ARTICULATIONS AND NEGOTIATIONS OF ROMA MASCULINITIES: AN

INTERSECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF ETHNICITY, SEXUALITY, GENDER AND

CLASS AT THE ROMA ACCESS PROGRAMS

By

Arman Heljić

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of Gender Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Critical

Gender Studies

Supervisor: Erzsébet Barát

Second reader: Elissa Helms

Budapest, Hungary

2016

ABSTRACT

The processes of articulations and negotiations of ethnicity on the intersections with sexuality, gender and class have been largely overseen in the field of academic knowledge production, especially in the cases of sexual minorities within the Romani communities in Central and Eastern Europe. My research project focuses on those intersections within the community of Roma students at the Roma Access Programs, at the Central European University, Budapest, Hungary. My specific interest has been to investigate how Gay, Bisexual and sexually non-identifying Roma men articulate and negotiate their ethnicity, sexuality, masculinity and class in interactions within a system where heterosexuality is not only the hegemonic sexuality, but also the organizing principle of hegemonic formations of Roma ethnicity, among the group of students at the Roma Access Programs. In my thesis I question the processes of formation and articulation of those multiple identities by using interdisciplinary approach grounded in intersectionality as a methodology, semi-structured interviews and queer methods such as self-ethnography in order to investigate the material consequences of queer narratives of lived experiences through the stories of students of Roma Access Programs. I propose that the very concept of 'hegemony' should be conceptualized as one that is structured by multiplicity, which is the major contribution of my project to the scholarship on masculinity studies. The research shows how hegemony is established and maintained among the students based on multiple levels of exclusions and inclusions in the processes of articulation and negotiation ethnicity, sexuality, masculinity and class. The major contribution that I make in the field of Romani studies is that I offer a new approach to understandings of identity formations within a complex field of power relations among a group of heterosexual, gay, bisexual and men who engage in same-sex practices, within the Roma

1

Access Programs. I believe that literature very little, if any literature is available on this topic in the English language.

Key words: Roma masculinities, masculinity studies, identity politics, identity, gay and bisexual Roma men, same-sex desire and practices, queer studies, gender, ethnicity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I was dreaming about this day when I would write the acknowledgements since I was a little boy. As I grew up, I was questioning what makes this little boy a boy. Wishes became reality and I would like to thank all of those who were with me, who were patient, loving and caring. Without you I would not have been able to make all of my big dreams come true. I would like to start from my sister Alma, by thanking her for her patience and love that she gave me. Thank you for being my sister, my brother, my mother and my father. I would like to thank my cousins Azra and Edita for all of the support that they gave me when I mostly needed it. I would like to thank Belma for being patient and for all of your support, love, laughs and smiles that you gave as presents to me. A special thanks to the Okvir collective, you made Sarajevo my home, and you were my light in the darkest days. I am also thankful for learning my first queer steps with you. You have been a tremendous support and source of inspiration. Your bravery makes all the difference. I would like to thank Yana for teaching me how to harvest light out of darkness, Andreas for those brief moments of silences that were the most comforting in moments when I needed them. A big thank you to Andrey. Thank you for being there when I mostly needed it, thank you for your hugs and love, for the long walks and lazy sunny days spent at the hill. I will always nourish those memories with love and care. I would like to thank all of those whom I met from Russian collectives, you are an inspiration and a source of strength. I would also like to thank my teachers, who called me stupid, slow and illiterate, because I learned 22 years after I started my education that I learned a lot from you as well. I learned that I can achieve and make my dreams come true, no matter how hard the circumstances of studying and learning are in life. I would like to thank those who were putting

3

seeds of hatred into my soil, I learned how to be my sun and shine; how to be my rain and how to grow those seeds into beautiful flowers of love. I would like to thank my professors who supported me during my stay at CEU. It has been a wonderful studying experience.

A special thanks to Professor Francisca de Haan, for teaching me how to edit and write my papers. Thank you for listening and for being patient with me. Thank you for caring. You made my learning process at school and in life a beautiful journey. I would also like to thank Professor Hyaesin Yoon. I learned that there are always more questions to ask, and that that process is beautiful. A special thanks to Professor Erzsebet Barat. You taught me that every word is important and counts and therefore needs to be questioned.

Last but not least, thank you Sarah, Smita and Tankut. I love you. I have to run now, otherwise I will be late. ☺

4

Table of content

Chapter 1:

 Introduction

The field of masculinity studies offers very limited literature on the topic of Roma masculinities in general, and specifically in the field of intersectional analyses of ethnicity, sexuality, gender and class. The little research that is available in the English language often reaffirms the stereotypical and harmful representations of Roma men. For example, the ethnographic research conducted by Levinson and Sparkes (2003) focuses on "Gypsy" masculinities at the comparative home/school interface, where it argues that Roma children and their fathers reproduce and display behaviors such as deceptiveness in business deals (usually with the white majority that the subjects live in), violence inside the Romani community and towards members of the white communities both at school and work. At the same time the research tends to oversexualize Roma men in general, and children as young as nine in particular. I refer to this research, as a starting point of my academic inquiry, in order to challenge the politically harmful perception of "Roma men" as described above. I believe that the depiction is harmful insofar as it might legitimize the social, political and economic discrimination of Roma men and Romani communities in general.

 In the analysis of literature, I have identified a particular gap in the domain of research on gay, bisexual and sexually non-identifying Roma men making them disappear within the heterosexual majority of the Roma male communities. Based on my observation and interaction with students in RGPP, I have seen that the power dynamics shape and produce different types of masculinities, as Connell (1995) described, however, the field of masculinity studies and researches conducted in the area of Roma masculinities do not analyze the spaces where and how these masculinities and their conceptualizations emerge.

The aims of this research are multifold. On the one hand, I want to contribute to the literature on hegemonization of notions of ethnicity, sexuality, gender and class in the processes of identity formations. On the other hand, I want to create a space for understanding power relations within the Romani community at CEU, the actual context where my participants live, articulate and negotiate their identities. In addition, my aim is to open spaces for critical reflections on the exclusions that happen while those identities are articulated and performed, in relation to the majority communities that surround my respondents, and the Roma communities that my respondents have a feeling of belonging to. Furthermore, the aim of my case study is to investigate the articulatory practices between different types of masculinities within the particular Romani community in the Roma Graduate Preparation Program (RGPP) at the Central European University (CEU) in Budapest, Hungray. I am specifically interested in the dynamics of power relations between the heteronormative, the hetero-conforming[1] Roma men in the program and the Gay, Bisexual and sexually non-identified minority within that student community. The interaction of these three groups creates a unique space of both political inclusions and exclusions in the processes of articulation of social and cultural identities. This analysis is contextualized within a broader network of social and political exclusions that all Roma men experience in the majority populations in the countries of their origin, including Hungary as the "host" country of RGPP.

My research question, therefore, is concerned with studying the ways Roma men in RGPP articulate, perform and negotiate their Roma identity, at the intersections of sexualities, masculinities and classes in a complex process of interactions between heterosexual, hetero-conforming, gay, bisexual and sexually non-identified students. My working assumptions are

---

[1] My experience as a student in RGPP class of 2012-13 shows that some Roma men tend to have sexual intercourse, intimate relationships of friendship and sexual bonds with, either Roma men or non-Roma men. In these cases, based on engaged observation and conversations with fellow students from the program, I have learned that their wish is to remain in an in between space of performing heteronormativity and practicing sex with (Roma) men. Here, I wish to explore how and if the space differs from the 'gay closet'.

based on my observations and previous research that I conducted as an RGPP student, in 2013/14. I have noticed that certain "enactments" of ethnicity, class and sexuality are policed, sanctioned or disidentified with, such as homosexuality, bisexuality, non-hegemonic notions of ethnicity etc. by the heterosexual majority. This experience led to a series of question. In short, what are the political prices of exclusion and distancing from non-heteronormative Roma masculinities? How gay, bisexual and sexually non-identified men are affected by the process of exclusion, and to which extent are these men excluded within the student community as well as the majority population where this program is situated? How the process of exclusion is manifested in the embodied and lived experience of both heterosexual and non-heterosexual Roma men? As I progressed in the interview, my one interviewee challenged my assumptions that all Roma men operate within

As the interviewing process progressed, one of my interviewees challenged my assumptions based on my previous research experience that those Roma men who engage in same-sex practices all use a common terminology to express their sexuality. However, my field work shows that these notions were wrong, and that not only there are differences in how same-sex desires are articulated, but also the understanding of multiple levels of discrimination based on the respondent's ethnicity, which was part of my theoretical framework on articulations of masculinities has been challenged. Therefore, a new question immerges: how different articulations and negotiations of sexuality produce different levels of exclusions and inclusions in the student community. Lastly, what are the political implications of uses of certain frameworks in field work with Roma men in RGPP?

In order to answer these questions I structured the thesis as following. Firstly, I provide a short literature review. The reason why I do not engage in a longer debate on literature is that the bodies of literature on Roma masculinities or sexualities are very little. After the literature

9

review, I provide an overview of my methodological choices that I have made in order to approach my research and my self-positioning. Following this chapters are two analysis chapters. In the first chapter I analyze the intersections of ethnicity and sexuality, while in the second analytical chapter I provide an analysis of the intersections of ethnicity, gender and class. Lastly, I give concluding remarks on why analyzing it is important to take into account sexuality, gender and class in an analysis of Roma ethnicity.

1.1 Research methods, limitations and ethical concerns

My research started in in the academic year 2013/14. At the time I was a student of the Roma Graduate Preparation Program (RGPP). The subject of my research for the final conference was an intersectional analysis of Roma masculinities. I have had a personal investment in this topic, since I was an LGBTIQA activist for many years in my home country, Bosnia and Herzegovina. During my activist years, I was questioning my own sexual identity, class background and ethnicity, but it was very difficult to establish bonds and connections to LGBTQIA Roma individuals in my home country. The reason of the absence of establishing a network was mostly because LGBTIQA Roma individuals in my country are invisible, and there are few, if any Roma individuals dealing with sexual minority issues. Therefore, I have decided to continue my work, both as an activist and academic. I have continued my search for a group of people who have gone through similar experiences in order to establish bonds through conversations and experience sharing about issues surrounding sexuality, ethnicity, class and especially masculinity. As soon as I started my program, in the introduction week, I came out as gay and Roma LGBTQIA activist. This decision was political, because I believed that my coming out might help me to establish friendships with queer friendly or queer people in the group. After my coming out, I made friends with three queer students in my generation. This marked the beginning of a three year long process of obtaining knowledge about what it

means to be Roma, what it means to be an individual who identifies as a member of a sexual minority, how class and the university environment change our perceptions of class, ethnicity, sexuality and gender. Many of my classmates became friends, we met regularly, discussed our experiences, and those discussions brought me to a deeper understanding about the struggle for recognition of Roma peoples in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE).[2] Also, through the interactions with other Roma LGB Roma individuals I learned about the struggle for recognition of sexual minorities within the Roma movements. Many of the participants in my research became friends, who had a common political struggle and a common agenda, to open up and create spaces for discussions of issues related to the LGBTIQA community at CEU. The university became a space to establish a network of support, solidarity and compassion during the processes of coming out, and many students came out to each other that year, but also supporting each other's decisions to stay closeted for wider audiences, but still find ways how to discuss our problems as Roma LGBTIQA individuals.

The interview criteria for all of my interviews were that the participants in the research are self-identified Roma men, who are or were students at the Roma Access Programs (RAP). Interview invitations have been sent out in coordination with RAP's program coordinators, who sent out an invitation email to RAP students and alumni.

---

[2] The lack of knowledge that I have is a consequence of my own positionality in the community I come from. I have grown up as an "integrated" subject. In Romani communities this term is used in order to signify subjects who live and grow up integrated within the majority societies where the subject is located. My parents belonged to a Yugoslav generation of middle class working people. Also, my ethnic and racial background is mixed. Therefore, I have grown up far away from the suburbs where my Romani family lived. Consequently, due to family choices and circumstances, I have not spent much time with my Romani family. At the times when we did spend time together I often felt unaccepted and rejected. As I was growing up, as a mixed marriage child, these divisions became larger, but I did understand that nobody in the school which I attended accepted me as a Bosniak or Montenegrin or Bosnian and Herzegovinian. In that time I understood that the positionality of a mixed marriage child causes violent responses from children and adults from all ethnic backgrounds. Especially, if one resists identifying as belonging to one ethnicity. This will be further addressed in the self-positioning subchapter in the introduction.

In 2013, I conducted five in depth interviews, with Roma men, out of which two were self-identified gay and bisexual men. The second interviewee dropped out of the research because he was scared that his colleagues might identify him. Despite my efforts to explain that the interview is anonymous, and that I do not use markers such as names, country of origin and age, he did not want to participate. Although he signed the contract, gave his consent, and I recorded the interview, I decided that I would not use his interview for my analysis, because I did not want to traumatize any of the participants. Dropping out of my research became a central concern, but also it signified that my research is extremely important, because only gay and bisexual men dropped out of the interviews. This also influenced my research design. I decided to use multiple research methods in my research, which will be discussed in the following section.

The case study includes six participants. The overall number of interviews was 15, five interviews were conducted during the year when I myself was a student of RGPP. I conducted semi-structured interviews. The questions were organized into six topics focused around ethnicity, sexuality, gender and class. The questions reflected the readings that I have covered that year during my engagement with tutorial classes in Gender studies and Sociology and Social Anthropology. Four of interviewees were interviewed in the following 2014/15 academic year, and six individuals were interviewed in 2015/16. As I was progressing in my understanding of gender, sexuality, class and ethnicity I added new interview questions in 2015/16, and I organized follow up interviews in order to ask the same questions to all participants of the research. The questions were designed according to my observations of group dynamics and interactions between self-identified gay or bisexual men and the heterosexual male students. The changes in the questions for the interviews are reflected by what DeVault calls "pre-topic" talks. In *Liberating Method: Feminism and Social Research,* DeVault (1990:100) claims that "pre-topical" conversations often help the researcher to create

a "sharedness" with the respondents. Furthermore, she emphasizes the importance of everyday talk in the process of shaping the research. The conversation with the respondents shapes the research in a collaborative manner. In addition, DeVault claims that researchers have to open up standard topics and incorporate everyday lived and shared experiences with the respondents in order to create a space for the respondent to participate in structuring the research, instead of the researcher only imposing his or her own interview structure on the respondents. For this reason, she also identifies open ended interviews, i.e. less structured interviews as an approach that leads to a process of mutual sharing and a collaborative relationship in the process of searching for answers (1990: 100). This specific research approach also raised awareness of the experiences that differentiated the respondents and the positionality of me as a researcher along the lines of different identity markers that distinguish us.

As I was interviewing, two concerns came up. The first is the language and the other one is active listening. None of my respondents is a native English language speaker including me as a researcher. It was very difficult at times for respondents to frame the experiences in a language that was foreign both for the experience and context in which the experience was conceived. Sometimes I was asked to fill in the gaps where the respondents could not find a word, and the technique of active listening helped me a lot during the interviews. I would listen to the respondents, write important notes about what they are saying, even though I was recording the interviews, and I was constantly checking if I can relate to my respondents experiences. DeVault (1990: 104) believes that sometimes standard vocabulary falls short or is inadequate to explain a situation or an experience. She claims, however, that the researcher's own experience can be a resource for listening, and that certain situations during interviews require the researcher's personal involvement in order to reach the answers to particular questions. Her suggestion is to reflect on those situations in the research analysis, which I intend to do in my own research. My research process, however, indicated that the relations

13

between the researcher and the respondents is complex. Although, I might have had shared experiences with my respondents, the interview questions have also raised my awareness of the differences between me and the respondents, as well as the differences between the respondents. These differences were shaped as a consequence of dissimilar countries of origin, gender, class and sexuality.

As previously mentioned, my position of researcher was different during the three years of research. First, I started as a student, with my position in the program being equal to the participants. During that period all of RGPP students were conducting research, and many of us were conducting interviews. The majority of students shared the feeling of general excitement about the interviews, but also nervousness about the research writing process. I was interviewed myself two times during that semester. During the second and third year of my research, the power positions changed significantly. I was in the position of being a master's student while a majority of the respondents were in the preparation programs, except four students who were in master's programs at CEU at the time of the interviewing. Two students were alumni of the program who were no longer at CEU at the time of interviewing. Since my power position changed, I decided to consciously raise my own awareness of these changes. I tried to find a way how to acknowledge and decenter my power position during the interviews. In *Queer(ing) Communication in Research Relationships,* Gorman-Murrey et al. (2010: 103) claim that: the key [...] is how interviewing is a two way process that does not recreate exclusion and power concentrations that mask the ways that boundaries of sexuality are blurred or reconfigured." In order to overcome boundaries not only of sexuality, but also gender, sex and class I indicated to the respondents that at any time they have the possibility to ask the questions back. My intention was to create a space of mutual sharing of experiences, vulnerability, as well as affective responses provoked by many of the intimate questions I had

14

during my interviews. It was at times difficult, but at the same time it was a learning experience for me as a researcher to self-reflect at any point during the interview.

An important component of my research is class. As my research is grounded in queer theory, it was very difficult to address issues of class through a queer theoretical framework. In *The 'Outness' of Queer: Class and Sexual Intersections,"* Taylor explores the connections between research design in queer anthropology and ethnography and class. Taylor (2010: 69) claims that: "While queer theory has sought to undermine universalism and meta-narratives, its frequent failure is in unpacking intersecting material dimensions, with the result that the resources through which sexual selves can be known and articulated are effaced." She also notes that class is one of the "differences" which cannot easily be integrated into queer empirical projects, and that it not often applied in the process of complicating understandings and diversifications of sexuality. Therefore, Taylor (2010: 69) concludes that queer theory often reproduces exclusion in favor of the most privileged. Although at first sight, Taylor might be making a dangerous generalization, I agree with her that some queer anthropologists reinforce exclusion. The exclusion reflects on the process of deciding whom researchers choose to participate in the research, but also the language of the analysis and the way research methodology is designed, as well as how the research questions are framed. I believe that one of the most important class markers in academia is language. Therefore, I have carefully thought about how to make the language that I use in the interviews as accessible and understandable for the respondents. One possible way to overcome the language barrier is to follow DeVault's research methodology. DeVault (1990: 108-9) states that the analysis of data should stay as close as possible to the language used during the interviews. Her own research experience showed interesting connections between how things are said, when pauses are made, and when the respondents use halting words and phrases (ie. Like, kind of, you know, uhm, I don't know etc.). Furthermore, the reasons for making pauses might be that the

15

respondent is not used to sharing experiences the researcher is asking about, or that that the vocabulary might not be adequate to express their experiences. In addition, she states that this "messy speech" is a reflection of the respondent's emotion and that as such they can be used in analysis for expressing relevance for the respondents. Another concern that Taylor (2010:70-1) also raises a very important concern about who gets to talk in research, as in who and why researchers pick interviewees with specific social background. She emphasizes the importance of awareness how class blindness does not only render some subjects as invisible, but also erases stories and data that could significantly contribute to a wider understanding of the research topic. However, what Taylor does not ask is what happens after the research. What happens to the communities that are made visible by the research? My experience as an activist shows that whenever visibility of sexual minorities is raised, either through articles, newspapers, academic articles, art and other forms of awareness raising, that the violence against these minorities increases. Therefore, the decisions were made to protect the identities of the respondents and exclude markers such as names, countries of origin, age of the respondents, departments in which the respondents study (in the cases of interviews with RGPP alumni).

Another important component of my research is self-reflexivity. In order to self-reflect and situate myself in relation to but also with the stories I interpret and analyze, I also plan to use autoethnography as a method for my research. According to Jones and Adams (2010: 207) claim that:

Autoethnography, as method, allows a person to document perpetual journeys of self-understanding, allows her or him to produce queer texts. A queer Autoethnography also encourages us to think through and out of our categories of interaction and to take advantage

of language's failure to capture or contain 'selves', ways of relating and subjugated knowledge.

Since my research reflects a journey of understanding my 'self' in interaction with the respondents, some of whom became close friends, and a community that I relate to, I believe that autoethnography is the best methodological tool to narrate those experiences. I would argue that in order to be self-reflexive, one does not only need to name the power markers, but also expose oneself to being or becoming vulnerable and sharing experiences about how oneself relates to the respondents interaction.

Lastly, my main aim in this research is to conduct an intersectional analysis of ethnicity at the intersections of sexuality, gender and class. Intersectionality is a term that was coined by Kimberle Crenshaw in 1989 in her groundbreaking article "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Anarchist Politics." Cranshaw defined intersectionality as a way of learning how multiple identities mutually construct each other and how they interact in society. By using an intersectional approach the researchers can learn how these identities create social, structural and institutional injustices and oppression. Intersectionality as a method of research for my case study can help understand how processes of hegemonization is achieved through practices of articulation of identities as well as negotiations. It is a methodological approach that can help understand how the power dynamics of social oppressions are structured. By applying intersectionality in my research, I hope to create a better understanding of not only to deconstruct the power relations between individuals and the social structures that are oppressive, but also the ways in which individuals negotiate and resist oppressions both in social interaction with institutions and members of the majority communities and the communities where those individuals come from.

Chapter 2:

Literature Review

The body of literature concerning Roma issues has been growing in the last 10 years. This positive trend of knowledge production takes place in many areas such as: history and gender history, social movements, sexuality, health, housing, education, discrimination in employment etc. One of the reasons for this increase might be the European Decade of Roma Inclusion (2005-2015). Priority areas of the decade have been housing, education, employment and health-related topics. Funding has been provided in order to stimulate social movements, anti-racist movements and NGOs promoting empowerment and community work, as well as academic research concerning these topics.[3] In order to situate my research I reflect on the three most important works that I use in order to formulate my questions and scope of research.

Firstly, in order to contextualize the struggle of Roma within a broader context of anti-Roma politics across the European continent, I find the book "The Gypsy 'Menace' Populism and the New Anti-Gypsy Politics" (year) very useful. The editor Michael Stewart, is an anthropologist, who has been engaged with issues related to Roma communities in Hungary and CEE, since 1998. He claims that in the last seven years, for the first time, Roma communities have become the main targets of xenophobic and radical politics across the European continent. The Roma populations become direct targets of projections of the majority populations' fears and frustrations over the loss of national sovereignty and democracy, failing national welfare politics, as well as social and political conflicts, which become represented as

---

[3] http://www.romadecade.org/about-the-decade-decade-in-brief

19

cultural conflicts in which, assumedly, the Roma populations are to be blamed for all of the failures in the nation states.[4]

The Roma populations become direct targets of projections of the majority populations' fears and frustrations over the loss of national sovereignty and democracy, failing national welfare politics, as well as social and political conflicts, which become represented as cultural conflicts in which, assumedly, the Roma populations are to be blamed for the failures of the nation states.[5] Stewart describes this type of politics as populist. Populism has two functions: one is to create a belief in the political and social value of belonging to a larger group or culture, the other it is to create the fear of being socially or culturally excluded, which politicians then use to their own advantage (11). The framework which Stewart provides for the analysis of anti-Roma sentiment in Europe is very useful for the contextualization of the struggles that Romani communities face. It helps to situate the social political and economic exclusion of Roma communities and LGBT Roma communities within a larger political context. The research also helps understand that there is a need for analysis of the multiple discrimination of LGBT Roma people, since such an analysis has not yet been conducted. I will reflect in the next section on one research that addresses gay issues within the Romani communities in Hungary, in relation to the Budapest "Gay" Pride, however I believe that this research is too short in order to be considered as a substantial analysis.

Based on my knowledge and networks within LGBT Roma communities in CEE, I have noted that in the last three years, there has been a trend of establishing LGBT Roma NGOs. However, issues that are significant to the LGBT Roma communities do not reach the mainstream Romani movement. For example, in the last three years I have searched for academic literature on LGBT Romani issues, however, all that I could find, that was available

---

[4] http://www.hurstpublishers.com/book/the-gypsy-menace/
[5] http://www.hurstpublishers.com/book/the-gypsy-menace/

20

to me within the limitations of the CEU library, was one research which explicitly mentions the word gay in correlation to Romani identities that the short article covers. Kata Horvath, published an article called "PASSING": REBEKA AND THE GAY PRIDE. On the Discursive Boundaries and Possibilities of Skin Colour" which is part of an edited book titled: *Multi-disciplinary Approaches to Romany Studies* edited by Michael Stewart and Marton Rovid (2010). In this article Horwath analyzes the discursive boundaries of skin colour in relation to a girl from a Romani community in Hungary. She examines how this girl passes either as non-Roma in different circumstances, such as the Budapest gay Pride. At the very beginning of her article Horvath starts analyzing situations in her research when she was faced with an example of constructing "Gypsyness" through practices of constructing differences via sexuality and family belonging (123). What she calls a "no doubt everyday" through which her point is made, in relation to the community that she researches: I am referring to what happens when, upon entering the room, the parents, siblings, relatives or visitors address a newborn baby in the following manner: 'Let me such your little black dick!'; 'Let me eat your little black hole.'" (123) I believe that if this situation that Horvat encountered was used to interpret body part appropriation through speech practices, it would have not been problematic. However, her claim is generalized and she states that: "The repetition of the interrogative "whose" involves the constant reformulation and animation of relations via the 'shuffling' of sexuality, kinship and **Gypsyness**" [6] (124). Generalizations like these are dangerous because I believe that sexuality and family relations are used to essentialize and "naturalize" entire Romani communities and those who identify as Romani individuals anywhere could suffer consequences of such a politically charged statement.

CEU eTD Collection

---

[6] Bold added.

The first book in English that has been published on issues of intimacy in Romani communities is Jud Nirenberg's book *Gypsy sexuality: Romani and Outsider Perspectives on Intimacy*. This book is a collection of works in which activists contribute with their case studies to a broader understanding of intimacy and sexuality in Roma communities. It covers a variety of topics in the field of women's rights, empowerment of women who survived forced sterilizations, rape, intimacy and (hetero)sexuality. However, the edition does not have articles on same sex intimacy, dating nor relationships. This fact made me question the nature of the exclusion of Roma LGBT voices, and the power dynamics in the process of multiple exclusions both within the Roma communities in Europe and the White majority populations in which these organizations and activists operate.

Chapter 3:

Sexing Ethnicity: Roma Ethnicity Formation through Establishing Sexual Boundaries

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will argue for an analysis of ethnicity, as a socially constructed and regulated concept, that cannot be grasped in terms of some essentialized cultural characteristic in the analysis of Roma ethnic identity. Formations of ethnic identity and community belonging heavily rest on the institution and assumption of heterosexuality as the most desirable sexuality. Therefore, I believe that an analysis of the intersections of sexuality and ethnicity can further deepen the understanding of ethnicity formation and negotiation.

This chapter is organized into four subchapters. I start my investigation by providing a framework for analysis of ethnic and sexual boundaries. This framework is embedded in Nagel (2003) book *Race, Ethnicity and Sexuality* and her conceptualization of ethnic and sexual borders. Nagel argues that ethnicity is always sexualized and serves as a framework for social, political, economic, cultural and jurisdictional exclusions. Then, I will discuss the situatedness of my interviews within the broader structures of power relations at RGPP, in order to provide interviews that will reflect on Nagel's theory and determine how sexual and ethnic borders are formed. In addition to Nagel's theorization on ethnic and sexual boundaries, I will claim that specific spaces produce different degrees of visibilities of sexualities in the processes of articulation and negotiation of ethnicity. In the second part of this analytical chapter I will build on Nagel's conceptualization of ethnic and sexual borders as performative practices by introducing Butler's (1999) notion of gender performativity as defined in the book *Gender*

Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. In this section, I will also introduce Browne and Nash's (2010) edition of *Queer Methods and Methodologies: Intersecting Queer Theories and Social Science Research;* and James Paul Gee (2011) in *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method,* in order to provide an analysis of queer narratives of my respondent's ethnicity and sexuality identification processes. Lastly, I shall argue that power relations involved in the interaction between ethnicity and sexuality produce exclusions, inclusions, desirability and rejection, social and communal affirmation and negation, as well as differential access to social privilege and psychological feelings of well-being in the case of the self-identified Roma men in my data.

Just as Roma ethnic identities are composed of multiple and diverse cultural and symbolic   categories, this ethnic group is also diverse in forms and organizational types of sexualities. Yet, as we could see in the literature review, heterosexuality is the presumed sexuality in most research done in the field of Romani studies as well. This tendency does not mean that it is or was the only sexual identity, type of sexual interaction, or organization of one's sexual life to be studied but it does entail the reiteration of the general social practices of silencing non-normative sexuality in the context of scholarship. The reasons for the lack of literature in this field might be numerous and some of those reasons will be addressed in this chapter. Shame, insecurity, isolation, distancing, policing, regulation and distribution of public and private spaces within the Roma movement, academic writings, news, and public discourses in general might be some of the reasons why sexual minorities have received limited space for addressing their needs, social, as well as political demands. As the prices for public address of issues related to Roma LGBTQ communities are high, there is an increase of individuals and activist collectives raising their voices against multiple discrimination. Against the lack of interest in scholarship, I argue that sexuality is a very important constitutive aspect in the formation of Roma ethnic identity.

24

3.2 Defining Sexuality in Relation to Ethnic Belonging

Nagel in *Race, Ethnicity and Sexuality* (2013) argues for an understanding of ethnicity in relation to sexuality. Her theoretical claims are founded on an intersectional approach to (collective) identity formation challenging the dominant scholarship that views ethnicity as a concept that is exclusively conceptualized in terms of cultural and symbolic practices. She argues that sexuality shapes ethnicity as much as other practices, resulting in intra-group differences:

Just as we can conceptualize ethnicity as a series of boundaries dividing populations according to various characteristics such as language, religion, culture, or color, sexuality can be seen as a set of boundaries dividing a population according to sexual practices, identities, orientations and desires (46).

Sexuality, since the 1980s of post-structuralist scholarship, has been considered as a socially constructed, regulated, spatial and temporal, ever changing concept. Seen as an institutionalized practice that is articulated tougher by other, differential practices, sexuality cannot be but diverse:

"men" and "women" as socially, mainly genitally defined individuals with culturally defined appropriate sexual tastes, partners, and activities. There is no universally shared conception of natural or proper sexual desires, sexual partners, or sexual activities, rather, there is as much variety in sexual practice as there are human cultures. (Nagel, 8)

This particular approach to sexuality is useful in so far as Nagel recognizes the multiplicities of sexualities as well as the impossibility to come up with universalized sexual identity

25

categories that would be the extension of 'appropriate' for one's sexual desire, partners or activities. However, the problem that arises here is that Nagel makes an interchangeable use of sex and sexuality, in which she partially reaffirms the belief that biological sex and sexuality can be equated. Although she states that essentialist understanding of sex and sexuality have been making assumptions that particular sex roles emerge as the result of one's biological sex, and she opposes to view sex as a natural category, her analysis does not provide clear distinctions between those two concepts. Nagel shows that sexuality, as a socially constructed category, is seen as a diversified concept that embraces various articulations of differentiated sexual practices; sexual activities; partners of choices.[7] At the same time, she acknowledges, when referring to the work of second and third wave feminists, that heterosexuality is the most favored mode in society that controls, regulates and approves men's and women's sexualized bodies. These bodies are sexualized through descriptions such as "fat or thin, strong or weak, black or white" (ibid.) They are regulated through socially accepted and encouraged norms about the number of sexual partners one can have, as well as what kind of sexual intercourse is socially affirmed. Nagel refers to this type of sexuality as hegemonic (8-9).

This intersectional understanding of the relationship between ethnicity and sexuality as mutually co-constructive elements of identity brings me to the central question of my analysis: How do ethnic and sexual boundaries create divisions in the course of negotiating one's identity in the case of my informers in RGPP. More specifically, how do they negotiate those boundaries within the program and at CEU where they are currently situated? The data shows that informants articulate and negotiate those norms differently in participant observation and in interviews. Generally, I have noticed in interactions with my fellow colleagues in RGPP in the academic year of 2013/14 that heterosexuality is articulated in public conversations and

---

[7] Not everyone gets to choose partners in sexual intercourses. There are various forms of sexual harassment, rape, religious and social rituals that violate the individual's rights to free expression, choice making and expression of sexual identity.

spaces, mostly "indirectly." This means that the speakers do not explicitly name the concept of heterosexuality in speech, but the elements mentioned (such as kinship terms or life trajectory events) are to be associated with heterosexuality and thereby it is only implied but never needed to be explained. It is this self-explanatory status that can be interpreted to be indicative of the given hegemonic status of the given sexual formation. For example in the series of lectures on Roma identity called "On Being Roma in Central and Eastern Europe" cultural and symbolic categories were mentioned in a series of talks about historiography, social-movements, forms of resistance in relation to the majority cultures and nations in CEE. Yet, gender and sexuality were addressed only on two occasions and in the context of reproduction only. In one seminar the lecturer claimed that statistical data show that there is an increase in the birth rate of Roma populations in CEE, and on the other occasion the topic was forced sterilizations. In the discussion, students would not even try to broaden the scope of potential issues by raising phenomena such as forced marriages, marital rape or domestic violence that one needs to be aware of when talking about, for instance, the increase of Roma populations in CEE. Nor was there any mention of non-normative sexualities and their lived experiences in the diverse Roma groups in the EU. [8] I believe that not reacting is a negotiation of one's own position in the hierarchy of power relations, especially one's own future in the Romani movements and academia. I believe that students might understand that providing criticism to the Romani movement in Budapest, especially when an acclaimed Roma activist is to discuss those topics, might undermine their chances in the future if they should look for employment in institutions within the Romani movement. Instead of such open confrontations, as I noticed in my

---

[8] Forced marriages, marital rape and domestic violence is used in my text not as a claim that it shapes the population increase of explicitly Roma populations. These issues exist in many ethnic groups, nations and societies. However, it is an issue that the Romani feminist's address increasingly in the last ten years, which is the reason why I use these examples in the analysis.

27

observations over the years, some students would discuss these issues in private conversations, trying to find political minds similar to theirs.

In contrast to the seemingly hegemonized structure of classroom interaction, the interviews I made with RGPP students show different types of articulations and negotiations. While the first most probably operates within a top down power relation, the interviews show how the narratives are challenged and negotiated in lived experiences of Roma students in RGPP. Out of the six persons I interviewed, only one, Mr. X identified as heterosexual when I asked them how they would describe themselves to me. Here is what Mr. X responded:

> Mr. X: Well, I'm a student, I'm a human being. I identify myself as Roma…[long pause]. Uhm… what is the **opposite of homosexual**?

> Me: Heterosexual.

> Mr. X: Heterosexual. [both laughing]. I think these are the main things I can say, but there are also lot of…uhm… different parts of my identity, but these are the main probably.

The respondent's primary identification is as a student, a human being, then Roma followed by his sexuality that is defined in relation to homosexuality, Based on this answer, I started questioning, whether this statement is a coincidence that was produced by the speaker's limitation of English language skills but soon I realized that it is a part of his relation to identity politics in general. First I was considering that his claim to a sexual identity in relation to homosexuality might indicate a queer positionality compared to mainstream narratives that do not even feel the need to identify in terms of their sexuality if it is within the norm. Although one could equally argue that this is a case of distancing oneself from homosexuality, the following part of the interview that asks the informants if they had ever imagined having sex

28

with a same sex partner, indicates that the opening statement is not part of a homophobic narrative of distancing. Mr. X responded to the question if he had ever imagined to have sex with someone of the same sex by stating that he has been imagining it, and that he has been excited by the thought, but that the thoughts would not be prevalent. When I asked the question why the thoughts would not prevail he answered:

> I don't know, a woman's body is something different for me, like, something that for sure makes me… horny… or I don't know. With men it's not that way… it's a male body, it's different… Maybe I should force myself somehow to think about this in the way of… this sexual way… with women it comes naturally. So yeah, this is the difference. There you imagine yourself, here it comes naturally.

Based on this answer, in the case of Mr. X, sexuality is seen as a matter of practice and one that is not only pure activity but a matter of reflection (should force myself somehow to think about this …this sexual way). What is more, by the force of the comparison he draws between heterosexuality (in relation with its bodily dimension as the salient element of sexual desire) heterosexuality itself comes to be a matter of socially regulated enactment but one that comes to be perceived as common sense (with women it comes naturally) where desiring a male body should take his 'imagination' yet. Hence, he does not speak the discourse of homophobia but registers a possible reason for his current distancing from desiring a male sexualized body. How is this experience of imagining intersectional? Although discourses on/of erotic imagination within the Roma male population do not exist, especially not in the form of (studies of) personal stories,[9] this narrative in so far it is shaped by the logic of common sense knowledge of sexuality, we can make valid points about the logic that informs it. Hence the

---

[9] These narratives do not exist in literature, academic discourses or other forms of available resources in English. As a preparation for my research I have constantly used the CEU database of online journals and library resources, but nothing was available in the course of the three years I have been researching this topic.

life story articulated here produces and sees identity as multiple on at least two accounts, supporting Nigel's claim about the different dimensions, i.e. the mutiplicity of 'sexuality'. First, regarding Nigel's distinctions of the 'internal' multiple dimensions of practice, desire, choice of partners, as I have already pointed out above, sexual practice itself is seen at the intersection of sexual acts 'proper' and sexual imagination (in the sense of conceptualizations of desire). Second, it is also multiple 'externally', in the sense that sexuality (itself internally multiple) is intersecting with ethnicity here. I believe that Mr. X's negotiation of sexuality indicates a queer positionality opposing the literature that seemingly depicts heterosexuality as a "taken for granted" identity in a way that raises awareness of agency in the process of negotiation and articulation of one's own sexuality and ethnicity. Ethnicity is very important here, because Mr. X's narrative is situated in a field where many individuals as well as literature assumes that Roma men are predominantly basing their heterosexuality on violent exclusions and oppressive practices towards LGBT individuals and heterosexual women.

3.3 Ethnosexual Intersections in Participatory Observation

The participant observation that I explore here took place in February 2015 in the laptop area of the main building among participants in the RGGP Program at CEU. The observation was not planned and the flow of topics during the conversation were spontaneous. There were two participants, one male, Mr. Y and one female, Sunshine, both of Roma origin, in their twenties. Both of them come from different European countries and at the time they studied in the same department.[10] In this particular observation I analyze the intersections of ethnicity and sexuality: How are hegemonic notions of Roma ethnic identity constructed through sexual expectations and norms mentioned or implicated in their interaction? Also, it is important to understand how interactions between heterosexual and non-heterosexual Roma men and

---

[10] In order to protect the identities of both participants I do not intend to provide further information about the background of the participants.

women re/produce expectations, how these expectations are asserted, maintained, reinforced and policed in the specific social context. The observation lead to a process of questioning the relations of power dynamics that characterize the process. Also, it called for an inquiry into the social consequences of transgression of the norms and expectations as well as into the ethnic differences produced through the actual acts of enforcing and policing sexuality boundaries. In order to answer these questions the analysis of the participant observation will be divided into two parts: (1) the analysis of spatial markers in the conceptualization process of ethnicity and sexuality, and (2) the analysis of the performances of ethnicity and sexuality through exploring the particular forms of exclusions these performances create, and the actual social, political and economic implications of the given exclusions for the two students within Roma communities.

I unexpectedly saw Mr. Y sitting in the laptop area, one of the common working areas at CEU. We did not see each other for a longer time and I went up to him to greet him. We started our conversation with some small talk on how our week had been and how much we both were looking forward to the weekend to start. Mr. Y's week was intense, and he was asking for advice about where to go out for the weekend. Since he knew at the time that I am gay, he asked me if I knew if there would be any gay parties which were worth visiting. He also asked me if I was going out and if the two of us could go somewhere together. I went through my Facebook profile and told him about a couple of parties, after which a beeping sound of his Grindr[11] profile changed the direction of the conversation. I made a joking remark about how his dating schedule must be busy since new messages were constantly coming in as we were conversing. We started discussing the profiles on Grindr, we made observations on

---

[11] Grindr is a gay, same or bi sex, social networking application for smart phones, which enables bi, and gay men to meet and possibly engage in sexual intercourse with men. This application is designed for meeting other men, for friendships and chats, although mostly it is used for finding partners for same sex sexual intercourse. The application is based on distance locating, showing the closest men in one's surroundings, and offers users the possibilities to identify their age, height, weight, ethnicity, relationship status, and "tribal" affiliations such as jock, hunk, otter, daddy, bear, discrete, geek, leather, rugged, trans and twink. The tribes are organized around body types, physical appearance, and performances of ones gender and sexuality.

some gay guys and their profiles. Back at that time, I myself did not have a Grindr profile, and I was curious to see the guys using the app, and to see if there is anyone whom I would fancy in particular. We looked at the distance of the guys as indicated in the profiles on the app and started talking about who of those guys using the app might be from CEU and which departments they are in. There were also some faceless profiles, and Mr. Y and I started playing a game of guessing who's behind the body on display. After this, we started talking about library crushes, and people Mr. Y had fancied, whom he used to either date or have sex with, or who the potential candidates would be. I was in a monogamous relationship at that time, however, Mr. Y asked if there were any guys I would potentially have sex with if I was not in a monogamous relationship. It was a two-way interaction, sharing information about which departments the guys we fancied were in, what they did in their free time, etc.

What can we learn about the social organization of Roma sexuality from this example? First of all, it is important to contextualize this observation. Mr. Y never, during any point of time, had identified himself as a gay Roma man in the conversation. In addition, Mr. Y at this point is also not *"out of the closet."* In this example of observation above, we can see how the common framework of sexual identification and explicit identity category production is not applicable to Mr. Y's case yet the casual question about the weekend activities can call for the mention of gay parties.[12] It is the assumption on Mr. Y's part that I should know of gay parties on account of my gay identification in the public that invites him to ask for the information and thereby implicate himself as "gay". It is not necessary for him to come out either as the beeping tones of his Grinde App does that for him with me. Mr. Y shared his "coming out fantasies" in the interview that I conducted with him in 2016:[13]

---

[12] The issues of non-identifications will be addressed at the end of this chapter.

[13] I have known Mr. Y for several years. We met in RGPP and have been friends ever since. In a number of conversations throughout the years we have discussed dating practices before. I also took an interview with Mr. Y in 2013 while I was a student of RGPP. Back then he decided to retrieve his consent and not to be part of my

I had a lot of night mares in RGPP because at that time I was dreaming about how I would do this ["come out"] etc. Actually, it happened very naturally with my girlfriend. With my parents... this would be... The first reaction would be: 'And what's your uncle gonna say?' This would be the first reaction. Why? Because my parents, they love me[…] (B)ut the pressure of the small community, of the people closest to them, that is something that might be... there might be killings... I don't know... I don't want to... really think of this.

Most of his Roma friends and relatives do not know about his same sex desires, nor about his dating life with men. When he imagines his "coming out" to his family he gets anxious and afraid by the thoughts about the consequences of his wish to "come out of the closet." His family reaction is very important because he claims that they are the source of support in his life disregarding which segment of his identity and life choices that he makes. Although he thinks that his immediate family would support him, he is still afraid that the extended family might reject him because he is gay. What brings hope for Mr. Y is his girlfriend's reaction. He stated that they have a close friendship after the "coming out" and that she accepted his sexuality disregarding the homophobic environment that they come from. In addition, his Grindr profile picture is a photo of a landscape, which is used in order to camouflage or avoid being identified or recognized by other users. The level of discretion might indicate the status of gay and same sex desire within the Roma community. By avoiding to identify himself as a gay person in virtual spaces like Grindr and in "real life,", namely in his family, Mr. Y creates some space for himself in which he is able to choose with whom, and under what conditions he shares information on and enactment of his sexual desires. This

---

research project due to fears of recognition within the group. I asked Mr. Y again in 2016 if he would participate and interviewed him again. This part of the analysis on "coming out" is an excerpt of the interview conducted in 2016.

extent of public disidentification with the gay community, his concern about the (assumed) effects of his coming out for his parents' life in the small town local community he comes from is indicative of the Romani community's disapproval, sanctions or discrimination against gay, same sex or bisexual desire and sexuality. As Nagel (2013) states:

Sometimes these [sexual] differences are benign and unimportant, but sometimes they become basis for discrimination, conflict and prejudice. Sexuality, like ethnicity, is a highly charged aspect of personal and collective life. Individual and group characteristics are subjects to strong moral judgements and strict social control (46).

The personal stories of my gay Roma respondents suggest that homosexuality is far from being a benevolent and banal difference in the Roma communities they come from. The discrimination and prejudice are strongly felt and experienced by those interviewees who either were talking about their "gay" friends, or their own experiences as gay Roma men (one out of six self-identified gay Roma men confirmed this assumption). One of them is Hugo, an RGPP alumni, who is currently living with his boyfriend. He remembered a conversation with one of his fellow students and friend, back from the time when he was an RGPP student. He explains that his friend came from a small village in South-East Europe where being gay is a "shock" for the family and the villagers. His friend also came from a Roma community in which being gay is a taboo.[14] Hugo also recalls that he was encouraging his "gay' friend by saying that:

> […] '(n)obody here [on CEU campus] has a problem with you here, it's really a
>
> safe bubble' [he said]. I was stupid to say that. I think like this now, but at that

time I did not know that this was stupid. "Why can't you live as you want? I was stupid because he brought something with himself and just because you are in another country or another university, it does not mean that everything will change like this [snaps his fingers].

 CEU is considered to be a "safe space" for being gay and Roma, especially for the support of Hugo's generation in academic 2012/13 when he was not the only one who was known to be gay, and the two of them could talk about their experiences of being gay with each other. Despite this fact if the wider community, especially his Romani community back at home finds out about his friend's sexuality, he would most probably suffer exclusion from his community. Hugo's friend's anxieties about his family finding out was based on the fact that he was not the only one coming from his country of origin, so he feared that some of his colleagues could spread the information once it is public. Some of the consequences of coming out will be addressed in the following paragraph.

Another important aspect to explore, is the fluidity of sexuality and ethnicity construction in relation to "outness" that is tied to spatial and temporal aspects of ethnic and sexual boundaries. Nagel defines both sexual and ethnic boundaries in terms of several structural distinctions:

> … *cultural,* involving **spectacles**, music, literature, art… film... gay prides…, *legal,* involving the regulation of sexual practice… *economic,* involving the production and consumption of sexual products and services such as contraceptives, fashions, sex aids, toys, and pharmaceuticals, prostitution, tourism, *political, …* debates over discrimination based on sexual orientation…, *racial, ethnic and national,* such as particular stereotypes of particular ethnic groups, the marginalization or exclusion of

homosexuals from ethnic communities, nationalist calls for compulsory heterosexuality and sex for procreation- to reproduce the nation (48).

What we can learn from the above disposition is that sexual and ethnic boundaries co-construct each other via cultural, legal, economic, political, racial, ethnic and national norms and practices of regulations. Still, although Nagel names several cultural elements, she does not take notice of the spatial dimension of these cultural practices of regulating same sex, gay and bisexual socialization of sexual desire and practices. The spatial dimension here is important on two accounts. Firstly, in the participant observation the conceptualization of ethnicity and sexuality is articulated and evoked in relation to the following locations: the university (classroom, library, corridors and laptop areas), gay, same sex or queer bars (some of which are explicitly men-only places, others are more mixed sex) in Budapest, and virtual spaces (Facebook and same sex dating apps). Second, during the interviews my respondents made a distinction between urban and rural areas and communities regarding their home context. The relevance of the location of expressing the same sex desire, either in physical locations, or in the virtual spaces, is the production of different degrees of visibility of both sexual practices and the struggle for recognition and social acceptance of same sex desire within and outside the Romani community at CEU. Specific locations have different implications on the ways in which someone's sexual desires are perceived.

For example, during my observations in these three years I have noticed that some students avoid public identification as gay in the Romani community at CEU. This avoidance is all the more significant as the university (CEU) in its Mission Statement offers a safe space for its students and their racial, ethnic, sexual, ability, age etc. diversity, that is implemented via legal regulations and anti-discrimination policies. Yet, my observations show that for some members of the Romani community this space means a high risk of identification as someone

of same sex desire, which many try to avoid. The implications of this recognition might be social exclusion, and discrimination.

On the other hand, Mr. Y's wish to go to gay parties in gay clubs indicates that he feels more comfortable to enact his sexual desires and sexuality in such designated spaces for same sex interaction.

We danced a lot. We had super much fun. That was it. I felt, somehow, very much comfortable. I didn't have to look on my sides, whether someone was watching me, or how I watch others, etc. You just watch men in the way you want to watch them. That's it. It's not something you have to hide.

What is interesting in Mr.Y's statement is that he feels much more comfortable and less observed in gay bars, and his self-control in terms of hiding his sexual desire is something that wears off in gay bars, as something that seems to be a safe space for him. Mr. Y's statement made me question my observations of the ways in which visibility is negotiated in the group of Roma men who engage in same-sex practices. Despite the fact that Mr. Y does not make statements about differences in how sexuality is articulated in terms of spaces of articulation, I believe that through my observations it can be stated that the reasons for this different disposition toward campus and gay night life in town might be multiple, one of which might be that he assumes that his fellow Roma students might not be visitors of the same clubs, and in this way those Roma men who visit gay bars preserve discreetness. Their particular choices might be indicative of fearing discrimination and exclusion of individuals who engage in non-heteronormative sexual practices. Lastly, Mr. Y's example confirms that the dimension of identity cannot be applied in his case, which indicates that not all aspects of sexuality should be integral to the formation of one's sexuality (i.e. sexual identity politics) context.

What could be seen from the interviews and observations above is that negotiation of non-heteronormative sexualities in the Romani community of students at CEU is a process of relations between visibility and spaces. Although the students are physically at CEU, some of them are cautious in openly acting upon their sexual desires in spaces where there might be a threat that their fellow students would find out and therefore they would be exposed to possible consequences of multiple discrimination inside and outside of the Romani communities, both at CEU and their home countries. This threat is constantly in the minds of Roma students at CEU, as they negotiate their sexual practices.

3.4 Introducing Performativity in the Analysis of Sexual and Ethnic Borders

In the analysis conducted so far I have analyzed narratives of three respondents; Mr. X and his queer narrative of identification, Hugo's example of his friend's concerns about coming out, and Mr. Y's examples of different spatial and temporal negotiations of sexual identity in relation to coming out narratives. In order to unify those narratives and make the claim that those narratives are queer I will first contextualize these experiences in a framework of performativity, queer studies and discourse analysis. I start from Nigel's (2013) disposition of sexual and ethnic borders as performative approaches to ethnicity, and further resort to Butler's (1999) formulations of gender performativity in order to arrive to Gee's (2011) conceptualization of language as a way of being.

Nigel claims that ethnic and sexual borders are defined as socially constructed entities that gain their shape through a series of performances and performatives. She sees the process as a reinforcement of: "ethnic performances such as "acting black" and "acting white" and through boundary recognition and regulation, such as the admonition to stick to your own kind". (54) But how do these performances take place in the lived experiences of my respondents, and how are they sexual and ethnic borders blurring each other in an intersectional

manner? She adopts Judith Butler's concept to understand the performative "nature" of both sexuality and ethnicity. Butler (1999) in her revised book *"Gender Trouble: Feminism and Subversion of Identity"* sees identification as:

> […] an **enacted fantasy** or incorporation, however, it is clear that coherence is desired, wished for, idealized, and that this idealization is an effect of a corporeal signification. In other words, acts, gestures, and desire produce the effect of an **internal core or substance**, but produce this on the surface of the body, through **the play** of signifying absences that **suggest**, but never **reveal**, the organizing principle of identity as a cause (175).[15]

What consequences does this have for my case study? Butler's understanding of gender performativity as an enacted fantasy,[16] with idealizations of coherence, or the political tendencies to create cohesive narratives about a (fictional) internal core of gender that is embodied and produced by the body? I believe that her theory of performativity can be applied to any dimension of identity, the intersection of sexuality and ethnicity included. Butler suggests that this process of identification or identity production is molded and maintained via discourses and 'corporeal signs.' (1999: 185-6). For Butler, the articulation and the performance of desire creates a "fictive interior" that only seems to be a "gender core," but in fact there is no core and no origin of neither gender nor sexuality, and I think it is safe to say of ethnicity either. In fact, Butler believes that this discursive illusion is purposefully maintained in order to regulate sexuality "within the obligatory frame of reproductive heterosexuality." (p.186). How does this performative understanding of gender identity relate

---

[15] Bold added
[16] Rather than a reality

to my analysis of ethnic and sexual boundaries?[17] First of all, regarding the power dynamics of this formation, there is a difference in power relations in the process of articulations and negotiations of ethnic and sexual identities in RGPP. Having in mind that the program is externally founded by Romani and non-Romani foundations and non- governmental organizations it seems to me that RGPP is a program that is situated in the mainstream Roma movement in Budapest. Although my thesis is not focused on the analysis of institutions, organizations and structures that RGPP operates with and in, nor is it concerned with how institutional practices shape the negotiations and articulations of Roma ethnicity or sexuality, I would like my reader to keep in mind that students whom I interviewed articulate and negotiate their ethnicity and sexuality in this institutional context. Therefore, I believe that institutional structures have an implication in this process. I believe that it is worth addressing those structures in a comparison to Butler's framework.

I believe that the "field" structure of my case study and the student's situatedness within it operates on two levels together with the examples of negotiating practices that have been mentioned above. On one level, the articulation seems to be shaped and enforced from the level of the NGO's and founders of RGPP, who appear to be producing those discourses of hegemonic notions of ethnicity and sexuality and disciplining the students of RGPP accordingly. Discourses on ethnicity and (hetero)sexuality create a fictive illusion of a "core" of a heterosexual Roma ethnicity based on the assumption that all Roma participants should come from similar (enough) backgrounds, regardless of their nationalities, socio-cultural contexts and they are all assumed to be heterosexual. However, the students 'horizontally', i.e. amongst themselves negotiate these norms and discourses from within their lived experiences, through embodied "enactments" of those discursive pasts. The above analyzed examples might

---

[17] An analysis of gender, that is masculinities, in particular will be provided in the next chapter. What I focus on here is the performative aspects of gender in relation to sexuality, in order to create a framework for understanding co-relations between sexuality and ethnicity.

be indicating that my respondents offer mainly queer discourses on norms accounts of Roma ethnicity and heterosexuality. Here it is important to understand the meaning of queer and the understanding of language and discourse analysis that I use.

When I say queer, I refer to understandings that is voiced in Browne and Nash's (2010) edition of *Queer Methods and Methodologies: Intersecting Queer Theories and Social Science Research.* In the introduction to the edited volume they state that certain tendencies in queer theorization are to reject representational theories of 'truth,' by employing forms of discourse analysis in order to deconstruct the ways of how power relations are constituted and maintained in, what they call, the production of social and political meanings (6) This means that for them queer is more of a matter of approach and less of an act of actual theory building. Browne and Nash (2010: 5), similarly to Butler, state that the norms and normative understandings of sexuality and gender are the central organizing principles of societies and its institutions, with the aim to preserve the hegemonic (heterosexual) social order. Based on this overview, one might claim that being queer means to challenge, subvert, deviate and reject hegemonic norms and their articulations by way of enacting and living experiences that bring those into crisis. Secondly, since I am conducting a discursive analysis of language it is important to note that just as norms are performed and embodied, language, or rather practices of symbolic representation are one aspect of this embodiment and as such are indicative of how those negotiations enfold in fields of power relations described above. James Paul Gee (2011) in *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method,* implies that language (i.e. speaking) is doing things: "*talking the talk is walking the walk*".[18] Gee (2011) claims that: "[Language] allows us to do things and to be things, as well. In fact, saying things in a language never goes without also doing things and being things" (2). In his view, language enables us to take on

---

[18] Gee claims that: "We can speak as experts- as doctors, lawyers, anime aicanados, or carpenters- or as "everyday people." (2010: 2) To take on any identity at a given time and place we have to "talk the talk," not just "walk the walk."

certain identities and, at the same time, if we do that "sufficiently" in line with existing practices, it allows us to be recognized as one of those identities.[19] Based on this interpretation I believe that the examples that I have previously provided, reflect a way of "being" what we know under the word "queer."[20]

3.5 Establishing Hegemonic Roma Ethnic and Sexuality via Practices of Exclusion

Before we set of into an analysis of the last cluster of narratives of the students of RGPP, I believe that it is important to make a bridge between Butler's theory of performativity and Laclau and Mouffe's concepts of hegemony, hegemonic practices and articulatory practices. This step is necessary in order to specify the structuration patterns of power relations into hegemonic versus marginal and therefore stigmatized identities.

Laclau and Mouffe (2001) see hegemony as:

> The general field of the emergence of hegemony is that of articulatory practices, that is, a field where the 'elements' have not yet crystalized into 'moments'. In a closed system of relational identities, in which the meaning of each moment is absolutely fixed, there is no place whatsoever for a hegemonic practice. A fully successful system of differences, which excluded any floating signifier, would not make possible any articulation; the principle of repetition would dominate every practice within this system and there would be nothing to hegemonize. (134)

---

[19] Gee (2010) understands identity as a way of being. He states that by identity he means: "[…] different ways of being in the world at different times and places for different purposes; for example, ways of being a "good student," an "avid bird watcher," a "mainstream politician" […] (3).
[20] I am making this claim of queerness here in relation to respondent Mr. X and the example provided in the analysis above. After I have presented my analysis of his interview to him, I asked if he finds my analysis of his sexual identification valid. With his permission, I have interpreted this finding as a queer narrative that challenges the norms of sexual identification practices in RGPP. Although he identifies as heterosexual, and although the analysis of this example is based on a binary of hetero/homo/sexuality the way of how he identifies as a heterosexual is, in my opinion queer within the context of my research scope.

What Laclau and Mouffee mean by articulation is practices that create connections among elements in such a way that their identities are consequentially changed [differentiated] as an effect of the articulating practice – that are shaped by differential relations of hegemonic power.[21] This is when they bring in discourse which they define as the "structured totality"[22] that results from the articulatory practice, and the positions of differences that they rely on in order to be articulated with a specific discourse, they call moments. Lastly, they define elements as differences that are not discursively articulated. In other words, in order for something to become a hegemonic notion or to be considered to be hegemonic, we need articulation. The process of articulation is discursive. Discourses are structures that differentiate and fragment identities which create a sense of instability or crisis. In order for hegemony to exist, crises and differences are constantly produced and reproduced through winning the consent of the relatively less possessed on the terms of the more privileged ones. This process is not a mere repetition, because if the elements would be apparent there would be no hegemony. As Laclau and Mouffee (2001) frame it:

> As we have said, there are hegemonic practices because this radical unfixity makes it impossible to consider the political struggle as a game in which the identity of the opposing forces is constituted from the start. This means that any politics with hegemonic aspirations can never consider itself as repetition, as taking place in a space delimiting a pure internality, but must always mobilize itself on a plurality of planes. If the meaning of each struggle is not given from the start, this means that it is fixed — partially — only to the extent that the struggle moves outside itself and, through chains of equivalence, links itself structurally to other struggles. (170)

---

[21] So every time you engage in an articulatory practice you are engaged in a process of creating differences
[22] Read: Institutional and Institutionalized structure

Therefore, they believe that hegemony supposes incompletes and an open character of "the social" in a field of articulatory practices.[23] These differentiations are important for my case study because they can be traced through the narratives of my respondents. This means that the narratives are "testimonies" of the diversification by which hegemonic ideal of Ethnic/sexual identities are produced, established and maintained. The production of (ethnic and sexual) differences is a never ending process and, actually, they are hegemonic reconfigurations that can be traced in the narrations of lived experiences of the RGPP students participating in my project. Therefore, the narrative production of sexual differences between homosexual, bisexual and men of unidentified sexual tendencies with same sex partners, are indicative of the process of articulation of differences in ethnicity, in comparison to heterosexual Roma men in RGPP, who maintain their position of hegemonic subjects by reaffirming this differentiation.

Having said this, one might argue then that the general lack of literature in the field of Romani studies on non-normative sexualities might indicate a discursive block (in Laclau and Mouffe's sense) that establishes heterosexuality as the hegemonic sexuality. What implications does this have for my case study? What are the prices this block implicates for self-identified gay Roma men in my research? In this section I will analyze two interviews I made with students from RGPP, in 2016. The respondents are Hugo who is an alumnus of RELP and RGPP, Arslan who is currently a student in RGPP. The analysis of both respondents shows how the practices of exclusion of non-heteronormative sexual practices operate within the field of my case study.

---

[23] Laclau and Mouffee (2001) first state that they do not make any distinction between discursive and non-discursive practices (105- 7). For them every practice exists in relation to a discourse. Secondly, Laclau and Mouffee talk about diversification or distinctions in identities referring to Foucault and the *Archeology of Knowledge,* by stating that Foucault makes dispersion a foundation of unity: "insofar as it is governed by rules of formation, by the complex conditions of existence of the dispersed statements." (105). This means that dispersion is actually working in favor of hegemonization and hegemonic practices and although it seems to be a chaotic process dispersion happens under (discursive) rules and regulations.

When I asked Hugo if he had a male best friend in the program, he stated that he used to have a straight male friend in the academic year of 2013/14, while he was a (RELP) student. Through this example it will become visible how some students are not complicit with the exclusions imposed in the processes of establishing hegemonic blocks, but as Hugo's narrative about his friendship unfold, we see that other students police these forms of negotiations and establish heterosexuality is favored in RGPP and RELP programs.

> Last year I had a Hungarian friend who was heterosexual, he was closest to me, and another girl. For them my relationship was very open, and he was also very open to me. At that time I didn't have a relationship, and I didn't date. I said stories from my past. And he talked about girls, we talked about everything.

Since he was the only openly gay identified man in the program that year, he felt that he was treated with more care and love by his friends and the people in the program. However, in the following statement he refers to the group of students in RGPP who were policing different non-normative sexualities:

> It was mid-program, people knew that we are friends and that we spend time together. He [his male best friend from RELP] told me that one of the guys asked him if he was gay, and he said no, and he said "why do you think I am gay?", and the other guy responded, "because you are all the time with Hugo."

What this example might unpack is the discursive formation of heteronormative Roma ethnicity, in that generation of students of RELP. In this case, both heteronormative and homosexual Roma identities were policed. In order for a hegemonic notion of ethnicity and sexuality to exist, or more precisely, in order to believe that all Roma are naturally heterosexual and so there is no need to see them to any extent autonomous dimensions of identity, differentiations are created in order to exclude the "different" and so maintain and reproduce

45

those differentiations in power relations between hegemonic and non-hegemonic Roma subjects. Both Hugo and his friend came to be viewed as non-hegemonic subjects in the process of articulation – although for different reasons but mutually reinforcing the same norm. The claim could be made that hegemonic Roma identity signifies compulsory heterosexuality. The students who police Hugo and his friend are engaged in an enactment of the norms in order to (seemingly) embody those hegemonic notions of Roma masculinity. Hugo and his friend's enactment is not according to the script and therefore they might not be perceived as "proper" Roma subjects. The differentiation might also create a feeling of fear of transgressing the expectations among the students, which then might (re)produce a discourse in which other Roma male students should keep a distance from the gay Roma student in the group or else they might be labelled as "homosexual" for mixing with his 'same kind'.

Hugo explains how this reaction made him feel:

> I was really angry, not because of the question, I was angry because somebody who is heterosexual and made a friendship with me, and maybe with this stupid question they will scare him, not to be with me. If they don't like gay guys, ok, but they don't have a right to scare others.

This leads to feelings of isolation and alienation in Hugo's case. He expresses the feelings of not belonging in either the white gay community in Budapest or the Roma community in RGPP on campus: "Sometimes I feel myself different in the Roma community, and sometimes I feel different in the gay community." (…) "I felt myself as an exotic animal or a toy." The policing of normative sexuality makes Hugo feel as the exotic other within both ethnic groups. The Hungarian and Roma group.[24]

---

[24] Throughout the interview Hugo made clear distinctions between the Romani communities and the majority communities. These distinctions would be made by specifying with the adjectives Roma or Romani in front of the

Hugo's narrative can also be analyzed from a discursive perspective of language use. I have previously mentioned Gee (2011) who claims that if we conceive language as a way of not only talking about things, but bringing about and so being things, he believes that if we "enact" speech accordingly or not, one might obtain social goods. Gee defines the use of language in correlation to social goods that are always at stake. He argues that: "(…) if no one cared about the game or practices anymore - no one saw being accepted as "acceptable" or "good" in the game or practice as important anymore - the game or practice would no longer have any social goods to offer and would cease to exist." (7) He adds that in those performances there are always losers and winners in the practice, and that social goods are distributed accordingly. For him, this process of distribution is always a matter of politics. Lastly, Gee claims that:

> At a much deeper level it is about how to distribute social goods in a society: who gets what in terms of money, status, power, and acceptance on a variety of different terms, all social goofs. Since we use language, social goods and their distribution are always at stake, language is always "political in a deep sense. (ibid.)

Gee makes us understand the material consequences of certain "acceptable" and "unacceptable" articulations and "enactments" of ethnicity and sexualities. In a system of social distribution of goods, discourses create a hierarchy according to which Hugo's performance and enactment of his situated embodied experiences might be evaluated by his fellow students in what seems to be a process of distribution of social goods, such as status in his peer group. This example will be further analyzed in the next analytical chapter.

---

communities within this ethnic groups, while he at that time, did not ethnically mark the majority white community in Hungary. Therefore I believe that this interview segment can be analyzed within this framework of differentiation.

The interview with Arslan signified a breaking point in my research. Arslan's narrative about his articulation and negotiation of his ethnicity and sexuality challenged my hypothesis. I interviewed Arslan at a very late point in my research, after conducting 9 interviews, out of which I could only use 4 (Mr. X, Mr. Y, Hugo and Arslan), because 5 interviewees decided to revoke their consent for their data to be used in my research. Arslan's story might be indicative of some of the reasons for the fact that so many interviewees revoked their consent in the last minute. At this point, I realized what my investments are, both theoretical and practical. I realized that I am deeply embedded in a knowledge production system that resonated with what Joseph Massad (2007) calls the "Western gay movement's" and neo-liberal investment in the human rights discourse and perceptions on sexuality and desire (160).[25]

Up until that point, the narratives corresponded with the theoretical approach to my interviewees' narratives. His narrative required a reconceptualization of my theoretical approach to my process of knowledge acquisition and knowledge re/production. The moment in the interview that made me question my entire approach was when we started talking about sexuality. It is important to note that Arslan, like the majority of Roma men whom I interviewed did not identify sexually but only ethnically. In the introduction of the interview he stated that he considers himself to be a Roma man, without any identification or naming of his sexual identity. He only vaguely remarks when asked about sexuality that there are some things that most of his friends and family do not know about: "I'm not opening everything to people, still I have some secrets inside of me. Let's say… that no one knows about it." During the conversation we arrived at a point when I asked Arslan to reflect on gay Roma communities. At this point he stated that for him there are no differences between Roma and non-Roma perceptions of gay people and that nothing about gay Roma men is specific because:

---

[25] This terminology will be elaborated in the part of the analysis of the interview with Arslan.

Even the government or elite of the country trying to liberalize their [heterosexual majority's] view of [gay] people. People still have their stereotypes. Let's say that they pretend that they tolerate [gay people], but they still do not have it naturally to welcome other people that have other behavior. Then we can't say anything about Roma people because they are the same people as others.

He further continues to explain what he thinks about issues of gay communities within "traditional Roma communities." His opinion is that in general gay people face different treatment, regardless of ethnic background. He sees that for gay Roma people the spaces where they can articulate or enact their sexuality might be very limited:

Roma guys and girls try to follow the rules, but you can imagine if you are gay or lesbian, you don't want to... you still want to be here, you don't want to go from the traditions, but you at the same time want to have a private life that you don't want... that will not be perceived in the Roma society.

I believe that it might be assumed that Arslan talks from his own positionality and desire to be part of the tradition and culture that he comes from.[26] As it can be seen from his statement, it

---

[26] It is important to note that I am not conducting this research or interpreting this interview in order to define, describe or say how different treatment is inherent to the traditional Roma communities or Roma communities in general. I am not framing the Roma community in my work as an "exceptional" case within a system that generally "accepts" sexual differences, in order to re-affirm the stereotypes that might exist in "first-world" countries, especially in discourses of non-governmental organizations that disseminate or defend gay rights under "neo-liberal" or "homonationalist" frameworks. I also do not aim to analyze these discourses in my interpretations. However, I find this topic important to include and address in my work because it is a part of narratives of my informant. I also find it important because I believe that it provides narratives of struggles within the context of my respondents in the Roma community at CEU in RGPP. For that reason, I believe that Arslan's interview adds to a larger debate of the position of same sex desire in the Roma community in contrast to the majority population that the respondent comes from, which I believe extends to his experience in Budapest, specifically to his experience at CEU and RGPP, since he lives here for a longer period of time. Having said this, I believe that this narrative contributes to an understanding of the differentiated positionalities that some individuals that I have interviewed within a struggle of acceptance of sexual identities that are highly ethnicized in both the majority population's perception of Roma gay men as victims of what they think is "Roma tradition", and that these men need to be saved, and the lived experiences of my respondent's struggle that sometimes "embraces" those terms

49

might mean that Romani culture or tradition does not embrace gay and lesbian people; hence his negotiation process involves secrecy, which enables him both to remain part of his Roma community, and also to act in accordance with what he calls his "private life." He believes that "Gadze"[27] (white men) have more space for expressing their sexual desires because they live separated from their parents' home and are not as close to their parents and their families.[28] When he contrasts this type of organization of sexual lives in Gadze communities to the Roma community, he states that in Roma "society" the majority of families have close relationships. Everyone knows everyone and how they live, what they do in life, and, what he calls what the "good" and "bad" behaviors of people within the communities. His concluding remarks on these "differences" are:

> So it's difficult to have that [gay] life, let's say, your natural life and at the same time have good relationships with your parents and be a good example for you family, not to be, for your family… not to be ashamed. So it's very deep. Then it's contradictory. Yes, generally all people think the same about the gays, but inside of the Roma society, who is subject of... I mean who is gay, they behave differently.

In order to offer a self-reflection and analysis of Arslan's views about the Roma "gay community"[29] I believe that Massad's interpretations have a significant impact on my research,

---

in order to live their lives in accordance to their beliefs, but sometimes their negotiations mean that they reject them, and decide not to identify.

[27] Gadze is a common term in Roma communities that is used to refer to white non-Roma members of society. I am using this term in my interpretation because Arslan used it while answering my interview questions.

[28] At this point Arslan realized that he might be generalizing, and he stated that he is aware that he might enforce stereotypes about Gadze people, because many of them from the society where he comes from have close relations to their relatives. However, he claims that there are many cases that support his previously articulated thought, and that therefore believes that Gadze people have it easier when it comes to "enacting" sexual desire. Their life decisions to build their own lives away from their parents and communities that they grew up in, for him makes it easier to be who they are.

[29] Throughout my thesis in cases when my respondents have made statements that could be interpreted within the framework and terminology of sexuality specifically, that from Massad's perspective could be classified under the term "Western" or part of the "Gay International's" agenda, I have used under quotation marks. Those specific cases, just like the interview that I am currently analyzing, are cases when the interviewee did not identify himself as a gay subject. Therefore, I believe that my interpretation within the framework that I have used, specifically

in terms of understanding that a specific language has social, political, cultural and ideological implications on me as a researcher and on my respondents. Massad (2007) in *Desiring Arabs,* identifies two types of bodies of literature on the Muslim world related to "homosexuality."[30] Firstly, the bodies of literature that "explain" and "homosexuality" in the Muslim world, and secondly, journalistic work that "describes" the lived experiences of the "gay" Arab subjects. (162) He implies that the research was done mostly by white "western" subject. He claims that these works reflect the aims of the "Gay International" to "liberate" the "gay" Muslim subjects from the terrors and oppressions that they face in their societies. Massad (2007) goes further to claim that:

> In contradiction to the liberatory claims made by the Gay International to what it posits as an always and already homosexualized population, I will argue that it is the very discourse of the Gay International, which both produces homosexuals, as well as gays and lesbians, where they do not exist and represses same-sex desires and practices that refuse to be assimilated into its sexual epistemology. (162-3)

Although I do not aim to deconstruct or analyze the orientalization of myself or my respondents, I believe that it is worth addressing the issues and my relation to Massad's claims. His work and interpretation makes me as a researcher aware of the terminology that I use in my research for two reasons. Firstly, because in the interviews I had respondents who self-identified as gay subjects. Secondly, because the interviews also showed that the majority of respondents does not sexually identify neither as homosexual or gay, nor as heterosexual. In addition, Massad's view warns me as a researcher to be conscious and careful when framing

the terminology cannot be applied, because it would be violent to name the experiences of my respondents instead of themselves naming their experiences.

[30] Despite the fact that Massad talks about the Muslim world and I am talking about Roma individuals and communities at CEU, I believe that his framework provides a good insight in how the process of othering of individuals and groups operates and is structured. I am not making claims that the experiences of sexualized "others" that Massad talks about in relation to the "Muslim world" can be applied on Roma communities, but I do see some similarities that I address in the analysis of Arslan's interview.

51

CEU eTD Collection

interpretations of experiences of my respondents, as well as my own. What I realized from the interview with Arslan, is that he chooses not to identify as "gay." When I asked him if there is a word in Romani language with which he identifies in relation to his sexuality, he said that there is not any. This does not mean that the Romani language does not have a vocabulary for same-sex desire. I believe the case is that Arslan does not want to identify sexually. This is where I connect Massad's research to my interview. Massad warns that during the process of creating discourses about "homosexuality" and "gay" identities that are imposed by "Western" scholars, the narrative about the saving of ethnic, religious or racialized subjects becomes a production of Orientalized knowledge, and those who choose not to identify "accordingly" get erased from same-sex epistemologies. What is even more important for my analysis of Arslan's interview is that my respondent does not make any difference between the individuals who identify as gay and Roma or those who are non-Roma and identify as gay. Based on the interview with Arslan, I believe that the claim can be made that not-all of my respondents can be considered or expected to make an explicit claim to their sexual identity. In addition, not all of them distinguish the differentiated treatment that they receive for having and perhaps engaging in same-sex practices, from those of the non-Roma individuals that surround them. In this case, it seems that ethnicity, "traditions" or "culture" has anything to do with differential treatment. This is important because it might imply that sexuality and therefore homosexuality is described and conceptualized in different ways from mine in the research. Another point that I agree with Massad is the fact that often times,[31] researches either describe or explain the lived experiences of Roma individuals, based on which generalizations are made. My intentions with this case study is not to describe or explain what Roma sexualities are, rather I focus my interests around how sexuality, ethnicity, gender and class intersect in the personal stories and lived experiences of my respondents and my own experiences. I am analyzing how distinctions

---

[31] As I have referred to in my literature review, especially those parts concerning Romani sexualities.

52

are made based on the knowledge that exists in various fields of feminist and queer scholarship in order to understand how articulatory practices shape hegemonic understandings of Roma sexualities and what the material consequences of those enactments are for my respondents in relation to their negotiations. Lastly, I do not "value" some of my respondents less or more based on the fact how they identify themselves, how they articulate or negotiate their sexuality, ethnicity, class or gender in interaction with the world that surrounds them because I understand there are multiple ways of reacting to and living with all of these elements that create current understandings in a moment when I took the interviews, but that might change as the circumstances in life for both my respondents and me as a researcher might change. I do not want to treat anyone nor myself as a "traitor" or say that I or anyone else fights for "foreign" causes, that I or anyone else that I interviewed is a victim of foreign concepts because of the fact that someone says that he is "gay." Rather, what I am doing here is to analyze narratives of lived, embodied, sexualized and ethicized experiences that have consequences for myself and my respondents compared to the communities that we come from, and the majority communities that me and my respondents are situated in. While doing this, I would like the reader to keep in mind that this knowledge is situated within a complex relationship of power dynamics, where the Roma community is constantly oppressed and discriminated against in Europe, and that most of my respondents, homosexual and heterosexual, are exposed to various forms of anti-Gypsism by the society where they are situated in. In the following chapter some of these dynamics will be analyzed and addressed in relation to ethnicity gender and class.

Chapter: 4

Intersections of Ethnicity Gender and Class

In the previous chapter I analyzed the intersections of ethnicity and sexuality by analyzing the participant observations and interviews of four of my respondents. Although these experiences are also gendered and classed, my aim was to focus on how ethnicity in relation to sexuality might be articulated in the cases that I described. Some of those differences are very minute, and perhaps they leave the impression that these differences could be lived by any other ethnic community. At times, as a researcher ask myself the question, what is it that readers expect when they read academic articles, journal entries, books, watch documentary series or want to obtain information about Roma issues. In my literature review I partially tried to answer this question. I believe that many readers, this is not an attempt of generalization, are used to reading ethnographies that Orientalize Roma communities and depict them as savage. This tendency is slowly changing, but also evolving. Although the aim of my thesis is not to look into how these stereotypes are articulated and reinforced, I believe that it is important for the reader to know that those stereotypes will not be found in my thesis.[32] The focus of this chapter is how ethnicity can be understood in relation to gender (i.e. masculinity) and class. I understand the interview materials that I used in these previous analysis as masculinized grounds for articulation of ethnicity, class and sexuality.

4.1 To be a "real" Roma man

In my six interviews some of the questions that I asked were explicitly aiming at understanding of how my respondents understand, articulate and define masculinity. The narratives that they provided might indicate the ways of how masculinity as a concept informs and shapes the articulations and negotiations of ethnicity.

In order to understand the processes of formation and articulation of Roma masculinities in the interview data, I would firstly like to introduce the concept of hegemonic masculinity as defined by Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) and then link it to Butler's understanding of gender. I shall analyze my data and compare to the results of the previous chapter of analysis. In the focus of my analysis then is the class dimension in the articulation of masculinized Roma ethnicity.

Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) define masculinities as: "[…] not a fixed entity embedded in the body or personality traits of individuals. Masculinities are configurations of practices that are accomplished in social action and, therefore, can differ according to the gender relations in a particular social setting" (836). This means that masculinities or gender is not an inherent feature, but rather an articulatory practice, which is based on and accomplished in social interactions. These social interactions are also correlating in interactions with femininities.[33] Connell and Messerschmidt see hegemonic masculinity as part of a larger system of distinctions between, what we might call ways of articulating gender. This distinction is made on three levels: Hegemonic masculinity is defined as "[1]a current way of expressing what is the most honored way of being a man [hegemonic masculinity], [2] [that]requires from other men to position themselves in the relation to it, [3]and it ideologically legitimates the

---

[33] During the interviews, my respondents shared experiences of how they think female students of RGPP understand or approve or disapprove them as men. However, the focus of my analysis is how Roma men articulate and negotiate their masculinities in relation to other Roma men within the program.

global subordination of women to men." Connell (1995) argues that hegemonic masculinity is viewed as a strategy in order to obtain and maintain cultural, political and economic dominance in society (77-8). This type of masculinity is embodied by a small number of men,[34] yet the majority of men benefit from hegemonic masculinity because they are complicit to subordination of women (78-9). He calls this kind of masculinity 'complicit masculinity'. Furthermore, marginalized masculinities are classed and raciazlied as well. Connell believes when race and class are introduced to the analysis of masculinities, the internal power dynamics of the different forms of masculinity become more crystalized. Hegemonic and complicit masculinities often enforce and engage in violent practices against racial minorities or men of lower classes in order to maintain their position in the hierarchy as if beyond class and race positions. Subordinated masculinities are considered to be a product of a complex system of power relations of class, race, and sexuality in which:

> Oppression positions homosexuality at the bottom of a gender hierarchy among men. Gayness in patriarchal ideology, is the repository of whatever is symbolically expelled from hegemonic masculinity, the items ranging from fastidious in home decoration to receptive anal pleasure. Hence, from the point of view of hegemonic masculinity, gayness is easily assimilated to femininity (78).

Connel claims that all of these distinctions of masculinity are historically and contextually defined.

Out of the six interviews that I can use in the analysis of masculinities, all respondents have identified as men. They are, Mr. X; Mr. Y. Hugo, Arslan and W.A. When asked how they define their own masculinity and what makes them "a man" all of the respondents have

---

[34] Connell (1995: 79) states that: "Normative definitions of masculinity, as I have noted, face the problem that not many men actually meet the normative standards. This point applies to hegemonic masculinity."

answered that masculinity for them is a social construct or that their masculinity is articulated against the socially defined norms. For example, Mr. X stated that the question of what makes him masculine is a difficult question. He states that everyone sees him as a man and that he identifies as one, but that in the process of negotiation he keeps in mind that there is nothing "inherent" that makes him a man. He further elaborates:

I think these features are mainly imposed by society, by some roles. As I mentioned, in my family, my mother's example. She was taking care about her kids, my father was mainly working. Of course he was also helping as much as he could. In my case, [pauses], and these inherent features are… uhm… maybe the attraction by some women […].

In this part of the interview with Mr. X some of the social norms that might imply that hegemonic masculinity in his family is organized within a heterosexual marriage, in which the mother takes care of the children, and the father works and provides for the family and helps the mother in raising the children. He further adds his "attraction by women" as one of these distinctive features. He later adds that social expectations include that men are stronger than women, or should be stronger. Here Mr. X pauses and explains that he negotiates and understands masculinity differently. He states that for him men can also show weakness and that some of his female relatives engage in activities that are usually considered to be masculine such as distributing and planning family budgets, making decisions which he calls "men's decisions", such as , implying that those decisions are supposed to be made by men.

Another example is Arslan, when I asked him how he defines his own masculinity he stated that:

I'm masculine because… let's say my behavior, I mean stereotypical behavior of how man behave. I am doing all these things naturally, not by pretending, let's say. I was

doing the same as my friends or colleagues at school. I was fighting… but girls were fighting as well... so... I know that this is a stereotypical thought that guys should be more active, than girls, that's why I am active...

From Arslan's example we learn that the distinctive elements which govern the articulation of his masculinity is embedded in a set of practices such as fighting and being more active. For Arslan masculinity is a way of being as Gee (2010) defines it, meaning that he does things *naturally* and that he is not *pretending* to *do it* or be masculine, but that he *is* masculine, that is he has enacted it to the point of routine performance.

For Mr. Y, masculinity is organized around the people with whom he spends his time. He states that he has both a lot of female and male friends, but that he does not have close male friends:

Honestly I don't know because I have a lot of both female and male friends. Like, I cannot say that I have a good male friend. Like the male friend I have now is gay, which is my best friend here. But, most of the time, I think I spend with the... with the women.

Mr. Y signals that the amount of time that is spent with a person identifying with a certain sex and gender is an important element in the process of producing and maintaining what might be considered to be hegemonic masculinity. Against this light we can read his comment that he spends most of his time with women because his best male friend is gay that to be recognized as sufficiently masculine he needs to spend more time with (heterosexual) women in relation to whose 'emphasized femininity' he can reiterate hegemonic masculinity in order to be perceived as a "member" of the ideal gender category. Mr. Y, in addition to observing that some of the physical characteristics make him manly, defines his masculinity as something that is given by society and it should be enacted in all fields of life:

58

> […] I've never questioned it actually. Maybe how you are behaving in a specific situation, what you do or what you dress... What is expected from me in the public transport or in a restaurant... You know to open the door... I've never taught of what makes me a man...

.

All of the three interviewees also shared some of the situations in which their masculinity has been policed by their fellow students in their programs. For Mr. X and Arslan the situations included event when they would engage in activities of maintaining their living space clean and taking care of personal hygiene and appearance. Both claimed that spending a lot on beauty products makes people from the program think that they spend too much effort and resources on their physical appearance. The students react to this by comparing them to women that is an act of feminization. In Mr. Y's case the fact that he has too many female friends, that he cannot drive a car properly, in addition to doing handy work around the household gets him into situations when he is laughed at by his colleagues. I believe that all of the examples above are indicative of setting the boundary of hegemonic notions of masculinity. The physical strength and ability to conduct and make business deals; providing and taking care of the family, having abilities and skills to navigate a car, and limited attention payed to appearance and enjoying interactions in the company of women, and a "reasonable" amount of heterosexual male friends as well as heterosexuality in general, seems to be something that articulates as hegemonic masculinity among my respondents.

However the following example of gender identification is peculiar. The last respondent to mention in this part of the analysis is W.A. He is an RGPP alumni, who in an interview that I conducted in 2014 stated that in his life he did not want to act violently and he sees those moments when he had felt like a woman, especially in business negotiations:

59

> At that point I had two choices, to act as a man, or not to act as a man. In my head it was like I will go and strangle him, shoot him in the head, I'm gonna take him to the neck… But a part of me was scared to do that… I just felt the violent way is not my way. I had the feeling not to be courageous enough to go there and act as a man.

He adds that many men could not understand why he did not act in accordance with the norm and that on such occasions he found himself to be made accountable for the violation of the norm, to defend his masculinity and honor. W.A.'s account of non-hegemonic masculinity in business is interesting because he was the only respondent who explicitly described his performance of masculinity in comparison to femininity. Although he relays to me situations where he himself does not embody the hegemonic type, but rather by stating what he is not he still acknowledges his awareness of the norm. Violence, like for Arslan, is a disliked element in negotiating what is to be valued by hegemonic masculinity: Violence is to maintain the domination over other categories of masculinity as well as heterosexual femininity.

4.2 Performing "realness:" challenging Roma hegemonic masculinities

Another important element for analysis is the distinction between sex and gender that is assumed in W.A.'s narrative, the interpretation about socially constructed bodily features of Mr. Y's narrative, and the socially expected "enactments" that are characteristic for men but not women in Mt. X's narrative. Butler (1999) explains that the distinction between sex and gender is part of a heteronormative matrix in which someone's gender is assumed to originate in someone's sexed body (143). She disagrees with this notion and states that perhaps there are genders that are not restricted to biological sex. Butler states:

> Consider the further consequence that if gender is something that one becomes—but can never be—then gender is itself a kind of becoming or activity, and that gender ought

60

not to be conceived as a noun or a substantial thing or a static cultural marker [of a given bodily sex], but rather as an incessant and repeated action of some sort (143).

For Butler if we imagine gender as not "tied to sex" for her then gender is more of a doing that re-produces beyond the sex binary. What is more, once there is no one-to-one relationship between sex and gender, it is also possible to imagine several gender performances in relation to the same embodiments of sex, or with no 'corresponding' sex at all. For Butler this means that there is no origin of gender, and that gender cannot be tied down to a sex category within the male/female sex binary. This is important for two reasons. Firstly, because it informs how hegemonic masculinity appropriates or disavows certain types of masculine practices, in order to reaffirm power relations and dominance. In this process it relies on an imaginary sex binary, which can also be seen from the examples above. Secondly, it is important for the interview parts in my data in which ethnicity is foregrounded, because these types of masculinities are articulated and negotiated within a group of Roma students, who shape their articulations in relation to other Roma subjects within RGPP.

When I talked with Hugo about traditional Roma relationships he stated that one could say that he is in what is considered traditional Roma relationship although Hugo is in a same-sex relationship with his partner for several years. Although he instantly stopped when I asked him about what makes his relationship traditional he eventually came up with this:

> I don't feel that it [their position in the relationship] is 100% equal, even if we say so and articulate it, but is it equal in reality? It is not. In reality I feel that he is the leader and I am the one who has some power to modify the things, but I am the one who is a little bit under the other. I also have stereotypes, because I am thinking that a traditional Roma partnership is not equal, so my bad. It's a stereotype. Also, if I look at my parents'

61

relationship, it's more equal than actually mine. I wouldn't say that my Roma parents'
relationship is traditional.

In the follow up, Hugo stated that the stereotypes about the traditional Roma relationships are
that women and men get married at an early age; that women are at home doing domestic labor
and taking care of the children, while men, if they are lucky and live in urban areas might have
a job. He further went on to say that he is unemployed and that he stays at home most of the
time while his partner is working. He is struggling to change his position, but while he is
searching for opportunities, the fact that he might be seen as a "housewife" does not bother
him. From Butler's perspective the theory of gender without an origin in what is attempted to
be situated into a physical/bodily core, makes sense to be applied to Hugo's narrative. Hugo
stated at one point that his masculinity is assumed by the people in his surroundings based on
the way he looks. This means that people from Hugo's environment base their assumptions on
biological features to determine his sex and gender. Hugo, however, narrative shows that he
does not make distinctions based on the opposed sex/gender binaries. His case raises the
questions of how his masculinity that is 'feminized' is perceived in the bigger network of power
relations among different masculinity types.

It is important to contextualize and situate all of the above mentioned examples. If we
position these narratives in relation to the framework provided by Connell and Messerschmidt
(2005), we might see that these notions and distinctions of masculinity in the narratives are
situated within a marginalized group of men who negotiate their masculinities in relation to
hegemonic masculinities of the non-Roma majority. Yet, at the same time, I can see the
narratives and experiences shared by my informants as negotiating hegemonic masculinity
within the Roma community where the informants are situated – both in the narrower CEU
based and broader, home culture. These narratives can be interpreted as practices or ways of

62

being, in accordance with Gee (2011). The hegemonic practices within the community entail exclusions of what is considered to be feminine, and appropriation of skills, knowledge and practices that are associated with manliness. However, this type of masculinity is still less valuable than the hegemonic type that is articulated in the white majority communities where they are situated. According to Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) this types of Roma masculinities in the cases of heterosexual Roma identified men, would be marginalized masculinities but ones that show to a certain extent that the individuals caught in them are still trying to be complicit to hegemonic masculinity in the majority white society where the program is situated. In cases of gay identified individuals the positionalities that Hugo for example holds is subordinate masculinity, which is often exposed to a twofold discrimination, based on ethnicity and his masculinity practices: he is not likely to be recognized as an embodiment of complicit masculinity in the eye of the white masculinity norm: unlike W.A., he cannot make up for his ethnic belonging through appealing to an ideal heterosexual family life. The hegemonic practices of masculinity in my data can be described in two ways. First, within the Roma group of RGPP students, where hegemonic practices reflect the ways in which hegemony is maintained and reaffirmed by creating diversifications among men who engage in different types of articulatory practices. Some of those practices bring more benefits than others. I believe that in the cases of those who "like" women or are engaging in "heterosexual" practices benefit more and are included or considered to be "worthy" of including into the hegemonic notions of Roma identities. Therefore, one can claim to be a "real" Roma man, if one rejects activities, behaviors, features associated with "femininity", same-sex intercourse and practices, shows skills and abilities seen to be "manly" in conducting business, be providing in heterosexual marriages, etc. This means that some of the respondents are more complicit than others. That is not a value judgement on my part, rather complicity entails different consequences for those who negotiate their masculinities in ways that are not accepted

63

by hegemonic masculinity in the Roma community where the respondents are situated. Secondly, this destabilization and diversification is part of a bigger system of relations between hegemonic masculinity in the majority society where the program is situated. What I noticed in my observations and in the analysis of my informants' narratives is that the negotiation loosens the hierarchy that Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) seems to conceptualize as the structuring principle of 'hegemonic masculinity'. Their conceptualization seems to rely on the presumption that one individual can be one type of masculinity within one context. However, I believe that it is worth considering that multiple positionalities in interactions with different types of masculinities may result in situations where someone can "hold" or "enact" multiple positions or distinctive masculinities simultaneously, depending on what the topics of conversations are and the individuals awareness of the types of dynamics between masculinities in a given context. In other words, on the basis of my data analysis, I propose that the very concept of 'hegemony' should be conceptualized as one that is structured by multiplicity, which is the major contribution of my project to the scholarship on masculinity studies.

4.3 Why class matters

The social background of my informants in terms of their class membership is very important for the analysis of ethnicity, sexuality and gender. The data indicate that the ways of how my informants articulate and negotiate their ethnicity, sexuality and gender is a classed process. However, due to the limitations of length, I will not engage in a deeper analysis of class relations in my thesis.

I became aware of class issues first mostly by reading literature in queer studies. For a very long time I have not been aware that my disposition to academic authors is class-based. When I started researching about the social background of my favorite authors, I started to

64

understand that the knowledge that is produced by them is also classed. The class distinctions that some of those texts imply are mostly related to the terminology that is used and the respondents that are interviewed or observed in the authors' researches. [35] Most of my experiences are based in a working class background. My parents are working class people, and I am the first member of my family to graduate from a university. I noticed that for many of my respondents it is the same. Some of my respondents come from families where they are the only ones with university education in their nuclear families, for others it is applicable to their extended families. Only two interviewees come from family backgrounds where all of their brothers and sisters have obtained university education. I have always had the feeling that class background has a significant impact on our experiences, but also our relations to people who surround us. Sometimes in life I felt that class and not ethnicity is a ground for more discrimination. Resources and cultural capital and social networks play a significant role in how one negotiates all of the elements of masculinity I have analyzed: ethnicity, sexuality and gender. I noticed as my informants were speaking about their experience that, some of them would be more open to talk about their sexualities, others would not be self-confident, or would not have the vocabulary to talk about their experiences in English. This does not mean that they do not know what sexuality is, or that they are unfamiliar with concepts of heterosexuality or homosexuality. On the contrary, four informants stated that they talk about sexuality with their friends and male best friends. I believe that class background is important in articulatory practices, hegemonic practices and negotiations.

---

[35] Some of the works that I found difficult to understand due to the use of language: Eve Kosofksy Sedgwick: "Shame, Theatricality, and Queer Performativity: Henry James's The Art of the Novel," in Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003); Lisa Duggan a & José Esteban Muñoz: "Hope and Hopelessness: A Dialogue," Women & Performance: a Journal of Feminist Theory, Vol. 19, No. 2, July 2009, 275–283; Karen Barad: "Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter," Signs, vol. 28, no. 3, 801-831 etc.

If we link these experiences to the previously defined identity interpretations by Gee (2010), who conceptualizes identity as a way of being in the world at this moment in time, in a particular location, and connect it to his statement that every doing and being enables one to obtain social goods, then we can assume that certain types of articulatory practices and negotiations of identities will bring one closer or farther away from those social goods. For example, in Hugo's case, I believe that being a highly educated Roma man, brings many social goods and opportunities. His resources such as social networks, language skills and education, and the fact that he is a man, all enable him to benefit in the distribution of social goods much more than in the case of a working class non-English speaking Romanian middle aged man. However, the fact that he identifies as gay, and structures his negotiation on public address as a gay identified Roma subject, might distance him from those social goods, because the system of hegemonic practices differentiates members of the Roma ethnic minority to begin with, and then in addition the hegemonic masculinity within the Roma and the majority society distance themselves from "gay" individuals in order to obtain and maintain social goods. His way of negotiating is also class specific. Although he holds a B.A. degree and is fluent in English, lives in a capital city in a good neighborhood he is still unemployed after RGPP. He states in relation to his non-Roma partner who is employed that it is easier for him to adjust to a better living standard than for his partner, i.e. Hugo, who has to share some of those benefits that he has:

For me it was easier because I got a higher standard of living. Of course there is another aspect to it. To tolerate each other and certain behaviors, routines etc., but for me it was easier because I am coming from a poor family, I was living a poor student life and

66

immediately [after graduation] I had everything. What I just wanted to have. Something that you cannot touch but you know.

Hugo states that he is aware that some of the goods that came with the life with his partner he gained also access to material goods, as well as possibilities that he was previously not used to. While he thinks that for his partner it is more difficult to adjust to living together because he was used to live alone and therefore had more freedom and privacy. The negotiation that Hugo is making is simultaneously distancing him from the distributions of social goods that are offered in the Roma community where he lived, which was an industrial small town and the life in Budapest, where he had his networks. However, Hugo's narrative shows that those networks did not significantly improve his living standard and possibilities. I believe that the ways in which Hugo articulated his sexuality in the program as well as the jobs that he used to have, did not bring him into a position of accumulating social goods to an extent that for example one of his heterosexual friend's articulation of ethnicity, sexuality and masculinity could. Therefore, I believe that in Hugo's case his class position has shaped his current status in the class hierarchy as well as his masculinity and sexuality articulations within the Roma community.

Chapter 5:

Conclusion

In the previous two chapters I have discussed ways in which students of RGPP, in the period from 2013 until 2016, have articulated their Roma identities, how I understood their articulatory practices and negotiations within a system of power relations that is complex and changing. I have argued for an intersectional analysis of what is considered to be hegemonic Roma identity within the group of students that I have interviewed and contrasted those narratives from several perspectives. I grounded my theoretical framework in studies of intersections of ethnicity and sexuality, and I have used an interdisciplinary approach in order to combine bodies of knowledges from the fields of sexuality studies, gender studies as well as discourse analysis in order to complicate the understanding of Roma identities within the group of students of Roma Graduate Preparation Programs at CEU, Budapest. The theoretical framework that I have referred to in my case study was defined by Nagel (2013). This framework enabled me to argue for an understanding of ethnicity which is always in relation to understandings and interpretations of masculinities (that is gender), sexuality and class. Ethnicity, sexuality, gender and class seem to always cut across each other and intersect in the **processes** of articulations of my respondents' identification practices they are engaged with. I approached my research also from a position of discourse analysis, in order to claim that these articulatory practices in the processes of hegemonization of identities, discussed in my thesis, in order to claim that language reflects on those practices. I used the framework offered by Gee (2011) in order to support this claim and indicate that talking is doing and doing is being. Sometimes the ways of being have consequences, as for me so for my respondents. In the

previous two chapters I have analyzed the ways of how hegemony is established and maintained from the perspectives of my respondents in comparison to their narratives about correlations with students who did not respond to the calls for participation in my research. Then, I have compared those narratives to components that are part of my research field, but due to the lack of space in this research paper I could not analyze them. However, I address the multiple structures in which students of the RGPP program are immersed, such as the founders of RGPP programs Roma and non-Roma alike, in order to indicate that there are both influences from above and below in the process of articulation and negotiation of ethnicity, sexuality, gender and class in what seems to be a process of policing of desirable ways in which Roma ethnicity, within the group of students whose interviews I have analyzed, in the process of establishing identities via practices of diversification and exclusions. The process of diversification, as reflected on in the previous two chapters, seem to have consequences in the way how social benefits are distributed among the students of RGPP.

The practices of articulations that have been analyzed in the previous chapters show the connections between ethnicity, sexuality, gender and class. Those connections are dependent on the ways in which the students negotiate the socially imposed norms and expectations in the process of identification. In my analysis I have described negotiation practices that reflect on how heterosexuality is established as the hegemonic sexuality within the group of students. Although only one respondent identified as a heterosexual man, and another one has indirectly implied it, the narratives of the four students who identify with non-normative sexuality practices also inform how heterosexuality is articulated as the hegemonic type of masculinity. The negotiation practices show that hegemonic notions of sexuality are established via practices of exclusions, and policing of heterosexuality. Also, my analysis shows that the negotiation practices work differently for every interviewee. For example, some choose not to

69

identify sexually, while some choose to identify as either heterosexual or gay. It seems that the choices of non-identification have several meanings.

One might be that by not identifying as a heterosexual, while engaging in heterosexual practices, the respondent creates a space for queer narratives about heterosexuality, which might mean that he is not complicit with the exclusions that are created by such an identification practice, especially in comparison to the respondents understanding of multiple discrimination of his either gay friends or friends who do not identify as gay, but engage in same-sex practices. Another reason for non-identification among the group of students who engage in same-sex practices might the respondent's belief that the terminology, as well as the political implications that identification as gay brings, puts them into a framework of multiple oppression, with which the respondent disagrees, while he claims that being gay in any community is difficult and that he does not see differences between Roma and non-Roma gays. In addition, not-identifying could mean that some of the respondents negotiate their identification in a process of comparisons with the prices of exclusions that some of the Roma gay identified men described in their interviews. I addressed some of those prices in a system of reproduction and distribution of social benefits that either include or exclude individuals with particular types of negotiation of sexuality, gender and class in the process of establishing hegemonic Roma identity.

Having said this, I return back to the contextualizations of these struggles within and outside of the Roma communities. As I mentioned throughout my thesis, the Roma communities in Europe face different measures of differentiation and exclusions, institutional and symbolic, in the processes of establishing national identities within the countries and regions where my respondents come from and often times return to after they complete their studies. Significant research has been done to document these processes of discrimination.

70

What this means for all of my respondents is that everyone faces anti-Gypsism or violence in different degrees. The educational program within the institution that my respondents are part of is a part of a struggle of the Roma movement to support and shape a generation of Roma students who will obtain the tools and knowledge to fight for equality within the communities that they come from and those where they might be departing to. RGPP as a program has helped significantly to raise the level of education among those students with university degrees and who have aspirations to continue their education either on an M.A. level or PhD levels. However, the number of highly educated Roma in Europe is still very small, and I believe that in the last 10 years the program has significantly impacted the fight against stigmatizations and exclusions such as economic, political, social and cultural. In this struggle, the impact of the Roma foundations and NGOs has been significant in terms of European wide policy negotiations, supporting financial and non-financial resources to RGPP and the students, and various types of support for Roma individuals to obtain and study and obtain degrees from elementary education levels to PhDs. Also, these organizations are engaged in fights against stereotypes of majority populations in forms of legal litigation, grassroots activism etc.

Keeping this in mind, I believe that it is important to contextualize my work in the field of multiple oppressions and indicate to some of the difficulties that some of the members of the community face in relation to both, the majority populations and the Roma communities that my interviewees come from. I believe that it is important to create a space for reflection on the problems that occur during the process of differentiations, in the Roma community of RGPP students, and raise awareness about the material and symbolic consequences of the differentiated articulations of hegemonic Roma identity in comparison to the minorities within the minority. This is important in order to understand that, like in any other community, the attempts to create hegemony are followed by processes of exclusions that in return have consequences for the lives of those students in RGPP who identify either as Roma and gay, or

71

who engage in same-sex practices but do not identify sexually, or those who engage in heterosexual practices but do not identify with heterosexuality. Some of those consequences have been addressed in my case study and the purpose of this research is to open the space for critical discussions on whether these exclusions should be maintained and re-enforced at the expense of multiple discrimination of people who are our friends; colleagues; neighbors; brothers; cousins; uncles; teachers; scholars; doctors; sweeper; merchants; electricians; or as a matter of fact unemployed. Another aim of this research is to invite LGBT scholars or scholars on Roma LGBT issues, as well as activists, to question the frameworks that are offered and if those frameworks are applicable to the communities where they work and live, because as my research indicates, not all Roma men identify or relate to some of the offered solutions. It is also an invitation to ask the question what is it that a recently rising Roma LGBT movement can do in the communities where they operate. What I find most important is what are the autonomous solutions that stem from the knowledges and experiences of multiple levels of discrimination that individuals in our communities experience and how that knowledge can be used and mobilized for autonomous actions.

Bibliography:

Barad, Karen. Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28.3 (2003): 801-31. Web.

Browne, Kath, and Catherine J. Nash. *Queer Methods and Methodologies: Intersecting Queer Theories and Social Science Research*. Farnham, Surrey, England: Ashgate, 2010. Print.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Connell, Raewyn. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: U of California, 1995. Print.

Duggan, Lisa, and José Esteban Muñoz. Hope and Hopelessness: A Dialogue. *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 19.2 (2009): 275-83. Web.

Gee, James Paul. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge, 2011. Print.

Hall, Stewart. *Gypsy 'menace': Populism and the New Anti-gypsy Politics*. Place of Publication Not Identified: Oxford UP, 2012. Print.

Levinson, Martin P., and Andrew C. Sparkes. Gypsy Children, Space, and the School Environment. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 18.6 (2005): 751-72. Web.

Nagel, Joane. *Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality: Intimate Intersections, Forbidden Frontiers*. New York: Oxford UP, 2003. Print.

Nirenberg, Jud. *Gypsy Sexuality: Romani and Outsider Perspectives on Intimacy*. Mesa, AZ: Clambake, 2011. Print.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. Shame, Theatricality, and Queer Performativity. *Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity Touching Feeling* (2002): 35-65. Web.

Stewart, Michael, and Márton Rövid. *Multi-disciplinary Approaches to Romany Studies*. Budapest: Central European UP, 2011. Print.

W., Connell R., and Messerschmidt W. James. Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society* 19.6 (2005): 829-59. Web.

Online websites:

Decade in Brief. - *Romadecade.org*. N.p., n.d. Web. 06 June 2016.

The Gypsy 'Menace' | Hurst Publishers. *HURST*. N.p., n.d. Web. 06 June 2016.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Before the interview:

- Can you introduce yourself, tell me your name and preferred pseudo name, age and where you were born?
- Can you tell me about your family's social background and the schools that you have previously attended?

1. **Self-identification and perception**
   1.1 Do you identify as a man, a woman or something else?
   1.2 What are the characteristics that make you masculine?
   1.3 Do you have/have you had any role models in your life?
   1.4 Who were/are they? For what reasons are/were they your role models?
   1.5 How much do you compare yourself with them?

2. **Male peers: acceptable and unacceptable masculinities**
   2.1 Who is your male best friend in the group? How did you come to be friends?
   2.2 Can you recall the story of this friendship?
   2.3 Are there things you and your male best friends share with each other? What are they?
   2.4 Do you have non-Roma friends as well?
   2.5 Can you recall an event or situations when someone has made jokes about your type of manliness?

3. **Romantic partners/ relationship questions**
   3.1 Would you say you have a tendency to go for a particular type of person? If so what's it like? If not, how diverse have your choices been?
   3.2 Do you currently have a partner?
       - What do your friends/ does your family think about your partner?
       - How do you feel about what they say as a man?
       - Have you ever lived with a partner together? If yes, how was it?
       - Would you say your current relationship is a traditional relationship?
       - What do you think of commitment?
   3.3 Have you had a non-Roma partner before?
   3.4 How did your friends and family react to that? How did your partner's friends and family react to that?
   3.5 If you have a brother and he came out to you as gay, wanting to get married to a man, would you support him?

3.6 How would you react if your best friend came out as gay to you?

4. **Gay corner**
4.1 Would you support your gay friends from the program on the Budapest Pride event?
4.2 How important do you think it would be to march at this event with a Roma flag?
4.3 Have you ever been to a gay bar or party?
   - How do you remember it?
4.4 Have you ever been in a situation in which you thought it would be better to be a Roma woman, a non-Roma man or a Roma gay man?
4.5 Can you recall any event in the program that upset you because you felt excluded, ridiculed or devalued?

5. **Sexual practices:**
5.1 Would you say you're sexually active?
5.2 How do you meet your partners?
5.3 Do you think your partner funinds you a good lover?
5.4 Have you imagined to/ would you have sex with someone of the same/ "other" sex?
5.5 How do you feel when a man is flirting with you? (Reformulation: How do you feel when a man is trying to make a pass at you?

6. **Class**
6.1 What kind of family/community do you come from?
6.2 Are you planning to return eventually? (why/why not?)

APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM

Consent to Participate in Research
Working Title of Study (Articulation of Roma: an Intersectional Analysis of

Ethnicity, Class, Gender and Sexuality at the Roma Graduate Programs)[36]

Introduction and Purpose

My name is Arman Heljic. I am a graduate student at the Central European University, in the Department of Gender Studies, Program of Critical Gender Studies. I would like to invite you to take part in my research study, which concerns how the male students and alumni of Roma Access Programs (RAP) articulate and negotiate their masculinities. The aim of this project is to investigate how Roma masculinity is articulated at the intersections of ethnicity, class, gender and sexuality.

Procedures

If you agree to participate in my research, I will conduct an interview with you at a time and location of your choice. The interview will involve questions in the topics of articulation and your perception of ethnicity, class, gender and sexuality. It should last about *one hour.*

---

[36] Template of the consent form was modeled and partially taken over from the template provided by: cphs.**berkeley**.edu/CF-Sample_Interview_Audiotape.doc.

With your permission, I will audiotape and take notes during the interview. The purpose of audio taping is to accurately record the information you provide. The audio material will be used for transcription purposes only. If you choose not to be audiotaped, I will take notes instead. If you agree to being audiotaped but feel uncomfortable at any time during the interview, I can turn off the recorder at your request. Or if you don't wish to continue, you can stop the interview at any time.

Confidentiality

Your study data will be handled as confidentially as possible.

The results of this study are part of my required thesis project. The results of the study will be available and accessible online. Individual names and other personally identifiable information will not be used. Pseudo names will be used instead.

To minimize the risks to confidentiality, the audio recordings will be available only to me while the notes and transcriptions of the interviews will be available only to me and my supervisors. Your names will be coded, and you can choose your own pseudo name.

When the research is completed, I might save the materials: audio records, transcription of interviews and field notes for future research, done by myself. I will keep the data

obtained in the research for no longer than two years after the study is completed. The same measures described above will be taken to protect confidentiality of this study data. After that period all data will be destroyed.

Rights

Participation in research is completely voluntary. You are free to decline to take part in the project. You can decline to answer any questions and are free to stop taking part in the project at any time.

Questions

If you have any questions about this research, please feel free to contact me. I can be reached at *Arman_Heljic@student.ceu.edu* *or +36705356461*

****

CONSENT

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your own records.

If you wish to participate in this study, please sign and date below.

_____

Participant's Name *(please print)*

_____ _____

Participant's Signature   Date

If you would like to state your preferred pseudo name please write the pseudo name:

_____ _____

Participant's Pseudo Name   Date