

26. Hall M. (2011) Constructions of Leadership at the Intersection of Discourse, Power, and Culture: Jamaican Managers' Narratives of Leading in a Postcolonial Cultural Context. *Management Communication Quarterly*. – N 25(4). – P. 612–643.
27. Hall S., editor (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (Culture, Media and Identities series). – London : SAGE.
28. Kronsell A. (2016) Sexed Bodies and Military Masculinities: Gender Path Dependence in EU's Common Security and Defense Policy. *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. 19(3) P.–311–336.
29. Mallavarapu S. (2007) Globalization and the Cultural Grammar of 'Great Power' Aspiration. *INTERNATIONAL STUDIES* 44, 2 : P. 87–102.
30. Martin E. (1991) The Egg and the Sperm: How Science Has Constructed a Romance Based on Stereotypical Male-Female Roles // *Signs*. – Vol. 16. – N 3. – P. 485–501. Цитується за: Гендерована біологія / М. Маєрчик, О. Плахотнік // *Гендер для медій : підручник .../ за ред. М. Маєрчик (гол. ред.), О. Плахотнік, Г. Ярманової*. – К. : Критика, 2013. – С. 61–78.
31. Riach K. (2007) "Othering" older worker identity in recruitment *Human Relations*; N 60. – P. 1701
32. Sanli S. (2011) Public Sphere and Symbolic Power: 'Woman's Voice' as a Case of Cultural Citizenship. *Cultural Sociology* N 5(2). – P. 281–299.
33. Sarmiento C. (2009) Folk Culture and Political Power: Practices and Representations of Moliceiro Culture in Portugal. *Clara Cultural Sociology*. – Volume 3(3). – P. 347–376.

Отримано 10.08.2017

UDC – 316.728

Шевцова М.Ю. °

Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, Senior Non-Resident Adjunct Fellow
Associate at Ukraine Democracy Initiative, кандидат економічних наук, доцент,
PhD in Political science

CONDUCTING LGBT MOVEMENTS RESEARCH IN THE POST-SOVIET CONTEXT: BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN ACTIVISM AND ACADEMIA AND OTHER CHALLENGES

Мета даної статті – виявлення та аналіз проблем, пов'язаних із міждисциплінарними дослідженнями в міжнародній науковій діяльності, яку спрямовано на подолання розривів між гендерними студіями, квір та ЛГБТ тематикою, дослідженнями сексуальності та такими більш

консервативними та класичними науками, як політологія, міжнародні відносини, а також юриспруденція або ж правознавство. В той час, коли провідні світові університети начебто декларують підтримку та вітають міждисциплінарні проекти, реальність виявляється дещо іншою. Саме тому, коли науковиця починає проект, який поєднуватиме декілька областей знань, дуже важливим є повністю усвідомлювати, з якими проблемами їй, напевне, доведеться зіткнутися. На базі огляду тематичної літератури, інтерв'ю з експертами та експертами галузі, а також аналізу провідних наукових видань у відповідній сфері науки, в цій статті виділяється три головних групи проблем, характерних для таких міждисциплінарних досліджень. Перш за все, стаття критично підходить до аналізу дебатів між так званими «східним» та «західним» напрямками фемінізму. Також в статті пропонується кількісний контент аналіз провідних академічних журналів з політології та міжнародних відносин для дослідження питання сучасної маргіналізації та виключення квір-тематики з конвенційних класичних політології та міжнародних відносин. Нарешті, в статті обговорюється складна взаємодія між науковим середовищем та активізмом громадянського суспільства та беруться до уваги такі важливі аспекти цієї взаємодії, як позиційність, дослідницька етика, так постійні рефлексії.

Ключові слова: квір-дослідження, міждисциплінарні дослідження, активізм, гендерні студії, квір міжнародні відносини, ЛГБТ

Целью данной статьи является выявление и анализ проблем, связанных с междисциплинарными исследованиями в международной научной деятельности, направленной на преодоление барьеров между гендерными исследованиями, квир и ЛГБТ тематикой, исследованиями сексуальности и такими более консервативными и классическими науками, как политология, международные отношения, а также юриспруденция или правоведение. Тогда как ведущие мировые университеты декларируют всяческую поддержку междисциплинарных проектов, реальность оказывается несколько другой. Поэтому при принятии решения о начале проекта на стыке нескольких областей знаний и науки, для исследовательницы особенно необходимо в полной мере осознавать, с какими препятствиями предстоит столкнуться в процессе реализации научной работы. Основываясь на обзоре тематической литературы, интервью с экспертами и экспертами и ведущими учеными в области социальных наук, а также на анализе специализированных научно-академических изданий, в данной статье выделены три группы факторов. Прежде всего, статья подвергает критическому анализу дискуссии между так называемыми «Восточным» и «Западным» феминизмами. Далее, в статье предлагается количественный контент-анализ ведущих научных изданий в области политологии и международных отношений для рассмотрения проблемы исключения и маргинализации проектов, связанных с квир-исследованиями из мейнстримной западной политологии и международных отношений.

Наконец, в статье обсуждаются сложные взаимоотношения между научной средой и гражданским обществом и активизмом, в процессе чего затрагиваются такие важные вопросы, как позиционирование, исследовательская этика, а также постоянная рефлексия.

Ключевые слова: квир исследования, междисциплинарные исследования, активизм, гендерные исследования, квир международные отношения, ЛГБТ

The aim of the present paper is to explore and analyze the challenges of interdisciplinary research in international academia aimed to bridge the gap between studies on gender, LGBT and sexuality issues with such hardcore social science areas as political science, international relations, and legal studies. While leading world universities claim to support and welcome mentioned kind of research, the reality presents itself somewhat different as a scholar dives into the project across several areas of knowledge, it is important for her to be aware of obstacles she may face along the way. Based on the review of the literature, interviews with the social science scholars, and analysis of leading journals in the field, this paper defines three main groups of problematic issues to be dealt with. First, it critically addresses the “Eastern” vs. “Western” feminisms debates. Secondly, it offers quantitative content analysis of the leading academic journals in political science and international relations to question the current situation with the exclusion or marginalization of the queer studies topics from the mainstream Western political science and IR academia. Finally, the article discusses complex interactions between the academia and civil society activism bringing up topics as positionality, research ethics, and constant self-reflection.

Kew words: queer studies, interdisciplinary research, queer IR, gender studies, activism, LGBT

Actuality. The last two decades have seen growing interest to the topic of LGBT rights and activism covering not only countries where LGBT movements have been present and visible for a while but also in less explored and analyzed in this regard post-soviet countries. Having emerged as rather a queer, gender and sexuality studies topic, the issue of political participation of LGBT community proved to have significant value and interest for other areas of social sciences. Recently more and more authors have been integrating the topic into the political science and international relations research [Ayoub, 2013, 2014, 2016; O'Dwyer, 2012]. However, it is crucial to point out that in spite of several bright examples of local authors [Martsenyuk, 2016] the international academic audience still remains influenced by rather Western or Eurocentric scholarship.

The **aim** of the present paper is to explore and analyze the challenges a scholar from a post-soviet country has to deal with while producing an interdisciplinary research in her home country with LGBT rights in focus. For the sake of turning this work into a condensed message, I divide them, tentatively though, into several groups. The first one, as it has been mentioned above, is closely related with the Westernization of queer studies and gender studies scholarship and can be defined as “affiliation” (rather than “nationality”) bias.

Traditionally bigger value – academically, firstly, but also while addressing wider audience – is attributed to the pieces of research produced by the people affiliated with the Western universities and published predominantly in English. The scholars who prefer deliberately or have to work in the post-soviet countries have, compared to their Western colleagues, much more limited outreach not only due to the language issue, but also because of lack of funding and low, so far, involvement into transnational networking.

Secondly, LGBT rights as a topic has been for quite some time discussed by the representatives of more “hard core social sciences” such as political scientists and IR scholars mentioned above. Still, despite of this, there remains a strong tendency to squeeze projects containing reference to gender, sexuality, or women’s or LGBT rights issue in the description into the “gender/queer studies” box. This, again, shortcuts the potential for the researchers who have chosen to bridge the gap between the disciplines and to integrate gender or queer studies into other, more established disciplines. To elaborate on this challenge, I draw on the works of Cynthia Weber, a feminist pioneer of queer IR studies. I complement her work with my own analysis of top international relations and political science journals. Based on my own research experience and data collected via interviews with my colleagues, I reflect on problematics of “queering” of modern political science (acknowledging, at the same time, successful cases).

Finally, in this paper I discuss some complex interactions between the academia and civil society activism and question the ways of one’s positionality as a researcher while studying such topic as LGBT movements. I raise both topics of one’s sexuality and gender identity as well as the limits of or potential for academic participation in civil society activism and policy-making. Acknowledging the need of self-reflection and constant process of peer-review, I address the problems a researcher may face due to own identity as well as due to the need to decide either to be a scholar or an engaged scholar. While I am far from suggesting solutions to all the problems this paper brings up, I am optimistic in stating that tackling those issues, discussing them and being self-reflective will, in the long term, bear fruits.

Performing a post-soviet gender studies scholar. It is well known that there is no Russian or Ukrainian word for “gender” as well as that it is quite difficult to come up with the decent translation to Russian or Ukrainian of “Gender studies” area of social sciences that would not sound peculiar to untrained ears. Most of the experienced scholars in the field coming from Eastern Europe were trained and draw their research on Western scholarship. Even though by the second decade of the twenty first century we have a list of authors writing extensively on the gender-studies/queer-themed topics, it is still rather early to talk about Ukrainian or Russian schools of thought. There is, however, constantly growing interest in Western academia in gender/queer-related issues in post-soviet context. Correspondingly, there is similarly growing body of literature covering these issues. Most of these works are either produced by Western authors or are substantially inspired and guided by them. This leads us to the assumption that gender and queer perspective on post-soviet area is viewed from rather Western or Euro-centric angle.

Allaine Cerwonka, in her article “Traveling Feminist Thought: Difference and Transculturation in Central and Eastern European Feminism” reflects on existing power relations within global academic political economy and on how these relations function in the field of women’s and gender studies [Cerwonka, 2008]. Her conclusion is somewhat disappointing as she points out limits of “women’s and gender studies’ dominant conceptual frameworks” and persisting uncritical structures in terms of national and regional differences leading to “missing much of the complexity and subtlety of how ideas and identities are constituted” [Cerwonka, 2008: p. 828]. Cerwonka’s main critique of Western views on “Central and Eastern European Feminism” was that the studies conducted by “outsiders” or “Westerners” cannot grasp the essence of the domestic contexts as those scholars look at post-soviet countries through the lenses of their own perception. Presumably, the body of the literature created by local scholars in Ukraine and other post-soviet countries would be less subjected to Westernization issue. However, here the issue of academic ranking and recognition comes into play.

While, on the one hand, there is declared and proven interest in the topics covering ‘less examined’ regions such as Central and Eastern Europe, there is no much real interest in the scholarship produced in those regions. Even if there are journals published in CEE countries offering articles not (only) in the official language of its country of origin but also in English, it is hardly unlikely that those journals reach Western audience. Therefore, the articles that are actually read are mostly articles either written by Western scholars for the Western journals from very particular perspective Cerwonka critically addressed or by the scholars coming from CEE countries but already successfully ‘integrated’ or on the way to being so into Western academia. There is a lot of positive in the fact that people from CEE countries can learn from the Western (European) standards and bring those to Ukraine, for example, however, since Central and Eastern European countries do, too, have their scholarly and academic traditions, it is important to ensure that there is not an imposition of views and Eurocentric perspective but a knowledge and experience exchange. This is more difficult to ensure considering existing hierarchy and system of ranking internationally where CEE countries are still mostly lagging behind. One of the major challenges for the local social sciences in these countries is to overcome existing bias and to promote national scholarship across the borders. I see some ways in which the efforts could be directed. First, there is, obviously, still need to work on increasing the quality, methodological novelty, and level of qualification of the scholars in the field using available resources to increase qualification of academic staff without losing the originality. Secondly, modern technology and internet in particular provide scholars with numerous opportunities for self- and knowledge promotion which are often neglected or overlooked. There is a need, therefore, to use new channels to increase the outreach of academic and semi-academic works of local authors, increase and develop cooperation between the universities and higher education and research institutions, and to introduce domestic perspective to the more mainstream areas of academia.

“Queering” the IR

For quite some time the topics of sexuality, LGBT rights, homophobia, queer migration and alike remained exclusively in gender/queer/sexuality studies box having made it somewhat later to wider scope of social sciences and sociology, in particular. While conducting interdisciplinary research seems to be encouraged in Western academia, the fields of international relations and political science tend to preserve rather conservative attitudes and express some alertness when it comes to incorporation of the topics mentioned into these areas. My own dissertation written in partial fulfillment of PhD degree in political science (more precisely, comparative politics) focused on LGBT rights related norm diffusion in non-EU member states. The most common question I would receive while presenting my research in front of a new committee would be “Why is this a political science topic?” While I find this question legitimate, in principle, hardly would someone working on political parties’ competition, which is more traditional issue for a PolSci department, get this kind of questions at least once. In order to check whether my personal experience coincides with the general trend, I went through the list of publications of the top-IR and political science journals for the last ten to fifteen years. The results of this research of mine are presented in two tables below.

Table 1. Salience of the topic of LGBT, sexuality, etc. in top-10 IR journals (2002-2017)

Journal Title	Amount of article where LGBT, gay, queer would be one of the keywords
International Organizations	2 (2013; 2014)
International Studies Quarterly	4 (2017; 2016; 2007; 2007)
International Security	2 (2010; 2002)
Foreign affairs	1 (2012, book review)
APSR (American Political Science Review)	7 (2002, 2004, 2009, 2x2013, 2x2014)
World Politics	0
European Journal of International Relations	3 (2x2-14; 2016)
Journal of Conflict Resolution	0
Millennium: Journal of International Studies	3 (all 2016)
Review of International Studies	5 (2007, 2x2010, 2016, 2017)

source: own research

Table 2. Saliency of the topic of LGBT, sexuality, etc. in top-10 Political Science journals (2002-2017)

Journal Title	Amount of article where LGBT, gay, queer would be one of the keywords
Perspectives on Politics	10 (2x2006, 2008, 2010, 3x2011 (article and responses to it), 3x2016 (same book reviews))
European Union Politics	2 (both 2012)
Western European Politics	0
Journal of Common Market Studies	2 (2009, 2014)
Political Psychology	4 (2012, 2015, 2016, 2017)
Politics & Society	2 (2005, 2009)
Political Science Quarterly	7 (2x2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2x2013)
Post-Soviet Affairs	3 (all related to Russia and Putin, 2x2013, 2016)
International Affairs	1 (2016)
State Politics and Policy Quarterly	2 (2012, 2014)

source: own research

The numbers shown in these tables are rather self-explanatory and while there is a small increase in amount towards years 2014-2017, it cannot be defined as drastic. Going through the search and filtering process (for example, the search engine could offer me an article written by a person with surname Gay on a completely irrelevant topic), I also could see that many names are repeating and most of them I quoted in my dissertation. In other words, there are very few scholars who not only are interested in queering IR theories or political science but also are successful enough in their endeavor to be published in top-international journals. One may argue, of course, that LGBT-related topics are not that popular in these journals simply because they, indeed, do not have much in common for these fields. However, to compare with, the amount of the articles having “feminism” as a key word in only European Journal of International Relations is 61 which is twice more than all the articles on LGBT-related topics in 20 journals in last fifteen years. There is no reason, and Cynthia Weber (2014) proves it in a brilliant way in her article “Why is there no Queer International Theory?” and later in her book “Queer International Relations: Sovereignty, Sexuality and the Will to Knowledge?” (2016), not to introduce queer perspective or not to mainstream LGBT(IQ?) rights into the international relations and political science fields. Yet, it presents quite a few challenges.

On the one hand, Weber claims, there are all the reasons to argue that queer-themed work does not present current interest of IR and political science scholars. This claim she supports with mentioning of growing membership in the International Studies Association (ISA) LGBTQA Caucus and significant amount of applications and submissions to the first interdisciplinary conference to focus on Queer IR. It is worth noting, however, that the situation seems to be much better in Anglo-Saxon academia whereas German and, overall, continental political science and IR scholarship remains much more conservative in this regard, not to mention almost complete absence of the topic in Eastern European PolSci academic curriculum. Weber also refers to an “expanding body of queer-themed work authored by IR scholars that dates back some 20 years” mentioning authors like A. Agathangelou, D. Altman, M. Jauhola, K. Kollman, P. Owens, V. Peterson, N. Pratt, R. Rao, L. Sabsay, L. Shepherd and L. Sjoberg, R. Smith and herself as a proof of such scholarly interest. Yet, as she writes and as my own research presented in two tables above confirms, these are mostly the articles that did not make it to the top-journals in the field which does not necessarily mean they are not of high quality or academic novelty. Finally, she points out that queer-themed scholarship in IR usually is focused on “classic” IR topics, such as “war, security, sovereignty, intervention, hegemony, nationalism, empire, colonialism, and the general practice of foreign policy.” This should have sent a very clear message to those questioning why these articles or papers are not to be placed into a “gender studies” or “queer theory” boxes [Weber, 2014]. Yet apparently it does not.

The analysis done by Weber in her “Queer International Relations: Sovereignty, Sexuality and the Will to Knowledge” book convincingly shows how homosexuality and gay rights have during the last decades penetrated the discourse of international relations and public policies both in world politics and in corresponding scholarship. Weber presents them as core topics in such key issues in international relations as migration, terrorism, European integration, regional development, and democratization. At the same time, she claims, the stakes to include the so-called “figure of homosexual” or a queer figure into classic IR scholarship seem to be rather high as, until today mainstream and even constructivist IR scholarship failed to “read sovereignties and sexualities together” in spite of the fact that in real life they have been intertwined for quite some time [Weber, 2016]. The combined reading of two scholarships - IR and queer studies - would significantly enhance our understanding of private and intimate relations of power in the society as well as of power structures and balances (and their shift) in regional and international politics. Such a reading, however, as well as suggested in the previous section exchange between ‘Eastern’ and ‘Western’ gender studies paradigms or academic bodies of the literature requires going against the well established tradition and includes, obviously, more efforts and potential failures from the side of queer/gender studies scholars than of those in mainstream political science or IR. Such efforts, however, seem to be inevitable and the only precondition to create queer IR theory to counterbalance the dominant paradigm.

Positionality: should black do research on black?

Positionality, I would argue, plays key role in qualitative research in social sciences. Unlike in quantitative approach when the scholar is one on one with the data set and sophisticated computer software, the qualitative approach, be that (semi)structured interview, participant observation, or, especially, ethnography often means direct contact with a person or a group of people. In order to collect empirical material, one has to spend significant amount of time shaping the questionnaire and/or the criteria based on which the data will be analyzed, find people to be interviewed or groups/events to be observed, and to establish good rapport. This is where the issues of positionality and group identity bias arise.

The title for this section speaks to Jane Mansbridge article, "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent "Yes" published in 1999 in "The Journal of Politics," by the way. Mansbridge's argument is, as it is clear from the title, in favor of so-called "descriptive representation." According to her, even if there are some costs to be paid in other values for the sake of granting the representatives of an oppressed group to represent in a governing body or institution the larger "disadvantaged polity", paying those costs "makes sense" [Mansbridge,1999: p.628]. While there are concerns regarding this position, such as encouraging to rule less qualified candidates, issue of essentialism, and risk of reduced accountability, Mansbridge successfully casts them away stressing the importance of experiential deliberation and access to enhanced communication.

The field of social science research often makes one face the need to answer the same question for her own research project. One case when it is even more so is for a researcher from a non-Western country working in Western academia. It is enough to browse through names of PhD and post-doctoral researchers in Western universities from post-soviet countries and see what kind of research they are conducting (this applies mostly to social sciences, of course). Not surprisingly, hardly you will see many Russians doing a research on German politics in German universities even though Germany would be a perfect place to conduct such a research. While you will definitely see many German students conducting research on foreign countries, there is a clear ethnic or national identity bias one can see with the naked eye: non-Western-Europeans are "expected" to conduct research on non-Western-Europeans to be of value added to Western academia (as I mentioned in the first section of this paper, they also are expected to publish in Western academic journals and present at the Western academic conferences to be recognized).

Similar bias concern applies when one is conducting research on LGBT movement and here, leaving aside ethnicity/national identity bias, I separate gender, sexuality, and political bias. First of all, historically until now political science as well as international relations remain very masculinized areas in Western academia. For example, according to the American Political Science research conducted in 2010, 71.4 percent of all faculty members in the field were male [McMurtrie, 2013]. While this situation in the US might have improved, according to the report made on Equal is not enough conference in 2015 in Brussels, in German academia by 2015 80% of full professorships in political sciences went to male staff (Equal is not enough conference, III, Antwerp,

February 2015). The same applies to the narrower field of LGBT rights in political science. To illustrate this statement, at the interdisciplinary conference last year (2016) at the University of Amsterdam, “Proud in Europe? LGBT Emancipation in Comparative Perspective,” out of approximately 30 panel organizers there were only 5 women. The same proportion, more or less, was for presenters. Moreover, there was not a single panel where the focus would have been on lesbian women in particular apart from a panel on LGBT parenting.¹ To rephrase is, to be a woman in political science in Western academia is challenging enough if one wants to make a career. To be a woman working on a “not-so-serious” topic as LGBT rights seems still to be challenging. I would like to quote here Cynthia Weber who, answering my question about how she made it to the top of the list of IR scholars with her kind of topic said:

“I got my first job because I knew statistics very well...so I had to teach this hardcore statistics course...To succeed with the topic like this you have to prove, first, that you are really good at what others are doing [mainstream IR – M.S], publish in top-journals...then, they will allow you to write what you want.”²

The sexuality issue is another one to be covered in the list of biases one faces while conducting a study on queer-themed issues using qualitative approach and, particularly, interviews and participant observation. LGBT rights and sexuality remain a delicate topic until now even in the countries as advanced legally and politically in this regards as the UK or Germany. Even more so happens when it comes to an issue so sensitive as refugees and asylum seekers on the ground of one’s sexual orientation and gender identity or homophobic violence. Establishing rapport or even getting access to the informants in the case of such issues is often easier for a researcher belonging to the oppressed group or at least having as intermediary someone belonging to the group and having its trust. Otherwise, the risk is to get access only to the limited amount of the information or no information at all. To give an example, one of my interviewees in Berlin, a trans activist working with LGBT asylum seekers from post-soviet countries commented on an attempt of a German heterosexual (presumably) researcher to collect some data via participant observation at a group talks for lesbian asylum seekers in Berlin:

“they [researchers – M.S.] come here, ask their questions, steal our topics, and then publish [articles on LGBT people – M.S.] while we are working here, they care about their career only.”³

Again, based on my personal experience of a heterosexual white female person I have to say that I did not experience any animosity or negative attitudes

¹ More information on the conference can be found here - <http://aissr.uva.nl/content/websites-research-projects/europride/europride.html>. I would like to stress that this example is mentioned by me not in order to accuse the organizers in being sexist or applying discriminatory politics towards female scholars. As a female scholar, I did not feel any negative treatment or attitude from their side. Yet the composition of the conference audience looks to me very telling as for the wider context of Western PolSci and IR field.

² Cynthia Weber at Queer International Relations - Book Launch and Lecture, Berlin, WZB, July 1, 2016

³ S., in personal communication, Berlin, October 2016.

from my LGBT interviewees and/or colleagues. I was asked, though, couple of times direct question about my sexuality in relation to my research and had to be rather careful in certain sensitive situation. It is not to claim that research projects related to LGBT community are easier to conduct for people coming out of this community. On the contrary, it can be that a researcher not belonging to the community and able to see the situation without personal touch will be able to bring certain value added to existing analysis. Yet it should be discarded that being an “outsider” limits to one access to certain amount of information. As I conducted my research on LGBT(IQ) movement in Turkey in 2013-2015, I met representatives of more than 10 major organizations presenting the movement and had more than 40 hours of interviews recorded. I was convinced that I had rather a comprehensive picture of what was going on inside the movement. The more my surprise was when at the presentation of my research at the Middle East Technical University, Ankara, I was told by one of the attendees about existing and ongoing conflict between several organizations that was, in fact, very important to my overarching research argument. None of the representatives of Turkish LGBT movement ever mentioned this conflict to me and kept saying that there were very friendly relations and collaboration between all the organizations.¹ This does not mean, of course, that if I were a lesbian, I would have been told about this conflict as I was still a foreigner and did not belong to the movement, which in Turkey as well as in many other countries, also included leftists, feminists, Kurds (specific for Turkish context). Which leads me to the third point I would like to make in this section, namely, political activism in academia.

In Turkey, where I lived and worked for some time, the universities have always been the centers of political activism, free thinking, and resistance to undemocratic governance. In Germany, being an engaged political scientist can server one a dirty trick as academic career in political science there requires a full dedication, especially on the early stages, rather than participation in campaigns and political events. Moreover, is academia not in search for objectivity and objective truth while activism is often one-sided and emotionally colored? Can one, being part of a movement, produce an objective research paper on the topic without trying to bring the audience on her side? My answer to this is “yes,” but with certain limitations. These limitations the self-reflectivity of a social scientist may have present one of the greatest challenges of conducting a research in the field. Yet while existing schemes of peer-review in the area are aimed at decreasing the risk of bias, the composition of peer reviewers’ pool has its own problems already addressed above. This is, therefore, another challenge in social science and humanities that remains to be solved.

Conclusion. In the present paper, I addressed the problems scholars from post-soviet countries conducting queer-themed research may face. In particular, I focused on the challenges of interdisciplinary research when one is trying to topics commonly considered belonging to gender/sexuality/queer studies into more “conservative” fields of International Relations and Political Science. In doing so, I discussed the issue of Western dominance in the field and persistent need to

¹ Later, when I asked the question in indirect way in follow-up interviews showing my “awareness”, my interviewees were much more open about the issue.

comply with Western academia standards in order to be able to promote research internationally. This Western lenses or somewhat Orientalist approach to studies in the post-soviet countries remain problematic as they miss complexities and nuances of domestic context, lead to depreciation of Central and Eastern European scholarship and to standardization of the knowledge instead of seeking for objectivity and variety.

Based on the works of Cynthia Weber on queer international relations theory, I discussed the challenge that bridging gender studies and political science and IR scholarship presents. Weber's work efficiently proves that there is both need and growing interest in queer-themes works on the subject and that these works do not focus on narrower issues of LGBT rights or feminism only but focus on such classic topics on IR as, for example, war, security, violence, power, etc. At the same time, however, dominant IR paradigm is still not perceptive of the topic as the overview of the top-IR and political science journals has demonstrated. The field also remains highly male-dominated. The recent years show, though, that persistent efforts bring fruits and there are visible changes and shifts allowing for such articles as "Same-sex unions: The globalization of an idea" by K. Kollman or "Why is there no Queer International Theory?" to appear in journals like "International Studies Quarterly" or "European Journal of International Relations."

In the last section of the paper, I discuss the topic of positionality in social sciences research. For the purposes of this work, I suggest separating so-called gender, sexuality, and political activism bias (I leave aside nationality bias as it has been discussed in the first section). I address the issue of "side-effects" different positions of a social science researcher dealing with sensitive issues of sexuality or homophobic violence, among other, can discover and suggest ways of approaching those and dealing with them.

The present paper, therefore, is not offering the unique answers to the problems mentioned and questions asked. It is not pessimistic, either, in suggesting to just accept those and live with it. Instead, I hope this article to become an invitation for a wider interdisciplinary discussion where representatives of different fields of science and areas of activity will gain access to so much praised by Mansbridge deliberation and where the optimal solutions will be found.

References

1. Agathangelou, A.M. (2013). Neoliberal geopolitical order and value. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 16(4), 453–476.
2. Ayoub, P. M. (2013). Cooperative transnationalism in contemporary Europe: Europeanization and political opportunities for LGBT mobilization in the European Union, *European Political Science Review*, 5, 279-310.
3. Ayoub, P. M. (2014). Contested norms in new-adopter states: International determinants of LGBT rights legislation. *European Journal of International Relations*, 1 – 30. doi: 10.1177/1354066114543335
4. Ayoub, P. M. (2016) *When States Come Out: Europe's Sexual Minorities and the Politics of Visibility*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016
5. Ayoub, P.M. & Paternotte, D. (Eds.) (2014). *LGBT Activism and the Making of Europe. A Rainbow Europe?* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

6. Cerwonka, A. (2008). Traveling Feminist Thought: Difference and Transculturation in Central and Eastern European Feminism, *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 33 (4), 809-831.
7. Kowalski, K. (2015, November 14). Betrayal and win of "LGBT clause. *Gay Alliance Ukraine*. Retrieved from http://upogau.org/eng/inform/ourview/ourview_3065.html
8. Kozłowska, H. (2014). Will the EU Sacrifice Gay Rights in Ukraine for Geopolitics? *Foreignpolicy.com*. Retrieved from <http://foreignpolicy.com/2014/03/28/will-the-eu-sacrifice-gay-rights-in-ukraine-for-geopolitics/>
9. Mansbridge, J. (1999). Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent "Yes". *The Journal of Politics*, 61 (3), 628-657.
10. Martsenyuk, T. (2010). LGBT Dvizhenie v Ukraine: 10 let spustya" (LGBT Movement in Ukraine: 10 years after). *Gendernye issledovaniya*, 20-21. Retrieved from <http://www.gender.univer.kharkov.ua/gurnal/20-21/07.pdf> accessed on 10.07.2015
11. Martsenyuk, T. (2012). The state of LGBT community and homophobia in Ukraine. *Problems of Post-Communism*, 59 (2), 60.
12. Martsenyuk, T. (2014). Prava lyudini dlya LGBT spilnoti i Evromajdan 2013-2014 (Human rights for LGBT community and Euromaidan 2013-2014). *Journal of social critique Commons*. Retrieved from: <http://commons.com.ua/prava-lyudini-dlya-lgbt-spilnoti-i-yevromajdan-2013-2014/>
13. McMurtrie, B. (2013). Political Science Is Rife With Gender Bias, Scholars Find. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Political-Science-Is-Rife-With/141319>
14. O'Dwyer, C. & Schwartz, K. (2010). Minority rights after EU enlargement: A comparison of anti-gay politic in Poland and Latvia. *Comparative European Politics*, 8 (2), 220–243.
15. Shevtsova, M. (2017). Queering Gezi and Maidan: instrumentalization and negotiation of sexuality in the protest movements in *Non-Western Social Movements and Participatory Democracy Protest in the Age of Transnationalism*, Arbatli, E., Rosenberg, D. (Eds.), Springer, pp. 85-100
16. Weber, C. (2014). Why there is no Queer International Theory? *European Journal of International relations*, 21 (1), 27-51.
17. Weber, C. (2016). *Queer International Relations. Sovereignty, Sexuality and the Will to Knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Отримано 10.08.2017