals of spreading LGBT awareness explores the internal (LGBT) conflicts of political/public "actions" (Abelove, 2003). Partially, this exposes the

complexities within the intended (hetero/homo) audience and the individual association with (supporting/opposing) social groups.

Therefore, I am interested in the analysis of the social networks/bonds created in building social movements, through collective identity as the key concept of "new social movement theory" (Taylor & Whittier, 1992, p. 104). So, with the notion that collective identity is formed by "member's common interests, experiences, and solidarity", there is still a missing element of the member's transformation into political actors, regarding the development of "politicized group identities" (p. 105). Although my intention is to dissect the generalization of collective identity, Pride's expanding interpretations will give insight of the members' political transformation regarding activist membership, participation and social interest. Nevertheless, these acknowledgements tend to merge and conflict through intercommunity debates.

> "LGBT community as a whole… it doesn't really exist that way [Western- style], in my opinion. There are LGBT people, but it doesn't somehow come together as a community that would be able to advocate for its own interest or to be visible in a structuralized way. So, of course, there are curtain events… where LGBT people can become visible in Hungary, but those are events, like the Pride… are not open to the public or visible to the public; although it is pretty heavily discussed in the media…" (Interview with D)

Therefore, the continued drive for a broader community tolerance level does initiate a source for collective action. However, inconsistencies are present in the formation of a group "consciousness" regarding the organized goals set for action (Taylor & Whittier, 1992, p. 110). In the case of Budapest Pride, this type of intercommunity separation is highly visible

through the minimal number of registered LGBT organizations, which causes a lack of diversity in public (non-activist) community. Thus, without a common ground with the main organizations most self-identified LGBT members fade into the hegemonic political sphere of standardization. Therefore, with the agreement of an increased visibility of LGBT issues through the presence of Pride, the conflicts arise through the level of importance Pride holds for public awareness compared to the organizational responsibilities it takes on.

First, I will construct the unifying agreement, among the supporting social group, of increased visibility and public discourse of LGBT issues as a drive for social mobility continuation. However, through this construction, I will reevaluate, or clarify, the binary set between supporters and opposing (internal) camps on Pride's functionality. Finally, by expanding Taylor/Whittier's formation of collective identity through the concepts of boundaries, consciousness and negotiation (p. 111), I will disrupt Pride's "grotesque" bodily concept with intercommunity debates and organizational struggles of comprising a 'group consciousness' evident in Budapest. In relation to this issue, the variable meaning of commonality within "actions" (Abelove, 2003) opens the sources of intercommunity debates.

> "I guess Pride has the strongest impact, because it is the most visible; because it is the most discussed in the media and (in my opinion) it is one of most positive things that can happen, because without this level of discussion; this level of visibility that the Pride provides; we would never be an issue in all of Hungary. So much of the legal rights we have gained for the past 3 years were due to the fact that we have Prides; we have huge discussions related to pros and contras in general; and there are also these attacks on Pride. And in an indirect way, they have helped us to promote our issues."
> (Interview with Adrian)

During this interview with Adrian, an organizer of Budapest Pride and other LGBT social functions, the strength of Pride's impact on hegemonic discourse emerged within an outlined historical context. In this sense, most of the legal, political and social awareness is lead towards the cultural intrusion of Pride; including the violent attacks most evident in 2007. Particularly, the recent legalization of same-sex partnership registration was used as a primary example for the general LGBT inclusion in (hetero) hegemonic norms.

Additionally, this generalized perception of Pride concretely set up the "boundaries" (Taylor & Whittier, 1992) of socially marked territories between the attackers and the participants. Oddly, this statement does combine these different social groups with the contribution of Pride's function of social mobility through the development of wide discussions relying upon it. Nevertheless, social (supporting/opposing) boundaries are set, but the main objective is to progress social movement through broadening discourses. This type of progress was a consensus throughout the interview, which leads me to infer that an underlying collectiveness is present by displaying a form of (homo) group commonality. However, these supporting/opposing boundaries are not limited as positioned against the (hetero) hegemonic opposition of Pride.

Additionally, this statement elaborates on the effectiveness of Budapest Pride. Specifically, it introduces the possibility of "an action", which includes a realization of an alternate world, in terms of publicly subverting a marginalized group, e.g. the (queer) LGBT community (Abelove, 2003). Composed of a group of committed members, they play with the concept and rhetoric of nationhood, by highlighting hetero-normative standards through destabilization of social (supporting/opposing) division. Similar to the "grotesque", this is ultimately a response to the "expectation of ennui" (p. 40) in regards to the boredom of hegemonic spaces/expectations. In addition, these actions are successfully portraying the

(queer) LGBT community's centrality in these public spaces versus the implied marginalization of their existence.

Although Pride supporters display a direct reaction to the opposing social groups ('the attackers') as part of their basis for community building, there are also boundaries placed internally. In this sense, the combination between interview claims and physical organizational actions focused on event security portrays the inter-LGBT community identity based on "the demand for recognition" (Taylor, 1992, p. 25). Specifically, this type of identity pertains to the commonality of LGBT goals. This demand focuses on modern political views of democratic equal recognition, relative to the notion of tolerance and acceptance. Though not as radical as "queer" motives but similar to them, this demand for recognition calls for acknowledgement of difference for (political/social) equality, which I argue is the aim of Pride visibility.

However, the person's or group's "mode of being" is affected and framed by public "misrecognition" (p. 25), regarding social inferiority. Due to "misrecognition", modern (personal) identity and recognition are joined by causing social/political harm to a specific group. Additionally, social reaction as a "demand" is provided through the notions of "honor" as a challenge to social hierarchies and "dignity" as a universalizing frame of the general public (p. 26-27). In the case of Budapest Pride, personal identity of the participants (supporting social group) gets conflicted with the combination of "national and transnational meanings" (Renkin, 2009), regarding recognition. By this, the participants encounter continuous divisions of public alliances and connected meanings. In this manner, it becomes difficult to assign group member commonalities, but acknowledgement of social "misrecognition" exposes inter-LGBT visibility aims.

"The (then) Dean of the Catholic University said: '… I have to warn you that there are homosexuals at 'that' department'… He [the Dean] wasn't trying to be malicious. He just thought, he should tell. We all have been laughing at that since." (Interview with A)

In this instance, the statement continues with notions of "misrecognition" in relation to identity (Taylor, 1992). Indirectly, this connection is formed by the recognition's discursive levels of "the intimate [private] sphere… [and] the public sphere" (p. 37). Specifically, the interviewee was explaining a colleague's story, but also this highlights the interplay of identity politics in relation to specified spaces. Basically, the Dean noticed a threat to the colleague's individual (national) identity. However, according to the space, these (hetero) expectations of the colleague resemble that of the struggles of Pride organizing. In this sense, national belonging is attributed through space relations, by means of (hetero) social regulation. Therefore, considering the space and the social relation, the colleague was identified as heterosexual; thus, belonging to (hetero) national expectations which would be threatened by the homosexual environment of the 'other' department.

In comparison to "the in-group" versus "the out-group" analogy (Taylor & Whittier, 1992, p. 111), these social boundaries set by Pride discourses do not only separate the violent attackers (opposing group) from the participants (supporting group), but also creates divisions among the LGBT participants. In reference to the most recent statement, the (homosexual) colleague is, at that moment, both "in" and "out", because in that University he is regarded as (a common) heterosexual but laughs about the situation with his "out" colleagues. Continually, I would present relative inconsistencies of clarified divisions among the supporting social group of Pride visibility.

"…The organizations [say]: 'yeah we should go, have the Pride march, and be visible'. A lot of the general LGBT public says: 'well, come on, I don't want to go and get beaten up'."

"People I know say: 'I understand the reasons behind the march, but I'm not gonna go there. It's crazy. We're just giving them ammunition'." (Interview with Rita)

There is an internal debate focused on the normalization of the event in avoidance of street violence, as pointed out by Rita, another LGBT activist and organizer. After the physical counter-protest of Budapest Pride 2007, there has been both an increase of discursive visibility and inter-LGBT community debate thereof. Mainly, the widened agreement of common interest the attacks instigated within local activists, created conflicts of "oppositional consciousness" (Morris, 1990, as cited in Taylor & Whittier, 1992). This type of consciousness is developed through challenges to dominant understandings (Taylor & Whittier, 1992, p. 114), which in this case is under intercommunity debate as to effective methods.

"[Before Pride] it [civil unions] might come up as an issue for a few days… [but not to a court level]" (Interview with D)

"[Her father:] We must show them! We must stop this kind of violence that happens on the streets of Budapest." (Interview with Rita)

"The gay pride is a commercial business. Bullshit." (Interview with M)

The range concerning Pride's visibility is displayed through these three statements. In general, Pride turns into being successful or useless regarding visibility. However, there is also the inclusion of progress, as in the case of D, where Pride create a discursive environment for LGBT issues, but does not go far enough. Nevertheless, the ideal of Pride effectively demanding "recognition" remains, and so does the direct opposition thereto.

Thus, I argue that with the sudden increase of visibility of the LGBT, a clear framework for challenging dominant systems is necessary for the function of the "political consciousness" (Morris, 1990, as cited in Taylor & Whittier, 1992) towards the aimed collective group. "Political and oppositional consciousness" function correlatively, regarding the capabilities of emphasizing members' common interest in contrast to the dominant order; thus, clarifying what these interests are and their function (Taylor & Whittier, 1992, p. 114). Nevertheless, most informants have either confessed or mentioned community realization of a need for collective action after the publicized attacks, which to some included official membership to LGBT activism.

In contrast, I would state that though the 2007 attacks formed a state of realization, it has done so to a limited degree. Politically, strong discontent with the collective actors present (p. 114) developed from both the perspective of the Pride participants and the opposition. The physical public attacks gave reason to the participants to establish necessary progress in collective action through widen transnational political system, in order to integrate global/political assistance for security. Therefore, prevalent in Budapest is the externally invisible (supporting) LGBT unification regarding "oppositional consciousness", specifically in the case of protection against violent attacks. In this sense, it is not obvious as to the extent or method Budapest Pride is aiming to challenge/demand their (political/social) recognition.

The following are two exemplary statements of Pride's cause and effects in terms of political/social struggles:

"There is a thin layer of gay people, who need an identity; and they have to show themselves somehow, and that's the channel [Pride] they find and that's it. But I find my identity in work and in my natural surroundings and so on. I never mention this thing: queer people." (Interview with M)

"LGBT people aren't a part of a physical community, they are a part of the general society… So, they don't have a common opinion about things, they have a very diluted opinion, and because it is very diluted in the general society, the [LGBT] majority has the opinion as the majority of the society. They think that this kind of norm [rude language/hate speech] should be accepted." (Interview with Adrian)

Although these informants contradict themselves on the uses of Pride, the notion of the LGBT community's identification with the (hetero) public insinuates some of the internalized struggles for commonality. However, in terms of Pride's effectiveness, these statements show that it is unclear how to reach for targeted (social) group for public/political "action" (Abelove, 2003). In this manner, that is where the boarder uncertainty of Pride's methods derives from.

Lastly, referring back to Taylor & Whittier's (1992) analysis of collective identity, there is a heavily present 'negotiation' on the methods for resistance within the LGBT community/organization. According to the first statement, Pride becomes a source for retrieving identity which is not entirely necessary, because the workplace/natural setting is (socially/personally) most important in constructing an identity, according to M. Therefore, in

conjunction with Adrian's statement, there is an increasing trend to remain hidden as an "implicit" mode of distancing from "dominant representation" (p. 118).

Throughout the interview process, there was a large dilemma on openly attempting to disregard hegemonic social standards, in terms of "explicit" identity negotiations (p. 118); mainly, with its association with scandals and provocation. In terms of directly/publicly challenging (hetero) social norms through deliberate "actions" (Abelove, 2003), it was either regarded as impossible, unnecessary, or dangerous. However, there was unnoticed potential in the commonly stated variations of privately deviating from Hungarian heterosexual traditions.

In conclusion, although there is a collective interest in broadening discursively Pride and LGBT issues, the intercommunity conflicts cause strong separation of members through differing 'group consciousness' and modes of resistance, in regards to their importance. Additionally, the interplay of dominating systems on the LGBT collective identity, through publicly and violently standardizing social norms, disrupts the unifying structure of the organization. And through that, there is a developing discourse on radical measures of Pride; by which the idea of a radical side leads to statements of coming-out as an additional necessity for LGBT visibility.

Therefore, the internal division of Pride's methods and effectiveness causes innovative modes of creating structured commonality. Nevertheless, Pride remains the focus of broadened awareness. In this sense, these intercommunity discussions continue from visibility towards the affects of (hetero) assimilation, which lends itself to social spaces in the following chapter. Therefore, through the argument of visibility and 'coming-out' what becomes most important is not only the national identity of the subject but also the spaces (media/political) in which these aims are being focused on.

Assimilation

In continuation with internal polarities of the LGBT community set by the discourses of Pride, cultural assimilation figures as a supplementary debate connected to visibility. Relating back to the statement commented on in the previous chapter, regarding the LGBT community's tendency to merge with the general public in Budapest, there is an apparent (hetero-normative) influence in triggering necessary cultural sameness by Pride opposing social groups, as a source for widened tolerance. Organizationally, Budapest Pride becomes conflicted with both "national and transnational" (Renkin, 2009) understandings included in inter-LGBT community discourse. Therefore, as the source of public visibility (recognition), (political) compromises are made for the actualization of the event, such as heavy security measures. However, this is not limited to the acceptance of the oppositional (heterosexual) group; it is also necessary for internal membership and agreement.

"Most of us [LGBT community] don't think that there is a problem [with rude language]. Most think we shouldn't do anything about it; and most think that we should hide more, we should hide better and we should try to cover our tracks and that would be a good defense system against these kinds of verbal or physical attacks, which I think is complete nonsense." (Interview with Adrian)

"Rude language" is in reference to openly homophobic rhetoric spoken by a few major public figures in recent Hungarian political history. Therefore, most important for the opposing social group, is the compliance with national identity, or tradition; in contrast to grassroots challenges on hegemonic spaces and standards. More specifically, in terms of (public) morality, there is a general (hetero) understanding of agreed behavior, which is the

38

responsibility of all citizens to comply with. Whether homosexuality itself is labeled as an immoral (Hungarian) public behavior continues to be intermittently debated, in reference to the informant's understanding of (social) privacy. But the Pride march singularly gets marked as inappropriate for public spaces, due to culturally dangerous practices during the event. In reference to the "grotesque", the interviewees' interpretation of Pride was based on their (dis)association with/from it (supporting/opposing social groups).

In this section, the notion of assimilation connects itself with the opposing social group, in terms of the 'foreignness' of Pride in Budapest. In relation to the following statement, Pride and its participants turn into public "freaks" through its foreign imported (transnational) association.

"The whole thing didn't exist until democracy came by. It's an import, just like Valentine's Day… The same way, some people thought it's good business for them to have a gay Pride, and that's how I feel about it… still feel that people who are boosting [Pride] lack identity and it's compensation. Then they feel good. OK, let them feel good. I don't mind, but don't force me to go to a fucking gay Pride. I'm not proud of it. It's a curse. I enjoy every moment of it [homosexuality], but it's a curse… You can't help it." (Interview with M)

With the focus on Pride, many of the public conflicts resulting from the march are usually referred to the media coverage it receives, regarding drag queens and nationally recognized costumes or symbols. Referring to the previous statement, this type of connection allows for identity compensation, but should not forcefully include all LGBT individuals. Therefore, I argue that Pride successfully includes a form of social destabilization of (hetero) norms. However, what is most striking is the general reluctance to an equal or stronger

resistance to homophobia at a macro-level beyond Pride. Figuratively, a type resistance that not only secures the continuance of Budapest Pride, but also disrupts hegemonic normalization standards both from the context of homophobia and from that within the local LGBT community. Furthermore, recalling Bahktin's (1984) grotesque body, I would argue that the interplay of exaggerated caricatures as a form of social critique remains relevant to this radical resistance of identity politics, regarding community unification.

For example, radical resistance recognizable through Queer Nation's (QN) disturbance of heteronormativity is done in unison, though it is apparent that QN seeks to separate itself from the hetero-hegemony, their critiques becoming an exaggerated caricature of hegemonic standards and normalization. In this sense, QN disrupts the boundaries set in national identity and in that of queer community by stating that subliminal sexuality, which is found in mainstream national identity, "makes explicit how thoroughly the local experience of the body is framed by laws, policies, and social customs regulating sexuality" (Berlant & Freeman, 1992, p. 152-153).

Therefore, QN tries to exploit these regulations of sexuality through its same regulatory methods of using the allure of nationalism and capitalism. Within this sphere, the body is still bounded by finite meanings of its actions; however, the focus of the spectacle is reversed, which then is used to exploit the contradictions of hegemonic norms; thus, implementing a universal meaning through the exploitation of contradictory standardization with exaggerated satire. With these intentions, QN enters the central spaces of public identification, embodied and disembodied social contact in order to exploit the structures regulating sexuality. This approach differentiates itself from the aims of Pride organizers mostly through its reversal of the spectacle relationship, regarding the lack of universalizing intensions. However, though this approach might seem exclusive, it also unifies the

40

differentiating views among the LGBT community by making them central through universal criticism of social norms.

However, in comparison to Budapest Pride, the hesitation of a deliberate resisting (queer) formation, such as QN, against (hetero) hegemonic societal normalization leads to a questioning of both the aim of visibility and the trend of assimilation. Therefore, as a continuation for inter-LGBT community discourses, many of the organizational struggles towards public festivities and media coverage is not only limited to the political opposition, but also internalized counter-interpretations. In this sense, when analyzing LGBT organizational struggles on the goals of visibility, there is an intersection of internal debates, which expands the source of organizing problematics and challenges hetero-hegemony resistance. In reference to Adrian's and M's most recent statement, these challenges faced by LGBT organizers are derived from internalized compliance to (hetero) social norms. Therefore, I will conceptualize this intercommunity intersection through the exploration of similar anti-assimilationist challenges.

Shepard (2001) focused on AIDS activism in junction with the GLBT movement in the United States and some of the emerging splits within the group members. Shepard notes that there was a shift, or progression, of the meaning behind the GLBT movements, such as the shift from themes focused on visibility against homophobia towards the AIDS crisis and then the issue of gays in the military. According to Shepard, it seems that the major factor for these 'splits' derive from the activists perception of visibility, accessibility and power. Shepard listed four questions, which convey these issues: "How are community decisions made and who makes them? Who has access – who doesn't? Who has visibility – who doesn't? and What is the relationship between money, control and power?" (2001, p. 57).

These questions refer to some of the lacking aspects some gay advocates were ignoring. At this moment, this is what separated the queer activists' interest in social and

economical justice to all, while the gay advocate was referring to their movement as a single issue, that of assimilation into the dominant culture's expectations (p. 58). In this sense, I am exploring the multiplicities found in queer theory and the potentials of fluidity in geographies and sexualities through the presented complexities of the Pride discourses.

First, 'queer' is located in the radical challenges of normativities through "continued (re)formations" of stabilized dichotomies (Browne, 2006, p. 886). However, these contestations of normative stability tend to remain within these boundaries without exploring new productions of "fluid sexes, genders, sexualities or desires" (p. 887). In this sense, with "uncoupling queer from normative hetero/homosexulaities" (p. 887), queer continues the possibilities for expanding relations of the "other" beyond the aim of public recognition towards social inconsistencies (p. 886). Specifically, these social inconsistencies are focused on the intercommunity debates surrounding Pride's effectiveness and overall necessity.

In relation to Budapest Pride, one could visually conceive the intentions to expand cultural diversity through the physical appearance in major public spaces. However, at the same time bureaucratic-like gay assimilationist organizations continue on the scope of a "just like everyone else" (Shepard, 2001, p. 50) campaign and focus on the regaining public tolerance in avoidance of discriminatory violence. Therefore, Pride marches which tend to limit visibility of variant sexualities and gender, is perceived to be a backlash. Agreeably so for the queer movement in Shepard's (2001) analysis, which argues that the assimilation approach only reinforces the hetero-dominant's agenda in keeping the gay/lesbian community in a 'docile' state, meaning that the power of profiting from the queer commodity/efficiency would remain in the hetero-normative favor. Similarly, this threat fits probable to the inter LGBT opposing social group's tendency to assimilate to Hungarian national (hetero) sexual regulations.

Essentially, the term "queer" is associated with the distancing from clear (hetero) normative divisions (Browne, 2006). Thus, with the exploration of the internal debates, the possibilities of multiple perspectives are allowed to merge or distance themselves. In the case of Budapest Pride, the subjects surrounding the inter-LGBT discourses encompass these conflicts individually. For instance, the "open secret person" was frequently mentioned, as the following statement explains. Figuratively, this is the "person/image" which characterizes the Pride opposing social group's hesitation for direct (hetero) social normative resistance.

"An open secret person: everybody knows, but he never mentions he's gay." (Interview with A)

In this manner, I would argue that the intercommunity hesitation emerges through the "queer" idea of "class dislocation" (Cohen, 1997). This term is used in association with the AIDS epidemic in the U.S.A., where the capability of certain gay men to pass as heterosexual in the public was damaged and/or challenged. Therefore, alienation from their (opposing social groups) heterosexual allies and (class) benefits causes a personal reaction towards assimilation. Additionally, affirming the attempts to balance between different private and public lifestyles discursively produces the 'gay men' (supporting group) as publicly deemed unworthy of concern or assistance (p. 86-87).

Therefore, in accordance with national identity and social regulations, "class dislocation" transfers individual "passing" (Cohen, 1997) as heterosexual into the (opposing) social group's trend to assimilate. In this sense, LGBT activism in Budapest is not only complying in accordance with hegemonic standards, but also with internalized hegemonic influences. Therefore, LGBT activism does not only concern itself with the will of the hetero-

dominate public, but struggles with the LGBT community for effectively spreading awareness of their limited civil rights.

Furthermore, LGBT organizations in Budapest have a small number of official members, from the two-person publication group of a national magazine (*Mások*) to the events made "for a closed circle of those 'in the know'" (Renkin, 2007, p. 39). Thus, activist compliance becomes a necessity in terms of organizational growth, because internalized hegemonic ideals are not based on the individual; they are merged into the community. Therefore, with the efforts for public visibility, there is a connection with hetero-norm influence through behavioral compliance regarding public/media imagery, which is not limited to the (hetero) dominant culture. In this sense, the hetero/homo divide is not limited to a specified national citizenship; the individual becomes a multiplied merger of meta-narratives through the discourse of Pride. In a sense, the LGBT individual encompasses the discursive complexities of Pride through his/her association with activism and public spaces. In relation to the occupation of public space for Pride, these inter LGBT debates highlight both organizational and participatory inclusive struggles.

Gruszczynska (2009) describes public space as being the source for heterosexuality and leaving all other sexualities discredited and displacing them at its boarders. Heterosexism is privileged in public space through repetition and regulation, such as public displays of affection, window advertising, products articulating heterosexual desires, etc. Furthermore, these images or actions regulate what is proper within public space and acts; concurrently, reinforcing the difficulties for other expressions of sexuality (p. 315-316). Therefore, in relation to the local LGBT organizations, these Pride parades invade and disrupt the 'naturalness' of heterosexual space through public performances of variant genders and sexual identities. So, events such as the Poznan March of Equality 2005 are usually (politically) encouraged to retain their views on homosexuality as private or remote, in order

44

not to "offend public morale" (p. 320). However, the goal of these organizations is to gain awareness of sexual diversity and not remain in their ghettoized locale. Therefore, in Poland one of the techniques the organizations used against the general homophobia was to ask other local non-profit organizations to join in their march, in order to widen their theme into a more democratic context.

This collaboration of NGOs portrays the gay and lesbian movement's trend to compromise to hetero-normative standards in their lifestyle and activism. This can be more obvious in Eastern Europe's approach to the Gay Pride Parade, in terms of the "just like everyone else" (Shepard, 2001) method of assimilating into public spaces. Though the mobility of the local LGBT organizations is increasing, the level of democratic order leaves other variant identities behind, in relation to the single focused liberation of gay assimilationists. Thus, the possibility for further cultural domination against the multiplicity of gender, which queer communities offer, remains a constant. Specifically, with the case of Budapest Pride continued marginalization is found on the specification of ideal (average Hungarian) participants, or visibility. In this sense, through the aim of broad public visibility, there is a limitation on the conceptual body which representatively makes this aim achievable.

Constantly linked with the discussion of a successful Pride parade organization, is the (hetero/public) awareness that the LGBT community belongs to the hegemonic national identity. However, this is interpreted differently on the premise of diversity regarding the normalcy of LGBT presence. Therefore, on the gay assimilationist perspective, there is a need to present diversity of the LGBT community as relatable to the 'average/everyday person' without a radical threat to the hegemony. Thus, the aim turns into the merger of similarities between the hetero-hegemony and LGBT community, in order to achieve public tolerance. Its effectiveness is a separate issue. With the (supporting/opposing) specified

boundaries on the LGBT community's public image, I argue that this marginalization is not focused on the premise of an organizational formation of hierarchical participation, but emerged from the inter LGBT discourses on Pride through national meta-narrative influence.

Most visibly obvious is the sudden decrease of transgender/drag queen/king participation with the Budapest Pride march, apparent in the media coverage (internet/public). For example, the YouTube video promotion of Budapest Pride 2009 includes unity between gays and lesbians, but shows little connection to the trans-community (Appendix VI). According to Stone (2009), there are misunderstandings present, in the U.S.A., at the activist level between transgender and gay/lesbian activism, in terms of merely 'adding a T' to the organizational name without preoccupying themselves with transgender/gender-variant issues (p. 336). Furthermore, the drag community, which is commonly associated with gender-variance, is regulated within the gay community, in relation to the limits of femininity and femaleness, which often times forces trans-people to 'pass' for increased public tolerance. In this sense, there is a slightly apparent regulation within the gay/lesbian activist community towards the visibility gender-variance receives in public spaces. Stone emphasizes the difficulties presented when balancing transgender inclusion. On the one hand gay and lesbian activist need to find some common ground between transgender and gay/lesbian issues; and likewise, leaving space for diversity between each other's struggles (p. 338). This alludes to the argument of LGBT activism assimilating to the hetero-dominant culture, in terms of Pride reinforcing normalization.

Specifically, I would like to expand on the notion of transgender "invading" LGBT movement (p. 344) in terms of normalization. Stone speaks about the internal marginalization of trans-people which resembles the security measures of Pride participants by drawing clear distinctions, but this puts into perspective the border organizational struggles. By this, I mean, intercommunity discussions on Pride turn into a search for the ideal solution to avoid

street violence through projected imagery. Therefore, the desire to regain a respectful public recognition is focused on the participants who appear in the media; thus, the image of Pride itself should become (hetero) normative.

> "Since it became violent and dangerous, now what you see in Budapest is that they have these fences all along the city… Media has a huge responsibility, because they only show drag queens or people who are dressed up in an extreme way… [So,] these kinds of [homophobic] prejudices still exist about gay people and it's very hard to fight these prejudices, if they don't see that the guy next door is a gay guy and is just a regular, average guy."" (Interview with D)

With this logic, the fences provide security against attackers throwing objects, but the general (hetero/nonviolent) public does not have the opportunity to visually redirect their misconception of the LGBT culture. Therefore, through televised imagery of the event, the public's general assumptions are reinforced with drag or extreme fashion as an offense against normalized standards. Agreeably so, these physical borders of the march display the national distancing of the event as a recognized group, but does portray a type of national/organizational concern. Furthermore, the space the march takes place is regarded broadly as physically important for both participant and opposing group. In this manner, the marchers physically belong to the area; thus, the opposing response for remote and obscure locations. Similar to the conflicts of the Poznan March, Budapest Pride organizers remain focused on the physical gain of visibility through recognized public spaces. However, these spaces hold specific boundaries both externally and internally to the LGBT community, such as the case of transgender inclusion.

In this sense, I argue further that there is a connection between the developments of securing (Hungarian) national identity and LGBT assimilation. In addition, LGBT organized resistance do not rely only on political agendas, but also on individual participatory willingness. Therefore, there is an increased necessity to spread awareness internally, regarding the fears connected to 'coming-out'. Partially, this emerges from the search for an ideal publicized image to eliminate the general (homo) public's hesitation to 'come-out', which then would solve the hegemonic hostility towards the LGBT (queer) community. Dubious as it might sound, variations of this type of solution has sprung up continuously, which correlates to cultural assimilation through the basis of the gay movement with a singular focus. Although, I agree with broadening the scope of the LGBT community resistance through the presence of an abundant openly, publicly 'out' citizens. However, why would the LGBT cultural image have to resemble the hegemonic standards?

In conclusion, the intersection between visibility, assimilation and space are presented through the discussions surrounding Pride, regarding the broadened interpretations of identities it represents. This habitually adds to the struggles of the Pride organizations through the internalized influences of public morale and national belonging. In an activist perspective there is a focus to devaluate the hegemonic 'coming-out' terrors through the formation of specialized social networks and policy awareness. Therefore, lending the political strength for individual resistance is approached as raising the capabilities for a diverse activist agenda. Nevertheless, the LGBT community as a whole has difficulty in finding commonality regarding (hetero) resistance, due to the dominating forces of normalizing national space.

"It's more like being a part of a cult [gay social groups]. You have this feeling that you're somehow closed from the outside world and even [physically] if you go to a

gay club in Hungary they are underground, like literally in cellars or basements. So, this gives you the impression that you're doing something semi-illegal. It's not open, not really visible to the public… I'm just saying in this physical appearance, it gives you the impression that it's somehow not OK." (Interview with D)

In this case, the social (hetero/homo) divide is actualized through the physical appearance of gay clubs/bars. Additionally, this statement shows a wider spectrum of the intercommunity debate on public visibility beyond Budapest Pride. Therefore, leaving the general (non-activist) LGBT public merged with heterosexual social norms, forms into an internal divide between supporting and opposing social groups on the topic of public visibility. This internalized divide is based on the terms of the need for Pride; however, the importance lies on the public image transmitted and interpreted. Thus, the search for the ideal (prescribed) image begins, but hinders the availabilities for a fluid, diverse (queer) conception of sexuality.

Conclusion

As a continuation from the pervious chapter, I will summarize the overall argument concerning Budapest Pride. Although, this (supporting/opposing) conception of Pride works for any type of organized social activism against hegemonic norms, Budapest Pride 2009 has struck me as distinctive; especially, through personal experience. Introducing the "grotesque" and "gothic" divide in constructing social bodies, I intended to broaden the possibilities of LGBT (queer) analysis' focus on (hetero/homo) normative divisions.

Therefore, giving Budapest Pride discourse a broad grotesque/gothic divide, formulated the basis of the intercommunity conflicts present. However, these conflicts do not remain in a simplistic binary of supporting (internal) and opposing (external) social groups. These conflicts are merged within the LGBT community and create internalized struggles for Pride organizing. Thus, concentrating with inter LGBT community debates about the interpretations/meanings of Pride, I continue to argue that the hetero/homo dichotomy give a generalized concept of the politics surrounding Pride. In this sense, going beyond the hetero/homo distinctions of Pride, the intercommunity debates highlight developing complexities of LGBT activism struggles, such as minimal group member commonality.

Therefore, I present both the complexities of the Pride organizational incentive and their oriented social community's interpretations. Visibility and assimilation becomes the major topics of debate, but I would like to contrast the presented Budapest LGBT activist approaches for public tolerance with broader aspects of diversity within (queer) sexualities/identities.

"Being not organized is part of the problem… If I were a human rights activist… it would be crucial to have at least one person [to point out as] the public gay guy." (Interview with D)

In relation to this statement, the aim for an ideal (public) imagery as representative of the LGBT community has been captured during the interview analysis. However, not necessarily part of a majority agreement of this approach, such aims have been historically present in the research of LGBT social movements. Therefore, I would like to disrupt these notions of cultural assimilation through queer theory's complexity on sexual identity and connected social binaries. This is not intended to criticize the current organizational dilemmas or intercommunity debates of Budapest Pride. Simply, with the connection of seeking public recognition and tolerance, the search for an integrated visibility leaves various possibilities for a more radical response towards (hetero) normative standards.

Although the formation of the social complexity within the LGBT community debates of visibility does not directly challenge the (hetero/homo) normative dichotomy of social construction, 'queer' lends itself to disrupt (hetero) categorization and question beyond its own social critiques. In this sense, the social critiques presented by Pride's intercommunity debates are also being challenged through the vagueness of the supporting/opposing divide.

Therefore, with the exploration of Budapest Pride discourses, I am intending to create new modes of thinking in regards to the social struggles this event develops. Therefore, instead of seeking an externalized source for Pride's struggles, the internal debates portray the fluidity of the focused LGBT community. Through revealing the complexities of these discourses, the intension was to portray the extension of political conflicts of the Pride organization onto an intercommunity debate as a "different mode of enquiry" (Browne, 2006, p. 888). Thus, questioning the paths of these internalized interpretations of Pride gives a

'queer' understanding of the implications of public imagery and assimilation. Essentially, through the bodily conception of Pride there is a continuation of the (re)making of social conflicts externally and internally. But with the assimilating emersion of cultural ideologies, I am purposely trying to avoid specific definitions of cause and move "beyond and through processes of normalization" (p. 888).

Nevertheless, this type of elusive queer connection to social interactions did emerge as problematic on the level of interview analysis. Though the normative of hetero/homosexualities remained a constant topic surrounding the struggles of Pride organization and implications thereof, the focus was not towards resistance against public heteronormativity, but merging this school of thought onto the spaces of LGBT centrality. Taking for granted that heterosexuality gains societal privileges through its "exclusive ability to interpret itself as society" (Warner, 1993, p. xxi) becomes apparent with the free association of the "general public" as discursively heterosexual. Therefore, with the innovative approaches for widened visibility, the merger of hetero/homosexualities remains challenged by accepted public morale. Thus, the social binary does not only divide heterosexual and homosexual identities, but also the LGBT community through body imagery interpretations, regarding public tolerance.

Just as normative dichotomies separate identities and sexualities, the categories of supporting and opposing social groups was formed based on Budapest Pride, in order to structuralize conflicting statements but also broaden the hetero/homo binary of social identities. This intentionally disassociates a direct connection between LGBT, queer, social groups, and the interrelated conflicts among them. In this manner, I aimed to 'queer' the topic by distancing it from direct social (hetero/homo) categories. Fundamentally, avoiding a specific social analytical description of "queer people" (p. xxiv), or 'queer' case, constitutes a broadening of the capable range of meanings and interpretations. Therefore, either

interviewee, or their statements, can float to and from conflicting (supporting/opposing) arguments on visibility or assimilation.

Nevertheless, in framing current LGBT activism the normative dichotomy of supporting/opposing social groups was formulated, which causes a risk of "homogenizing and "de-queering" them through the act of naming" (Browne, 2006, p. 888), according to critiques of queer theory. However, I argue that these (supporting/opposing) categories function to destabilize the hetero/homo binary, by revealing some of the internal complexities of Pride organizing. First, there are the supporting social groups, which ally themselves with the success of the Pride march; however, this too has multiple implications. What considers it a success? Is it the media coverage? Is the right type for gaining visibility? Or does it rely on the Pride actually occurring? Therefore, as a result of the social struggles of Pride, the common mentality for social mobility gets blurred through the specification of "identity negotiations" (Taylor & Whittier, 1992).

This is specifically where the merger between supporting/opposing social groups occurs, due to the subtle differences of correct approaches for visibility. Generally, there were varying theories on 'coming-out', in terms of who should be, the quantity and how that will be representative of the LGBT community as a collective. In a practicality, either everybody should be 'out', or a relatable (Hungarian) celebrity/personality should be 'out', or nobody should care about the 'private' sexual lifestyle of others. Therefore, the supporting/opposing social group categorization becomes problematic, because these varying interpretations not derivative of a specific group and technically did not relate directly to the Budapest Pride march. Although these implications do surround the discussions of Pride, the supporting/opposing binary is implied directly to the importance, or actualization, of the march itself.

Therefore, the opposing social group simply does not think the event is necessary, or have no relation to it, or radically does not think it should exist (in Hungary). Honestly, it was difficult to find such radical opposition within my interview sample, but if such statements were not explicitly mentioned, they were certainly alluded to. Thus, this topic was continually connected to the thoughts of "others", which surprisingly remains in the complex nature of inter LGBT discourse and not directed against heterosexual hegemony. Therefore, in refraining from the hetero/homo dichotomous normative of the Pride debate, I directed these statements towards the trends of cultural assimilation. Furthermore, I am arguing that this type of assimilation connects itself with the homo-hegemonic terrors on the notions of public 'coming-out'.

Through the historical context of Budapest Pride, there is a broadened acceptance of the increased visibility of the event regarding public discourse. However, 'coming-out' awareness remains limited and slightly disassociated with the originating discussion of Pride. Insofar as the participation factor compiles diverse implications, the act of 'coming-out' becomes independently separate. In this manner, with diversified participants allocated to the cause of general human rights, Pride becomes a generalized critique of social (hetero/homo) construction through conjoined understanding and festivities. However, 'coming-out' as a representative of the LGBT community becomes secondary and risks possible "class dislocation" (Cohen, 1997). Thus, the assimilating trend to remain the 'gay' topic 'private' emerges for the political aim of specified equality and avoidance of physical violence.

Therefore, my aim of "queering" the LGBT organizational struggle becomes both difficult to achieve and to distance from, because of the lack of continual specified boundaries regarding resistance. In this sense, the connections between the Pride discourse, the intercommunity debate and the normative (hetero/homo) dichotomy allows for multiple descriptions of the societal/sexual "other" (Browne, 2006, p. 886) within this normative.

Although the overarching theme is framed from the bodily conception of Pride and the organizational aim for political/public recognition, the potential for differentiating links remain open to interpretation. Thus, the founding critical construction of Pride's bodily concept becomes 'queered' through the emerging complexities of the normative (hetero/homo) argumentation. Therefore, intercommunity debates are academically "in opposition to 'normalcy'" (p. 889), in terms of the Eastern European political focus of Pride discourse.

In conclusion, I recognize the lack of specificities on LGBT description regarding future implications and motives. However, as my informants described it, the future is "unknown" and I intend to keep it that way. In this sense, the potential of this research remains available for constant "queering" of Pride, entailing "radical (re)thinking, (re)drawing, (re)conceptualizing, (re)mappings that could (re)make bodies, space and geographies" (p. 888). In my point of view, Pride can develop multiple perspectives internally and externally; therefore, as a continuation, I insist on such radical (queer) behavior and instinct on the topic. Budapest Pride is just an event that lasts a day, but the discussions seem (interchangeably) to go on forever.

Appendix

I. Rainbow Mission Foundation. (2009). *14.Budapest Pride/2009.* Retrieved from

http://2009.budapestpride.hu/en

II. Rainbow Mission Foundation. (2010). *15.Budapest Pride/2010.* Retrieved from

http://www.budapestpride.hu/en/join-us

III. BudapestPride. (2009, July 29) *Gaypride March 05. 07. 2008* [Video file]. Retrieved

from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4X_Ic3Po-Fw&feature=player_profilepage

IV. Szimpozion Egyesület - LMBT Fiatalok Kulturális, Oktatási és Szabadidős

Közhasznú Egyesülete. (2006-2010). *About Us.* Retrieved from

http://melegvagyok.hu/rolunk

V. Rainbow Mission Foundation. (2009). *Hungarian artists against homophobia: "Fuck

you (very very much).* Retrieved from http://2009.budapestpride.hu/magyar-

muveszek-a-homofobia-ellen-fuck-you-very-much

VI. BudapestPride. (2009, July 20) *Rise up for diversity and human rights!* Retrieved

from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m5Okj7vvkDk&feature=player_embedded

Reference List

Abelove, H. (2003). *Deep Gossip.* Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Rabelais and his world* (H. Iswolsky, Trans.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press. (Original work published 1965)

Berlant, L. & Freeman, E. (1992). Queer nationality. *Boundary 2,* 19(1), 149-180.

Browne, K. (2006). Challenging queer geographies. *Antipode,* 885-893.

Cohen, P. (1997). 'All they needed': AIDS, consumption, and the politics of class. *Journal of the History of Sexuality 8(1),* 86-115.

Diamond, L. M. (2006). Careful what you ask for: reconsidering feminist epistemology and autobiographical narrative in research on sexual identity development. *Signs,* 31(2), 471-491.

Graff, A. (2006). We are (not all) homophobes: a report from Poland. *Feminist Studies,* 32(2), 434-449.

Gruszczynska, A. (2009). Sowing the seeds of solidarity in public space: case study of the Poznan march of equality. *Sexualities,* 12, 312-333..

Hurley, K. (1997). *The gothic body: sexuality, materialism, and degeneration at the fin de siecle.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Morris, A. D. (1990). Consciousness and the collective action: towards a sociology of consciousness and domination. In *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 9- 13 1990,* San Francisco, CA.

Renkin, H. Z. (2007). *Ambiguous identities, ambiguous transitions [electronic resource]: lesbians, gays, and the sexual politics of citizenship in postsocialist Hungary.* (doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, USA.

Renkin, H. Z. (2009). Homophobia and queer belonging in Hungary. *Focaal – European Journal of Anthropology*, 53, 20-37.

Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society,* 5(4), 177-205.

Russo, M. (1995). *The female grotesque: risk, excess, and modernity.* New York: Routledge.

Schwarz, K. Z. S. (2005). Gay rights: united in hostility. *Transitions Online,* 1-5. Retrieved from: http://www.ceeol.com

Shepard, B. H. (2001). The queer/gay assimilationist split: the suits vs. the sluts. *Monthly Review,* May, 49-62.

Stone, A. L. (2009). More than adding a t: American lesbian and gay activists' attitudes towards transgender inclusion. *Sexualities,* 12(3), 334-354.

Taylor, C (1992). *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, V. & Whittier, N. E. (1992). Collective identity in social movement communities: lesbian feminist mobilization. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory* (pp. 104-129). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Waitt, G. (2005). Sexual citizenship in Latvia: geographies of the Latvian closet. *Social & Cultural Geography,* 6(2), 161-181.

Wallace-Lorencova, V. (2003). Queering civil society in postsocialist Slovakia. *Anthropology of East Europe Review,* 21(2).

Warner, M. (Ed.). (1993). *Fear of a queer planet: queer politics and social theory.* Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.