LUND UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Social Sciences

**Master thesis (two years)**
**Master programme in Development Studies**
**Major in Development Studies**

# Sexual rights of the other

**By: Sofie Rex Iversen**

Department of Human Geography          Spring 2012
                                        Supervisor: Maria Andrea Nardi

**Abstract:** The thesis investigates the Danish approach to sexual rights in development through the national development agency's (DANIDA) strategy for sexual and reproductive rights (SRHR) and a small side project sponsored by Danida on LGBT rights in the global south. In doing so, the thesis utilizes post-colonial and post-structural perspectives of among others Chantal Mouffe and Homi K. Bhabha to investigate how the strategies produce discursive meachnisms of exclusion, stereotypes and antagonisms. This involves looking at the conceptions and discursive constructions of sexuality and gender as essentialist identity categories, as well as constructions of pervasive and essentialist gender roles and antagonisms between competing identity claims, as LGBTs are constructed as the fixed but deviant 'sexual other' which becomes constitutive for maintaining the colonial order and heteronormativity. The thesis thus analyses mechanisms of exclusion within the strategies, and how these serve to invisibilise alternative gendered, sexual or kinship identifications, interests and expressions, constructing the stereotype of 'the victimized and a-sexual third world woman'. This leads to conclusions and reflections on how a division of SRHR and LGBT sexual rights interests forms a reductive perspective to the complex intersections of sexuality, gender and development, as well as the construction of heteronormativity and the positioning of heterosexual reproduction as the primary collective sexual rights interests within developmental approaches to sexual rights.

**Keywords**: Sexual rights, Post-colonialism, Post-structuralism, Bhabha, Mouffe, othering, heteronormativity, Danida, LGBT.

**Word count: 19.926**

# Table of contents:

## List of abbreviations:

**DANIDA: Danish International Development Assistance**

**ICPD: International conference on population and development**

**LGB: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual**

**LGBT: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered**

**LGBTI: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered and Intersex**

**LGBTIQ: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, Intersex, Queer**

**LGBTIQAA: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, Intersex, Queer, A-sexual and Allies**

**MDG: Millennium Development Goals**

**MSM: Men who have sex with Men**

**POA: Program of Action**

**SRHR: Sexual and reproductive health and rights**

**STI: Sexually Transmitted Infection**

**UN: United Nations**

**UNFPA: United Nations Population Fund**

**WSW: Women who have sex with women**

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Sexual rights and development

"We used to talk about development with a human face, we should be talking about development with a body" (Oku-Egbas, 2005, Africa Regional Sexuality Resource Centre, Nigeria, cited in Cornwall and Jolly 2006, p.10).

People's bodies, sexuality and gendered expressions affect every aspect of our lives. Conceptions of sexuality as essentialised identities and the positioning of heterosexuality as the hegemonic norm can build sexual hierarchies and discrimination. This also serves to shape norms for gendered and sexual behaviour and stereotypes, based on the heteronormative idea of men and women as each other's opposite (Butler 1990; Cornwall and Jolly 2006; Armas 2006; Lind 2010). It governs how we are perceived and valued, what is expected of us and which possibilities we have for realising our wishes, desires and needs. As such, sexuality is interconnected with development in every way, affecting people's positions and possibilities economically, politically and socially. Violence, security, health, poverty, equality, freedom and well-being are all aspects of development that are closely intertwined with issues of sexuality and sexual freedom (Lind 2010; Jolly 2010; Armas 2006; Cornwall et. al. 2008). As stated by among others Susie Jolly (2000, p.79):

> *"Freedom to determine one's sexual behaviour is closely connected to economic and political freedoms … Gender norms concerned with sexuality shape both women's and men's lives … These norms are all-pervasive, and not only determine the sexual aspect of our lives, but also shape our access to economic resources, and our ability to participate in social and political activities"*

This perspective on sexual norms as all pervasive and sexual freedom as crucial to economic, political and social freedoms and opportunities can be seen as the background perspective for the following research, giving grounds to the study of

sexual rights as part of developmental strategies. In this context, the conception of sexual rights in development includes perspectives on both gender and sexuality, minorities and majorities as all of these are reciprocally constitutive of each other (Jolly 2010; Lind 2010).

Securing people's freedom and equality for sexual and gendered expressions and practices can thus be a crucial developmental goal and the conception of sexual rights can be seen as a tool that has the potential to secure people's freedom for sexual and gendered expressions, as well as their protection from violations based on their sexuality or gendered expressions. The rights based perspective to sexuality and sexual and gendered expressions, can be argued to hold potential in not just empowering people in their rights to equal treatment no matter what their gendered and sexual preferences might be, but to a formal accountability from states and international development agencies to secure the sexual freedom and equality for a broad spectrum of people with different sexual and gendered affiliations and performances. It can however be argued that many current policies and strategies for sexual rights fail to include such a broad spectrum of people, limiting their focus to either heterosexual norms for sexual rights or including non-heterosexuals only within the labels of LGBT, where as polyamory, inter-sex people, hijras and many other sexual and gender identifications and practices go unmentioned within sexual rights discourse (Miller 2000; Saiz 2009; Correa, et al. 2008; Lind 2010).

In many developmental strategies and practices, sexuality has been positioned as mainly a health issue concerning maternal health and reproduction or prevention of sexually transmitted diseases and sexual assaults within a framework where heterosexual reproductive sex is positioned as the norm. But positioning sexuality as a health issue within development and as mainly having to do with reproduction, maternal-health, and sexual violence excludes a vast number of people from the protection of sexual rights in ignoring many non-reproductive aspects of sexuality. Furthermore, such a focus on maternal-health and protection from violence and disease can fail to also encompass the empowering potential of

sexual rights and can ultimately take part in constituting gendered and sexual stereotypes along with the all pervasive power structures that sexuality and heteronormativity construct around the body (Cornwall et. al. 2008; Lind 2010; Jolly 2010; Miller 2000; Correa, et al. 2008).


## 1.2 Sex as reproduction and the homosexual other – case study on Danida's approach to sexual rights

The above mentioned focus on reproduction, disease and maternal health within sexual rights can be found within the program of action (POA) from the 1994 International conference on population and development (ICPD) in Cairo (Parker 1997). Furthermore, this focus can be seen as connected to some of the Millennium Development Goals: Third goal: Promote gender equality and empower women, fifth goal: Improve maternal health, and sixth goal: Combat HIV/Aids, malaria and other diseases. Denmark is one of many countries that follows the POA from the 1994 ICPD in Cairo in their approach to sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) (Danida 2006, p.6-7).

The Danish approach to sexual rights can thus be seen as an example of a strategic approach that is also used in a larger international strategy and approach to sexual rights. The national Danish development agency's (Danida) approach to sexual rights holds one main strategy titled; 'Strategy for sexual and reproductive health and rights'. It can thus be seen as a subsumption of sexual rights and a focus on heterosexual reproductive sex (Danida 2006). Furthermore, Danida has recently funded a small information project which is carried out by the Danish LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered) organisation in cooperation with several other Danish NGOs. This project aims to develop information and strategies for other Danida and other Danish development organisations on LGBT rights and interests in the global south (LGBT Denmark 2012).

A conflation of sexual rights with reproductive rights in the main strategy can be seen as based on an assumption of sexual activity as mainly heterosexual with a

reproductive purpose, excluding many people and other sexual activities and expressions from the protection and empowerment of sexual rights. With a focus on maternal health, reproduction and the protection of women from sexual assaults and disease, one can ask how both men and women are positioned within this and how female sexuality that goes beyond motherhood, men's sexual rights and the rights of non-heterosexual people are excluded from this approach to sexual rights. Seeing as women are addressed as mothers and victims of sexual assaults, does this approach to sexual rights actually fulfil a liberatory purpose that both protects and empowers women and their sexual liberty or does it limit sexual rights to a protection paradigm, where women are positioned as victims, men as sexual predators and sexual rights become a tool for population control (Miller 2000; Lind 2010; Correa, et al. 2008)?

When non-hetero sexual relations and people are addressed within developmental approaches to sexual rights, it is often addressed through the LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered) movement and categories, and as a smaller side project to the focus on reproductive rights and maternal health, as is also the case with the Danida sponsored project on LGBT rights in the global south. This separation can in itself be seen as problematic as non-heterosexual sexualities are positioned as outside the main heteronormative sexual rights discourse. Furthermore, these strategies and issues of promoting rights and social inclusion/acceptance of LGBT people are complex and connected to problems of creating new stereotypes and universalising images of LGBT people (Lind 2010; Budhiraja et.al. 2010; Kollman and Waites 2009). One can question how the LGBT categories can answer to the broad cultural and local interpretations and expressions of gender and sexuality. It can thus be discussed whether such initiatives are part of a process of promoting general gendered and sexual diversity and freedom for all people, or to which extent is it a process that promotes specific alternative sexualities and new stereotype gay gender roles within which conceptions of non-hetero sexual acts are increasingly connected

and inflated to specific cultural gendered and sexual identities (Currier 2010; Lind 2010; Budhiraja et. al. 2010; Kollman and Waites 2009)?

In this case, people will have to adapt to specific labels of sexual identity that might be produced through specific European sexual discourses in order to claim sexual rights. The terms homosexual, gay, heterosexual, bisexual, transsexual or lesbian which are often used in formulating strategies for sexual rights can be seen as culturally specific and thus fail to grasp the complexities of sexual desires, practices and identities in different cultures. One can thus raise the question whether an approach to sexual rights for non-hetero sexualities and gendered expressions through the LGBT labels include all those who fall outside the heteronormative framework, or whether it protects and promotes specific European interpretations and representations of non-hetero sexualities, as a form of homo-normative imperialism (Cornwall et.al 2008; Lind 2010; Kollman and Waites 2009).

This gives grounds to a critical reflection on the discursive essentialisation of gender and sexuality within developmental approaches to sexual rights (Miller 2000). From a post-structural perspective, strategies that focus on sexual rights for the so called majority of heterosexuals where reproductive rights and maternal health is the main concern and strategies that focus on LGBT rights are reciprocally constitutive of each other. They are structured in opposition to each other through processes of 'othering' where heterosexuality is accepted as the norm which serve to structure pervasive heteronormative gender roles and the positioning of sexual minorities as the deviant other (Cornwall et. al. 2008, Lind 2010, Miller 2000).

The emphasis of the analysis will thus be on investigating universalising and possibly Euro-centric conceptions of sexualities within the Danish approach to sexual rights and how these can create mechanisms of exclusion, stereotypes and antagonisms. In the combination of post-colonial and post-structural perspectives, the idea of euro-centrism in sexual rights discourse is used as a perspective on

how dominant European or Western norms for sexual identifications and expressions are constitutive of sexual rights discourse; it is thus not seen as a unified European or Western perspective, but as a reflection on the power-relations within sexual rights discourse (Miller 2000, Lind 2010).

## 1.3 Problem formulation and research questions

### Problem formulation:

**How can the Danish approach to sexual rights be seen to produce discursive mechanisms of exclusion, stereotypes and antagonisms?**

### Sub research questions:

In looking at the case study of the Danish developmental approach to sexual rights, which is defined as Danida's strategy for sexual and reproductive rights and the strategy of the Danida funded project of LGBT rights in the global south, the following sub-research questions will serve as the focus of the analysis.

1. **Which discursive conceptions of gender and sexuality can be found within the Danish approach to sexual rights?**

2. **Which mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion does this entail?**

3. **Subsequently, how are those discursively included and excluded as rights bearers positioned in relation to each other?**

# 2. Theoretical perspectives - Identity politics and 'othering' in sexual rights discourse

## 2.1 Ontological and epistemological background

The theory of science perspectives for the research process can be seen as based on a post-structural perspective, with a focus on analysing and displaying discursive tendencies and normative frameworks within the two strategies for sexual rights in development. The ontological and epistemological positions can be seen in relation to among others Foucault's (1972-1977, p.131) conception of power and knowledge:

> "Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only on virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as truth."

In this post-structural perspective, truth and reality is thus constructed through discursive power-structures. In this context it is an ontological perspective of how specific ideas on sexual rights and essentialism of sexual and gender identities can be constituted and normalised within society and developmental institutions and practices. In this case truth is seen as the discourse which is accepted in that particular society or within a particular developmental approach. "...truth is centred on the forms of scientific discourse and the institutions which produce it" (Foucault, 1972-1977, p.131). This can further produce a form of social control around this discursive truth, working through both scientific and administrative systems of power and knowledge which can serve to normalise as opposed to individualise. Deconstruction and reconstruction of 'knowledge' or normative perceptions of gender and sexuality can thus be used as a tool for creating social change (Foucault 1972-1977). The analysis thus critically reflects on any essentialist constructions of sexuality and gender within the Danish strategy for

sexual rights, and the possible functions of normalisation and social control within them. Within this research perspective, alternative discursive approaches to sexuality and sexual rights might be suggested. However, these should not be seen as the 'real' nature of sexuality and gender, but merely as an alternative discourse, or as a process that aims at creating a productive instability of situated knowledge and attached power-structures (Delanty and Strydom 2003).

## 2.2 Ontological and epistemological perspectives on sexuality and gender

In analysing and addressing issues related to sexuality and gender, one must take into account both the construction and discursiveness of the terms and how the generalisation within the terms serves to enhance sexist and racial structures. The intersections of categories and stereotypes are embedded in historical accounts, ideologies and policies as well as social perceptions. The post-structural and post-colonial perspective of deconstructing stereotypes based on colonial patterns can be argued to create a productive instability of cultural perceptions of gender and sexuality, thus challenging power structures attached to fixed and binary conceptions of sexuality and gender. In this ontological approach, sexuality is closely interconnected with gender, as gender roles and conceptions of sexuality serve to constitute each other. This can be seen in relation to Judith Butler's (1990, p.151) conceptions of the heterosexual matrix: "I use the heterosexual matrix throughout the text to designate that grid of cultural intelligibility through which bodies, genders and desires are naturalised".

The term heteronormativity, which will also be used throughout the analysis, thus refers to the normalisation and naturalisation of heterosexuality and attached gendered roles, where the hetero sexualisation of desire, desiring the opposite, is seen as a driving force in constituting binary gender roles as the oppositions between the sexes, where everything that lies outside of heteronormativity is positioned as deviant (Butler 1990, P.17). Drawing on Foucault, one can further relate this to how the invention of categories for non-hetero sexualities, such as

LGBT, are connected to the invention of the idea of perversion and to a historical and scientific process of positioning and separating normal and deviant sexual behaviour (Foucault 1976).

## 2.3 Development as a discourse of normalisation and the common good

Looking at the conception of development, this term can be discursively positioned as meaning a positive progress, moving towards the better society - the common good. As pointed out by Ilan Kapoor (2008, p.76-78), foreign aid is often positioned as a mere gift from the wealthier nations to the poorer nations, based upon an array of assumed binaries; north/south, rich/poor, developed/developing, but also indicating the idea of collective wishes and needs of a society or community, and a 'collective good' that we are developing towards (Kapoor 2008). In speaking of a rights-based approach to development and sexual rights in particular, there is thus a question of which system of the 'sexual good' lies within these rights-based approaches, and how this perception of the collective good is formed. As Pointed out by Ilan Kapoor (2008, p.34):

> "They call human rights transhistorical and 'natural', yet they are drawing on a particular tradition (i.e. the Western liberal rights tradition of Euro-North America)...The end result is that the promulgation of human rights amounts not to the promotion of universal rights, but to the universalisation of the *Western* legal tradition."

One can thus criticise the universalising assumptions of 'progress' or any naturalisation of the common good within the concept of development. Not least in terms of the binary division of development as a transfer of not just resources, but political and cultural systems from the developed nations to developing nations. The terms developed and developing countries in itself suggest a positioning of the West as the norm for civility and progress, dismissing the values of alternative local cultures (Kapoor 2008, p.35). A rights-based approach to development, and in this case sexual rights, can be said to hold much potential for securing accountability from policymakers and development agencies and

multifarious inclusion in developmental goals, but at the same time one can criticise the developmental lack of awareness about the extensive cultural assumptions made within rights-based approaches to development, not least within sexual and gendered rights. As is argued by Sally Engle Merry (2003 cited in Kapoor 2008, p.34), as she comments on the transnational drafting of rights treaties, she states that they: "... think they are doing law, but they are actually making culture".

In the developmental debate, post-colonial perspectives can be used as a critical perspective on power relations between donors and receivers, or between wealthier countries and poorer countries, and as such challenge the discursive conception of development as a gift or as a neutral progress towards the common good. Post-colonial perspectives can thus be used to discuss whether or how development can be seen as a project of shaping receiver countries in accordance with Western norms and role models, viewing development in the light of the colonial conception of normalising the colonised in the image of the colonisers as a role model (Loomba 2005). It is a discussion of the continuing impact of colonial patterns in social, developmental and political accounts of the world, as Loomba (2005, p.256) states:

> "Are academics located in the West or working with Western conceptual and narrative paradigms, incapable of opening up the perspectives within which we can view the non western world? Or have they adopted reactive perspectives which lock them into a reductive position whereby they can return the colonial gaze, only by mimicking its ideological imperatives and intellectual procedures".

From this perspective one can critically assess the possibility that developmental approaches to sexual rights are "locked in a reductive position" which reproduces colonial imperatives and procedures of normalising social, civil and political practices and structures in receiver countries in accordance with western norms for the common good or  the western conception of what constitutes a civilised sexual system.  The term 'post'-colonial can thus be discussed as perspectives within this theoretical field hold that colonial structures are still present and

functioning within international, political, social and developmental relations (Hauge 2007, p.7-8).

## 2.4 Sexual rights and identity politics

The post-structural perspectives of Mouffe (2005) and Lloyd (2005) address a general critique of so called identity politics and the problematic assumptions of collective interests that can lie within rights claims as a tool within development. In making claims for sexual or reproductive rights for women, homosexuals, heterosexuals, hijras, transgendered, lady-boys, kinnars or any other sexual or gendered categorisation, assumptions are made about collective interests of that specific group, in order to make rights-claims that address these interests. According to Chantal Mouffe (2005), Moya Lloyd (2005) and Iris Marion Young (2003), among others, claiming that certain priorities or rights-claims correspond to the interests of specific groups such as women or homosexuals will always entail a suppression of the differences of experiences and identifications within the group. As it is portrayed in Iris Marion Young's (1989, p.257) statement:

> "In a society where some groups are privileged while others are oppressed, insisting that as citizens persons should leave behind their particular affiliations and experiences to adopt a general point of view serves only to reinforce the privilege, for the perspectives and interests of the privileged will tend to dominate this unified public, marginalizing or silencing those of other groups".

In looking at approaches to sexual rights, one may thus question if strategies for sexual and reproductive rights require people to adopt a heteronormative or reproductive point of view, silencing or marginalising other aspects of sexuality. In using specific sexual categories as the condition for inclusion in rights protection and empowerment, sex and sexuality are thus seen as something that you are, and not something that you do, constructing an essentialist idea of sexual identities (Lloyd 2005, p.55).

This subsequently creates a mechanism of exclusion where sexual minorities in other cultures have to adapt to these labels and perspectives, giving up any

alternative sexual perspectives and affiliations in order to be included within these rights claims. It can thus be seen as important to re-conceptualise and investigate the structural, discursive and practical oppressions within the use of gendered and sexual group identities used in constructing interests and rights claims on behalf of specific groups. According to Lloyd (2005) and Mouffe (2005), among others, identity is not a fixed entity, but constantly changing as they argue that the subject can be positioned within several group categorisations that can be both conflictual and/or cooperative. Lloyd (2005, p.15) presents the idea of the coalitional subject which is constructed through various axes of identifications - one could also say various social categorisations related to gender and sexuality - all of which have different proclaimed collective interests and rights claims. One must therefore be aware of how group-interests, based on essentialising ideas of collective gendered or sexual identities, are constructed and also run the risk of appearing as natural.

> "Interests thus, I propose, require reconceptualization in the light of identity critique. They too are constructions, negotiable and open to reformulation and, like identity, they too may be come reified to the degree that they appear to be natural" (Lloyd 2005, P.153).

Viewing both identity and group identity as well as interests and collective interests as inessential constructs, post-colonial and post-structural perspectives present us with a critique of the idea of any developmental common good or any common interests of women, homosexuals or any other groups, and an incentive to look at the power relations and inequalities at play in the construction and use of sexual identities, interests and rights claims.


## 2.5 The process of 'othering' – essentialism, antagonism and ambivalence

The construction and discursive function of essentialised gendered and sexual identities can be seen as connected to a so-called process of 'othering', which comes into play in both perspectives on relations between the coloniser and the colonised, homosexual and heterosexual, and the positioning of the normal and

the deviant. According to Chantal Mouffe (2005) and Moya Lloyd (2005), among others, social categorisations and identities in relation to gender and sexuality are constructed in a circle of 'othering', understood as always defining a group and its members in opposition to someone else, namely 'the others'.

The post-colonial conception of 'normalisation' of the colonised can also be seen as connected to this process of 'othering' and the construction of natural oppositions. In a post-colonial perspective the 'othering' of the non-Europeans can be seen as attached to a binary and discursive logic of racial, sexual and gendered difference, which positions the non Europeans or the non-heterosexuals as foreign, exotic and inferior. This process of othering is thus seen as attached to binary oppositions of essential racial, sexual and gendered differences, which serve to both position non-Europeans in fixed positions as different and inferior, but also to construct the superior 'European self'(Loomba 2005, p.91).

The construction of essentialist gender and sexual norms is thus connected to this process of othering, where essentialism of gendered and sexual categorisations and possibly cultures is constructed through the positioning of natural oppositions. Man/woman, heterosexual/homosexual, North/South, Barbarian/Civilised; all of these oppositions are constructed and naturalised through processes of othering, as they become constitutive for one another. As Mouffe (2005) and Lloyd (2005) argue, the 'othering' process contains an exclusion that is constitutive for forming political identity and corresponding rights claims. Mouffe (2005, p.108) states the following about this process:

> "The other who up until now has been considered simply as different, starts to be someone who is rejecting my identity, and is threatening 'my' existence. From that moment on, any form of us-them relationship becomes political".

In this perspective, rights claims based on essentialising group identities, such as homosexual or woman, can be seen as not just established upon exclusion but on a

relationship of antagonisms. As subject positions are portrayed as essentially opposite, they can be seen to threaten one another, creating an enemy relationship between apparently conflicting identities and interests and as such political frontiers are drawn (Lloyd 2005, p.108-109). In this argument, conceptions of the common good, or collective identities and interests for specific population groups, based on essentialising ideas of subject positions and identity politics, thus serve to create political antagonistic we/them relations that can hinder coalitions and dialogue between different groups of sexual and gendered identifications (Lloyd 2005, p.108-109).

As displayed in both Mohanty (2003), Bhabha (2004) and Loomba's (2005) accounts of the colonial process of othering, it is both a process of 'normalisation' trying to civilise the colonised in the image of the colonisers, but also to maintain them in a position as different or less civil and developed, as Loomba (2005, p.145) states: "One of the most striking contradictions about colonialism is that it needs both to 'civilise' its 'others' and to fix them into perpetual otherness". In relation to this, one can bring forth Bhabha's (2004) description of fixity, as he states that the colonial discourse is entirely dependent on fixating the 'others'. The colonised are to mimic the behaviour of the colonisers; although they can never be quite like them, they are fixed in a position as the eternal 'other' (Bhabha 2004). However, within this paradox lies a discursive ambivalence and according to Bhabha it is this ambivalence of identities and cultures that makes the stereotype necessary in order to maintain the fixity of the colonised.

> "...colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed recognizable other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite. Which is to say, that the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference" (Bhabha 2004, p.122).

In mimicry, Bhabha (2004) thus refers to a dichotomy between the colonial project of normalising and civilising the colonised in accordance within their own

norms, and the simultaneous 'othering' of the colonised where the colonised are fixated in constant otherness. Bhabha (2004, p.94) further states:

> "Fixity as the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism is a paradoxical mode of representation: it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repetition".

As Bhabha (2004) points out, there is a colonial necessity of fixating cultural and historical differences or oppositions to create an unchanging order. In his description, this also holds disorder, degeneracy and demonic repetition which can be seen in relation to the discursiveness of these oppositions that are created. These differences and natural oppositions cannot be entirely proven, as they are mere discursive constructions. This unchanging order is thus also vulnerable and must produce its slippages, constantly reproducing this order by feeding us the same discourse over and over again until it is accept as truth. As such, the means to hegemonise this discursive order is through 'demonic repetition'; the constant display and repetition of specific ideas and images of the other, which could be done through political or developmental strategies, media, etc. In this context, Bhabha (2004) presents the stereotype as a colonial tool to maintain the discursive image of natural opposition (Bhabha 2004, p.94-95).


## 2.6 The stereotype in developmental approaches to sexual rights

The stereotype is thus, in relation to Bhabha's (2004) presentation of the ambivalence in the othering process, a discursive tool to maintain an unchanging order of natural oppositions between man/woman, coloniser/colonised, heterosexual/homosexual, normal/deviant and civilised/uncivilised. Chandra Talpade Mohanty (2003) has presented a critical focus on how this process of othering entails the construction of a homogeneous account of the victimised 'third world women'.

> "...the feminist writings I analyze here discursively colonize the material and historical heterogeneities of lives of women in the third world, thereby producing/representing a composite, singular "third world woman" -an image that

appears arbitrarily constructed but nevertheless carries with it the authorising signature of Western humanist discourse" (Mohanty 2003, p.19).

As such, political and developmental initiatives that attempt to represent the rights and interests of third world women can in the process discursively colonise 'third world woman's interests and construct these around an unambiguous westernised image of 'the third world woman'(Mohanty 2003, p.18-20). In looking at women's sexual rights, Mohanty argues that western feminist accounts for gendered oppression of third world women construct a homogeneous image of the average suppressed 'third world woman'. In describing some of the discursive characteristics of this 'third world woman' as she is constructed in western feminist accounts and developmental approaches, Mohanty (2003, p.22) further states:

> "This average third world woman leads an essentially truncated life based on her feminine gender, (read sexually constrained) and her being "Third World" (read ignorant, poor, uneducated, tradition-bound, domestic, family oriented, victimized etc.)".

In opposition to this, as Mohanty (2003, p.22) argues, Western feminists view themselves: "...as educated, as modern, as having control of their own bodies and sexuality, and the freedom to make their own decisions". This image of third world women's oppression is thus constructed through the positioning of one group ,western women and western society, as the normative 'good gender hierarchy' that is both constituted by and constitutive of the homogeneous image of the victimised, truncated, family oriented third world woman. Within this colonial discourse, third world women are positioned as victims of barbarianism and patriarchal suppressive structures. The rescuing of the native women from the native men and pathriarchal structures thus serves to legitimise the colonisation and so-called mission of civilising the natives (Loomba 2005, p. 143-144). This raises the question of how current developmental approaches to sexual rights follow the colonial pattern by constructing a discursive victimisation of 'third

world women', saving them from the violent sexual behaviour of 'the third world man' and the uncivilised gender hierarchies of the south.

## 2.7 Challenging essentialism and stereotypes in sexual rights discourse – possibilities for agency

Although it is not the objective of the following analysis to present specific alternatives or solutions for sexual rights approaches, but to critically reflect on the exclusionary and normative functions of the Danish approach to sexual rights, Bhabha's (2004) and Mouffe's (2005) conceptions of how to challenge essentialism and stereotypes, provide concepts that can be used for further critical reflection of the formation of stereotypes in the Danish approach to sexual rights, not least by looking at the intersections between sexual and gendered aspects of sexual rights interests within the strategies. As such, these will be presented in the following section.

As mentioned earlier, Bhabha's (2004) perspective on the unchanging order of colonial patterns views this as dominant but also as vulnerable and holding an ambivalence, as it is dependent on constantly reproducing this discursive order through the construction of stereotypes and demonic repetition. In challenging this order and its stereotypes, Bhabha (2004) speaks of a hybridisation of cultures and identifications. This might be seen as cultural, sexual and gendered intersections between different norms, an ambivalence of identifications that can serve to challenge or threat the idea of the essentialising fixity of identifications and otherness.

> "Hybrid hyphenations emphasize the incommensurable elements – the stubborn chunks – as the basis of cultural identifications. What is at issue is the performative nature of differential identities: the regulation and negotiation of those spaces that are continually, contingently, 'opening out', remaking the boundaries, exposing the limits of any claim to a singular or autonomous sign of difference – be it class, gender or race" (Bhabha 2004, p.313).

In this conception BhaBha might be seen to emphasize the possibilities for the subaltern, the colonised or those standing outside of dominant discourse of gender and sexuality, to speak and act against the unchanging order, by expressing and acting out alternative discursive interpretations. Hybrid expressions and identifications can thus be seen to challenge the idea of the essentialising identification and categorisations of gender and sexuality as well as the order of what is normal/deviant, civilised/uncivilised and the antagonistic division of we and them. According to Mouffe (2005), the we/them relationship is seen as constitutive for politics and citizenship, and cannot be removed. However, Mouffe's (2005) claim is that it can be constructed differently through the positioning of the subject and community identities as inessential, political constructs and thus open to change (Mouffe 2005, p.19-20). The alternative democratic approach addressed by among others Lloyd (2005) and Mouffe (2005) is a notion of social-groups that moves beyond essentialising subject positions and antagonisms based on identity-politics, as the ambiguous subject should be organised politically in relation to changing interests that might have connections to multiple communities, giving potential to the forming of inessential coalitions across communities.

Mouffe's (2005) focus in the idea of the Radical Plural democracy and a new form of organising rights claims around gender and sexuality is thus not on achieving consensus in new ways, for actual consensus of a 'common good' or 'common interests' of all women, transgendered people, homosexuals etc. can never be achieved. The aim is, however, to create a framework for the expression of a multiplicity of interest and social logics. There will still be positions of we vs. them, but the ambiguous subject can be positioned within different constellations of we's and them's in relation to different issues, creating a framework of agonism, a disagreement of interpretations and interests, but within a framework of dialogue and coalitions that might move beyond antagonistic relations based on essentialism. In relation to making rights claims and developmental initiatives

concerning sexual rights, one could thus talk of creating a framework for the expression of a multiplicity of interests and sexual and gendered identifications, as opposed to organising sexual rights around pre-given ideas of sexual and gendered identities and interests. Or one could in Bhabha's (2004) terms say that there is a need for articulation and visibility of borderline-existences and the hybridity of culture, sexuality, race and gender.

## 2.8 Some critique and limitations of the post-colonial and post-structural perspectives

As Loomba notes, post-colonial studies both provide a framework for a critical perspectives on Euro-centrism and is itself an object of this critique, as post-colonial studies are to a large extent developed within European academia, drawing on so-called western concepts and academic traditions (Loomba 2005, p.256). The conception of Euro-centrism or Western-centrism in development as a perpetuation of colonialism can thus be seen as rather complex. In talking about sexual rights and Euro-centric perspectives on sexual and gendered categorisation and interests, the term Euro-centric could seem to indicate that there is a specific unified European or Western perspective or set of norms for sexual and gendered categories, as opposed to a plurality of perspectives and identifications. Just as any division of North/South, developed/developing can be criticised for its binary logic, as there are significant differences in wealth, culture etc. within and between countries that might be termed as developed or developing.

In a further critic of this binary logic in post-colonial theorising, Ilan Kapoor (2008, p.129) argues that it ignores the existence of 'third worlds' in 'the first world', such as migrant communities in Europe or 'native' communities in Northern America. Furthermore, the extensive time differences between decolonisation processes can be seen as missing from some perspectives in post-colonial arguments. As argued by Kapoor (2008, p.129), the fact that South American nations received independence much earlier than African nations, could

mean that analysing post-colonial patterns and effects in these areas requires different theoretical perspectives.

But post-colonial perspectives can be said to also draw on post-structural perspectives of discourse analysis and deconstruction; especially Bhabha (2004) can be placed within a significant post-structural framework. In the context of analysing approaches to sexual rights, post-structural perspectives on the construction of gendered and sexual categories can supplement the post-colonial perspectives in not assuming any pre-given, unified European or North American sexual discourse. The post-structural perspective for studying sexual rights provides a framework for investigating dominant norms for sexuality that might be produced within Danida's approach as a European development agency, but is ultimately a perspective of a general critical reflection on the social construction of sexual and gendered norms and power-structures, whether they are constructed within Europe or Africa, thus serving to challenge any binary logic.

But in also criticising post-structural perspectives as a tool for analysing developmental policies and strategies, it can be said that this logic supplied by Chantal Mouffe (2005) and Moya Lloyd (2005), among others, focuses on the general problems of discursive assumptions made with the formation of group-interests and rights organising, without any perspectives on how relations between 'first' and 'third world' come into play in this context. While they can be seen to be highly critical of Western conceptions and functions of liberalism, they do not include any considerations of colonial patterns within this perspective (Kapoor 2008, p.113).

In the discursive focus material, inequalities might be overlooked, just as Mouffe's conception of inessential coalitions as a way to move beyond essentialism can be criticised for a lacking reflection on how to also move beyond material inequalities, as a barrier for people's possibilities to participate in differing coalitions. Furthermore, both Mouffe (2005) and Bhabha's (2004) perspectives can be criticised for lacking concrete tools for their perspectives on

deconstructive agency: how to maintain inessentialism in coalitions for rights claims, and how Bhabha's conception of a hybridisation of culture and identities, based on the possibilities of the sub-altern to act, is to overcome material inequalities and hegemonic barriers for the sub-altern to be seen and heard (Kapoor 2008, p.148-149).

Never the less, the use of both post-colonial and post-structural theoretical perspectives can be seen as an attempt to investigate the continued functions of colonialism and the dominance of western norms and cultural bias within developmental approaches to sexual rights, without succumbing to any binary logic of a unified western/European or native perspective.

# 3. Methodological considerations

## 3.1 Choice of case-studies and delimitations

In investigating the conception of sexual rights, several international and local tendencies can be seen as relevant. Not least have the MDG's and the ICPD's POA been major contributors in shaping sexual rights discourse within developmental strategies. In order to look more specifically at the perspectives on sexuality and gender, as well as other central concepts in sexual rights discourse, two case studies have been chosen as an example of how international tendencies result in specific national strategies for sexual rights. Danida's strategy for SRHR is presented as being in accordance with the MDGs, and builds upon the ICPD's POA. As such, the Danish strategy for SRHR can be seen as coherent with a general UN approach to issues of sexual rights, and thus serves as an example of a larger international tendency for sexual rights approaches. Furthermore, as the LGBT framework for addressing non-hetero sexualities and LGBT organisations have substantial influence in developmental approaches to sexual rights, the two objects of analysis for the research can be seen as representative for two often used approaches to sexual rights in development.

The analysis will be limited to the mentioned strategies and reflections of former research on SRHR and LGBT strategies for sexual rights. As such there will be no analysis of any implementations of the strategies or projects based on the strategy. These mentioned strategies funded by the national development agency of Danida are seen to constitute the Danish approach to sexual rights. In referring to and analysing 'the Danish approach to sexual rights', this means both the context and focuses within these two strategies as well as the overall framework of dividing sexual rights into a main strategy for SRHR and a small side project on LGBT. Sexuality or sexual rights might be mentioned within other Danida projects, such as the independent strategy for HIV/Aids; these will, however, not be included.

## 3.2 Presentation of cases and research Design

**Chapter four:** will present some of the crucial aspects of how sexual rights matter in developmental contexts, as an argument for the developmental importance of sexual rights discourse and a presentation of the intersections between gender, sexual rights and development. This chapter thus sets the background for the analysis of discursive perspectives on sexuality and sexual rights within the two case studies.

**Chapter five - analysis of Danida's strategy for SRHR:**

Danida's strategy for SRHR builds on the ICPD's POA and the following three MDGs. MDG three: Promoting gender equality and empowering women; MDG five: Improving maternal health ; MDG six: combating HIV/Aids, malaria and other diseases. Danida's strategy for SRHR is from 2006, but it is the current strategy for implementing SRHR in Danish developmental aid. It should be mentioned that Danida is currently working on a new overall strategy for Danish developmental aid. However, they report that there will not be any new strategies for SRHR, and that the current strategy for SRHR will thus be valid in years to come (Voetmann 2012). Three main discursive focuses can be found within this strategy and the analysis will thus be structured around these. Based on the research questions, chapter five is thus structured as a three part analysis which looks at conceptions of gender and sexuality as well as the construction of stereotypes and mechanisms of exclusions within:

1. The SRHR strategy's focus on heterosexual reproduction.

2. The SRHR strategy's focus on violence against women.

3. The SRHR strategy's focus on health and gender roles.

**Chapter six - analysis of the LGBT South project:**

The LGBT South project, defined by LGBT Denmark as meaning Asia, South America, Africa and the Caribbean (LGBT Denmark 2012, p.2), is carried out by LGBT Denmark and funded by Danida. This so-called 'knowledge project' is focused on creating a web-base and a handbook that supplies NGOs that are working with development aid with knowledge of LGBT rights issues and interests in the south. The project has only recently been developed and the strategy was first published in 2012. This strategy might be seen as one of the first approaches to incorporating a more specific focus on sexual minorities in the Danish developmental strategy, following in the footsteps of international tendencies to incorporate sexual minorities in sexual rights strategies through the use of LGBT labels and organisations (Kollman and Waites 2009, p.1). The declared objective of the project is to provide knowledge and strategic approaches to LGBT rights issues for Danish and international development agencies and NGOs, so even though the project is relatively small, it has the potential to influence how other development projects and strategies understand and approach issues of LGBT rights in developing countries.

The main focus of this analysis will be to reflect on the discursive effects of building sexual rights around LGBT labels, chapter five will be structured in three theoretical perspectives to analysing the use of LGBT categories within this project, building on Lloyd (2005), Mouffe (2005) and Bhabha's (2004) conceptions. In doing so the analysis will also reflect on how these perspectives are connected to the separation of the LGBT rights approach from the main strategy for SRHR. The analysis will be divided into the following three analytical perspectives on the LGBT south strategy:

1. The conception of LGBT as essentialist and universalising identities.

2. Othering and antagonism within the use of LGBT labels.

3. The constructions of LGBT stereotypes and 'demonic repetition'.

**Chapter 7:** Will discuss some the theoretical implications of the division of SRHR and LGBT rights, as well as the intersections between SRHR and LGBT rights issues and interests as a reflection on the Danish approach. In doing so, a few additional perspectives in the debate will be presented in order to contextualise the analysis of the Danish approach and as a reflection on possibilities for further research in the area. Subsequently, the final conclusions on the Danish approach to sexual rights will be presented in section 7.3.

## 3.3 Use of previous research on sexual rights

The concrete material that is used in the discourse analysis consists of the published reports which describe the focuses, objectives and priorities of each strategy. Using these allows for a more concrete image of how an SRHR or LGBT rights strategy present their perspective on sexual rights. These specific examples will be supplemented by perspectives from former research on sexual rights and international tendencies in relation to sexual rights frameworks in development. The journal and research papers used supply perspectives on and investigations of international tendencies within developmental agencies' use of SRHR strategies, concrete analysis of perspectives of sexuality and gender within the ICDP's POA, as well as former research on tendencies within the use of LGBT strategies as part of sexual rights frameworks in international and national development strategies.

The theoretical reflections and critique supplied by these research papers and journals will be used in a comparison of how these tendencies can be seen as present within the Danish approach, placing it in a larger international context. As such, the analysis will be built around the two case strategies, but will also be supplemented by additional research on international tendencies within SRHR and LGBT rights, and can as such be used as an overall reflection on the use and division of SRHR and LGBT strategies for sexual rights.

## 3.4 Strategy for the analysis: Discourse analysis based on post-structural and post-colonial perspectives

The analysis will be based on a post-structural conception of the discursivity of meaning, the discursive and contextual construction of meaning and the social world. In this perspective, understandings, meanings and perceptions can never be fixed, because of the instability of the discursive and linguistic field. There is thus a constant struggle over the definition and constitution of meanings attached to phenomena, concepts and the social in general (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, p.24-25). As such, the analysis investigates which meanings of sexual rights, sexuality, and gender are constructed within the Danish approach to sexual rights, as well as the meanings and images that are constructed around the categories of people addressed in the strategies, such as: women in developing countries, men in developing countries, and LGBTs. Who are included within these discursive constructions of sexual rights, gender and sexuality, and what characterizes the discursive positionings of these. In relation to the theoretical perspectives presented, this will also include a reflection on "the processes of which some fixations of meaning become so conventionalized that we think of them as natural" (Phillips and Jørgensen 2002, p.26).

The analysis, in accordance with the theoretical concepts presented, will thus also reflect on how developmental approaches to sexual rights fixate meanings to a point where they are naturalized; as a continuation of colonial imposition of western interpretations of what constitutes the 'collective good' in development and sexual rights. Referring to Laclau and Mouffe's approach to discourse analysis, it is an investigation of the 'field of discursivity' within the Danish developmental approach to sexual rights. 'The field of discursivity' is seen as a flexible mass of meaning which constitutes the social world, determining the perception and meaning of a concept, idea, word or developmental approach at a certain time and place (Phillips and Jørgensen 2002, p.27). As noted by Phillips and Jørgensen (2002), there is no clear conception of what can be termed as included in the field of discursivity. In this case, the methodological approach to

the analysis will be based on a perception of the field of discursivity as including concepts, words, phrases and most of all choices of focus and priorities within the two strategies for sexual rights, also including perspectives from the ICDP's POA upon which Danida's approach to sexual rights is based. The perspectives in the strategies will further be contextualised by comparing them to former research on sexual rights discourse in international development, as part of the discursive field in relation to sexual rights. The analyzed field of discursivity will also include a reflection on possibly excluded meanings of sexuality, gender, sexual rights and development, as well as associated discourses and concepts (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002, p.27). In relation to a rights perspective and the presented theoretical perspectives on the constitutive outside (Foucault 1972-1977; Butler 1990), the construction of normal/deviant holds that what is excluded or left unmentioned within the discursive approaches to sexual rights becomes just as important for the establishment of meaning as what is included.

# 4. Sexual rights' significance to development

"Why is sexuality a development concern? Because sexuality matters to people, and is an important part of most people's lives. Because development policies and practices are already having a significant - and often negative – impact on sexuality. And because sexuality and the societal norms that seek to contain and control it have, in turn a significant impact on poverty and well-being" (Cornwall and Jolly 2006, p.10).

## 4.1 Challenging the discourse of sex vs. poverty

The positioning of sexuality as important to development has proven to be difficult. Some see it as a private matter that development agencies and governments should not be involved with, or it is seen as less important than e.g. poverty reduction. So how can we talk of sexuality and sexual rights in a developmental framework in comparison to apparently crucial basic needs and rights of e.g. poverty reduction, rights to education, security, work and health. As stated above by Cornwall and Jolly, developmental policies and practices are already having an impact on sexuality, and are taking part in constituting international sexual discourses which affect norms and practices (Cornwall and jolly 2006, Lind 2010, Armas 2006, Miller 2000).

Viewing sexuality as a system of all pervasive power-structures and behavioural norms (Butler 1990), poverty and possibilities for work and economic advancement are crucially connected to gender and sexuality. In 'Development with a body', Sonia Correa, Andrea Cornwall and Susie Jolly (2008, p.28-30) argue that poverty and sexuality are closely interlinked, but in spite of this the process of formulating the Millennium Development Goals, as well as the practices for their implementation, is characterised by: "the consistent incapacity

of poverty thinking to acknowledge the meaning of sexuality in the lives of the poor". There is thus a need to link the two issues and challenge the idea of sexuality as a private matter or as inappropriate for developmental policies and practices, as well as the idea of sexual vs. economic/social and political rights, and instead present the indivisibility of human rights and the meaning of sexuality for people's well-being (Armas 2006, 2007).

The argument behind the following perspective on sexual rights as crucial to development is not that sexual rights are more important or should be prioritised over other issues and rights that are central in development, such as poverty reduction, security, health, rights to education etc. Instead, it is a perspective of how sexual rights are part of these issues, as sexuality is connected to poverty, the labour market, violence and war as well as general freedom of expression and well-being (Armas 2006, p.21). As a background for studying the sexual and gendered discourses in Danida's strategy for sexual rights, the following will thus present some of the ways in which sexuality is connected to basic needs and developmental opportunities, arguing that it is not a question of sexuality vs. poverty as developmental priorities, but that sexuality can be determining for people's possibilities for development and meeting their basic needs (Armas 2006; Lind 2010; Bannon and Correia 2006; Cornwall et al. 2008).

## 4.2 The heterosexual matrix as all pervasive – everyone needs sexual rights

The heteronormative social governing of sexual and gendered behaviour and norms can be said to affect both women and men as well as sexual minorities and majorities. Those who fall outside the heterosexual norms, such as self-identifying gays, lesbians, polyamorous people, trangendered people, Kinnars, transvestites, hijras, lady-boys and many others might suffer from stigmatisation, exclusion, violence or prejudices based on their gender expression or their sexual acts and identification. But as argued by Cornwall et al. (2008), Jolly (2010), Lind (2010), Armas (2006) and many others, those who adopt to the heteronormative system of

gendered and sexual behaviour are also restricted in their freedom and well-being, as these norms govern and restrict behaviour and opportunities in both the private and the public sphere, the workplace and the political arena (Cornwall et. al. 2008, Armas 2006, Lind 2010).

Starting with the sexual and gendered minorities, heteronormative norms create severe cases of discrimination against self-identified lesbians, gays, transvestites, transgendered people or anyone else who either have a gendered expression that does not correspond to heteronormative assumptions about gender roles, or who are openly engaged in sexual relations that are non-hetero. Employment opportunities for these groups are often limited. Henry Armas (2006, 2007) reports how non-hetero sexual orientation and preferences have often been the reason for people being fired from their jobs, experiencing severe discrimination in their workplace or being denied employment. Transgendered people have even fewer possibilities for employment. Investigations show that in parts of Asia and South America, among others, many transgendered people are forced to work as sex-workers as their only opportunity for work (Armas 2006, 2007). Discrimination in the workplace and limited employment opportunities are thus both connected to sexual preferences and gendered expressions.

Feminist perspectives on development and poverty have given us many accounts of the divisions in the labour market where 'female' areas of employment, such as the care-industry and the informal-sector, are valued and prioritised lower, just as the global wage-gap between women and men displays the gendered aspect of employment opportunities. Furthermore, intra-household divisions of resources and work-loads have been argued to be unequally divided between men and women. Education opportunities are also unequal in availability to women and people falling outside dominant gendered and sexual norms, a form of discrimination that can be performed in many different ways, e.g. through school bullying and stigmatisation of feminine boys and pregnant teenage girls that can be forced to leave school (Armas 2006, p.26).

Gender and sexuality based violence takes many forms. One of the most apparent structural forms of this is the criminalisation of homosexuality and other non-hetero sexual acts in approximately 75 countries, with penalties ranging from fines, jail-time to death sentence for same-sex sexual acts (LGBT Denmark 2012; Human Dignity trust 2012). In some countries where homosexuality has been decriminalised, there is still a pervasive stigmatisation, discrimination and extensive occurrences of violence against people who engage in non-hetero sexual acts. Even more countries do not have possibilities for non-hetero couples to get married or adopt children. While laws concerning homosexuality are developed in many countries, a large number of sexual and gendered identifications, preferences and possibilities go unspoken altogether in many contexts, and as such suffer from a different form of discrimination. While gay rights are now by some seen as a symbol of developmental progress, with debates over gay rights and opportunities amongst others to get married, have been going on for nearly five decades, there's been little or no discussion on opportunities for polyamorous marriages as an example of a kinship perspective that is excluded from sexual rights discourse (Lind 2010).

In many countries, homosexual acts are only criminalised for MSM (men who have sex with men), and not for WSW (Women who have sex with women); this can among other things be related to a general perception of women as a-sexual and as such that WSW or lesbians could not and do not exist within the country (Amnesty International 2008, p.10-11). In such cases, rights and empowerment for WSW might entail different actions and perspectives than the discourse of gay rights entails. The acknowledgement and possibilities for WSW might thus be seen in relation to a general suppression of female sexuality. This issue is a wide ranging form of gendered and sexual discrimination. Female genital mutilation is by some seen as a form of systematic violence against young girls in order to remove possibilities for sexual pleasure for women. However, the suppression of female sexuality and desire also exists in the form of prescribing female roles that position women as chaste and a-sexual, and also in the form of arranged marriages

that could be seen to rob both men and women of their sexual and romantic autonomy (Armas 2006, Ilkkaracan and Jolly 2007).

Within the heteronormative framework, just as women are prescribed to be chaste and pure, men can be expected to be violent, capable of providing for their families by any means, they can be expected go to war and even kill as a condition of their gender (Ilkkaracan and Jolly 2007). With a case study on Colombian male gender roles, Alcaraz and Suarez (2006, p.101-103) describe a system of a discursive, gendered embodiment that results in different acts of violence; for instance, the occurrences of domestic violence where men beat women, based on an essentialist perception of female submission and masculine aggressiveness and superiority. They describe a negative socialisation of masculine norms where any display of emotions is considered to be feminine, and men as such take extreme measures to live up to expectations for normative masculine behaviour, which involves displaying courage, violent behaviour, competitiveness and what they term patriarchal archetypes - all of which is further connected to a high occurrence of substance abuse, general violence, injuries, suicide and homicide amongst Colombian men (Alcaraz and Suarez 2006, p.102).

Bannon and Correia (2006) further describe how hegemonic conceptions of correct masculine behaviour govern male behaviour, and how being accepted as a real man in accordance with masculine norms is central to social and cultural acceptance, e.g. in Sub-Saharan Africa – however, this phenomenon might be seen to exist in different forms in every part of the world. Bannon and Correia (2006, p.168-169) also explain culturally correct masculine behaviour in Sub Saharan Africa as connected to having multiple partners and sexual experience as well as expectations of how they are to perceive and treat women, which can have further implications for HIV/Aids prevention. Men who fail to live up to crucial indicators of masculinity, such as marriage or economic achievements, might engage in criminal activity, violence or become soldiers to prove their manhood (Barker and Ricardo 2006, p.159-180). Normative stereotypes for male and

female behaviour can thus have severe effects on our lives, and prevent other developmental goals of security, health or poverty reduction. Barker and Ricardo (2006, p.159) thus argue for *"a more sophisticated gender analysis that requires us to understand how men and women and boys and girls are made vulnerable by rigid notions of manhood and gender hierarchies"*.

## 4.3 Sexuality and the rights-based approach to development – addressing the intersectionality of gender, sexuality and development

The above-mentioned are only a few examples that help to illustrate the intersections of sexuality with developmental concerns of for instance, poverty, violence, war, health, general well-being and freedom, just to name a few. Furthermore, these examples can be said to illustrate that sexuality and attached gender roles have developmental impacts on everyone, not just non-heterosexuals and women in poorer countries, but everyone including both people from poorer countries and wealthier countries. Therefore, it can be argued that attempts to include influences of sexuality in developmental strategies, should attempt to incorporate this perspective where gendered and sexual roles and norms for both men and women are interconnected with different aspects of development, freedom and well-being.

A rights-based approach can be seen as a methodological and political tool for an inclusive approach to addressing the interconnections between basic, economic, health, security and other needs in relation to heteronormative sexual power structures. A rights-based approach can take on different forms for different donors but can be seen to have an emphasis on accountability, empowerment, participation and a focus on vulnerable groups and discrimination (Armas 2006, p.21). The UNFPA (2012) states the following about its perspective on a rights-based approach:

> "UNFPA and its UN partners now work to fulfil the rights of people, rather than the needs of beneficiaries. There is a critical distinction... A human rights approach to programming differs from the basic needs approach in that it

recognizes the existence of rights. It also reinforces capacities of duty bearers (usually governments) to respect, protect and guarantee these rights. In a rights-based approach, every human being is recognized both as a person and as a right-holder. A rights-based approach strives to secure the freedom, well-being and dignity of all people everywhere..."

Sexual rights thus hold the potential to create a framework where governments or international development agencies could be held accountable for upholding the rights of people who face sexual discrimination, whether it is based on sexual orientation or heteronormative binary gender roles, de-marginalising these issues as part of development. Sexual rights as part of human rights could further serve to empower people and to enforce a sense of governmental accountability regarding intimate aspects of people's lives (Armas 2007).

The enormous potential of sexual rights as an approach to include gender and sexuality as well as the relations between these, as an integrated part of developmental approaches, can be argued to be somewhat dependant on the ability of the rights formulations and approaches to not rest on pre-fixed sexual-identity categories. The potential of a rights-based approach to hold accountability for protection against discrimination and empowerment in the establishment of people's rights to sexual freedom and well-being only apply to those who are included as rights bearers. As such, the following analysis of the national Danish approach to sexual rights will investigate who is included as a rights bearer and how these are positioned in terms of both protection and empowerment to sexual freedom and well-being, bearing in mind that rights formulations and approaches do not just make legislation and protect, they also construct culture and norms for social behaviour (Merry 2003 cited in Kapoor 2008, p.34).

# 5. Danida's approach to sexual rights – heterosexual reproduction and the victimised 'third world woman'

## 5.1 Focus on heterosexual reproduction

As presented in the title of 'Sexual and reproductive health and rights', the national Danish inclusion of sexual rights within developmental strategy is within a subsumed framework of sexual and reproductive health and rights, as opposed to an independent strategy for sexual rights. As the Danish development agency's strategy for SRHR is based on the plan of action adopted during the 1994 International conference on population and development in Cairo (Danida 2006, p.6), the strategy refers to the ICPD's POA in many instances. In defining sexual and reproductive rights, Danida's (2006, p.11) SRHR strategy also refers to a paragraph from the ICPD's POA which states:

> "These rights rest on the basic rights of all couples and individuals to decide freely and responsibly the number, spacing and timing of their children and to have the information and means to do so, and the rights to attain the highest standard of sexual and reproductive health. It also includes their right to make decisions concerning reproduction free of discrimination, coercion and violence as expressed in human rights documents".

This presentation of sexual and reproductive rights can be said to hold a vast focus on sex as primarily reproductive. The focus on heterosexual reproduction within the ICPD's POA has been criticised by amongst others Richard Parker (1997, p.34) as he states:

> "The ICPD programme of action explicitly included sexual health as part of an array of rights that population and development programmes should protect, yet even here, the extension of such rights was questionable at best, linked first and foremost to heterosexual reproduction".

Basing their approach to sexual and reproductive rights on the ICPD's POA, Danida's strategy for SRHR can be said to have a general focus on heterosexual reproduction and health as the norm for what sexuality and sexual rights are concerned with. The following analysis will go through the three main focuses of the strategy starting with focus on reproduction, secondly with focus on violence against women and lastly with overall focus on sexual rights as a health issue but also with the mentioning of gender roles.

Starting with the cover page, an image of a Mother and her baby[1] is portrayed, as the image of motherhood and reproduction as the main focus of this strategy. This focus is among others presented as a tool to meet MDG 5 on reproduction and maternal health (Danida 2006, p.7). In the opening summary of the SRHR strategy it is stated that SRHR is essential to good health and human development and that:

> "People should be able to make their own decisions about their sexual and reproductive lives and have the means to do so. This includes access to reproductive health services and information and to safe and legal abortion. Enabling people to have fewer children, if they want to, helps to stimulate development and reduce poverty, both at the individual level and the macro level" (Danida 2006, p.6).

As also pointed out within the Danish strategy for SRHR, discussions of incorporation of both abortion and contraception in strategies for SRHR were controversial topics at the ICPD in Cairo (Danida 2006, p.9-10). The incorporation of these might thus be seen as progressive in terms of sexual rights. However, as displayed in the previous quote, the idea of sexual liberty and people's free choice for sexual and reproductive acts and decisions is quickly subsumed to reproductive choices of how many children to have as well as reproductive healthcare as a means to poverty reduction. As with the image on the cover, sex and sexual rights have either disappeared behind the focus on

---

[1] See Appendix 1

reproduction or sex and sexuality are simply viewed as mainly a matter of maternal health and heterosexual reproduction.

As such, any aspect of sex that goes beyond reproduction, non-reproductive heterosexual sex as well as non-hetero sexual acts is positioned as outside the main discourse of sexual rights (Miller 2000, p.86). One can see this in relation to Mouffe (2005) and Lloyd's (2005) conceptions of how rights claims and formulations will be dominated by the privileged group or perspective, which in this case would be a norm of heterosexuality, creating a normalisation and universalisation of heterosexuality as the norm and sex as mainly concerning reproduction. It is, however, stated within Danida's strategy for SRHR that they deliberately use the term sexual along with reproductive rights and that they recognise that sexuality and sexual well-being goes beyond reproductive choices. Danida state:

> "Denmark deliberately uses the term 'sexual' together with reproductive to underline that sexuality and the purpose of sexual activity/relations is not limited to reproduction. It also includes the recognition of homosexuality. This approach is rooted in the belief that sexual health care and human sexuality also contribute to the quality of life and well-being – both mentally and physically – and enhance personal relations"(Danida 2006, p.12).

As such, there is a recognition of sexuality and sexual rights that moves beyond reproduction and maternal health. This is also in line with the ICPD's POA, but as Parker (1997, p.33-35) and Miller (2000, p.86-87) have argued regarding the ICPD's POA, statements as the one above might show a certain recognition and wish for sexual rights to have a broad inclusion and empowerment for women, but there are severe lacks and limitations within this approach. As the strategy fails to explicitly state what sexual rights beyond reproduction and health is and what it might entail, as opposed to the repetitive focus and concrete suggestions for reproductive choices and health, talking of contraceptives, abortion, family planning, maternal health etc. Homosexuality is only mentioned in the one case displayed above, within the whole strategy. Furthermore, there is no mentioning

of any other sexual orientations or preferences outside of heterosexuality and the homosexual other.

It seems to be a mere hesitant recognition of the existence of other non-reproductive aspects of sex and sexualities rather than an inclusion of these within rights protection and empowerment. Danida's strategy for SRHR thus invisibilizes several forms of sexual activity and groups of people that are not included as rights bearers within this discursive framework (Miller 2000, p.87). Viewing this in relation to both Lloyd (2005) and Mouffe's (2005) perspective on the construction of the 'common good' and 'common interests' connected to essentialising conceptions of gender and sexuality as well as post-colonial perspectives of othering and normalisation, this discourse serves to normalise heterosexuality as the norm as opposed to the deviant homo-sexual other. This further entails the positioning of reproductive health as the 'common sexual interest' of the normal heterosexuals. It further takes part in the essentialising positioning of women as mothers without any other apparent aspects of sexuality. In turn, maternal health is naturalised as women's common sexual interest.

As the issue of reproductive health seems to drown out questions of sexual rights outside of reproduction, one can thus raise a series of questions and criticisms concerning the subsumption of reproductive and sexual rights and health, and how these issues are interconnected and/or separate in different areas - as amongst others presented by Correa, et al. (2008, p.179):

> "If reproductive rights include the right not to reproduce, then does this not include all forms of non-procreative sex; so why should any one form have the status of normativity or moral virtue? That is, if we refuse the principle that only procreative sex is 'good', or that it has a higher place than any other form, are we willing to reject all sexual hierarchies?"

One can thus ask: is the focus on reproductive rights and health as a heterosexual prerogative not a moral judgement of heterosexuality and reproductive sex as the norm and 'common good'? Aside from the argument that sexual rights becomes a

secondary concern to the focus on reproduction and health, one can further inquire about the health and reproductive rights of non-heterosexuals, transgendered, intersex people or third gender indentifying people, and how these are neglected within Danida's strategy for SRHR. Should the listing of rights to abortion, maternal healthcare and contraception not also include transgendered surgery, hormonal treatment, opportunities for same sex-couples to adoption or insemination (Correa, et al. 2008, p.179)? These are just a few of the reproductive rights and sexual-health services that seem to be missing in Danida's approach to sexual and reproductive health and rights.

## 5.2 Focus on violence against women, constructing the stereotype of 'the victimised third world woman'

In talking about sexual health and ill health, aside from reproductive issues, another dominant focus within Danida's strategy for SRHR is on sexually related violence. One of the thematic actions presented in the strategy is on gender equality and women's empowerment addressing MDG 3. In this context, Danida's strategy for SRHR states: "Danish efforts in the field of gender equality focus in particular on violence against women during peacetime and situations of armed conflicts..." (Danida 2006, p.15). In talking about women's ill sexual health, violence against women can be seen as one of the dominant focuses. Danida further states:

> "Violence against women and girls takes many forms and includes physical, sexual and emotional abuse by intimate partners, sexual exploitation or rape by close acquaintances (teachers, relatives and people in authority) or strangers, female genital mutilation/cutting, trafficking of women and children, prostitution, and sexual assault and rape in situations of armed conflict, civil unrest and disaster. Studies show that between 4% and 20% of women experience violence during pregnancy, with consequences for themselves and their babies, such as miscarriages, premature labour and low birth weight" (Danida 2006, p.23).

This kind of focus on sexual exploitation, violence and abuse against women has been widely criticised for the problematic victimisation of women within such a

discourse. This is not to take away from the existence, extent and grave consequences of sexual violence and women's subjection to this; it is more so a critic of the one-sided perspective on women and women's sexual interests within a SRHR discourse on female empowerment and gender equality. For instance, the following is stated about the consequences of sexual violence against women:

> "Violence generates fear and causes physical and psychological damage and its specific consequences for sexual and reproductive health include unwanted pregnancy, unsafe abortion, chronic pain syndromes, sexually transmitted infections including HIV, and gynaecological disorder" (Danida 2006, p.23).

In presenting the specific consequences of sexual assault and violence against women, on women's sexual ill health, the focus is on pregnancy, abortion, disease and possible damages to reproductive abilities. However, there is no mentioning of how it might also cause severe damage to women's chances of having a satisfying sex life and sexual pleasure as part of women's sexuality. The strategy also includes promotion of gender equality in terms of equal access to control over resources, girls' education and women's participation in economic and political decision-making (Danida 2006, p.14-16). But as also stated within the strategy, opportunities to make use of access to resources and decision-making are tied to a general empowerment strategy and a changing of social and cultural norms for women's roles.

> "Empowerment is a key condition for enabling women to demand and make use of equal rights, resources and influence and thus for gender equality. The concept implies that each individual acquires the ability to think and to act freely, to take decisions and to fulfil his or her own potential as a full and equal member of society" (Danida 2006, p.14).

Within this empowerment discourse, there is subsequently this focus on violence against women. While the objective of such a focus might be to protect women from violence and sexual assault, this can be said to have the unfortunate effect of discursively victimising women within a protection paradigm as opposed to empowering them (Miller 2004; Correa, et al. 2008). In explaining the

background for this focus on violence and sexual assault against women within sexual rights discourse, Correa, et al. (2008) argue that the focus on violence against women in relation to SRHR was perhaps a necessary tool to display the gendered nature of rights and sexual rights issues. It became a feminist tool for reaching recognition of women's inequality in relation to sexual harm within the UN, as stated by Miller (2004, p.25):

> "In order to make sexual harm a rights issue, advocates came to the UN and to mainstream human rights and health policy organizations to force them to take positions, set legal standards, and change policy. To build a political force that could not be resisted, advocates had to emphasize and make visible what was different about the experiences of women; they had to make these experiences too horrendous to ignore".

Emphasising violence against women as part of sexual systems might have served to put gender equality and the gendered nature of sexual health on the top of rights agendas, but it can also, as argued by Miller (2004, 2000) and Correa, et al. (2008), serve to position women as victims who need the state or developmental agencies from the west to act as their protectors. As argued, a rights based approach can include both protection and empowerment, but within this victimisation paradigm there seems to be a discursive overload of protectionism which can work against the potential for rights based empowerment of women.

This focus on violence against women within Danida's strategy for SRHR, can be seen in relation to both Bhabha's (2004) conception of the postcolonial functions of the stereotype and Mohanty's (2003) conception of how western feminists construct the hegemonic image of the victimised third world woman. According to Bhabha (2004), the construction of the stereotype can, within a post-colonial perspective, serve to uphold a so-called unchanging order. This unchanging order is thus constructed through the process of othering, portraying the natural oppositions between the violent third world man and the victimised third world woman, as well as the natural opposition between the developed civilised Europe/North and the primitive developing countries, that should try to mimic the

civilised behaviour of the west and strive to be like them, although they can never quite be. In order to uphold this discursive order of male vs. female and North vs. South as an unchanging hierarchy, the colonial discourse needs the stereotype and the repetition of the stereotype to create a hegemonic discursive order. The victimised 'third world woman', and the natural opposition of the violent 'third world man' as a discursive stereotype thus upholds this order.

As Mohanty (2003) further argues, these stereotypes present a homogeneous account of an average 'third world woman' that does not hold the complexity of women's sexual rights interests. It can thus also be connected to an essentialism of gender and sexuality, which - based on the post-structural perspectives of Moffe(2005) and Lloyd (2005) - can further create an increased antagonism between the constructed opposites. As presented in chapter four, these essentialised gender roles and sexualities, and the antagonisms they can entail for those who fall outside of this norm, can have severe consequences for both women and men's developmental possibilities.

Within this focus, there is no mentioning of any gender or sexual identifications or preferences outside of heterosexuality and the binary division of male/female, such as what Bhabha (2004, p.312) terms hybrid-hyphenations or borderline existences, meaning any alternative gendered or sexual identifications and expressions. The constant repetition and display of the 'victimised third world woman' and her role as a mother, as well as heterosexual reproduction as the sexual norm, serves to hegemonise this discourse establishing it as true, and invisibilizes the any possible hybridity of gender and sexuality as well as any alternative gendered expressions and identifications outside of the stereotype.

## 5.3 Focus on health and gender roles

Within Danida's strategy, there is an attention to the function of gendered roles and norms, and how these play into the positioning and possibilities for women in terms of empowerment and SRHR:

> "Violence against women, family planning, prevention of STI and respecting women's rights are all related to how men and women interact. Women's SRHR are highly related to the prevailing perceptions of women's roles and rights in society and in the family: the more gender inequalities the poorer the SRHR of women" (Danida 2006, p.15).

The strategy also mentions how men should be included in this process for improvement of women's SRHR:

> "Men's responsibility for supporting women's SRHR is vast – as a decision maker, father, husband, lover, brother and son. Men's participation in improving women's SRHR is far more important than previous policies have reflected. Traditional norms for masculinity are often embedded in heterosexuality together with power over and dominance of women. Part of the mainstreaming of gender equality is therefore questioning the traditional norms for both sexes to give way to a broader and more varied set of roles for men and women" (Danida's SRHR's strategy 2006, p.15).

The recognition of the vast influence gender roles and norms have on SRHR, and the mentioning of how norms for masculinity are connected to norms for heterosexuality and dominance of women, might be seen as a positive move towards a broad contextual sexual rights discourse. However, in this statement, there is still no direct challenging of these roles and stereotypes; instead, it's positioned as men's responsibility as decision makers for improving women's SRHR, once again positioning them as the superior who should take part in protecting the victimised woman.

Furthermore, stating that norms for masculinity are embedded in heterosexuality could seem as another opening point for moving beyond heteronormativity and essentialism of gendered and sexual categorisations. Nevertheless, the heteronormativity within Danida's SRHR strategy in full, as presented in the

previous sections, indicates that the strategy itself is further part of a discourse that constructs essentialising images of sexual and gender stereotypes. This discursive construction of stereotypes and essentialised images of gender roles is not least connected to what is left out concerning women's and men's sexuality.

The approach to sexual health and disease within the strategy, once again, has a prevalent focus on women's ill sexual health in connection to reproduction and maternal health. Aside from this, there are many statements concerning HIV/Aids and how this is also connected to SRHR, not least in relation to reproduction and the transmission of HIV/Aids from mother to child, as well as a priority of women's subjection to HIV/Aids.

> "Denmark supports the development of comprehensive global and national strategies that address HIV/Aids in a balanced way, integrating prevention, care and treatment interventions. Priority areas of intervention include addressing the specific needs of women and girls, adolescents and other young people, children and orphans and people in conflict situations. Integrating sexual and reproductive health and HIV/Aids efforts, and fighting stigma and discrimination are other priorities" (Danida 2006, p.14).

Within these priority areas, there is no mentioning of MSM (men who have sex with men) or sex-workers as possible risk-groups that need further attention. In general, the disease prevention and sexual ill health focus seems to be centred around women, children and young people. It is mentioned that:

> "The sexual and reproductive health needs of men received little attention in public health services until the HIV/Aids epidemic brought them into focus. Men need more information on all aspects of sexual and reproductive health" (Danida 2006, p.29).

Aside from this statement, there is little mentioning of men's sexual-health. Even within this one mentioning of men's sexual health, the presentation is that men need more information which can be seen in opposition to the rescuing of women's ill sexual health and subjection to sexual violence. As such, within the focus on health, some of the aspects of sexuality and sexual health that are left

unmentioned are:  men's sexual rights and ill sexual health and how they too can be victims of cultural norms for gendered and sexual behaviour, as presented in chapter four. Within the protection and victimisation paradigm, women are protected from sex and sexual harm, leaving out the possibility of women's sexual wants, just as men are positioned as outside of sexual harms protection. The focus on disease along with reproduction, maternal health and violence can be said to emphasise the health and ill health focus, as opposed to any conception of sex and sexual rights to also include positive aspects of sex, such as sexual pleasure. However, one can ask what this means for the goal of women's empowerment and gender equality. In reference to the ICPD's POA, it is stated that:

> "The strength of the new agenda was in its emphasis on the empowerment of women and the improvement of their political, social, economic, and health status as a highly important end in itself" (Danida 2006, p.8).

It is further stated that: "Human sexuality and gender relations are closely interrelated and together affect the ability of men and women to achieve and maintain sexual health and manage their reproductive lives" (Danida 2006, p.22). But the consistent focus on health and reproduction fails to follow up on this perspective on how sexuality and gender roles are interconnected. Especially as conceptions of sex and sexuality - especially in relation to women - hold no mentioning of sexual pleasure as part of a healthy sexual life. This can be seen as a direct reflection of a discursive approach within the ICPD's POA, as stated by Parker (1997, p.34):

> "Nowhere in the Cairo document did sexual pleasure, freedom of sexual expression, or freedom of sexual orientation take shape as part of a more broad reaching and emancipatory notion of sexual rights".

As such, the goal of empowerment of women and changing gender roles for both men and women can seem to be subverted by the persistent focus on health, reproduction and violence, which de-sexualises women and creates a stereotype that can seem to resemble Mohanty's (2003) account of the colonial stereotype of the homogenous third world woman, who is described as having an essentially

truncated life, sexually constrained as well as domestic, family oriented and victimised. In opposition to this the strategy thus also serve to indirectly construct the third world man as a perpetrator of sexual violence, without any mentioning of the possibilities of male sexual i'll health.

# 6. The Danida sponsored project on LGBT rights in the global south

## 6.1 Essentialism and universality of LGBT-identities

The LGBT south project declares to have 5 main areas of focus which will be presented in the following throughout the three parts of the analysis. The first of the five goals in the strategy for LGBT rights in the global south is: "To incorporate LGBT human rights in developmental aid – both the Danish national aid as well as aid from the volunteer aid organisations' financial support and conditions for aid" (LGBT Denmark, 2012).[2] It is thus a direct objective of the project for this strategy to be incorporated in both the national Danish development aid as well other development agencies. They further state as goal number two:

> "To Support LGBTs and LGBT-human rights activists in the global south directly
> – through goal oriented development projects and other forms of cooperation, but
> also against assaults and punishment where it is necessary" (LGBT Denmark,
> 2012).

The first assumption and mechanism of inclusion and exclusion within this strategy is thus the definition of LGBT's as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered people, which are referred to as specific categories of people with specific sexual identitifcations. In order to be included within this strategy for rights protection, one has to adopt this conception of a unified perspective of sexual identifications and interests, giving up any other affiliation and experience. The labels in themselves suggest an essentialism of gender and sexuality where LGBT is something that you are, around which your sexual rights should be organised. This can be seen as conflictual with Mouffe (2005) and Lloyd's (2005) conceptions of identity as inessential and non-fixed but constantly changing.

---

[2] All quotations from LBGT Denmark's strategy for LGBT rights in the global south are translated from Danish by the thesis author

Viewing sexuality, gender and attached identities as inessential and changeable, a conception of LGBT rights becomes problematic as people are positioned in fixed identity labels of gender and sexuality in order to claim their sexual rights. This could entail that people do not hold the possibility of changing their sexual and gender identification if they are to maintain their sexual rights.

As this promotion of human rights attached to the LGBT categories is presented, these categories come to appear as universal and essentialist, as the promotion of LGBT rights is aimed at a global level - as also pointed out in the third goal formulation: "3. To support the political LGBT-human rights struggle on a global level – through UN, ILGA and other international organisations and NGOs" (LGBT Denmark, 2012).

It is thus assumed and promoted that these categories and the LGBT labelling of sexuality should function as the primary or sole systematisation of sexuality and gender on a global level. From a post-colonial perspective, one can thus criticise the cultural specificity of these categorisations as 'western' norms for systematisation of sexual identifications and how they within this approach come to appear as universal. This is not least apparent, as the strategy from LGBT Denmark (2012, p.5) in reference to goal three states that: "LGBT-human rights are not just a national or culturally specific issue but an international topic and a universal objective".

While the protection and violation of sexual rights and sexual minorities might be seen as a universal issue or problem, structuring this within the labels of LGBT identities can certainly be seen as culturally specific. But even though these categories might be seen as mainly a western invention or norm that is thus imposed on receiver countries, and positioned as the global norm for sexual categorisations, the vast number of people who are not included within or who identify with neither heterosexuality nor the LGBT terms can be found in all parts of the world. This system of sexual rights organising and these labels of heterosexuality and the LGBT minorities might thus be seen as the dominant

system within Europe, North America and other countries. A post-structural critic supplied by amongst others Mouffe (2005) and Lloyd (2005) thus further entails a general critic of how interests attached to these group identities come to appear as natural, and LGBT as fixed sexual identities become the norm for sexual minorities' rights organising. As pointed out by Miller (2000, p.74):

> "Despite the importance of documenting abuses directed at persons for claimed or imputed gay identities, any movement to locate "gay rights" within human rights must also avoid artificially affixing rigid gay identities in the name of protection".

Naturalising and universalising this system of sexual and gendered identification can be seen to utterly dismiss the values of local interpretations and identifications of sexuality and gender. In this context, the LGBT system of organising the 'sexual others' within these fixed categories is positioned as the natural and civilised system of sexual identifications and rights. In relation to Kapoor (2008), this could be seen as the positioning of the 'western system' of sexual identifications as the norm for what is civilised and what is not, and the construction of the common 'good sexual hierarchy' which then - based on Lloyd (2005) and Mouffe's (2005) conceptions - serve to suppress differences and fluidities of sexual identifications and rights interests.

## 6.2 Othering and antagonism connected to essentialism of gay identities

From a post-colonial perspective, one can thus speak of how the LGBT framework might be seen as a European or Northern norm for the systematisation of essentialisation of sexual identities and discourses (Loomba 2005). As presented within the theoretical framework, such universalisations and essentialisations of sexual identities also take part in constituting processes of exclusion, excluding all who do not conform to these sexual identity labels. Furthermore, it can entail processes of 'othering' between categories and systems of sexual identities, creating antagonistic relations between these (Lloyd 2005, Mouffe (2005). Fixating the 'sexual other' in essentialist identity categorisations can thus, according to the theoretical conceptions of Mouffe (2005), Lloyd (2005)

and Bhabha (2004), create antagonistic relations between sexual categories, a form of enemy relationship.

Relating this to the international development and spread of LGBT politics and identities, Kollmann and Waites (2009, p.7) state that the global LGBT rights movement's influence in the non-western world has both provided positive legal moves against discrimination based on sexual orientation along with decriminalisation of homosexuality. However, it has also served to create a so-called 'backlash' in the acceptance of non-hetero sexualities in some countries, a deterioration of the condemnation and intolerance of non-hetero sexualities as these are essentialised within the LGBT labels. They for instance state that this 'backlash' is:

> "...particularly true in formerly colonized states in Africa such as Nigeria and
> Zimbabwe, and in some countries with Muslim majority populations such as Iran;
> this phenomenon is also apparent, however, in some parts of Eastern Europe and
> the USA" (Kollmann and Waites 2009, p.7).

The division of heterosexual sexual rights interests and LGBT interests in itself serve to position these sexual identifications and categories as essentially different or opposite and thus as possibly threatening to each other. The perspectives of Mouffe (2005) and Lloyd (2005) can further be seen in relation to how debates over homosexuality in amongst others some African countries have centred around a discussion on whether homosexuality is un-African or not. This perspective has been addressed from both those who condemn homosexuality as a western imposition and those who argue for the recognition of homosexuality and who argue that homosexuality is authentically African, and that it predates colonialism (Currier 2010, p.158). As presented by Ashley Currier (2007, p.8) "Scholars have documented that black southern Africans engaged in same-gender sexual practices before, during, and after colonialism, debunking the notion that homosexuality is un-African" As such, the debate over recognition or condemnation of homosexuality in many countries have come to be centred around a perception of sexuality and homo/hetero sexuality as essentialised

identities and whether these are essentially African or a western imposition. This is for instance displayed in statements from governmental leaders who are anti-LGBT rights, such as president Yoweri Museveni from Uganda, who described homosexuality as a decadent culture passed by western nations and as a danger to all of Africa and Christianity. The anti-LGBT movements have also described homosexuality as against the law of nature, having their anti-LGBT strategies manifest in the publication of pictures, names and addresses of LGBT people and activists, effectively pinning them up as targets for hate-crimes (Human Rights Watch 2008, p.4). This gives grounds to a further critique of how promoting LGBT rights as essentialised identities can cause increased antagonism between a constructed homo/hetero binary.

Uganda is just one of approximately 76 countries which, based on this perception, continue to criminalise homosexuality (LGBT Denmark 2012, p.2). According to Human Rights Watch (2008), approximately half of these countries are preserving the so-called anti-sodomy law which was originally implemented by British colonial rule as a tool to prevent perverse and barbarian sexual conduct in the colonies, and to civilise and reform the colonised (Human Rights Watch, 2008, p.5). Ironically, the claim to prevent the imposition of western homosexuality thus holds a defence of the preservation of colonially enforced anti-sodomy laws.

Ania Loomba (2005) presents how colonial accounts of deviant sexualities among the colonised were used to constitute both deviant and normative behaviour in Europe during the colonial period. Colonial accounts of the sexual behaviour of the colonised portrayed homosexuality and sodomy as the deviant and barbarian sexual behaviour of the colonised. Loomba (2005, p.132-133) thus states that colonialism and colonial accounts of native sexuality constituted the connection between the colonised lands and deviant sexual behaviour. As such, an 'othering' of both non-hetero sexuality as deviant and the colonised as deviant barbarians is constructed. This at the same time serves to position heterosexuality as the norm, and the colonisers/Europeans as the superior and civilised nations.

The colonial imposition of anti-sodomy laws in the colonies, which are still enforced in some countries, were thus based on a moral normalisation of sexual behaviour and systematisation of sexual identities where heterosexuality was established as the norm. As described in chapter two, a post-colonial perspective of analysis entails a reflection on how colonial patterns are still present and functioning within developmental strategies and in relations between wealthier countries in the north and poorer countries in the south, and how these relations involve a shaping of receiver countries in accordance with 'Western' or 'Eurocentric' norms and role models (Loomba 2005).

From a post-colonial perspective, the LGBT system of sexual categorisations and sexual rights organising might be seen as the current 'western' norm for systematisation of non-hetero sexualities. From a postcolonial perspective, this systematisation and fixation of non-hetero sexualities within the Danish approach to sexual rights and the transfer of this system to receiver countries can be seen as a normalisation of sexual categorisations based on 'western' norms and role models. This construction of the LGBT categories and system of rights organising as the universal truth about sexual identities and the universal 'good system for sexual categorisation' is among others displayed in LGBT Denmark's (2012, p.3) statements of how the LGBT Denmark organisation can be seen as having:

> "...great potential to be one of the LGBT organisations that show global initiative and leadership because of its experience and position in Denmark and internationally. This is whether it is concerning basic knowledge about sexual orientation and gender identity ..."

LGBT Denmark thus positions itself as an authority in terms of knowing or defining minority gender identities and sexual orientations. The system of LGBT organising has for some years been increasingly established as the norm for systematisation and rights of non-hetero sexual identities to such a degree that it has recently been argued that the introduction of gay and lesbian rights is seen as

a barometer of progress within development and human rights (Lind 2010, p.3). The norm and 'common good' for sexual-minority organising is thus that gay and lesbian rights and the LGBT system becomes a sign of progress and the civilised method of sexual rights organising.

Bringing in Bhabha's (2004) conception of mimicry in this perspective, mimicry in this context might be seen as the objective of the LGBT system of sexual rights organising; to fixate the sexual others in developing countries within 'western norms for sexual categories and identifications, where the 'sexual other' in receiver countries is to mimic the behaviour and identifications of western gay identities and categories. As Bhabha (2004) presents, the functioning of mimicry is that the coloniser dominates the 'other', and as such the coloniser has an interest in maintaining this dichotomy where the colonised are positioned within the hegemonic norms and practices of the coloniser, but at the same time positioned as essentially different.

In looking at developmental strategies for sexual rights and LGBT rights dicourses, this perspective can be used to reflect on the mechanisms within which people in developing countries are included in sexual and gendered categorisations and discourses of the west, such as LGBT, in making rights claims on behalf on this group, and the objective of protecting LGBT's in the south. But simultaneously, the failure of developing countries to live up to these rights discourses and LGBT systems can be used to display the inferiority of developing countries. This at the same time becomes constitutive for the positioning of the western system of sexual categorisations and associated rights systems as superior, or the most civilised, and only the adoption of this system is considered to be developmental progress in relation to sexual rights.

## 6.3 Demonic repetition and the LGBT stereotype

According to Bhabha (2004), the unchanging order in which the Western norms for what is civilised are dominant, is dependent on the fixity of the 'other'. What Bhabha (2004) terms 'demonic repetition', and stereotypes can serve to establish a hegemonic perception of the LGBT labels and system as natural and the only civilised system for sexual rights organising. In relation to LGBT Denmark's strategy for sexual rights organising, the discursive tool of repetition can be found in both the emphasis on information campaigns for LGBT rights and knowledge, based on LGBT Denmark's definition of these, and the wish for these LGBT rights approaches to be instated in every developmental agency within states and NGOs nationally and internationally, this is among other done through goal four: " To spread the knowledege of the LGBT- human rights situation in the global south in Denmark through information activities" (LGBT Denmark 2012, p.6). LGBT Denmark further state they wish to be the organisation that functions as national spokespersons for matters concerning global LGBT rights. (LGBT Denmark, p.6) Furthermore, goal five in the strategy can be seen to include several possibilities for this so called 'demonic repetition' and the construction of essentialist LGBT stereotypes. The goal is:

> "To incorporate corporations, research institutions, sports organizations and other
> actors who can promote LGBT – human rights in the global south – for instance
> through LGBT-policies, development of knowledge and competences or as role-
> models for good LGBT-practise and equality" (LGBT Denmark 2012, p.7).

Within this part of the strategy, there is also a specific focus on International and Danish companies' function as role-models for so called good LGBT-practice, as well as a strategy for how internationally famous athletes could function as role models for 'good' LGBT behaviour, as stated:

> "Athletes can be important role-models also in relation to knowledge and respect
> for LGBTs in the global south. Especially internationally known sports-
> celebrities' convictions and statements can take part in affecting especially
> younger generations" (LGBT Denmark 2012, p.8).

This can be seen as constructing famous athletes who are self-identified LGBT's as the 'good gay' or 'good LGBT'. Even though the objective is to provide positive images of LGBTs as citisens, this can function to construct a further essentialised image of the gay, lesbian, etc. It can thus further create stereotypes of LGBT identities, fixating 'the sexual other' by creating an image, or what is normatively termed a positive role model, of how LGBTs are supposed to be. In relation to the function of companies to act as role-models for good LGBT practice, the strategy further states:

> "This can for instance be in connection with the  stationing or local employment of employees with LGBT background … to be a positive role model in Southern countries through politics, branding, CSR-activities or similar. LGBT Denmark thus wants to first and foremost reach out to companies with information, guidance and feedback." (LGBT Denmark 2012, p.8).

The strategy thus wishes to use stationed LGBT identifying people as examples and role models for LGBT people and rights. Suggesting that 'good' LGBT practice and the promotion of LGBT employment and politics can also be included in company branding and similar activities, the strategy further creates mechanisms of repetition and stereotypes in maintaining the fixed sexual identities of LGBT labels and sustaining the unchanging order of the sexual hierarchy and systematisation. They include private companies in this process where LGBT Denmark through counseling for companies, are positioned as the determinants of 'good' LGBT policies, which can subsequently be used by the companies to promote their image as gay or LGBT friendly, once again establishing what good or civilised sexual systematisations and rights entail.  The outreach of this strategy to create repetitions and stereotypes to establish the LGBT labels as the dominant system of sexual identification and systematisation can thus be seen as far-reaching, going through both national and international development agencies and NGOs as well as affecting private companies on the matter.

According to Bhabha's (2004) conceptions, these forms of repetitions and stereotypes are crucial to the fixity of the 'other', which in this case can be seen as the sexual others, the fixity on the non-heterosexuals within the LGBT labels. This can both apply to non-heterosexual identifying people in poorer countries in the south as well as in Europe, North America and other places. In accordance with the system of othering and natural oppositions (Loomba 2005, Bhabha 2004), this can be argued to both serve to establish and position heterosexuality as the norm and LGBT as the deviant but fixed sexual other. Also the 'Western' norm for sexual categorisations and rights organizing is positioned as the most civilised system, whereas other nations' failure to live up to these thus position them as inferior.

Not only can this create the earlier mentioned antagonism between sexual categorisations and the suppression of local interpretations of sexual identities and interests, as sexuality is connected to gender roles; it can also take part in creating essentialist gender roles and natural oppositions and antagonisms between the real way to be a man/woman and the deviant. As argued in chapter four, gender roles and hegemonic masculinity are built around heteronormativity and the fixed position of the deviant homosexuals/LGBTs. Hegemonic conceptions of masculinity, for instance, is as presented in chapter four connected to the constant need to prove essentialist heterosexual masculinity, which can have severe developmental consequences in the form of violence, patriarchal structures, crime, conflict and even war. It is also connected to the stereotyping of the 'third world man' as a violent, sexual predator as presented in chapter five. Building on the perspectives of both Mouffe (2005), Lloyd (2005) and Bhabha (2004), these gender orders and the developmental consequences they have can, within the process of othering and natural oppositions, be connected to the fixation of sexual deviants within LGBT labels as this is part of a process of general essentialism and fixation of gender and sexuality.

# 7. Discussion and conclusions: Looking at the intersections between LGBT rights and SRHR - possibilities for deconstructive agency

## 7.1 Discussion and further perspectives: Balancing between protection and liberation in sexual rights politics

Criticising sexual rights approaches and the whole foundation of sexual and gendered identities as the basis for rights organising can be seen to be a dangerous project. As pointed out by Miller (2004, p.19) among others, claims for sexual rights and protection from sexual harm and ill sexual health are still quite new and under constant development within human rights organising and developmental strategies. As presented in the beginning of chapter five, including issues such as abortion and contraception in the ICPD's POA was seen as controversial, and the same can be said for any claim for sexual rights for non-heterosexuals. Sexual rights claims in their current form are still facing severe attacks and challenges, and are as such quite fragile. Turning an extensive critique against it at this point in time could thus be perceived as the failure of sexual rights as a developmental tool, or as an argument for those who believe that sexuality is a private issue that does not belong in development policy.

As argued by Miller (2004, p.19), however, it is a process of simultaneously defending sexual rights, including the rights of some collective identities, and critically examining the exclusionary and suppressive cultural governing of sexual norms within these approaches. As argued by Ignacio Saiz (2009, p.8), and as presented in chapter four, the rights based approach could have the potential to incorporate sexuality and gender in development in a way that does not need to define specific sub-groups, and which is inclusive of the many intersections and

possibilities for coalitions between different subject positions and interests concerning sexual and intimate aspects of people's lives. But the construction of sexual rights within the SRHR acronym and LGBT rights as the small side projects vastly neglect this opportunity. The idea of human rights as inclusive of all people is dismissed by the cultural assumptions within rights formulations and approaches. The Danish sexual rights approach's assumptions about the sexual interests and identifications of the 'other' does not reflect on the exclusionary mechanisms within these assumptions. As argued by Correa, et al. (2008, p.179) in reference to Butler (2005):

> "The facile SRHR acronym relieves us of responsibility for thinking through what this inclusive vision would mean and, specifically, who counts as full human beings in the discourse of human rights; or, as Butler has framed it, 'what makes a life livable' and 'whose lives count as lives' in our moral universe (Butler 2005, p. 17)".

As further noted by Butler, the conceptions of LGBT human rights suggest that LGBT's are not included in former conceptions of the human and human rights (Butler 2004, cited in Kollman and Waites 2009, p.2). In the case of the Danish approach to sexual rights, the LGBT Denmark organisation as the authority for the approach of the LGBT South strategy are both the fixed minority 'sexual other' in one context, and the 'authoritative colonial power' who fixates the 'colonised sexual other' in another. As the LGBT movement and system of categorisation is continuingly gaining power and rights, the idea of challenging this system as a constructed and possibly suppressive 'western invention' might be seen as a threat to the influence of this movement. This also entails that arguments and expression of a 'colonised sexual other' that does not express or identify with heterosexuality or with the LGBT labels, the so-called hybrid expression of gender that moves between these categories can challenge or stretch this order of sexual hierarchies. As such these hybrid-identities can be seen as a threat by those who wish to maintain the conception of LGBT as essentialist and universal entities, and the political power associated with this position. Fixed

identity categories might be seen as an important tool for gaining recognition and political power, but subsequently it is also a tool for suppression (Gamson 1995, p.391). As argued by Miller (2000, p.74), a central question is: "...will it be possible to 'deconstruct' and 'defend' sexual identity at the same time?"

Mouffe's (2005) proposition for political and rights based organising centres on forming different constellations of we's and them's, which are based on the changeable subjects' differing interests and a conception of forming rights around coalitions of interests, as opposed to essentialist conceptions of collective identities. As presented in chapter four, there has been much critique of the lacking contextualisation of intersections between sexual rights and developmental issues, such as poverty, security, violence, etc., just as the analysis in chapter five and six present a critique of the lacking focus on the intersections and contextualisation of LGBT rights and SRHR. Looking at the connections and intersections of interests that are overlooked in the Danish approach to sexual rights, one can mention the de-sexualisation of women, connected to both female empowerment and challenging pervasive gender roles; this perspective in sexual rights interests might be shared with self-identifying lesbians, who are invisibilized and deemed as non-existent, based on the discursive perception of women as a-sexual.

This discursive phenomenon and the fact that many countries criminalise homosexuality for men, but not for women, as they do not believe WSW to exist, indicates that WSW might hold differing sexual rights-interests and face different forms of discrimination than self-identifying gay men. This can further be connected to the discussion of whether and how to incorporate perspectives on sexual pleasure within a rights framework, as part of a deconstruction of the victimisation and de-sexualisation of women. In connection to this pleasure discussion, the strict division of LGBT interests from SRHR can be seen to further ignore the intersections within these, in relation to LGBTs and other non hetero-sexualities' reproductive rights and interests. This division can seem to indicate

that the heterosexual interests are restricted to reproduction and health, whereas the focus within LGBT rights seems to overlook the possibilities of LGBTs' interests in reproductive rights. The same forms of intersections can be pointed out in the connection between the constructions of male behavioural norms and heteronormativity. As described in chapter four, gendered behavioural norms can have severe developmental effects, such as discrimination, crime, and violence, just to mention a few of the acts that might be committed in order to live up to the norm for correct heterosexual male behaviour. These behavioural norms are constructed around the homosexual male as the natural opposition and the constitutive outside. Once again, the interests of challenging gender roles is an area of concern that crosses over the LGBT/SRHR division, also including the possible interest of transgendered people for more fluid gender interpretations. As the Danish approach to sexual rights in its division of SRHR and LGBT rights fails to address these intersections, one can, based on Mouffe's perspectives, reflect on how these mentioned intersections could function as inessential coalitions for sexual rights organizing based on intersecting interests, as opposed to collective identities. In Mohanty's terms these intersections reflect a 'common context of struggle' within intersections of apparently conflicting identity claims.

## 7.2 Pushing the discourse to its absurd limits

Bringing in Bhabha's (2004) perspective on hybridisation and expansion of discourses as a tool for deconstruction of colonial hierarchies, and in this case gendered and sexual hierarchies, the SRHR strategy's proclamation of wanting to challenge gendered roles would benefit from the recognition and inclusion of what Bhabha terms hybrid identities, which might be seen as expressions of identifications that are self-positioned as outside, between, or within intersections of established categories of gender and sexuality. From the perspective of a hybridisation strategy, these could challenge and expand the discursive framework for sexual rights and essentialism of gendered and sexual identifications and hierarchies. As Kapoor (2008, p.121) explains Bhabha's approach to a hybridization strategy: "It's a non-dialectical space standing in-between the binary

structures of orientalist representations and imperial power. In this sense agency's difference is about negotiating polarisations without acceding to their foundational claims."

It is important to mention that in Bhabha's (2004) perspective, the possibilities for agency - in terms of challenging 'the unchanging order' and the hegemonic position of colonial power, and in this case essentialist conceptions of gender and sexuality as well as stereotypes - is not about overthrowing it to replace it with a completely new order or any 'real' or 'true' native perspective or desire of the colonised. Such nationalist approaches holding any conception of a 'true native identity' would merely reproduce new forms of binaries and suppressions of heterogeneities (Kapoor 2008, pp. 123-124), just as conceptions of any unified perspective within Europe or any nation or area would entail suppressions of heterogeneities of identifications and interests. Instead, his approach to transformation is focused on expanding the colonial discourse, changing it from within. This might be seen as what is in the process of happening within LGBT rights organisations at the moment, as the acronyms in different countries and organisations have expanded from LG to LGB, LGBT, LGBTI, LGBTIQ; one of the most extended versions of this framework being LGBTIQAA, which refers to: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, Intersex, Queer, A-sexual, and Allies (Budhiraja et al. 2010).

The problems of defining personal identifications and preferences within specific categorisations have further led to the invention of the terms WSW (women who have sex with women) and MSM (men who have sex with men), which have mainly been used to refer to sexual actions as opposed to sexual identification. However, these terms have further been disputed, and at a 2006 AIDS conference it was subsequently suggested that MSM would be expanded to MSMW, to indicate that some men who have sex with men also have sex with women. This lead attendees at the conference to argue that "...adding letters of the alphabet only pointed out the potential absurdity of our effort to "fix" sexual practices into

nameable categories rather than taking on the fluidity – indeed the messiness – of sex and sexuality" (Budhiraja et al. 2010, p.134).

As such, this can be seen in relation to Bhabha's (2004) conception of how an expansion of the discourse, pushing it to its limits, can reveal the insufficiency, absurdity and constructedness of the discourse in itself, as a process of denaturalising and challenging colonial power structures for sexual rights discourse. The same process might be imagined in including more and more non-hetero and alternative gendered and sexual expressions in the dominant sexual rights strategies, and recognising the intersecting interests and multiple identifications and rights interests of individuals, slowly changing the division between the heterosexual as the norm and homosexual/LGBT as the deviant but fixed other.

In Bhabha's perspective, changing the colonial patterns in developmental approaches to sexual rights is thus both about the development agencies' responsibility for being responsive to cultural differences, but also to find ways to allow for alternative interpretations to be seen and heard. As argued by Kapoor (2008, p.148-149), postcolonial politics in development are constantly luring and in need of critical interrogation, but any attempt to move past these - and the cultural imperialist suppressions that they entail - requires development agencies to find new ways for the subaltern/colonised to be heard, as well as development agencies' responsiveness to their claims.

## 7.3 Final conclusions

As presented in the previous analysis, sexual rights approaches promoted within a protection paradigm can entail a construction of culturally specific ideas of sexuality and gender that exclude people and continue colonialism's reign of naturalizing specific 'western' values and norms as the epitome of progress and civility. Post-colonial critique of the continuation of colonial patterns and cultural

imperialism in international relations and developmental practices should hold developmental practitioners and international political institutions to an extensive responsibility for reflecting on the situatedness of their knowledge-production and developmental approaches (Kapoor 2008, pp.148-149). The tendencies of development and sexual rights approaches to position valued-laden goals and approaches as the naturalised 'common good' requires a critical investigation and unveiling of these discursive propagations of sexual and gendered biases, not least in light of the extensive patterns of antagonisms tied to discursive essentialism of gender and sexuality.


The Danish SRHR approach fails to face the difficult task of representing an array of culturally diverse sexual rights interests, and instead boils the complexities of sexual desires, identifications, threats, and joys down to a focus on reproduction and protection from ill sexual health in the form of disease and violence against women. By default, the strategy thus takes part in constructing an essentialised image of gender and sexuality, as well as the stereotype of 'the victimised and a-sexual third world woman'. As the strategy holds little recognition of men's sexual I'll health and subjection to suppressive gendered norms or pressures, the natural opposition to 'the victimized woman' is constructed in the form of 'the violating and unfeeling third world man'. These stereotypes, as well as the exclusion of non-reproductive aspects of sex and non-hetero sexual relations and identifications, construct a discursive essentialism of gender and sexuality within which heterosexuality is positioned as the norm and heterosexual reproduction is naturalised as the collective sexual good and focus of sexual rights interests.

Within the Danish approach to sexual rights, any non-hetero sexual rights interests and identities are only addressed in the small separated project on LGBT rights, positioning these as outside of the dominant sexual rights discourse and as the deviant but fixed sexual other which serves as the constitutive outside to heteronormativity. Denmark's strategy for LGBT rights and the incorporation of

these in both national and international development agencies and NGOs can be said to construct a fixed and essentialising conception of specific non-hetero sexualities and gendered expressions in the form of LGBT labels and stereotypes. This excludes any alternative identifications of sexuality and gender, overlooking local interpretations and expressions and requiring people to adopt to these collective LGBT identities in order to be included within rights protection.

Viewing the LGBT system as the dominant 'western' norm for fixating and systematising non-hetero sexual categories and rights organising, this strategy can from a post-colonial perspective be seen to attempt a normalisation of non-hetero sexual relations, fixating these within the prescribed norms of LGBT as the civilised system of non-hetero sexual rights organising. The strategy thus fails to reflect on the responsibility of such a strategy to be inclusive and responsive of cultural differences.

As the Danish approach to sexual rights fails to see the intersections between SRHR and LGBT sexual rights interests, as well as the possibility of alternative interpretations of sexual identifications, it is not just a question of how protection tied to specific essentialised categorisations of gender and sexuality is prioritized over sexual and gendered freedom and empowerment within the Danish approach. It can further seem to be a reductive perspective that, in its simplification of the collective 'sexual good', fails to see how essentialist sexual norms, gender roles and antagonisms resulting in violence, discrimination, etc., are all interconnected. Given that the focus on protection of both women, children and LGBTs also constructs essentialist conceptions of gender and sexuality, which by Mouffe (2005) and Lloyd's (2005) perspectives result in antagonisms, as identities come to appear as threatening for each other's existence, this reductive protection paradigm can be seen as partly responsible for reproducing the sexual-hierarchies and antagonisms that it offers protection from. In not reflecting on the essentialist assumptions and exclusionary mechanisms within the SRHR and LGBT strategies and their separation, the Danish approach to sexual rights avoids a direct

confrontation with the question of which aspects of sexual lives and identities they recognise as valid and deserving of rights protection. This approach to sexual rights thus silently falls into a colonial mechanism of naturalising familiar perspectives on sexuality and sexual rights as the universal common good.

# Reference list

Armas, H., 2006. Exploring Linkages Between Sexuality and Rights to Tackle Poverty. In: Cornwall, A. & Jolly, S. eds., 2006. Sexuality Matters. *IDS Bulletin,* volume 37, number 5, October 2006, pp. 21-26. London: Institute of Development Studies.

Armas, H., 2007. *IDS Working Paper 294: Whose Sexuality Counts? Poverty, Participation and Sexual Rights.* Brighton:  Institute of Development Studies.

Bannon, I. & Correia, Maria C. eds., 2006. *The other half of gender: men's issues in development.* Washington: The World Bank.

Barker, G., 2006. Men's Participation as Fathers in Latin America and the Caribbean: Critical Litterature Review and Policy Options. In: Bannon, I. & Correia, Maria C. eds., 2006. *The other half of gender: men's issues in development.* Washington: The World Bank.Ch.3.

Bhabha, Homi K., 1994. *The location of culture.* 2nd ed. London/New York (NY): Routledge.

Budhiraja, S., Fried, Susana T. & Teixeira, A., 2010. Spelling it out: from alphabet soup to sexual rights and gender justice. In: Lind, A. ed., 2010. *Development, Sexual rights and Global Governance*. London/New York (NY): Routledge. Ch.8.

Butler, J., 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* 3rd ed. London/New York (NY): Routledge.

Butler, J., 2004. *Undoing gender.* London/New York (NY): Routledge.

 Chant, S., 2003. Dangerous equations? How female-headed households became the poorest of the poor: causes, consequences and cautions.  In: Cornwall, A.

Harrison, E. and Whitehead, A., 2007. *Feminisms in development: contradictions, contestations and challenges*. London/New York (NY): Zed Books.

Cornwall, A. Harrison, E. and Whitehead, A., 2007. *Feminisms in development: contradictions, contestations and challenges*. London/New York (NY): Zed Books.

Cornwall, A. & Jolly, S. eds., 2006. Sexuality Matters. *IDS Bulletin,* volume 37, number 5, October 2006. London: Institute of Development Studies.

Cornwall, A., Corrêa, S. & Jolly, S., 2008. *Development with a body: Sexuality, human rights & development.* London/New York (NY): Zed books.

Corrêa, S., Petchesky, R. & Parker, R., 2008. *Sexuality, Health and Human Rights.* London/New York (NY): Routledge.

Currier, Ashley M., 2007. *The Visibility of Sexual Minority Movement Organizations in Namibia and South Africa.* Doctoral dissertation. University of Pittsburgh.

Currier, Ashley M., 2010. Behind the mask: developing LGBTI visibility in Africa. In: Lind, A. ed., 2010. *Development, Sexual rights and Global Governance*. London/New York (NY): Routledge. Ch.10.

DANIDA, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. 2006. *The Promotion of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights.* [internet] Copenhagen: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.
Available at: http://um.dk/da/danida/der-goer-vi/udv-strat-indsats/ligestil/sund/seksuel-og-reproduktiv-sundhed/~/media/UM/Danish-site/Documents/Danida/Det-goer-vi/Ligestilling/SRSR%20Strategi.ashx
[Accessed 14 February 2012].

Delanty, G. & Strydom, P., 2003. *Philosophies of social science: The Classic and Contemporary Readings.* Maidenhead/Philadelphia (PA): Open University Press.

Foucault, M., 1976. *History of Sexuality vol. I.* Translated from French by: Robert Hurley New York (NY):Penguin books.

Foucault, M., 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Translated from French by: C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham & K. Soper. New York (NY): Pantheon Books.

Human Rights Watch, 2008. *This Alien Legacy: The Origins of "Sodomy" Laws in British Colonialism.* [Online]. Human Rights Watch (Published 2008).
Available at:
http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/lgbt1208_webwcover.pdf
[Accessed 5 May 2012].

Hauge, H., 2007. *Postkolonialisme.* Århus: Århus universitetsforlag.

Jolly, S., 2000. 'Queering' development: Exploring the links between same-sex sexualities, gender, and development. *Gender and Development Vol. 8, No. 1,* [internet] March 2000.
Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/741923414
[Accessed 12 November 2011, downloaded from Lund University Libraries].

Jolly, S., 2010. Why the development industry should get over its obsession with bad sex and start to think about pleasure. In: Lind, A. ed., 2010. *Development, Sexual rights and Global Governance*. London/New York (NY): Routledge. Ch.1.

Kapoor, I., 2008. *The Postcolonial Politics of Development*. London/New York (NY): Routledge.

Kollman, K. & Waites, M., 2009. The global politics of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender
human rights: an introduction. *Contemporary Politics Vol. 15, No. 1*, [internet] March 2009.
Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13569770802674188
[Accessed 12 April 2012].

LGBT Danmark, 2012. *LGBT Danmarks strategi for styrkelse af LGBT-menneskerettigheder i det globale syd.* [internet] Copenhagen: LGBT Danmark.
Available at:
http://www.lgbt.dk/fileadmin/site/billeder/afdelinger/afd_international/sydstrategi.pdf
[Accessed 13 February 2012].

Lind, A. ed., 2010. *Development, Sexual rights and Global Governance*. London/New York (NY): Routledge.

Lloyd, M., 2005. *Beyond identity politics: feminism, power & politics.* London/New Delhi/New York (NY): SAGE.

Loomba, A., 2005. *Colonialism/PostColonialism: The New Critical Idiom.* 2nd ed. London/New York (NY): Routledge.

Miller, Alice M., 2000. Sexual but Not Reproductive: Exploring the Junction and Disjunction of Sexual and Reproductive Rights. *Health and Human Rights, Vol. 4, No. 2, Reproductive and Sexual Rights,* [internet] 2000.
Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4065197
[Accessed 20 March 2012].

Miller, Alice M., 2004. Sexuality, Violence against Women, and Human Rights: Women Make Demands and Ladies Get Protection. *Health and Human Rights, Vol. 7, No. 2, Sexuality, Human Rights, and Health,* [internet] 2004.
Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4065347
[Accessed 25 April 2012].

Mohanty, Chandra T., 2003. *Feminism without borders.* Durham/London: Duke University Press.

Mouffe, C., 2005. *On the Political: Thinking in Action.* London/New York (NY): Routledge.

Parker, Richard G., 1997. Sexual Rights: Concepts and Action. *Health and Human Rights, Vol. 2, No. 3, 2nd International Conference on Health and Human Rights,* [internet] 1997.
Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4065151
[Accessed 22 April 2012].

Phillips, L. & Jørgensen, Marianne W., 2002. *Discourse Analysis: as Theory and Method.* London/Thousand Oaks (CA)/New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Saiz, I., 2004. Bracketing Sexuality: Human Rights and Sexual Orientation - A Decade of Development and Denial at the UN. *Health and Human Rights, Vol. 7, No. 2, Sexuality, Human Rights, and Health,* [internet] 2004.
Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4065348
[Accessed 20 March 2012].

UNFPA, 2012. *The Human Rights-Based Approach.* [online]
Available at: http://www.unfpa.org/rights/approaches.htm
[Accessed 9 March 2012]

Voetmann, Anne M. T. (anmvoe@um.dk), 2012. *Re: spørgsmål ang. Danida's strategy for seksuel og reproduktiv sundhed og rettigheder.* [e-mail] Message to S. R. Iversen (srexi@ruc.dk).
(Personal communication, Monday 23 april 2012).

Young, Iris M., 1989. Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship. *Ethics 99,* [internet] January 1989.
Available at: http://polisci2.ucsd.edu/rabarrett/ps108/Young--Polity%20and%20Group%20Difference%20%28Critique%20of%20Universal%20Citizenship%29%20%28abridged%29.pdf
[Accessed 17 May 2012].

**Appendix 1:**

**Ministry Of Foreign Affairs of Denmark**

**DANIDA**



# THE PROMOTION OF SEXUAL AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH AND RIGHTS

**STRATEGY**
FOR DENMARK'S SUPPORT