Opposing Ugandan homosexual policies—an activist perspective

Av Elin Nilsson

LUNDS UNIVERSITET Socialhögskolan

Kandidatuppsats (SOPA63)

vt 13

Abstract

Author: Elin Nilsson

Title: Opposing Uganda Homosexual Policies—An Activist Perspective

Supervisor: Lars Harrysson

Based on the perspective of LGBTI-activists, the aim of this study was to analyze the policy processes that frame homosexuality in Uganda, as well as to illuminate different powerful stakeholders involved in the debate with power in the policy process. In October 2009, Member of Parliament David Bahati tabled the Anti-homosexuality Bill in Uganda. The drafting of the Bill condemns people convicted of homosexuality to life imprisonment and anyone convicted of aggravated homosexuality to suffer death. The Bill has caused protest among both local and international Human Right groups. This study is based on an eight-week Minor Field Study conducted in Uganda, which consisted of interviews with LGBTI-activists representing NGOs working toward improvement of homosexual rights. In my analysis I use different structural approaches in order to study the policy process. This helps to understand the complexity of the homosexuality debate and to locate sources of power and at the same time establish the division power among these sources. Marxist and Top Down perspectives show an unequal power deviation in which the government has much power and acts as a controller in the society. Elite theory brings forward elite stakeholders in the policy process; these include as religious leaders, politicians and the president. Turning to a Bottom Up perspective, the Pluralistic theory shows that the power division in the policy process is unequal and that the government is using authoritative means to maintain the power in society. Globalization theory shows that the Anti-homosexuality movement creates tensions between Uganda and its international relations. For instance, donor countries that contribute to its foreign aid have criticized Uganda. This study shows that the democratic system in Uganda is dysfunctional, implying that the LGBTI-activists face obstacles to their advocacy work for homosexual rights from the government and elite stakeholders. On the other hand, the LGBTI-organizations can gain power in the policy process, as depicted by the network theory, by networking with other stakeholders.

Key words: LGBTI-activism, Anti-Homosexuality Bill, and Policy process, Democracy, Networking

Foreword

Index

1. Introduction

1.2 Introduction to the Problem

Mayer explains how being gay in a heterosexual society can lead to minority stressors related to stigma because of the minority status (Meyer, 1995). The dimension of challenge based on stigma depends on where in the world one is located, as the acceptance of homosexuality differs around the globe. Each country has its own legal provisions, either against homosexuality or against discrimination of homosexuality. Uganda is one country that has legal provisions restricting homosexuality. As a homosexual in Uganda, one can be exposed and humiliated because of this sexual orientation and the stigmatization thereof can become unbearable for a homosexual person. Miss Mirie, a homosexual-activist[1] in Uganda explains that her organization started as resistance against the harassment towards homosexual people that made her friend commit suicide:

> "…a lesbian committed suicide. The reason because she committed suicide was because she was humiliated in school in front of everyone and then she could not take it anymore. So she had to take her own life. So people jubilated. They were rejoicing over the radio and stuff like that, that they had got rid *of a lesbian*. So three people, founding members *of the organization*, one who is anonymous the other one is X and X come up and said 'Why do we need to suffer like this? We need to form an organization and fight for our rights' (Miss. Mirie LGBTI-org 5).

It is illegal to attempt and or commit homosexual acts according to Uganda Penal Code Act §145 and §146 Unnatural Offences. The law says that "any person who has carnal knowledge of any person against order of nature" is liable to imprisonment for life or any person who attempts to commit any of this offence is liable to imprisonment for seven years (1998).

These laws were imposed in Uganda during the British colonial rule (Hollander, 2009). They are rarely, if ever enforced but they still do contribute to hostile attitudes and justify discrimination and harassment of homosexuals in Uganda (Hollander, 2009). A new Anti-

---

[1] With activist I imply "a person engaged in or advocating vigorous political activity: an active campaigner" (Oxford English Dictionary: activist, 2013).

Homosexuality Bill was proposed on 14th October 2009 to fill the gaps in the Penal Code Act. The Anti-Homosexuality Bill is referred to by some like "Kill The Gays Bill" (Ling, 2012).

The first drafting of the bill condemns people convicted for homosexuality to imprisonment for life and people convicted for aggravated homosexuality to suffer death. Aggravated homosexuality means for example that the offence is committed to someone under the age of 18 or if the offender is a serial offender. The Bill also declares that it is illegal to promote homosexuality and that a person in authority has obligation to report to the authorities within twenty-four hours if they suspect anyone to be homosexual, or else that person can suffer imprisonment up to three years (The Anti-Homosexuality Bill, 2009). This means that teachers, doctors and parents should report if they suspect their students, clients or their own children to be involved in any homosexual acts (Sandgrove et. al. 2012). Homosexual people will not be able take part of social services like going to school, getting medical care or go to therapy counseling without the risk of being reported to the police. The Ugandan regime has approved the central human right conventions but The Anti-Homosexuality Bill contravenes the key human rights protections (MR-rapport, 2012) and Human Rights in Uganda will be affected if the bill becomes a law (Strand, 2011). United Nations High Commissioner for Human rights declares fallowing:

> "The application of international human rights law is guided by the principles of universality and non-discrimination enshrined in article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that 'all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights'. All people, including lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) persons, are entitled to enjoy the protections provided for by international human rights law, including in respect of rights to life, security of person and privacy, the right to be free from torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, the right to be free from discrimination and the right to freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly". (United Nation, 2011. p 4)

Intense debate followed the Anti-Homosexuality Bill tabled in October 2009 by David Bahati a Member of Parliament from the ruling party, National Resistant Army. The bill has caused protest among both local and international human right groups. (Strand, 2011) In this study I

will—from a homosexual activist's perspective—analyze different stakeholders[2] taking part in the homosexuality debate both in and outside Uganda. Diverse stakeholders are trying to influence what action the Ugandan society should take towards homosexuality. These actions will form the Ugandan homosexuality policy. Policies can be seen as deliberate line of actions that are taken based on decelerated principles, it is the principle that steer what actions that a group, person or society is taking (Hill, 2007).

With the Anti-Homosexuality Bill pending, the national homosexuality policy is changing in Uganda. There are stakeholders that are fighting for the rights of homosexuals and there are stakeholders that are fighting for prohibition of homosexuality. Stakeholders advocating[3] for homosexual rights include Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transsexual and Intersex (LGBTI) - activists based in Uganda. My study focuses on their work and their perspective toward the ongoing policy process.

1.3 Objective

This study takes an LGBTI-activist perspective in its analysis. The objective is to analyze stakeholders who have power in the processes that frame homosexuality, and to study the power distribution among them. The goal is to provide a better understanding of the debate surrounding homosexuality in Uganda, from the vantage point of LGBTI-activists. It creates an opportunity to see what capabilities these activists and other pro-homosexuality groups have in influencing the government's policies on homosexuality, and the policy process carrying it. My study also examines many difficulties the activists face when carrying out their work.

---

[2] With stakeholder I indicate: "a person, company, etc., with a concern or interest ensuring the success of an organization, business system etc." (Oxford English Dictionary: stakeholder, 2013)

[3] With advocacy I indicate: "The act of publicly representing an individual, organization or idea with the object of persuading targeted audiences to look favorably on –or accept the point of view—the individual, the organization, the idea" (Edgett, 2002. p. 1 cited from Özemir, 2012. p 24).

1.4 Limitations

Since this study is based on one side's perspective in the homosexuality debate—the perspective of LGBTI-activists—it does not provide a complete representation of the ongoing debate in Uganda. It gives a picture of the perspective of the activists participating in the debate. I have chosen to carry out this study with this focus for different reasons. One is that homosexuality is a sensitive subject in Uganda, which can provoke the asking of questions; consequently, people can be offended. To avoid this I chose to focus this research on the perspective of homosexual-activists as they do not dread to talk about homosexuality openly. Another reason why I find this study important is because I suspect that people fighting for homosexual rights are suppressed in Ugandan. The opposition, who are against homosexuality, has bigger spaces to openly promote their cause in for example mass media (Sandgove et. al. 2012). Focusing on the LGBTI-activist perspective in the debate will gain knowledge about their specific role in the policy process framing homosexuality and their view on the homosexuality debate in their society. The activists participating in this study work in non-governmental organizations (NGOs) with the purpose of influencing homosexuality policies in Uganda.

1.5 Research questions

The following questions are discussed in the ambition of fulfilling the objective. The first one regards what stakeholders that are engaged in the debate. The second question lifts the issue of the actual doings, to how they are fulfilled and whom that have the powers to direct them. Finally, I look at the activists themselves how they interact with other stakeholders in the homosexual policy discourse of Uganda.

1. What stakeholders may be identified in the homosexuality debate?

2. Who is portrayed to have the political power to influence the direction of the homosexual policy and how do NGOs advocate for the rights of homosexuality in Uganda and what obstacles are they facing?

3. Which different inter-exchange relationships—in their network—do homosexual-activists define as important when carrying out their advocacy?

2. Perspective matters – my theoretical frame

In my analysis I use different approaches for how to study the policy process. These different approaches help me identify stakeholders in the homosexuality debate who are portrayed with power to influence the policy process. The study of policy processes can be defined as the analysis of how power is practiced when politics are formed. Analyzing the characteristics and sources of power in the process is central in the policy study. That is to answer the question stated by Michael Hill of to what extent systems have existing power divided equally between them and if the power is centered or spread (Hill, 2007). The study of the homosexuality policy in Uganda from different structural approaches helps me understand the complexity of the homosexuality policy and in locating sources of power and their division. I start my analysis by using the traditional policy process approaches found in Marxist theory and in Elite theory, which both study the policy process from a top down perspective from where the power is unequally distributed (Wang, 2010). Marxist theory is used to illuminate the government's power and interests in the policy process. Elite theory has the purpose to locate elite stakeholders with power to influence the policy process. Then I turn to a bottom up perspective using a Pluralist theory, in which power is spread between interests, actors and institutions (Wang, 2010) with an intention of analyzing the policy process from the fact that Uganda is a democratic country. Further I discuss the setting of Uganda as being a part in world politics. How do international relationships influence the policy process? This analysis is supported by newer ideas within policy research, the globalization theory. Finally, I employ the network theory to analyze the LGBTI-activists' networks and their interest-exchange relationships, which include multiple policy stakeholders (Wang, 2010). A critique of network theory is that it is hard to include all relationships between the government and other groups. It is important to determine whether the state is a dominant stakeholder or not. There are those who suggest that network theory is more aptly described as method for analyzing a structure than a theory. It is imperative to note that all policy theories used in this analysis only describe the policy process; they do not attempt to explain it (Hill, 2005). The individual perspectives are discussed in greater depth, as they are used within the analysis.

3. Methodology

3.1 Method

This thesis is based on an eight weeks of study in Uganda. I have used a qualitative method based on seven interviews with LGBTI-activists representing organizations advocating for homosexual rights. When I first lived in Uganda (January to June 2012) and conducted my internship, I got the impression that the picture of homosexuality was represented negatively in media. (This is discussed in my analysis.) I undertook this study in order to spread more knowledge on the perspective of LGBTI-activists in Uganda, and to learn more about the activist perspective in the policy process. I consider interviewing to be the best approach for this study, as it focuses on people's points of view (Bryman, 2012) and my objective is to get knowledge about the views of the LGBTI-activist. I conducted semi-structured interviews. In semi-structured interviews the researcher has an interview guide but the interviewee can be open with their answer. The question does not have to be answered in a specific order and new questions might be asked by the researcher if the interviewee brings up new interesting information valuable for the study (Bryman, 2012). I used semi-structured interviews to give space for the interviewees to be flexible in their answers. This made it possible to go deeper into the subjects that came up that I considered to be of interest for the study. At the same time, I needed to follow an interview guide to get information that focuses on my objectives. The interview guide is found as Attachment 1.

3.2 Critique of the method

Interviews—looked upon with a social constructed perspective—are affected by the current context, in the way the researcher interacted with the person and the language spoken to each other. An interview is only giving information about the present and its interpretation from the person interviewed. The data gained from these interviews can say much about the subject but they cannot say all. They cannot give the sole answer or one truth (Ahrne & Eriksson-Zetterquist, 2011).

3.3 Sampling

To find activists advocating for homosexual rights I contacted the Swedish embassy in Kampala before I traveled to Uganda. From them I received a list of six non-governmental organizations that are working with advocating for homosexual rights in Uganda. I started with emailing these organizations. This is a purposive sampling, meaning that participants in my research are not randomly selected. My target group is all organizations in Uganda operating within my study area. In a strategic way, I focused on the people who worked in these organizations that could help me gain information about my research questions (Bryman, 2012). I only got one email reply from the executive director of one of the six organizations that were on the list and this person did not want to meet me without being sure that I am who I said to be. Organizations are nonpublic settings and it can be hard to gain access to them (Bryman, 2012). As the study topic in this study is sensitive, the activists have to be careful with whom they speak to because of safety reasons. After arriving in Uganda I contacted the Swedish embassy and they connected me with an activist representing one organization on the list. Going through the embassy helped the activists to trust me. I met three activists from three different LGBTI-organizations for lunch and booked interviews with them. They also gave me contacts to activist operating in other LGBTI-organizations. LGBTI-organizations in Uganda are collaborating and have a close contact with each other. When I called the other organizations I told them from whom I got their contact so they felt safe meeting me. This means that I used a snowball sampling, were I started with one contact that were of interest for my study then got connected to other interesting people through them (Bryman, 2012). The risk with using a snowball sampling is that the people you get in contact with influence and share the same values, which could limit the breadth of the study (Ahrne & Svensson, 2011). Since there are not many LGBTI-organizations in Uganda of which the available ones collaborate with each other, it was hard to avoid the mentioned risk during my study. During my stay in Uganda I got aware of nine organizations working with LGBTI questions and homosexual rights. I successfully interviewed activist working at seven of these organizations.

3.4 The organizations

The target group is individuals working in LGBTI-organizations with purpose to influence the policy process and improve rights for homosexual people. Three organizations participating in this study were manly working with one of the sexual minority-groups, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, or intersex. One organization was an umbrella organization, one was a coalition and the other two were working for sexual minority groups and homosexual rights in general. One of these two had a focus on right to health care for sexual minority groups and the other focus on youths and sexual minority issues. The organizations were working close together to improve homosexual rights in Uganda.

3.5 Dependability and Creditability

Reliability deals with the extent to which the tools I measure with are reliable such that my research can be repeated (Bryman, 2012 & Jönsson, 2010). Reliability can be difficult in qualitative research as the research is taking place in a complex context. Another term that can be used is *dependability* (Bryman, 2012). Dependability means that the study should be trustworthy and have an auditing approach. The researcher should keep complete records during the whole research throughout all stages—selection of research participants, notes, interview transcripts, and data analysis to increase the dependability (Bryman, 2012). I have tried to keep a complete record during all steps in this study. I have *recorded* six of the seven interviews. The six recorded interviews were carried out with one staff member and the one interview, which was not recorded because it was a group interview with six staff members representing the organization. The participants were spread out in the room and recording became a practical problem. Asking the staff members to pass the recorder did not feel appropriate and could affect the interview as the participants would not be able to speak freely. Not recording this interview somewhat affected the dependability negatively.

I took *notes* during all interviews. Taking notes has helped me organize the recorded data and was back up in case of technical equipment failure or problem (Ahrne & Eriksson-Zetterquist 2011 & Bryman, 2012). To increase the dependability I have also in the analysis of the data *transcribed* the interviews and *coded* them. Coding means that I break down my data into component parts, which are given names (Bryman. 2012). This helped me sort my material and find patterns (Jönson, 2010). Codes used in this study are: "Donors": those who donate to

LGBTI-organizations, "Stakeholders"—those with a stake in the policy process concerning homosexuality, "Factors"—those affecting the policy process concerning homosexuality, "Power use"—by various stakeholders in the policy process, "Advocacy"—methods LGBTI-organizations use in their advocacy work and "Obstacles"—those faced by LGBTI organizations doing advocacy work.

One of the concerns that could have affected the dependability negatively is that I have been asking a few leading questions. I noticed this when transcribing the recorded interviews. Leading questions can affect the interviewer to answer to in a way that agrees with the question (Thrén, 2005).

Validity is the extent to which the study is measuring what it is supposed to measure (Jönson, 2012). Another term, which may be more appropriate for quality research, is *credibility*. Credibility is concerning being clear about the relationship between how data is collected and how it is used. (Bryman, 2012) To gain creditability I have presented the method in which I have analyzed this relationship in a clear and correct way. This will make it possible for the readers to analyze if they find my research trustworthy or not (Ibid).

3.6 Formalities

This study is based on the views of activists in the policy process but it does also contain a lot of research from other sources. Most of the data I use when I analyze the policy process with a pluralistic theory are not based on the views of the activist. This data is based on previous research describing the political system in Uganda, which has been necessary in order to understand the context in which the activists operate.

In the analysis I have indicated if the information comes from previous research (by refer to the source) or from my own collected data with the interviewed activist by writing the number of the organization after the statement. When I have quoted any of the persons interviewed I have written a fictitious name and a number of the organization they work with. The numbers given to the organizations are given in the order they were participating in interviews. The sex of the interviewee is also randomly selected.

Organization 1 Mr. Mukula

Organization 2 Group interview

Organization 3 Miss Musisi

Organization 4 Mr. Sula

Organization 5 Miss Mirie

Organization 6 Mr. Kiza

Organization 7 Miss Oroma

Organization number two is not quoted in the study as this is a group interview and the interview was not recorded. Therefore I do not have data to quote directly from this interview.

Only taking few sentences in a statement can sometimes leave out details on the main subject in the statement. I have therefore added some word in quotes to clarify the statement's meaning or idea. For example when the interviewee says "it" or "him" I have specified what "it" stands for and how "he" is. The added words in the quotes are marked with italic.

3.7 Ethical considerations

Bryman indicates that it is important to keep the organizations and participants of the research confidential (2012). This has been particularly important in my case, as the people I interviewed work with a sensitive subject and are, according to this study, exposed in the society. I have therefore chosen to keep both organizations and participants confidential. Many LGBTI-activists are living under the threat of being exposed in the media, which will be discussed in this study. I do not want to contribute to this harassment.

Bryman also describes the importance about not invading someone's privacy (2012). This is something that I have kept in mind when carrying out the data collection for this study. I have considered the questions carefully before the interviews. I also told the interviewees before the interviews that they should object and not answer if there were any question they did not want to respond to. I have also shared the purpose of the study to the participants before carrying out the interviews. This is important so that the persons interviewed could decide for themselves if they want to participate or not (Bryman, 2012).

In the beginning I had plans to write my thesis about average people's opinions about homosexuality in Uganda. But as the subject could provoke people, my university did not accept this approach. Instead I choose to study the policy process from a LGBTI-activist perspective as they are working with homosexual rights and are more comfortable talking about the subject.

4. Previous research

LGBTI activists in Uganda are challenging the local laws that discriminate against them by standing up for their rights and bringing their case to international courts and governments. (This will be further discussed in the analyses). Below I present previous research on other countries where anti-sodomy laws and others that discriminate against homosexuals have been overturned. Other countries that, like Uganda, are former British colonies have recently brought down anti-sodomy legislation. These include Australia, Canada, South Africa, and United States (Hollander, 2009).

I will present examples of the end of anti-sodomy laws in two countries. The Canadian case shows how the efforts of individuals can indeed overturn discrimination against homosexual people. This is followed by an example from South Africa, where an end to anti-sodomy laws has recently occurred.

4.1 Canada

Canada removed its anti-sodomy laws in 1969, which is early compared to the rest of the world. However, discrimination on the basis of sexual orientations was not included in the Individual Rights and Protection Act (IRPA) of 1973. Delwin Vriend worked as a lab coordinator at Kings College in Alberta, and was dismissed from his position because of his sexual orientation. Vriend brought a complaint under the IRPA, but was unable to pursue it on the grounds that could sexual orientation was not included (Hollander, 2009). "In response Vriend brought suit for declaratory relief alleging that IRPA violated section 15 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms for not including sexual orientation" (Hollande, 2009. p 248). The section 15(1) states:

"Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to equal protection and equal benefits of the law without discrimination and in particular without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, color, religion, sex, age or mental or psychical disability". (Hollander, 2009. p 248)

The court held that the exclusion of sexual orientation in the IRPA gave the impression that all persons have equal right accept gay men and lesbians, and that the law sent the signal that discrimination on the basis of homosexuality was acceptable. Therefore the court concluded that the sexual orientation should be read into IRPA as a protective status (Ibid). This case can be compared to Article 21 Equality and freedom from Discrimination of the Constitution of Uganda, which provides the most straightforward attack against the anti-sodomy laws.

"1. All persons are equal before and under the law in all spheres of political, economic, social and cultural life and in every other respect and shall enjoy equal protection of the law"

"2. Without prejudice to clause (1) of this article, a person shall not be discriminated against on the ground of sex, race, color, ethnic origin, tribe, birth, creed or religion, social or economic standing, political opinion or disability" (Mujuzi, 2012. p53).

(This will be discussed further in the analysis.)

4.2 South Africa

South Africa recently dismissed a series of anti-sodomy laws. The changes were conducted by the Constitutional Court of South Africa, with the newly signed 1996 South African Constitutions in National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality. The court used different sources found within the South African Constitution to bring down the anti-sodomy regulation such as rights to dignity, equality, privacy and freedom. The Constitutional Court also utilized emerging international consensus against the sodomy-laws. The specially cited legalization of sodomy in England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, Australia, New Zeeland, Germany and Canada (Hollander, 2009)

The court noted that the anti-sodomy-laws included far more than just intercourse among gay people. The laws limited fundamental freedom of the citizens of a country. These laws

include, at a practical level, moral questions about citizenship, and sense of self-worth. These concern the nature of the democratic and pluralistic society intended by the Constitution. Section 9 of the 1996 South African Constitution was the first in the world to include sexual orientation as a protected class. In other countries, sexual orientation had been inclusive in the protection of "sex" (Ibid).

> "1. Everyone is equal before the law and has the right to equal protection and benefits of the law.

> "2. Equality includes the full and equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms. To promote the achievements of equality, legislative and other measures designed to protect or advance persons or categories of persons, disadvantage by unfair discrimination may be taken.

> "3. The state may not unfairly discriminate directly or indirectly against anyone on one or more grounds, including race, gender, sex, pregnancy, material status, ethic or social origin, color, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth. (Hollander, 2009. p 245)

These changes of consensus towards anti-sodomy laws are mainly taking place in the west. However, the recognition of such rights in major parts of the world could serve as a recognition to the courts of Uganda that this right should not be seen as an outrageous clam (Hollander, 2009).

5. Results and analysis

5.1 How to study the policy process

The word policy implies something more than a decision, the term considers actions based on principles. As mentioned in the introduction, policies can be described as a deliberate line of actions based on decelerated principles. The principle steers what actions that are taken by a person, group or society (Hill, 2007). This study is analyzing the homosexuality policy at a national level.

The study of policy process is about studying how power is divided, which stakeholders that

have power to influence policies that form politics. Power can be central and or spread in the systems that rule the society (Hill, 2007). The Oxford English Dictionary describes the term policy as "The art, study, or practice of government or administration; the conduct of public affairs; (The Oxford English Dictionary: Policy, 2013). This description views the policy as something conducted by a government or an administration. Hill defines a state as "a group of institutions with a superior power over a certain geographical area" (Hill, 2007, p. 18). These perspectives are represented by traditional policy process approaches based on a top down perspective. But does the state have the superior power over the nation? In today's society, there are institutions that stand above states, such as the United Nations and the World Trade Organization, for example, that can impose certain policies. There are also institutions like the European Union, which, establish laws over the states (Hill, 2007). These institutions influence states to adopt certain policies. This indicates that there are forces that have power to affect that policy process in a country that the state has to consider. Another factor is that the central organs in a state often make contracts with private organizations to cover some parts of the social service. This could be seen as a technical arrangement from the state to implement a certain policy. Delegation to implement a policy as a private organization does however include controlling over the policy (Hill, 2007). In Uganda much social services are covered by NGOs for implementation of certain agreed policies. This network of different institutions that influence policies indicate that the central organ of a state is no longer the only one effecting the policy making and implementation of policies in a state. This has made a change from the term *government* to the term *governance* meaning steering. The term governance is formed to include different actors beside the government that are taking part in forming the politics in a state (Hill, 2007). Following—viewed from an LGBTI-activist perspective—this complex power deviation between different actors will be analyzed with help of different theories that view the policy process from different angles. How you look influences what you see. Studying the same phenomena from different angles will help to see the policy process from a wider perspective.

5.2 Power as structures for control - viewing from above (top-down)

A Marxist approach towards understanding policy control is the first relevant approach for studying the policy process based on a top down approach (Wang, 2010). Today this theory is not reverent in the same extent as before but it is an alternative method to explain imbalanced power division in the policy process (Hill 2005). The classic Marxist position is indicating that the capitalistic-states main function is to help monitor the capitals accumulation process, in other words create conditions that give the capitalists room to develop and gain profit. The state is in this way a controlling factor that maintains order in the society (Hill, 2005). The state policy should be determined by the interest of the capitalist (Wang, 2010). Wang explains following: "The Marxist theory states that the policy outcome is the product of structural pressure and every stakeholder in the policy domain has to follow the rules of capitalism" (Wang, 2010 p 103). There are indications that power is unequally divided in Uganda were the government is playing a controlling role with much power to influence the policy process (Human rights watch, 2012). The ruling party in Uganda is the National Resistant Movement (NRM) which has been the leading party with Mr. Yoweri Kaguta Museveni as president of Uganda since 1986 (Human rights watch, 2012). A big part of the social services in Uganda is carried out by NGOs. Some NGOs collaborate with the government and some are working independently to represent the people. Herrington imply that nonprofits is not proscribed to act where government fails but deem as social capital assets and act as agents for the public (2012). Indications based on LGBTI-activists interviewed in this study and the Human Rights Watch report from 2012 show that the government is having a controlling role over NGOs in Uganda. I will in the following section discuss different tactics that the governments use to retain this control. Some aspects that will be discussed next indicate that the government prevents NGOs from registering and or operating legally. In addition, the government goes on to control the work of NGOs and prevents them from having an influence in the political field. I will also discuss how the government uses intimidation and obstructive methods towards NGOs to hinder their work. Finally I will address the impact that the government has on the media and how this affects the homosexuality debate in the media.

5.2.1 Preventing and controlling

Some NGOs are more exposed then others to the governments control system. LGBTI-organizations are one of these groups. Other groups are actors working with land, oil or other sensitive issues (Human right watch, 2012). To operate legally, a NGO organization needs to register at the government's National Board (NGO-board) under the NGO act. The Ministry of Internal Affairs oversees the NGO-board and its members are appointed directly by the ministers. The board can refuse registration or revoke already registered organizations if the boards deem it *in public interest to do so* (Human rights watch, 2012). To register the local NGOs must provide documents like a work-plan and budget declaration. Even if all the requirements are fulfilled the board can still deny registration and there is no law for judicial oversight or any institution that oversees the NGO-boards decisions. The government works in this way premised on security and control rather than development considerations (Human rights watch, 2012). Six LGBTI-organizations out of seven participating in this study indicate difficulties to register at the NGO board (LGBTI-org 1 2 3 4 5 &7). Four has not yet been approved to register (LGBTI-org 1 2 5 & 7) and two had to change their names to register (LGBTI-org 3, 4).

According to a report by Human Right Watch the criticism of the government from the public has increased since the last election 2011. To control this criticism the government is increasing inspections of NGOs and the influence their work have on the public (Human Right Watch, 2012). Miss Oroma describes how her organization was listed and investigated by the government:

> "… we have been investigated because our organization were listed in the list that was put, the list that came out with organizations that *the government* are investigating and we were investigated. So we do not know what will happen so we are just preparing, we have been preparing for all this. It is just that it will be very saddening to go back to where we were seven years ago when we did not have any office to sit in, where we were just be moving with the organization with our laptops in our backpacks". (Miss Oroma, LGBTI-org 7)

5.2.2 Intimidate and obstruct

The Human Right Watch report from 2012 also indicates that government officials at both the national and local levels have deployed tactics to intimidate and obstruct the work of NGOs operating in certain sectors. The LGBTI-community is one of them. Methods mentioned is closing meetings, reprimanding NGO staff because of their work and demanding for apologies, threats and physical violence (Human rights watch, 2012). All the LGBTI-activists interviewed in this study express obstacles in their work based on actions taken from the government (LGBTI org 1,2,3,4,5,6 & 7). Examples been brought up are that police come and walk around the office which makes the staff feel intimidated (LGBTI-org 5). Difficulties to carry out meetings and workshops as these are often clamped down by government ministers and the police, (LGBTI-org 1, 2 & 5) moreover the police sometimes break into the activities' houses without an arrest word (LGBTI-org 5). One other concern the LGBTI-activists express is that they have difficulties to access to the media. The media only write bad things about homosexuals, and expose activist names in newspapers. This puts the activists in danger (LGBTI-org 1 2 5 & 7).

5.2.3 Controlling the media

Newspapers in Uganda are debating about homosexuality and reflecting social anxieties over the new sexual norms that homosexuality represents. The way that the newspapers present the debate can be described as *moral panic*. Moral panic in the media can be used by politicians to orchestrate consent to make social phenomenon newsworthy (Sandgrove et. al, 2012). One example of a head line in this moral panic was published October 2010 the Rolling Stone newspaper. The article included pictures of homosexual people with the text *hang them*. After the exposure, four people whose pictures were published were violently attacked, of which one man, David Kato was murdered brutally in his home. His face had appeared at the front cover of the article (Oates, 2011). Moreover, the anti-homosexuality nationalizing project was expressed in government owned newspapers (Sandgrove et. al, 2012). Many radio stations are also owned by the government. If media are unfavorable toward the ruling party they can be victimized. This happened to Central Broadcast Service in the Buganda Kingdom (the area around the capital Kampala), which was suspended for two years (Makara, 2010). Mr. Mukula and Miss Mirie are giving the following statements about their view on the media.

"… the kind of hate that goes around, because they have the power they speak on television and they are so negative and they speak all this ill things and lies about homosexuals. It puts your life in danger because you do not know what your neighbor will do to you, when you walk out of you house" (Mr. Mukula, LGBTI-org 1).

"I feel that the media has been threatened by the government, by the people that came up with the bill. So if they are reporting on homosexual issues on LGBTI issues, then it looks like they are promoting the view of people of that kind. So media right now, what they do actually, there is no positive reporting. Always they are talking about negative issues, calling us name, all nasty things. Just to make you feel like you are less of a human-being or something like that (Miss Mirie, LGBTI-org 5).

Sandrove et. al. explains this national unity that is shown in media towards homosexuality as a way for elite actors to draw attention from economic insecurity and fears from the future (2012). LGBTI-organizations taking part in this study describe the fear raised towards homosexuality by the government and other stakeholders as way to take focus from corruption (LGBTI-org 4, 5 & 7). Miss Oroma explains her view

"… and people *of Uganda* are saying: ʹHow come that donors are giving the Ugandan government money and the government is not giving the people the services that they are supposed to get?ʹ And they are busy telling them about these homosexuals somewhere. How does that connect? You are just trying to divert my mind from whatever you eating so that I am thinking of what whomever you are sleeping with. And for me those two things do not coordinate (Miss Oroma, LGBTI-org 7)

Corruption in Uganda is something that will be discussed much later in this study. Marxist theory says that the state is not a neural actor but a tool for the capitalists. This makes the power unequally divided and the state has a controlling roll in the society that is for privilege for the capitalists (Hill, 2005). The previous examples, preventing LGBTI-organizations from registration, controlling their work, using intimidation and obstruction tactics and media shadowing indicate that the government's controlling over the homosexuality debate. This prevents stakeholders who do not agree with the government's position to get a platform in

the debate. This oppression on the LGBTI-community—and other groups that are working with unwelcomed advocacy—can be compared with the oppression in Marx theory of the working-class to keep order in society (Hill, 2005). This oppression is in privilege of influential political institutions[4] in Uganda for example the church, ministry and other elite stakeholders with close collaboration with the government (Hill, 2005).

Next I will look deeper in to political institutions and elite stakeholders that have power to influence the homosexuality debate in Uganda. I will start by introducing the elite perspective on the policy process and then identify elite stakeholders in the debate. The stakeholders are representing different institutions. I will discuss influential politicians, ministers and the influence church leaders have had on the policy process. Finally I will analyze the president's role in the homosexuality debate.

5.3 Identifying Elite-stakeholders in the policy process

The elite approach pronounces the power distribution in the society as unequal and that the sours of power are occupied by key position in the government, business and the military. The public has little influence on the states policy process (Wang, 2010). The NRM Member of Parliament David Bahati proposes the Anti-Homosexuality Bill. He seems to have connection with the strong USA religious-political organization The Family. The Anti-Homosexuality bill was proposed few months after a three-day seminar that three well known US evangelists were holding in Uganda with the purpose to expose the truth about homosexuality (Sandgrove et.al. 2012). Mr. Kiza explains how the bill was proposed:

> "… this bill was a private member's bill. It was proposed by the owner Bahati
> in his individual capacity. Not as his capacity as a government official minister.
> So it is not a government bill it is a private member's bill". (Mr. Kiza, LGBTI-
> org 6)

---

[4] With political institution I indicate: "… a set of contextual features in a collective choice setting that defines constraints on, and opportunities for individual behavior in that setting" (Diermeier and Krehbiel, 2003. p 125 cited from Sujay, 2009. p 475).

The Anti-Homosexuality Bill has been backed by different senior people for example the former Ethics Minister James Butoro (Sandgrove et.al. 2012). Mr. Butoro is determined that the government should pass the bill even if it means withdrawing from legal treaties (Sandgrove et.al. 2012). Another supporter of the antigay movement is current Minister for Ethics and Integrity Rev Simon Lakodo, who stormed a hotel and shut down a workshop that an LGBTI-organization was organizing. Mr. Lakado said to the newspaper Daily Monitor: "I have closed this conference because it's illegal. We do not accept homosexuality in Uganda. So go back home". But there is no law in Uganda that says that public assembles of gay people is a crime, this will however change if the Homosexuality Bill becomes a law (Ssebuyira, 2012).

Speaker of parliament Rebecca Kadaga has also expressed support for the Anti-Homosexuality Bill. Mrs. Kadaga defended the government's position on homosexuality at the 127th Inter-Parliamentary Union Assembly in Quebec when the host foreign Minister John Baird attacked Uganda on grounds of human rights. Mr. Baird indicated that Uganda does not respect human rights based on the conduct of sexual minorities. Mrs. Kadaga reminded Mr. Baird that Uganda was neither a colony nor protectorate of Canada and as such their sovereignty, societal and cultural norms were to be respected (Mugerwa, 2012). Mrs. Kadaga has also done statements to speed up the process of the Anti-Homosexuality Bill. For example, Mrs. Kadaga promised the antigay-activists during a press conference, the enactment of the bill as a Christmas gift to the people of Uganda (Nututinda, 2013). Mr. Kiza was in the visitor galleria that day and he explains his reaction to the speakers statements:

> "The whole feeling which she put in defending the passing of the bill scared all
> of us. … You know, first of all what she said was really shocking because she
> is supposed to be neutral" (Mr. Kiza, LGBTI-org 6).

As mentioned earlier there are indications that Mr. Bahatis proposition of the bill was inspired by US evangelists (Sandgrove et.al. 2012). Also evangelists in Uganda are showing their support of the bill. Christianity is the most popular religion in Uganda. About 85% of the citizens of Uganda belong to Christian Church (Nationalencyklopeding: Uganda:Relion, 2013). The moral tone encouraged by religious leaders in Uganda is that homosexuality is blamed for causing a moral decline in Uganda including the spread of HIV, promiscuous dressing in girls and the use of alcohol by young people (Sandgrove et. al, 2012). Between 2008 and 2010 press coverage about homosexuality escalated, this escalation was catalyzed

by the actions of the Church of Uganda in leadership of Archbishop Henry Orombi. He was often speaking about homosexuality and the issues around it both in church and in wider society (Sandgrove et.al, 2012). One other religious leader involved with the mobilizing the anti-gay sentiment is Pastor Martin Ssempa of Makarere Community Church. His most recent demonstration included screening homosexual acts in church, which has become a famous YouTube clip *eat-da-poo-poo*. Mr. Ssempa has strong links with American religious rights and with the government minster in Uganda (Sandgrove et. al. 2012). Mr. Mukula a LGBTI activist explains his view on this issue:

> "The religious leaders have been advocating for the bill, want the bill, and *they are* preaching against this kind of *lifestyle*, I will call it mob-justice, yeah. Because they are using the majority vote to oppress the minorities". (Mr. Mukula, LGBTI-org 1).

One other elite stakeholder that has a lot of influence in Ugandan politics is the president. The message publicized about Mr. Museveni's position on the homosexuality debate is that he is backing the church against homosexuality. He is praising the Archbishop and other Bishops in Africa for their work against homosexuality (Sandgrove et. al. 2012). Even though Mr. Museveni in one way is backing prohibition of homosexuality it is not clear what his estimation is about the bill. He has not spoken out if he will sign or veto the bill (Bailey, 2010). Issue of money and funding are considered to be a factor related to the homosexuality discussion. Donor countries have attracted attention to the government's handling of human rights. Museveni risks being criticized and pressured by donors. This seems to be the reason why he speaks little of the bill and advises people advocating for the bill go slowly (Sandgrove et. al. 2012). Mr. Kiza describes his thoughts on the president's position towards the bill:

> "Museveni is a very cultural man. He is a man who believes in his own culture, in the general culture across different tribes. He knows about Uganda, he is very well read in politics and culture and all those things, but he is also a very rationale man. Even if he himself does not believe or does not advocate for love for or sex for people with the same sex, he knows that this is a group of people that are recognized as a minority group by many countries specially western countries. Countries that recognize democracy should protect everybody including minorities" (Mr. Kiza, LGBTI-activist 6).

In this study I use different structural approaches to analyze the policy process from different angles. The perspective used to analyze the policy process matters and different perspectives shows different sources of power in the policy process. Viewing the homosexuality debate from a Top Down perspective shows an unequal distribution of power in the policy process. Indications are made that the government is playing a controlling role in society. The Government is controlling registration of NGOs advocating for homosexual rights and oppressing homosexual activist by controlling their work and their influence in the debate. The government does also control the media by owning newspapers and radio stations, which makes it hard for homosexual activists to access these spaces. There are also elite stakeholders in different institutions that have had much influence in the policy process concerning homosexuality. These elite stakeholders are politicians like MP Mr. Bahati who proposed the Anti-Homosexuality Bill, Speaker of Parliament Mrs. Kadaga, former Ethics Minister Mr. Butoro and the current Minister for Ethics and Integrity Mr. Lakodo. One institution that seems to have had big influence on the policy process in Uganda is the Church. Influence of evangelists from USA and religious leaders in Uganda seem to have contributed to the establishment of the homophobic movement. Archbishop Mr. Orombi is one person that has been influential in advocating against homosexuality and Pastor Martin Ssempa is another person involved with the mobilizing of anti-gay sentiments. The president of Uganda Mr. Museveni supports the churches view on homosexuality but his position towards the Anti-Homosexuality Bill is unclear.

In the next section I will analyze the policy process from a Pluralistic approach which views the policy process from a bottom up perspective were power is spread and equally divided among the people (Hill, 2007). Uganda is a democracy where the government is supposed to be elected by the public and reflects the view of the public (Schumpeter, 1974, p. 269, cited from Hill, 2007, p. 26). However there have been issues in the political system in Uganda. Analyzing the policy process in Uganda from a plural perspective will help to understand the role of the government in the policy process. I will focus on the government's role, based on previous research and not directly connected with the homosexuality debate. The role of the activists will be introduced in the end. Analyzing the government's role in the political system will build an understanding of the resistance that the LGBTI-community is facing. I will start by introducing the pluralistic theory. Then I will clarify the democratic political system in Uganda and indications of dysfunction in this system. I will analyze NRM methods that use authoritarian means to control the policy processes and stay in power. Some of the tactics that

will be discussed are: government's control of seats in parliament, governance of military and police, wide Local Council structure that aims to reach out and spread the party's ideology among the people and bribing people with money in order to again their loyalty. I will finish this perspective by what the LGBTI-activists bring to the political arena.

5.4 Agency and influential actors - viewing from below (bottom-up)

Pluralist theory indicates a bottom up perspective in the policy process. The policy process is seen as a complex and wide interaction between actors, interests and institutions rather than just between institutions themselves (Wang, 2012). Pluralism theory regards the policy process as a democratic process where everyone participates. The government is representing the people by forming political parties. The power in the policy process is in this way equally divided (Hill, 2007). Schumpeter is defining democracy as an instructional arrangement to come up with different political decisions where representatives are fighting to get the peoples votes to gain power (Schumpeter, 1974, p. 269, cited from Hill, 2007, p. 26). Uganda is proclaimed as a multiparty democracy. The ruling party is the National Resistance Movement (NRM) with their leader president Museveni. There have been elections in Uganda since 1990 but the elections' outcome and quality has been debated up on. The election of 2011 was the second-ever multiparty election in Uganda organized by the ruling party. The NRM got to power in 1986 by fighting a guerilla war between 1981 and 1986 launched by Mr. Museveni. The capture of the state by the NRM resulted in a one party system. Uganda was virtually a state with only one party between 1986 and 2005. Even though opposition parties were allowed to exist, restrictions made them impossible to become a political challenge to the NRM (Mugaju & Oloka-Onyango 2000, cited from Mwenda & Tangari 2008. p. 181). This limitation on political pluralism ended 2005 when the Political Parties and Organizations Act (PPOA) were introduced. With this Act political parties could develop and carry out activities (Makara, 2010). The return of multiparty politics in Uganda does however not mean that democracy in the country was implemented. The state institutions have been accused for violating opposition parties in different ways. The government is supposed to fund all political parties, but there is no funding included in the budget for this purpose. (Makara, 2010) During the years of the NRM regime, only a limited democratization has occurred and instead a semi-authoritarian political system has prevailed (Mwenda & Tangri, 2008).

The government has secured most of the selected seats in the parliament including seats reserved for the army, people with disabilities, workers representatives, youths and women. It is also believed that NRM bribes individuals in opposition parties to undermine their own party. The main opposition party, Forum for Democratic Change (FDC) lost the loyalty of three members in parliament 2008 and 2009 (Mwenda & Tangri, 2008). The constitution also allows the president to nominate ministers who are not Members of Parliament (Makara, 2010). This makes the NRM in control of important posts in the political field. Ten seats are reserved for the army in the parliament. Indications are made that these seats are also being controlled by the NRM as army personnel cannot expect legal protection if they criticize the government. An example of this is when former director general of the Internal Security Organization and army MP Brigadier Tumukunde criticized the government on radio and was removed from parliament simply for that. In this particular court case, the judges observed in their ruling that some questions were too political for courts (Makara, 2010).

Moreover, military corruption has been used to keep the NRM in power (Mwenda &Tangri 2008). The military is loyal to Mr. Museveni and assumptions are made that the army would not allow any other person to take power (Makara, 2010). Also the police force and other security agencies are responding directly under the NRM more like agents than servants of the state (Makara, 2010). Previous statements indicate that that the government has control over different political institutions, which gives them a great deal of power in the policy process. How does this lack of democracy in Uganda affect the people? The government has different tactics to reach out to the people.

NRM is constructing a Local Council structure to easily mobilize and reach out to the people. The number of districts in Uganda has increased from 56 in the year 2005 to 112 in the year 2010 (Makara, 2010). Poverty in Uganda is pervasive and is more significant in remote areas where people are gaining their livelihood by crop farming (Birungi & Hassan, 2011). Positive effects can be achieved with this outreach if it benefits the people by increasing their livelihood and access to healthcare. Makara does however imply that its purpose is to spread the NRM ideology in schools and in society (2010). By the fact the majority of people are poor, makes them vulnerable and easily manipulated. Indications are

made that the NRM takes advantage of this by using government agents to bribe people with money to support for the NRM (Ibid).

The previous statements that the government controls most of the seats in the parliament, the military, police and the wide spread NRM ideology coupled with bribing of people indicates that the democratic system in Uganda is not working. In Uganda the power is unequally divided. Pluralism is fundamental in democracy. Power is supposed to be distributed equally among the people and the governmental institutions have the role to represent the public (Hill, 2007 & Wang, 2010). Even though Uganda is considered to be a democracy, factors brought up indicate that the power distribution is not equal. The power is occupied by key positions in the government and authoritarian means like military force and political manipulations have been put in system by NRM to stay in power (Mwenda & Tangri, 2008). But there are stakeholders that oppose the government. Pressure groups like for example the LGBTI-community are trying by different means to gain power in the policy process.

5.4.1 The interests of the government and the elite stakeholders; opposing interests and pressure groups

Beer (1965) describes that pluralism includes pressure groups, which the government has to consider in the policy process. He is making a comparison to Great Britain in mid nineteenth century and presents a "collectivist representation theory". He implies that collectivists groups were given a bigger role than before and were affecting the policy process in all stadiums. Beer was talking about groups' structures in for example worker and employing-organizations. Negotiations about details in laws were made between these organizations and the government (Beer, 1965 cited from Hill, 2007. p 36-37). I imply that the LGBTI-community can be seen as a collectivistic group that is trying to influence the homosexual policy process and is working to affect the formation of politics in Uganda. These organizations are formed at a micro level and try to influence the homosexual policy process by affecting decisions made in the parliament and fight for everyone's equal rights and to have their voice heard. They are this way fighting for democracy. Mr. Kiza an LGBTI-activist gives the following statement on why he is fighting for homosexual rights.

"He, *the president,* says that homosexuals should live there quiet life, he has no problem with them. Yes that is what he says but for us of course we are not going to live quiet lives. If I go to the hospital and I am denied treatment I am not going to live a quiet life it is going to turn political" (Mr. Kiza, LGBTI-org 6).

Even if the government has a lot of influence in the policy process other stakeholders interact and affect the policy process. The international field also affects Uganda. How does the impact of the global market affect the policy process I Uganda? Flowing I will introduce the globalization theory and discuss how the western world influences the policy process by threatening to stop donating aid to the Ugandan government. I will also bring up the discussion about homosexuality as a western influence.

5.5 A web of relationships - networks

5.5.1 Globalization and global actors

The globalization theory indicates that transnational finance markets and global culture influences states autonomy. The state has to consider and adapt to the international market. International political interaction is making new political group formations beyond the national state that the state has to consider and that affects the policy process in the country (Hill, 2007). There are many examples that can be discussed about how international relationships affect the homosexuality debate. One is that one-sixth of the Ugandan GDP comes from foreign aid (Hollander, 2009) and countries that donate grants to the Ugandan state have threatened to stop funding aid if the Anti-Homosexuality Bill is passed. This upsets people who believe that homosexuality is a disruptive influence from the West that puts Uganda's moral integrity at stake. They further claim that Uganda must be resistant to these influences (Sandgrove et. al, 2012). The former Minster of State for Ethics and Integrity, Mr. Butoro pronounced "I have been pressured by some donors to allow homosexuality but I have told them that they can keep their money and the homosexuality because it is not about charity at the expense of our moral destruction" (Monitor 02.07.2009 cited from Sandgrove et al, 2012, p. 104-105). There are also indications showing that the anti-homosexuality movement started with influences from the West. For example MP Mr. Bahati who proposed the Anti-Homosexuality Bill has strong connections with *The Family* a US religo-political

organization. This organization had a seminar about moral values and homosexuality in Uganda a few months before the bill was proposed (Sandgrove et.al. 2012). Also the Penal Code Act that prohibits homosexuality was imposed in Uganda during the British colonial rule (Hollander, 2009). Miss Oroma makes the fallowing comment about this subject:

> "… so when anybody says that in Africa it, *homosexuality*, was brought by the western people it is a lie. The reason why they started even criminalizing homosexuality in Africa was because the religion that the whites brought, actually the Christian religion. Why would the Penal code that was brought from the white people in Britain have unnatural offences if *homosexuality* were not existent in our country? It means that even before the whites came it was here, so when they came they had to find a remedy to end it because where they came from it was unnatural" (Miss. Oroma, LGBTI-org 7).

One side indicates that the west is forcing homosexuality on Uganda. But there is also another side showing that the west started the prohibition of homosexuality in the country. This shows that Uganda is not isolated from the rest of the world but part of a bigger network (Wang, 2010).

Policy networks are a form of new governance that includes co-ordination and co-governance relationships between different agents at the cross national and domestic levels (Wang, 2010). In this study I have analyzed different stakeholders with power in the policy process seen from both a top down and a bottom up perspective and declared stakeholders on a domestic and international level. I will next try to analyze the relationships between stakeholders on both levels. Focus will be on LGBTI-organizations' role in the policy process, their network and strategies they use in respect with other stakeholders. My analysis starts by describing the network theory and how using this theory brings a better understanding on how the LGBTI-organizations influence the policy processes by coalition between themselves and cooperation with other organizations. Then I discuss global influence on the policy process in network with the LGBTI-organization. I continue to illustrate how the LGBTI-organization is networking with the civil society and the role of social media in their network. Finally I lift LGBTI-organizations networking with the government and the role of courts in the LGBTI-activists network and in the policy process.

5.6 Network as a basis for stakeholder influence

The network theory is complex and explains the policy process as a result of multi policy stakeholders, their interests and exchange relationships. "The concept of network is an appropriate metaphor describing the strategic between Congress, bureaucrats, the president, the courts, the people, the media, interest-groups and all other possible actors playing important roles in policy domains" (Wang, 2010. p. 105). Network theory can be analyzed as a way to link structure to agency in the policy process. There are two main characteristics to be considered when analyzing policy networking. Number one is that no stakeholders can archive their goals without the support of others. This includes financial support, information and exchange of recourses. The second concerns the exercise of power as a main factor in the policy process (Ibid). LGBTI-organizations participating in this study have different strategies to carry out their advocacy and support for different sexual minority groups (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual or intersex). At the same time they all profit from each other's work as they all fight for sexual rights as a human right. To become stronger and gain more power in the policy process LGBTI-organizations and other organizations collaborate with each other. Of the seven organizations participating in this study one is an umbrella organization and one is a coalition. This means that they monitor and coordinate organizations advocating directly or indirectly for sexual rights. Organizations that work indirectly with homosexual rights are organizations that are affected by the discrimination against homosexuality and want to take part of the advocacy work for homosexual rights (LGBTI-org 1). Examples of such organizations include organizations working with counseling and HIV treatment. After the proposal of the Anti-Homosexual Bill homosexual people are scared of going to their regular counseling or treatment in fear of being reported to the police (LGBTI-org 2).

The organizations are now collaborating among themselves in order to raise their voices and gain power in the policy process. The relationship between two or more policymakers is central in the network theory as policymakers depend on each other. (Ibid) Miss Oroma gives the following comments on the collaboration between organizations.

> "Yes, X *organization* are actually a founding member of Y *organization*, we actually became very active in the forming of the Y *which* was because we thought that we needed bigger spaces to work in. We needed bigger voices to go out and focusing...

> … one of our strategic ways that we do our advocacy is that we belong to different movements we belong to different coalitions that do advocacy work at national and international levels to see that we can also work strongly in improving the individual people's lives" (Miss Oroma, LGBTI-org 7).

The LGBTI-organizations are also part of a bigger international network and depend on international stakeholders to carry out their work. One ground of collaboration is that LGBTI-organizations get their main funding from donations outside Uganda. International funders are the government of France, Britain, Denmark, US, Netherlands, and Kenya. Other funders are organizations and institutions such as the US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), East African Sexual Health and Rights Initiative (UHAI) and USAID. There are also private people giving funds like professors and individuals (LGBTI-org 1,2,3,4,5,6 & 7). Many of the LGBTI-organizations experience difficulties with getting enough funds to carry out their work (LGBTI-org 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7). One organization does not have enough money to pay the staff so they are working voluntarily (LGBTI-org 4). The network theory is focused on the relationship between different stakeholders and their dependency on each other. The power to influence is not divided equally, one actor generates control over other's behavior (Wang, 2010). LGBTI organizations depend on donors to be able to carry out their work. Donors have the power in the relationship to choose which projects get funded and which ones do not.

Other relationships with international institutions have the purpose of exchange information and resources. For example the Norwegian and the USA embassy are active in the homosexuality debate. They invite LGBTI-activist to parties where the activists get the chance to conduct one to one talks with politicians and local leaders (LGBTI-organization 2). The LGBTI-community also has exchange programs with other countries like Kenya (LGBTI-org 7) South Africa and Sweden (LGBTI-org 3). LGBTI-activists participating in this study were going to Sweden to join a world conference arranged by Riksförbundet för Sexuell Upplysning (RFSU) shortly after being interviewed (LGBTI-org 2,5 &7).

At domestic level LGBTI-organizations collaborate with community owned institutions like churches, healthcare centers and schools. This collaboration has the purpose to reach out to the people in the community and educate about homosexuality, trans and intersex (LGBTI-

organization 2,3 & 7). This includes traveling out and meeting the public. Miss Oroma describes the work they do:

"…last year we were meeting people *face to face*. And it was okay, we were scared before meeting them. But when we meet them and we told them everything about us and everything they went: ´Oh my god you should tell the people about yourself we thought you are just as this or what?` People are just not aware so we are looking forward to that but we have to strategize so that we are not misunderstood". (Miss Oroma LGBTI-org 7)

LGBTI-organizations collaborate between themselves, between other organizations, international partners and with community institutions. Still LGBTI-organizations in this study are having difficulties to carry out their advocacy work. For instance the police comes after them and shuts down their workshops, much as it is illegal for the police to do so (LGBTI-org 1 & 5). Worse still, it is hard for the LGBTI-organizations to have access to media like newspapers (2, 5). One strategy that LGBTI-community uses in their advocacy work is social media such as websites, YouTube, blogs, Twitter and Facebook. Social media helps LGBTI-organization to spread documentation and information about LGBTI people's life in Uganda (LGBTI-organization 3, 4).Compared to mass media, social media also have some privileges that can help build a stronger relationship with the target groups. Organizations can campaign and update information more regularly. Social media can also reach broader public and provide a two-way platform were mutual communication with the public can take place. Social media can—more than other spaces—facilitate participation in advocacy campaigns (Özemir, 2012). It is an effective strategy to reach out to people both national and international but it has limits. Uganda is a poor country with "one of the world's lowest BNP per capita close to 2/3 live in poverty and spend under 2 US dollar per day (Nationalencyklopedin: Uganda: Sociala förhållanden, 2013) and many people do not have access to internet in Uganda. Internet is a luxury that only rich people can afford to access. Radio, on the other hand, is a more accessible forum for people who live in rural areas (LGBTI-org 3). One other problem is that organizations have to be careful with what they post on the Internet. Miss Oroma explains following:

"Yes we have a Facebook page some of us are on twitter. I know my program has a blog. I know that X *the umbrella organization* are on different pages, I am also

on different pages so we use it but it depends on what we put there. Because we do not want to put our members in trouble. So we filter what we put there" (Miss Oroma, LGBTI-org7)

Different perspectives in this study have helped to better understand the policy process in Uganda. The pluralistic theory explains how different pressure groups are trying to influence the government. A Marxist approach explains the government's role as a controller of the society (Hill, 2007). The network theory indicates that the interest groups and the government need each other. Stakeholders in the policy process exchange experience, knowledge and influence with each other. Smith explains that the governmental and other stakeholders in the civil society are connected because they share the same interests. The state and civil society are constantly in contact with groups that represent interests in the society. Representatives of the government are also humans who are part of the civil society and therefore the government is developing alongside with the interests of different groups in the society. How much influence and exchange these groups and the governments have is depending on the character of the network (Smith, 1993. p 67 cited from Hill, 2007. p 84). Even if the collaboration between the government and LGBTI-organizations in Uganda is small, it does exist. One organization participating in this study has been able to influence the government by sitting on a governmental committee:

"We have also been able to influence the process of government in how it utilizes resources for health specially guarding Health Structure Strategic and Investment plan *(HSSPI)*. HSSPI and us, sit on the X committee and our interest in the committee is to follow how public health policy and law addresses the right for heath for sexual minorities" (Mr Sula LGBTI-org 4).

Other strategies LGBTI-organizations use to influence the government are talking one on one with government representatives and ministers by visiting their offices (LGBTI-org 1). In addition, they participating in parties arranged by the embassies to get in contact and start a discussion with politicians and leaders (LGBTI-org 2). Furthermore, they hand in local petitions to the speaker (LGBTI-org 6) and resist statements made of the government to repeal and reach out to the government and leaders (LGBTI-org 1). Even if this study shows lack of democracy in Uganda, pressure groups and government officials are living side by side and are interacting at different levels. One other institution that creates exchange in the policy

network between stakeholders is the courts.

5.6.1 Courts of law

Governmental officials, religious leaders, military officials, pressure groups and civil people are all humans and have the same rights. LGBTI-people are people like everyone else and share the same rights. This makes the courts a strong advocacy tool for LGBTI-activists fighting for human rights. Article 21: Equality and Freedom from Discrimination of the Constitution of Uganda expresses everyone's equal right and freedom of discrimination:

"1. All persons are equal before and under the law in all spheres of political, economic, social and cultural life and in every other respect and shall enjoy equal protection of the law"

"2. Without prejudice to clause (1) of this article, a person shall not be discriminated against on the ground of sex, race, color, ethnic origin, tribe, birth, creed or religion, social or economic standing, political opinion or disability" (Mujuzi, 2012. p53).

LGBTI-people can use the courts to claim their rights when they are treated unfairly. When the Rolling Stone newspaper published pictures of homosexual people, LGBTI-activists pressed charges on the newspaper resulting into the LGBTI-activists winning the case (LGBTI-org 1). Mr. Mukula explains what this means in for his work:

" So when we won that case it is also used for advocacy *for LGBTI-people's rights*, now no one can just publish anything because the court pronounce itself on it" (Mr. Mukula LGBTI-org 1).

However the laws also oppress LGBTI-people. The Constitution of Uganda does not recognize same-sex marriage and also the Penal Code Act forbids intercourse between people with the same sex. So the police and other law-enforcement officers mistakenly believe that it is acceptable to harass, humiliate, and arrest people suspected or presumed to be in same-sex relationships (Mujuzi, 2009). Miss. Ormoa explains how the laws are being misinterpreted:

"I think that one of the biggest challenges is the laws of this country, because I will tell you that there is no clear law in Uganda that is clearly targeted towards trans-gender and intersex people, there no law. But people are being prosecuted using sodomy laws that are unfair. Those are two different things (Miss Oroma, LGBTI-org 7).

The court can be seen as a powerful stakeholder in the policy process and can be both a privilege and a threat to the LGBTI-community. If the Anti-Homosexuality Bill becomes a law the oppression of homosexual people will be escalated. If this bill is passed, the LGBTI-community will press charges on the government in the Constitution/East African Court (LGBTI-organization 5 & 7).

Network theory describes how different stakeholders depend on each other in the policy process. I have discussed the LGBTI-activists influence in the policy process with focus on their networks and interactions with other stakeholders. I have discussed the fact that the LGBTI-organizations in Uganda are working close together and that they collaborate with NGOs which operate in other fields but that are affected by the discrimination against homosexuals. I have discussed that LGBTI-organizations depend on donors and international parties and that they collaborate with institutions in the civil society to reach out to the public. I have also discussed how LGBTI-organization use social media in their advocacy work and how they collaborate with government institutions and officials. Finally I have discussed how the court of Uganda is both a threat and an important advocacy tool for homosexual activists.

6. Discussion and conclusions

This study has analyzed the policy process regarding homosexual rights in Uganda from a LGBTI perspective. This has been done by using different theoretical approaches, which have considered the policy process from different angles. Using different theories has helped to understand the complexity in the policy process as well as identifying different stakeholders in the policy process and the power distribution among these stakeholders.

This study, starting with a *Marxist and top down perspective,* shows an unequal power deviation in which the government has much power in Uganda and controls the society (Hill, 2007). This study elucidates how the government shuts out stakeholders that do not share the government's principles from the homosexuality debate. This includes the LGBTI-activist fighting for homosexual rights. The government is controlling NGOs' work and prevents them from advocating and operating freely. The government uses intimidation and obstructive means to keep NGOs under control (Human right watch, 2012). The government also controls the mass media, and therefore it is hard for LGBTI-activists to access and use this space in their advocacy work. Instead, the mass media presents social anxieties over homosexuality (Sandgrove et. al, 2012). In this way, the government as a controller can be a privilege of certain political institutions and elite stakeholders (Hill, 2007).

Elite theory sees the power in the policy process divided between different elite stakeholders. The public has little influence in the policy process (Wang, 2010). Elite stakeholders that have been identified to influence the homosexual debate in Uganda are religious leaders, politicians and the president. MP David Bahati proposed the Anti-Homosexuality Bill. Indications are made that his initiative to table the bill were inspired by the US religo-political organization, The Family, which preaches negatively about homosexuality (Sandgrove et. al. 2012). Minster of Ethics and Integrity Simon Lakodo is another elite stakeholder that has expressed dislike towards homosexuality. He also stormed a hotel and shut down a peaceful workshop organized by LGBTI-activists (Ssebuyira, 2012). The Speaker Rebecca Kadaga has also expressed support of the Anti-Homosexual Bill even though she as a speaker should be neutral (Nututinda, 2013). Some religious leaders are negative towards homosexuality, for example Archbishop Henry Orombi and Pastor Martin Seempa have spoken openly about the issues of homosexuality (Sandgrove et al, 2012). The President of Uganda Mr. Museveni is backing the church against homosexuality. It is however unclear what his estimation is about

the bill. His doubts toward the bill seem to be based on the critic the bill has gotten from the western world including donor countries (Sandgrove et. al, 2012). As the President of Uganda he values the country's international relationships.

The pluralist theory is viewing the policy process from a bottom up perspective with democracy and equal power deviation as the main focus (Wang, 2012). Even though Uganda is considered to be a democracy this study indicates that the power deviation is unequal and that government is using authoritative means to maintain power in the society. The ruling party National Resistance Movement (NRM) has been in power since 1986. They have different strategies to stay in power. There have been multi-party elections two times in 2007 and 2011 but the state's institutions have been accused of violating opposition parties (Makara, 2010, Mawenda & Tagri 2008). NRM have secured most of the selected seats in the parliament reserved for the army, people with disabilities, workers representatives, youths and women. The government is accused of bribing individuals of opposition's parties as well as corrupting the military and police (Mwenda & Tangri, 2008). NRM are also constructing a local structure to easily mobilize them and reach out to influence the people (Makara, 2010). In that regard, there are indications that NRM bribes individuals to gain support (Ibid). This implies that power is centralized within the government and this shows that there are faults in the democratic system (Hill, 2007). On the other hand, there are existing pressure groups in Uganda. NGOs can be seen like agents of the public obligated to fulfill an agreement about a mission (Harrington, 2012). One pressure group is the LGBTI-organization fighting for homosexual rights and democracy in Uganda. There are also forces outside Uganda that are trying to influence the policy process.

The globalization theory focuses on the influence that the international field has on the policy process in Uganda (Hill, 2007). Countries in the West threaten to stop giving aid donations to Uganda if the Anti-Homosexuality Bill becomes a law. This creates tensions with Uganda's international relationships (Sandgove et. al, 2012). At the same time there are indications that the prohibition of homosexuality are coming from the West. MP David Bahati seams to been influenced by evangelists from USA to table the Anti-Homosexuality Bill (Ibid). Also the Penal Code Act that prohibits homosexual acts in Uganda today was imposed in Uganda during the British colonial rule (Hollander, 2009).

Marxist theory, Elite theory, Pluralistic theory and Globalization theory show that national and international stakeholders influence the policy process. *The network theory* explains the

policy process based on interaction between different stakeholders at cross national and domestic levels. In the policy network stakeholders have more or less power but they all depend on each other (Wang, 2010). In this study I have focused on the network around the LGBTI-community. The LGBTI-organizations collaborate with each other and with other NGOs in their advocacy work to gain a stronger voice. They also depend on and work together with international institutions. The civil society is also a stakeholder in the policy process, with which the LGBTI-organizations are collaborating in order to influence homosexual rights in Uganda. This involves building alliances with community owned institutions like churches, health centers and schools. As mentioned before, it is hard for LGBTI-activists to access space in the mass media as the government controls this space. Using Social Media has instead become a strategy in the advocacy work of homosexual activists. Social media can reach a broader public and are a platform for mutual communication (Özemir Özemir, 2012). Despite all the obstacles and difficulties the LGBTI-community are facing with the government, there exists interaction and collaboration between them. One LGBTI-organization in this study focuses on health for sexual minorities and is in position to influence the government as it sits on the health, human rights and gender committee. Other ways LGBTI-organization interacts with the government is talking one on one with politicians, participating in parties arranged by embassies, and resisting statements made of the government. The courts are also important stakeholders in the policy process. The court has oppressed homosexual people by interpreting the sodomy laws incorrectly. But the courts are as also stakeholders in LGBTI-organizations advocacy work. For example LGBTI-activist pressed charges on the Rolling Stones newspaper when the newspaper published pictures of homosexual people with a negative standpoint. The activists won the case. This teaches that oppression and invading someone's privacy are a crime and homosexual people have the same rights as everyone else.

This study indicates that the democratic system in Uganda is dysfunctional and LGBTI-activists are facing obstacles in their advocacy work for homosexual rights from the government and powerful elite stakeholders. To gain power the LGBTI-organizations depend and network with other stakeholders. In the network of stakeholders taking part in the policy process, the power is unequally distributed but they all interact and influence each other.

My study has discussed the policy process from several theoretical perspectives. This reveals how the theoretical setting makes an impact on what is moved to the forefront of the analysis, but also that single perspectives may very well miss critical aspects of a phenomenon. It is

however obvious that many perspectives make an analysis shallower as well as introducing some meta-theoretical issues due to various scientific foundations in the perspectives. A furthering of my work could be to explore more in depth and establish the scientific links between the different theories used in the essay. Further studies can, I believe, be developed within several different areas touched upon in this essay. How do these organizational networks grow and increase in strength? What makes different stakeholders gain power over time and what makes some able to sustain it? The topic in my essay has been homosexuality, even though my objective has been to understand the policy process surrounding it. On the topic side there are many questions referring to Uganda as a space. Why hostile policies, public hostility, regarding homosexuality? In what ways do different Bourdieuan capitals (social, cultural, symbolic and perhaps economic) as concepts help us understand a policy setting such as the one in Uganda? These are questions on which I would enjoy doing further research.

7. References

Ahrne, Göran & Svensson, Peter (2011). *Handbok i kvalitativa metoder*. 1. uppl. Malmö: Liber

Ahrne, Göran & Eriksson-Zetterquist, Ulla (2011). "Intervjuer" I Ahrne, Göran & Svensson, Peter, (red.): *Handbok i kvalitativa metoder,* Malmö: Liber

Anti-Homosexuality Bill (2009). Found at: <http://wthrockmorton.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/anti-homosexuality-bill-2009.pdf.> Accessed 2012-11-02

Bailey Pulliam, Sarah, (2010). "Intercontinental Divide Global pressure months for Uganda to defeat antigay bill, and put evangelicals at odds with one another" *Christianity today* vol.54 no. 2, pp 17-19

Bryman, Alan (2012). *Social research methods*. 4. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Birungi, P. & Hassan, R. (2011). "Social capital and poverty in Uganda", *Development Southern Africa ,* vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 19-37

Herrington J. Bryce (2012). *Players in the public policy process [Elektronisk resurs] : nonprofits as social capital and agents*. 2. ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Hill, Michal, (2007). *Policyprocessen*. 1.ed. Malmö: Liber

Hollander, M. (2009). "Gay rights in Uganda: seeking to overturn Uganda's anti-sodomy laws", *Virginia Journal of International Law,* vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 219.

Human Right Watch (2012). *Curtailing Criticism Intimidation and Obstruction of Civil Society in Uganda* New York: Human right watch

Jönson, Håkan (2010). *Sociala problem som perspektiv* 1.ed. Malmö: Liber

Ling, Justin. (2012). "Ugandan politician pushes for vote on "Kill the Gays" bill. *Capital Xtra (Ottawa), (*249), 15

Makara, Sabiti (2010) "Deepening Democracy through Multipartyism: The Bumpy Road to Uganda's 2011 Elections", *Africa Spectrum,* vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 81-94.

Meyer, I.H. (1995). "Minority stress and mental health in gay men", *Journal of health and social behavior,* vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 38-56

MR-rapport, (2012). *Mänskliga rättigheter I Uganda 2012.* Utrikesdepartementet.

Mujuzi, J (2012). "The drafting history of the provision on the right to freedom from discrimination in the Ugandan constitution with a focus on the grounds of sex, disability and sexual orientation", *International Journal Of Discrimination And The Law*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 52-76

Mujuzi, J (2009). "Even Lesbian Youths or Presumed to be Lesbians Are Protected by the Constitution of Uganda—But to a Limited Extent: Rules the High Court", *Journal Of LGBT Youth,* vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 441-445

Mugerwa, Yasjin, (2012). "Kadaga, Canadian minster in gay row" *Daily Monitor*. Article 2012- 10.25. (electronic) <http://www.monitor.co.ug/News/National/Kadaga-Canadian-minister-in-gay-row/-/688334/1594430/-/emkqmuz/-/index.html> accessed 2013-02-07

Mwenda, A.M. & Tangri, R (2008). "Elite Corruption and Politics in Uganda", *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics,* vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 177-194.

Mwenda, A.M. & Tangri, R (2003). "Military Corruption & Ugandan Politics since the Late 1990s", *Review of African Political Economy,* vol. 30, no. 98, pp. 539-552

Nationalencyklopedin: Uganda: Religion, (2013). (Electronic) <http://www.ne.se.ludwig.lub.lu.se/uganda/religion> accessed 2013-09-01.

Nationalencyklopedin: Uganda: Sociala förhållanden (2013). (Electronic) <http://www.ne.se.ludwig.lub.lu.se/uganda/sociala-förhållanden> accessed 2013-03-12.

Naturinda, Sheila (2013). "House opens tomorrow, faces congested agenda" *Daily Monitor* Article 2013.02.03 (electronic) <http://www.monitor.co.ug/News/National/House-opens-tomorrow--faces-congested-agenda-/-/688334/1683550/-/7u5ubp/-/index.html> accessed 2013-02-08

Oates, Lauryn, (2011). "Ugandan Newspaper's Hit List of Gay Citizens Results in Tragic Murder" *Propagandistmag* Article 2011-01-27 (electronic) <http://www.propagandistmag.com/2011/01/27/ugandan-newspapers-hit-list-gay-citizens-results-tragic-murder> accessed 2013-02-07

Oxford English Dictionary: activist (2013). (Electronic) <http://www.oed.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/view/Entry/273137?redirectedFrom=activist#eid> accessed 2013-02-16

Oxford English Dictionary: policy (2013). (Electronic) <http://www.oed.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/view/Entry/146842?isAdvanced=false&result=1&rskey=ytxyWI&>. Accessed 2013-02-07

Oxford English Dictionary: stakeholder (2013). (Electronic) <http://www.oed.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/view/Entry/246856?redirectedFrom=stakeholder#eid> accessed 2013-04-09

Penal Code Act 1950 (Ch 120). Found at: <http://www.vertic.org/media/National%20Legislation/Uganda/UG_Penal_Code_Act_1950.pdf> Accessed 2013-02-07

Sadgrove, J., Vanderbeck, R., Andersson, J., Valentine, G. & Ward, K. (2012). "Morality plays and money matters: towards a situated understanding of the politics of homosexuality in Uganda", *JOURNAL OF MODERN AFRICAN STUDIES,* vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 103-129.

Strand, Cecilia (2011). "Kill Bill! Ugandan human rights organizations' attempts to influence the media's coverage of the Anti-Homosexuality Bill", *Culture, Health & Sexuality,* vol. 13, no. 8, pp. 917-931.

Ssebyira, Martin (2012). " Ethics Minister shuts down gay rights conference" *Daily Monitor* Article 2012-02-14 (electronic), <http://www.monitor.co.ug/News/National/-/688334/1327440/-/b0qolnz/-/index.html> accessed 2013-02-07

Sujay, Ghosh (2009). "NGOs as Political Institutions" *Journal of Asian and African Studies* vol. 44, no. 5, pp 475-495

Thurén, Torsten (2005). *Källkritik.* Stockholm: Liber

United Nation, (2011). *Discriminatory laws and practices and acts of violence against individuals based on their sexual orientation and gender identity,* (A/HRC/19/41) General assembly: United Nation

Wang, Guang Xu, (2010). "A Theoretical Debate and Strategy to Link Structure and Agency in Policy Process Studies: A Network Perspective" *Journal of Politics and Law*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp 101-109.

YouTube (2010). "Eat-da-poo-poo" (electronic) available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=euXQbZDwV0w> accessed 2013-02-08

Özemir, B. Pinar (2012). "Social Media as a Tool for Online Advocacy Campaigns: Greenpeace Mediterranean's Genetically Engineered Food Campaign in Turkey" *Canadian Edition,* vol. 5, no. 2, pp 23-39.

To learn more about the homosexuality debate from a LGBTI-activist perspective, I recommend the documentary "Call Me Kuchu" by Katharine Fairfax Wright and Malika Zouhali-Worrall. It follows LGBTI-activists fighting for homosexual rights in Uganda. One of the people featured in the movie is David Kato a homosexual-activist who was murdered. The documentary follows him when he was still alive, and illustrates the drama caused by his death (2013).

8. Attachments

8.1 Interview guide

1. Can you tell me about the organization? What is the organization's main purpose and what strategies do you use to reach out to that purpose?

2. How do you work in a practical sense? How do you carry out the advocacy work?

3. Do you use media in you advocacy work?

4. How many staff members does the organization have?

5. From where does to organization gets it support?

6. Is the organization registered at the NGO board?

7. How does the organization work to gain political influence, like influencing the government?

8. How does the fact that homosexual acts that are allegedly against the law in Uganda affect your organization's work?

9. What difficulties and obstacles does the organization face when carrying out its work?

10. Have the staff members in the organization experienced harassment in any way?

11. Do you think that the anti-homosexuality bill will come up for voting in the parliament?

12. Are you working with spreading awareness of the bill?

13. Do you have any plan if the bill became law?

14. I have heard politicians saying that the west is getting too involved in the homosexuality debate. Do you have any comments about that?

15. Donor countries say that they are going to withdraw funds from Uganda if the bill passes. Do you have any comments about that?

16. Does your organization work together with other organizations?

17. Uganda signed up for international human right conditions. What do you think will happen with the human right issues if the bill passes?