



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

„Dangerous Desires – an Analysis of Argumentations against
Same-Sexual Desires in South Africa“

Verfasserin

Mag. Johanna Treidl

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag. phil.)

Wien, 2012

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt: A307

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt: Diplomstudium Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie UniStG

Betreuerin: Mag. Dr. Herta Nöbauer

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of writing this work was accompanied by meeting great people, spending wonderful moments, sharing completely interesting thoughts on the one hand, but on the other hand also being confronted with dramatic stories, moments of uncertainty and desperation. This work means a lot to me. The passing year not only was about writing a diploma-thesis, it was a stage of life, almost like a rite de passage that announces the transition from student life to whatever will come next. Such insights strike me with melancholy but also curiosity. I therefore want to thank everybody who accompanied me profoundly in this very strange and emotional time. Further, I am very much obliged to all the important people who in one form or another contributed to this work.

First of all I want to thank my family, especially my parents, for trusting me and all the confidence they gave me. I am sorry for the sorrows I may have caused you during my trips far away from here. This always reminded me that you love me as much as I love you. Thank you for supporting me! I owe special gratitude to my sister Kathrin who introduced me to a world of politics and activism. You strongly influenced my ideas and thoughts. I wouldn't be doing what I do without you and I want you to know that you are one of the strong figures in my life.

Further I really enjoyed living in the most wonderful living community of Vienna. Madelaine and Christoph, I thank you for all your blind eyes when the diploma-chaos splashed over into the flat and left disasters. And I also thank you for all your open ears when I got into greater detail about my extraordinary, completely fascinating findings. Merci à Valerie who guided me on the way to find my sexual identity and who helped me to immediately deconstruct it once I had found it. Thank you also for your critical comments. Special thanks to Marius, with whom I spent so many hours of discussing Foucault.

I really appreciated my time of research in the Gay and Lesbian Memory of Action (GALA) in Johannesburg. The GALA-team provided me with important information and a very comfortable working atmosphere. You do a great job! I owe further gratitude to the workers at Fluchtpunkt, especially to Herbert Auderer, who almost persuaded me to venture my trip to South Africa and with whom I spend some very pleasant time in Cape Town.

I want to say thank you to Herta Nöbauer. When I finally had found her as my academic advisor, my work advanced so fast that I almost regret not having taken more time to learn from her experiences.

And finally I owe a lot to all my friends who regularly rescued me from the 'diploma djinn' that had occupied my room. They took me out to interesting places far away from pages of white and thoughts of black. But equally accepted all my antisocial attitudes when I couldn't break away from work.

Johanna Treidl, July 2011

TABLE OF CONTENT

Introduction.....	1
-------------------	---

PART ONE: PREPARATIONS

Chapter I: Method.....	8
1.1. Literature inquiries.....	8
1.2. Literature findings: Arguments against same-sexualities.....	9
1.3. Empirical endorsement.....	11
1.4. Interviews and contact.....	12
1.5. Interview situation	14
1.6. Analysis.....	16
1.7. Reflexivity.....	18
Résumé.....	19
Chapter II: Grasping Homosexuality in Africa – A Concept, an Identity, an Act.....	20
2.1. Homosexuality: A short history of a concept	20
2.2. Homosexuality: A universal concept?.....	21
2.3. Same-sexuality: Between identity and act	23
2.4. Sexuality – Sex – Intimacy.....	25
2.5. Same-sexuality, sex and gender.....	28
2.6. Homohostility and homophobia.....	30
Résumé.....	30
Chapter III: On the Origin of Species Revised – The Emergence of Same-Sexualities.....	32
3.1. A social thing? Lesbian and gay lifestyle theories.....	33
3.2. Disappointment, bad experiences with the opposite sex and lack of discipline.....	34
3.3. Homosexual prostitution, forced sexuality and same-sex environments.....	36
3.4. A biological thing?	37
3.5. Diagnosis: 'homosexual'	38
Résumé.....	40

PART TWO: ARGUMENTATIONS

Chapter IV: 'A Western Thing, a White Thing' – The 'Un-African'-Argument.....	42
4.1. Homosexuality – the continuance of 'Western' colonialism?.....	43
4.2. Where has 'African traditional culture' gone?.....	44
4.3. The implantation of 'European homophobia' into 'African traditional culture'	46
4.4. Another history: Same-sex institutions in pre-colonial Africa.....	49
4.5. 'Old Thing' – 'new thing' and the 'culture of discretion'	51
4.6. Post-Apartheid Constitution or how South Africa became a 'Western' country.....	53
4.7. Constitution – more than just a piece of paper?.....	56
Résumé.....	59
Chapter V: Adam and Steve in Paradise – The Religion-Argument.....	60
5.1. Religion in Africa and elsewhere.....	60
5.2. Religion and homosexuality in Africa.....	62
5.3. Homosexuality in the Bible.....	65
5.4. Religious morals against sexual liberality in the South African Constitution.....	69
5.6. Rules versus spirituality: Concepts of personal believe.....	72
5.7. God's creatures and Christian love.....	75
5.8. Only God can help	77
Résumé.....	78

Chapter VI: About Being a 'Real' Man – The Masculinity-Argument.....	79
6.1. Lesbian women.....	79
6.2. Gay men.....	81
6.3. Masculinity in traditional initiation schools.....	85
6.4. Women, patriarchy and the 'crisis tendencies of masculinities'.....	88
6.5. Heteronormative projections and family conceptions.....	93
Résumé.....	96
Chapter VII: All About Bodies and Reproduction – The Biology-Argument.....	97
7.1. The 'racial' component of black and white.....	97
7.2. 'Homosexuality disease' and concepts of 'healing'.....	98
7.3. Bodies – a biological sex cage?	99
7.4. Grey scales: What Castor Semenya did to South Africa.....	100
7.5. Counter the lifestyle-theory.....	102
7.6. Reproduction.....	104
Résumé.....	107
Chapter VIII: False Parents, Wrong Education – The Social Influence-Argument.....	108
8.1. Adoption and 'gay' parenthood.....	108
8.2. Lack of education.....	110
8.3. Representation of same-sexuality in the media.....	111
8.4. Sexual education at schools.....	113
8.5. Dangers and concerns of coming out to the community.....	115
Résumé.....	117

PART THREE: CONCLUSIONS

Chapter IX: Argumentations against Same-sexual Desires in South Africa.....	120
9.1. What ideas and concepts are the basis of these arguments?.....	120
9.2. How are such ideas and concepts related to each other?.....	122
9.3. In which way are the arguments used to stigmatize 'homosexuals'?.....	124
9.4. How does the production of heterosexual norms work within this frame?.....	125
9.4. To what extent are those norms connected to power?.....	127
Prospects.....	129
Bibliography.....	131
Online sources.....	140
Appendix	141
Table of interviews.....	141
Interview guide – Example 1.....	142
Interview guide – Example 2.....	144
Category System.....	146
Discourse Analysis.....	148
Abstract.....	149
Zusammenfassung.....	150
Lebenslauf.....	151

INTRODUCTION

My first contact with homophobia¹ in Africa was a discussion on homosexuality I had with two young Malian boys in Summer 2007. I had never considered that their reaction would be that strong. They described homosexuality as something 'against nature' and 'extremely appalling'. They even threatened to immediately stop talking to me if I admitted being interested in girls. Back in Austria I reported this situation to some friends of mine who had observed similar reactions during their trips to Africa. At this point I started to wonder where these strong anti-homosexual attitudes come from.

The existence of homophobia in Africa has been proved by several scientists (see Aarmo 1999, Epprecht 1998 and 2005). However, this does not automatically lead to the conclusion that same-sexuality is not accepted all over the African continent or that 'homophobia' is something typically 'African'.² The diversity within the conglomeration of countries subsumed as Africa does not allow any generalisations. Still there are tendencies that will be outlined in this work and there is, over all, a discursive concept of Africa that plays an important role when it comes to the (non-)acceptance of alternative forms of sexualities in Africa.

I want to foster research on same-sex intimacies by looking at the different homohostile arguments that are used in African context with a regional focus on South Africa where I spent one month of investigation from the end of January till the end of February 2011. Based on interviews and literature I will try to understand why same-sexualities are declared as 'a threat', as 'unnatural' or even 'pathological'.

My main question, how and why same-sexualities are estimated as 'deviance', leads to several, subordinated questions:

- What ideas and concepts are the basis of these arguments?
- How are such ideas and concepts related to each other and in which way are they used to stigmatize 'homosexuals'?
- How does the production of heterosexual norms work within this frame?
- To what extent are those norms connected to power?

The following work will contribute to giving answers to these questions.

¹ The term 'homophobia' as well as most of the important terms and concepts used in this work will be discussed in chapter II.

² I want to remark at this point that even though I dislike the notion 'Africa' as a homogenising description I will use it without quotation marks as a geographical term.

My thesis is structured into three parts:

Part one aims to prepare the readers for a better understanding of this work by presenting its approach and positions. There will be a short outline of the methodology used to answer the questions of research. Further I will introduce important terms in the realm of homosexualities and same-sexualities and I am going to discuss the concepts that lie behind those terms.

Part two comprises the analysis of five leading argumentations that are frequently used against same-sexualities in South Africa. The analysis mainly will be oriented towards the first three subordinated questions, namely the argument's base, how each argument is connected to other arguments and used against same-sexuality and finally, how the argument produces heteronormativity.

Part three attempts to give some insights in how these arguments work on a general level and in which way they are connected to power.

Theoretically, this work first and foremost applies feminist theory and gender studies. Sexuality, the construction of sex and gender, expressions of third sex and third gender, heteronormativity, patriarchy, male bias – all these terms and their feminist considerations are important to understand different perceptions of same-sexualities. As I talk of a South African context, post-colonial studies and black feminists critique of 'Western' feminist assumptions will be significant.

Apart from feminist theory, the analysis of argumentations against same-sexualities can be rooted in the research on 'deviant' behaviour (cf. Rubin 2002: 26). According to Lamnek (cf. 1996: 11) this kind of approach in general aims to explain three things: First, how do norms occur? Second, how is it that some behaviour does not fit the norms? And third, how does society react to this deviant behaviour? These questions also will lead through the analysis of the different argumentations in part two of this work.

Furthermore this work has been strongly influenced by the thoughts of Foucault who discusses the construction of norms and excluding mechanisms for people that do not fit the norm. His works such as 'Abnormal' and the first volume of 'The history of sexuality' will be of special interest for my diploma-thesis (cf. Foucault 2007a, 1983a). Foucault will help me to put the discourse of argumentations against same-sexualities into a larger frame of power and history. Due to South Africa's exceptional Apartheid past and still ongoing racial segregation,

sexuality also must be analysed in intersection³ with race. Class and gender, two important social divisions in South Africa, will be taken into consideration as well.

The regional focus of this work passed through a zooming-process. Whereas in the beginning my research consisted of a rather broad literature investigation on same-sexualities all over Africa. Over time, the focus shifted from general Africa via Sub-Saharan Africa to Southern Africa and finally settled in South Africa. As I will explain in the first chapter, this regional specification was provoked mainly by methodological reasons. However, in several places of this work, I will not strictly stick to South Africa but also draw connections to other African countries, especially to South Africa's neighbouring countries.

The analysis aims to investigate present-day arguments against same-sexual desires in South Africa. Even today, several arguments refer back to history, such as to colonisation or to the period of Apartheid. In those days same-sexual acts were socially stigmatised and legally prosecuted. Consequently same-sexuality was kept secret and took place in strict privacy. Since 1994, the year of the implementation of South Africa's new constitution, same-sexual acts are legal. Nevertheless, people who openly express their same-sexual identity in current South Africa run the risk of experiencing homophobia.

This work's content

As maybe noticed, the table of content of this work is not structured into a separate theoretical and separate empirical section. Instead this thesis tries to interweave theoretical approaches with remarks from my own empirical founding. The ulterior motive standing behind this way of conduct was to cross fructify arid but potential theory with exciting but grounded empirical research. Thus, each chapter comprises a kind of mixture of both: theory and empiricism.

Chapter I of this work will give insights in my methodological approach that consists of literature inquiries as well as qualitative interviews. The chapter also will go into the challenge of how to investigate a very sensitive subject such as sexuality in another country. Thereby also my personal role as researcher will come into question.

The **second chapter**, will try to grasp the concept of homosexuality. It will contain a brief outline of the history and context of origin of the term. Thereafter the universality of the concept will be discussed and alternative notions such as 'same-sexuality' will be introduced. Further, the concept will be dismantled to investigate the consistence of different components such as

³ Approaches of intersectionality not only focus on one social category but examine the connections between several categories (see McDowell 2008, Pincheon -Stanford 2000).

sexuality, intimacy, sex, gender and identity. Finally, this chapter will review the critique of the term 'homophobia' and propose 'homohostility' as an alternative.

In **chapter III** different theories about the origin of same-sexualities will be outlined. This chapter is crucial as most arguments refer to a specific idea of how homosexuality is 'developed'. Chapter III will also challenge the explanatory claims of two different theoretical approaches: biological essentialism and social constructivism.

After having set this terminological frame, the following five chapters in the second part of this work will analyse different arguments that were used against same-sexualities:

Chapter IV will deal with the quite widespread idea that homosexuality is 'un-African'. How come? To understand this argument, it will be necessary to have a look at the production of the concept 'African traditional culture'. This chapter will trace back the history of same-sex institutions in pre-colonial Africa, the perception of 'homosexuality' in times of colonialism and during independence movements. Then I will focus on the situation of 'homosexuals' in South Africa, a country with one of the most progressive constitutions concerning same-sexualities that, at the same time, has difficulties to cope with the high rate of hate crimes against 'deviant' sexualities.

Another leading source of arguments against 'homosexuality' is religion. In course of **chapter V**, I will first outline the importance of religion in African context. In the case of South Africa, I am going to portray essential religious morals and values of Christianity, which is predominant in South Africa. These Christian ideals will be contrasted to same-sex practices and other alternative forms of relationships. I will then describe the impact religious bashing against 'homosexuality' can have on people who do not correspond to religious norms. This chapter also will contain different concepts of personal beliefs and possibilities to combine same-sexual orientation with faith.

The aim of **chapter VI** is to visualise how certain constructions of masculinities found themselves upon heteronormative ideology which stands in contrast to same-sexual identities. This chapter will not only explain why butch lesbians and effeminate gay men are perceived as a 'threat' to the dominant view of 'African' masculinity but once again draws a line to colonialism and the nationalist movement and the crisis tendencies of masculinity. Thereby also traditional initiation rites where such masculinities are formed and passed over to the next generation will be issued. Finally, I will investigate whether patriarchal family concepts can be applied in African context and how these family concepts are connected to women's repression and reproductive roles. This leads to the next chapter.

In course of the **seventh chapter**, I will have a look at how biology is used as an argument against same-sexualities. This chapter demonstrates how sexual 'deviation' is put on the same level as biological 'abnormality' and 'disease'. I am going to embark on the discussion of how the construction of biological sex was used to normalise heterosexuality. Furthermore, I will explore how the idea of biological causes of same-sexuality is used as an argument by 'homosexual' people to legitimate their desires. Another important issue broached in this chapter is procreation and the importance of reproduction for society.

Chapter VIII will then focus on the social reproduction of norms and values and the question of socialisation. Thereby we will face the idea that same-sexuality is a social phenomenon, something that is 'learned' or 'caused' within a certain environment. Thus, also education and gay parenthood will be discussed. I will then have a look at the representation of 'homosexuality' in the South African media, sexual education at schools and the influence of the near social environment, the family and the community on same-sexual lives.

Subsequent to the analysis of arguments, the conclusion will reinvestigate the meaning of these arguments from another perspective.

In **chapter IX**, I will come back to the questions raised in the entrance of this work. There will be a short summary of the most important and most exiting results of my research and analysis. By means of Foucault, the arguments will be connected to each other, examined on a meta level and put into the context of power structures.

**PART ONE:
PREPARATIONS**

CHAPTER I: METHOD

The following chapter gives an outline of the methodology used to satisfy my curiosity and interest of research:

What are the arguments and strategies used to stigmatise same-sexualities in South Africa? How does the internal logic of these argumentations work and how are they connected to each other? How can these arguments and the different ways to deal with 'homosexual' people be pictured in a larger social network of power?

The findings in this work are based on extended theoretical investigation as well as empirical research.

1.1. Literature inquiries

Literature search and the reading of theoretical publications was used in the first place to get an overview of the topics pertaining to same-sex intimacies in Africa, the concept of homosexuality, African ideas and practices of gender and post-colonial critique. As the regional focus came apparent only in course of my research, my first approach was a rather general consultation of books on same-sex issues in Africa.

Supposedly due to the lack of current data, literature on same-sex practices in Africa is rare (Epprecht 2001: 122). Further, missing accounts on same-sex intimacies need to be put in a juridical context. Several African countries sentence sexual acts between the same sex with prison or even the death penalty (cf. *online source 1*). For that reason research on same-sex intimacies can imply a lot of risk and danger. Nevertheless there exist works that discuss homo-eroticism in Northern Africa. Most of them rely on itineraries and books from western scholars and their 'exotic' and 'erotic' (homo)sexual experiences in the colonies (cf. Aldrich 2003).

Apart from Northern Africa, works on same-sex intimacies in Sub-Saharan Africa are exceptional (Morgan/Wieringa 2005a: 11). In respect to female same-sex intimacies the situation of data gets even worse (cf. Murray/Roscoe 2001: XX, Blackwood 2002: 78ff). South Africa, one of the countries with the most liberal constitution concerning LGBTIQ⁴ rights in the world, stands out of the map. In course of transition from Apartheid to Democracy between 1990-1994 a new and very progressive constitution was formulated that prohibits any kind of discrimination against people due to their sexual orientation.

⁴ LGBTIQ is an acronym for the conglomeration of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex and Queer people.

No person shall be unfairly discriminated against, directly or indirectly, and, without derogating from the generality of this provision, on one or more of the following grounds in particular: race, gender, sex, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture or language (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1994, Section 8, Clause 2).

Since then, a number of very interesting publications on same-sex practices in South Africa and neighbouring countries were released by authors such as Ruth Morgan, Saskia Wieringa, Marc Epprecht, Edwin Cameron, Henrietta Gunkel, Mark Gevisser, Stephen O. Murray, Will Roscoe and others. The liberal judicial situation in South Africa as well as the state of the current literature provide the reasons why the regional context gradually moved to South Africa and the surrounding areas.

1.2. Literature findings: Arguments against same-sexualities

On the level of literature five major arguments used against same-sexualities in African context can be deduced.

1st argument: Homosexuality is 'un-African' and a colonial import

The perception of homosexuality as a colonial import has been propagated by several African politicians such as Zimbabwe's president Robert Mugabe (cf. Aarmo 1999, Epprecht 1998 and 2005). In her article 'How Homosexuality became 'un-African'' Aarmo questions the hypothesis that homosexuality traditionally did not exist in pre-colonial Africa and therefore is not an appropriate sexual behaviour in Africa. Although scientific research proves the existence of same-sex intimacies in pre-colonial Africa (cf. Gevisser 1999: 961), this argument still seems to have much impact on the reputation of homosexualities in Africa. Additionally in the course of independence and the struggle against colonialism, homosexual relationships between rich, white and Western scholars and mostly poor and black 'servants' were interpreted as a mean of suppression by colonial powers (cf. Hayes 2000: 35). This fact might have an influence on homophobia in Africa as well.

2nd argument: Religion provides interpretations to de-naturalize same-sex intimacies

Both Christianity and Islam have interpretations that prohibit same-sex intimacies. As active commitment to religion is very common in Africa, this could be one of the causes of homophobia in Africa. This hypothesis is supported by Epprecht who argues that homophobia (brought by missionaries in times of imperialism) is much more likely a colonial import than homosexualities (cf. Epprecht 2005: 257ff). However, the question is whether religion is used as an argument against same-sex intimacies or not, and what these argumentations rely on (see Shannahan 2009).

3th argument: Homosexuality is a contaminating disease

AIDS is largely spread over the African continent and therefore poses a big problem in many African countries. In his article 'Die schwul-lesbische Welt: 1980 bis zur Gegenwart'⁵ Hekma (cf. 2007: 339ff) outlines that AIDS and other venereal diseases have been pictured for a long time as predominantly homosexual illnesses. In argumentations against same-sex intimacies these two facts easily can be put together (cf. Wakabi 2007: 1017). Hence homosexuality leads to AIDS and this confirms that same-sex intimacies must be prohibited.

4th argument: Homosexuality hinders state-reproduction and thus must be abolished.

As two persons of the same sex cannot reproduce (biologically) without technical inventions, homosexuality is perceived as unnatural. Homosexuals cannot contribute to (biological) survival of society and therefore are pathologized. In this case homosexuality sometimes seems to be accepted as long as homosexuals fulfil their societal task by "producing" and raising children (cf. Wietersheim 2001: 65f). This argument gets even more weighty as in many African states offspring still guarantees kind of social security once you can no longer sustain yourself.

5th argument: Homosexuality is a threat to African masculinity

In his article, 'Cowboy' Masculinity: A Genealogy of Homophobia in the African Nationalist Movement in Zimbabwe to 1983, Epprecht describes in how discourses on homosexuality came into being used as a pawn in the game of contesting masculinities, a game of power (cf. Epprecht 2005: 254f). 'Traditional African male identity' had been heavily afflicted with the colonial regime. The independence struggle lead to a 'back to the roots' new construction of 'African masculinity' that strongly relies on a fundamental idea of heteronormative relationship structures (cf. Epprecht 1998: 641). Homosexuality thus was conceptualized as a threat to this new concept of 'traditional African masculinity'.⁶

As the reader will notice in part two of this work, not all arguments could be maintained the way they are summarised here. Whereas the first, the second and the fifth argument more or less match the chapters IV, V and VI, argument three and four partly will be discussed in the chapters VII and VIII. This restructuring was caused by the results of my empirical work.

⁵ 'The gay- and lesbian World: from 1980 to the present day'.

⁶ Interestingly this 'new' concept of masculinity often is referred to as 'traditional African male identity'.

1.3. Empirical endorsement

This theoretical approach was rounded off with sixteen qualitative interviews that had three main objectives:

First, to revise the five arguments found in literature and to put them in contradistinction to the information obtained by the interviews. This approach can be said to be deductive.

Apart from that, there was a second, inductive interest namely to find additional argumentation strategies that are used against same-sex intimacies in African context, to understand the internal logic of such explanations and within those, to crystallise the connections that exist between them.

The final aim was to place those arguments in a broad context of power and social division which requires a historic and regional specification as well.

Three different groups of people were interviewed:

- Eight heterosexual South Africans were interrogated by using problem-centered interviews. The main purpose of those interviews was to collect the different ideas, thoughts, images and feelings that are revealed in conversations on same-sexuality and homosexuality. Problem-centered interviews are based on theoretical pre-investigations but also aim to generate new theories, thus combine inductive and deductive methods of approach (cf. Witzel 2000: 2).
- The 'outside' images of homosexuality and same-sex practises portrayed by heterosexual South Africans was complemented by the 'inside' view of six 'homosexual' South Africans. By using those 'counter-examples' (cf. Gläser/Laudel 2004: 96f) the differences and similarities between those pictures and arguments can be discovered. Once again problem-centered interviews were used to get perceptions on situations and experiences of homo hostile incidences.
- Expert interviews are a useful tool to acquire particular knowledge of a certain social context that the researcher (at least initially) does not belong to (cf. Gläser/Laudel 2004: 9ff). In regards to this research, two experts were interviewed to obtain specific information on same-sex intimacies from a gender-africanist perspective and on same-sex intimacies in context of medical anthropology. Apart from those insights, experts could also provide contacts to other important and interesting interview partners as well as useful information and ideas concerning the process of research.

But what exactly is an 'expert'. Let's take a women's rights activist working in an NGO in South Africa. Her knowledge of women's situation, gender roles and violence against (lesbian) women in her country declares her as an 'expert'. In course of the interview she comes out as a lesbian which all of a sudden changes the whole focus of this interview. Can this interview still be used as 'expert' interview? According to Gläser and Laudel (cf. 2004: 9) not only people in expert-positions can have expert-knowledge but also 'ordinary' people working or living within a certain context can provide a special expert knowledge of their own social context. It therefore can be said that personal concernment does not necessarily exclude people from being 'experts'. Hence the border between experts and non-experts is fluid. In the end it is left to the researcher to decide how a person in a certain context of investigation is going to be presented. The use of a specific set of questions will decide whether someone is an 'expert' or not. At any rate bias caused by personal dispositions and involvement needs to be reflected in the process of analysis.

1.4. Interviews and contact

Conveniently, none of the experts I interviewed was South African. Both expert interviews were established rather easily by e-mail contact, a fact that compensated for all the discouraging difficulties in accessing the 'field': People or organisations were not interested in my research or unfortunately had no time and in some cases e-mails and phone calls were simply ignored. However, in most cases people were very cooperative and provided me with further information, ideas and contacts to other important people for my research. That is how I came across my two experts.

The first expert I interviewed was Martina Kopf⁷, who is a scholar of African science at the University of Vienna with a focus on literature of trauma, sexuality, feminist theory and post-colonial studies. The interview took place in December 2010 and was very productive. My second interview partner, again interviewed as an expert, was Doris Burtscher⁸. She is a cultural and social anthropologist who works for the organisation 'Doctors Without Borders' in Vienna. Her statements were especially valuable in respect to the AIDS crisis in African countries and different concepts of illness/disease and healing.

The interviews with heterosexual, black, rich, white, young, homosexual, old, liberal, poor, conservative, lets say all kind of Africans took place in urban Johannesburg and Cape Town, during a field trip to South Africa in January and February 2011.

⁷ Cited as (MK: line numbers). For more information see *online source 2*.

⁸ Cited as (DB: line numbers). Also have a look at *online source 3*.

As the research on sexualities belongs to the realm of the extraordinary (cf. Rubin 2002: 28), I had my concerns about finding people who would easily talk about such intimate issues. Luckily the starting point of my research in Johannesburg was the Gay and Lesbian Memory in Action (GALA)⁹ whom I owe a lot of thanks. GALA was founded in 1997 by Graeme Reid. Situated at the University of the Witwatersrand, the organisation aims to create a safe place for LGBTI issues and materials within the country. Apart from providing access to archive materials, GALA supports empiric research on LGBTI topics as well. They didn't only provide me with a working place but also offered access to a lot of important materials for my research as well as contacts to other cooperative LGBTI organisations. Almost all 'homosexual' people I interviewed are/were activists of such organisations. Due to time pressure I had to visit some organisations without calling in advance. However, I experienced that the reference to other well-known people or organisations within the community was a very useful and trust building way to get in contact with interview partners. The prosperity of these measurements became obvious in the high level of intimate information I was faced with and also because all of my interview partners rejected my offer to use a pen-name.

In Johannesburg I interviewed Lesogo Tlhwale¹⁰, spokes person of 'Behind the Mask' (BTM), which is a non-profit organisation that publishes news on LGBTI issues in Africa. My second interview was with Denise Neo¹¹ who is chair person from Activates, a LGBTQIA¹² students collective at the University of the Witwatersrand. Further I interviewed Dikeledi Sibanda¹³ from the organisation 'Forum of the Empowerment of Women' which defends and protects the rights of lesbian, bisexual and transgender women in South Africa and also deals with hate crime victims especially survivors of so called 'corrective' rape¹⁴. Apart from interviews, GALA is a place where many activists go in and out every day leading to several utterly informative conversations.

To collect some of the non-'homosexual' point of views I spent one Sunday afternoon in a park in Johannesburg. Together with Siebert Kruger¹⁵, a companion I had met at the backpackers, I interviewed different (groups of) people who spent their leisure time in this park and were willing to share their opinions and thoughts about same-sexuality in South Africa. Surprisingly again my worries that people might not be willing to talk about such a difficult topic were in

⁹ For more information have a look at GALA's homepage (cf. *online source 4*).

¹⁰ Cited as (LT: line numbers). Also have a look at *online source 5*.

¹¹ Cited as (D: line numbers). Also see *online source 6*.

¹² LGBTQIA: **L**esbian, **G**ay, **B**isexual, **Q**ueer, **T**ransgender, **I**ntersex and **A**sexual.

¹³ Cited as (DS: line numbers). For more information on FEW see *online source 7*.

¹⁴ The term 'corrective' rape is the idea/act of violating lesbian women to convert them into heterosexuals.

¹⁵ Referred in this work as SK.

vain. Most people were eager and very interested in expressing their perspectives. We interviewed three schoolgirls, a mining engineering student and a man who wanted to start a pharmacy assistant course¹⁶. The conversations varied but lead to several very interesting and new insights. Additionally I had the chance to interview Laurent¹⁷, a student of counting science whom I had met at the backpackers in Johannesburg.

In Cape Town I conducted eight more interviews. The first one was with Johan¹⁸, a homosexual hairdresser with Afrikaans background.

Again on a Sunday I went to the HIS People Church of Cape Town, a church that is known for a explicit homophobic position, to get some more opinions on same-sexualities.¹⁹ After the service I interviewed Tarryn, a young woman who originally lives in Johannesburg, an elderly lady, Teddy Mkumbi²⁰, a Congolian who migrated to South Africa and a young man. Due to the church-context and also because I presented my theme as a 'research on religious views on homosexuality' almost all interviews had a strong religious focus.

Further I interviewed a 'bi-racial' lesbian couple, Catherine and Christine²¹, who both are very much engaged in LGBTIQ-activism and study at the University of Cape Town.

My last interview partner was Sharon Ludwig²² whom I had met at the gay-church in Cape Town. The interview took place at her working place in Triangle Project, an organisation that aims to eliminate discrimination against LGBTI people but also discrimination within the community.

The combination of different people resulted in a very contrastive and interesting collection of inside and outside views and diverse perspectives on the subject. For a better visualisation of all the interviews used for this work see the table of interviews in the appendix.

1.5. Interview situation

All interviews were guided interviews that contained questions on personal data, personal experiences and contact with homosexual people or homophobic incidences, questions about the concepts homosexuality, gender, sexuality and normality, and questions concerning the five arguments that were only asked when they were mentioned by the interviewee.²³ To es-

¹⁶ Cited as (P3: line numbers), (P7: line numbers) and (M8: line numbers).

¹⁷ Cited as (L: line numbers).

¹⁸ Cited as (JDW: line numbers).

¹⁹ For more information on HIS People see *online source 8*.

²⁰ Cited as (T: line numbers), (HIS4: line numbers), (TM: line numbers), (HIS7: line numbers).

²¹ Cited as (CC: line numbers).

²² Cited as (SL: line numbers). See the homepage of Triangle Project (cf. *online source 9*).

²³ For more detail have a look at appendix Internet Guides.

establish a rather 'natural' conversation-atmosphere, the guide wasn't followed in a strict manner but adapted to the specific answers and issues introduced by the interviewee. Thus the formulation and order of the questions changed.

In the beginning of each interview I introduced myself and the topic of research. People were asked to participate. As mentioned before the interviews with people from HIS People Church in Cape Town took place as 'interviews on religious views on homosexuality'. This was a compromise because I feared that explaining my plan to analyse homophobic arguments would position me in a pro-homosexual corner and therefore would produce understated material. In her book 'The Ethnographic Self' Coffey (1999: 54) writes about research relationships:

The quality of our data (and our analyses) relies upon the establishment, development and critical reflection of ultimately personal relationships. But these relationships are subjected to the same rigours and tests of all human relations. They are fragile, complex and multidimensional. (...) Relations break down in circumstances where trust and the values of reciprocity are violated.

A strategy to gain reliance was to tell interviewees that they would not have to answer questions, if they didn't want to. I also offered them to stay anonymous and pointed to a confidential use of their data. All interviews were recorded with the consent of the interviewees. To preserve a rather 'neutral' position, inquiries on my personal point of view were either postponed or answered evasively.

At the end of each interview the interview partner was invited to ask questions in her/his terms. The purpose of this turning act was to change and eventually dissolve the hierarchy between the 'me' as active researcher and 'them' as passive objects of research²⁴ but also to open space for new aspects. Most of their questions again gave interesting insights in how they had experienced the interview situation and what their specific interest in the topic was. Whereas some respondents wanted to know more details about my work and background, others started to ask back the same questions I had enquired before.

Thereafter I explained about my plan to transcribe and analyse the interviews. They were asked if they approved to me using their statements for my diploma thesis, in which way they wanted to be referred to, whether they preferred a pen-name and how they wanted me to proceed with the transcription of the interview.

The situation and atmosphere during the conversation as well as additional important information and details were written down after each interview in an interview protocol.

²⁴ I refer to the many criticism that occurred during the crisis of representation and the emergence of the 'reflexive trend' in the 1960s which was further emphasized by postmodern debate since the 1970s (cf. Robben/Sulka 2007: 9f, 17, 19).

1.6. Analysis

The interviews were fully transcribed. Expressscribe and Audacity, two free software programs were used to facilitate the process of transcription. Froschauer and Lueger (2003: 223) recommend a pragmatic style of transcription that meets the requirements of your research interest. As there was no intention to conduct a detailed analysis of syntax, the transcriptions did not include all repetitive conversation fillers. Furthermore, previous research experiences have taught me that people sometimes feel offended when they read their own statements spiked with 'wrong' grammar and half finished sentences. Especially in the process of interview authorisation an overly detailed transcription can cause problems.

Apart from that the transcriptions more or less comply with the suggestions made by Have (cf. 1999: 75-97): Emphasisers, brakes, gesticulation and facial expressions as well as incomprehensible text passages and simultaneous speaking were noted and explained in a glossary. All transcriptions were furnished with line- and page-numbers and included information about date, time and duration of the interview.

The quality of the transcription was very much dependent on the record situation (background noise, echo) and language difficulties. Most interviews took place in English language, except for three interviews. The interview with the Congolese of HIS People Church took place in French and the expert interviews with Martina Kopf and Doris Burtscher took place in German. All direct citations in my work that come from these interviews were self-translated.

The interviewees were offered to be sent the transcriptions of their interviews. In some cases they had no interest in reviewing it and offered to me to use it any way I wanted. Those who preferred to have a look at the transcription were asked to correct and complete incomprehensible text passages. They also could delete the statements they didn't want to be used.

The method of analysis applied on these interviews is a conglomeration of different methods of analysis I came across during my studies: Global Analysis (cf. Legewie 1994), Qualitative Content Analysis (cf. Mayring 2008), and a very rough Critical Discourse Analysis (cf. Jäger 2004). The aim of this setting was in a first step to get an overview of the different arguments and topics that were spoken about in the interviews. All this information was reduced to a category system which was used as an advanced base to decide which terms and topics needed to be further explored. The following part will explain step by step how the analysis was carried out.

- 1) Reading: Each interview was read. Important passages and catchwords were underlined.

2) Summarising: For each interview a short summary (approximately one page) was written including the main issues mentioned by the interviewee.

3) Sight Seeing: A paragraph per paragraph sight seeing was done. Important phrases and catchword as well as own thoughts and ideas were noted in the margin by following the lead-questions: What is this paragraph about? What is the person's intention in this paragraph? What important information contains this paragraph in terms of my research?

4) Category system: After the analysis of six interviews, a category-system was distilled (see appendix: Category system)

5) Orientation: On the basis of the category system, it was decided which aspects would be interesting for further analysis on all-interview-level. Thus either structuring analysis of large categories or explication analysis of important concepts and terms was used.

5.1) Structuring Analysis: There are different ways to structure data material. This work only applied content structuring which aims to bring about essential aspects, to structure them in a logical way and to define and summarise those aspects. Thereby one works along a certain adjustment scheme that defines which text passages shall be structured. After having collected all important passages they further are characterised which might lead to a redefinition and restructuring of the scheme. In the end the new structure and the categories within this structure is explained and summarised (cf. Mayring 2008: 82-99).

5.2) Explication Analysis: This approach aims to conflate additional material to explain unclear text-passages such as terms or sentences etc. This additional material shall be used to enlarge the context of understanding of a certain text passages (cf. Mayring 1994: 164). Explication Analysis mainly consists of lexical research, narrow and wide content analyses to find material within the interviews and outside the interviews that can explain uncertain text-passages. Thus also information on the interviewee, her_his position, the interview-situation etc. can provide important side facts.²⁵ In the end a kind of definition or paraphrase is formulated to describe in which way the text-passage can/shall be understood (cf. Mayring 2008: 77-81).

²⁵ In this part of analysis the discursive part of the analysis was very useful. See step number 6.

6) Contextualisation: A rough Critical Discourse Analysis was applied to contextualize the obtained information. Discourse Analysis aims to question and critically reflect information within its position of power (cf. Jäger 2004: 171). Foucault's concept of discourse emanates from the assumption that spoken as well as unspoken 'facts' produce reality. In turn this reality has an impact on how people express themselves. As a consequence language or the discourse has become a tool of power that needs to be analysed within its context. To return to my research, a set of questions concerning the interviewee's personal motivation and intention, as well as her_his organisational environment were inquired. On interview level synchronicities, discontinuities, unsaid implications of norms and values, stylistic ornaments, gaps in cause and effect-theories and many more questions were investigated.²⁶

7) In a last step, all results of analysis were brought together. Thus the various meanings of terms and concepts, and the different categories were connected to each other. They also were situated within different fragments of discursive power following the question: What is the larger socio-political impact of the different arguments and strategies against same-sex intimacies?

1.7. Reflexivity

Ethnographic qualitative research in social and cultural Anthropology has a long history of critique (cf. Coffey 1999: 8ff). Criticisms on former research procedures particularly reflect upon the role of the researcher within the field, the researchers' identity and reflexivity in her_his work, the ability to question personal bias, the ethical implications of the project and the overall dynamics of representation (cf. Coffey 1999, O'Reilly 2005, Robben/Sluka 2007). Time is long gone when researchers went into their fields seemingly 'without leaving any traces'. Hierarchies between researcher and 'subjects' of research and the differentiation between 'us' and 'them' were rendered problematic together with books that were published telling private details about people without them even knowing, not to mention having their consent. Research ethics and reflexive approaches have become important cornerstones of (post)modern explorations.

This research was seeking to apply the criticisms and to transform them into a useful tool in methodology. Self-reflexive research cannot only be a burden but also be productive. To question hierarchies within the process of research delivers very interesting insights and new per-

²⁶ see the List of Discursive Questions in the appendix.

spectives on information. As part of my research it was necessary to be aware of my own position in the field namely a white, young-looking, female, scientist coming from a well situated European country and thus being relatively privileged. In reference to Mohanty (2002: 518-523) Mama cites three types of feminists: First, the “feminist-as-tourist/international consumer”, second, the “feminist-as-explorer who is more open minded but no less voracious a consumer” and third, the “feminist solidarity/comparative feminist studies type” (Mama 2005: 104). I have tried to be the last type but finally I still 'consumed' wonderful interviews with very interesting people who hopefully enjoyed the conversations as well.

Fieldwork challenges the researcher's identity. It is all about getting involved and abstaining at the same time (Coffey 1999: 21): “The ethnographer can utilize the experiences of fieldwork to gain a better understanding of the self. Yet this self should remain distinct from and distant to the field setting”. On the other hand this combination of dissociation and involvement can result in fascinating insights, ideas and perspectives, which can be said to be the nucleus of research.

Résumé

The purpose of this chapter was to deliver insights into the methodological approach I used for this work. Thereby I explained the difficulties but also the outcomes of my literature research and theoretical investigation of same-sex issues in Africa. Further I pointed out the cornerstones of my empiric investigation which contains sixteen qualitative guided interviews with experts in Austria as well as same-sexual and heterosexual people in South Africa. The interviews were analysed in a specifically designed manner using a combination of Global Analysis, Qualitative Content Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis. In the end of this chapter, I discussed my personal position and the complexity of challenges as a researcher within the field. The next two chapters are going to continue this sensitive approach by turning a critical look towards important terms and concepts in the realm of same-sexualities.

CHAPTER II: GRASPING HOMOSEXUALITY IN AFRICA – A CONCEPT, AN IDENTITY, AN ACT

The following part will propose a sophisticated understanding of the concept of homosexuality. There are advantages, there are disadvantages, there are alternatives and, after all, the terminology of homosexuality is a huge and very complex construction site. As a concept it contains various ideas, theories and judgements. Some of them shall be outlined in the following chapter to give a better understanding of what it means to apply the concept of homosexuality in an African context and why exactly this question is of major importance in this work.

2.1. Homosexuality: A short history of a concept

The term homosexuality is a modern term that only has been introduced in the later 19th century, when homosexuality became a public and controversially discussed issue in most European countries (cf. Hayes 2000: 23ff). Already in 1869 the Hungarian writer Karl Berkert, also known as Karoly Maria Kertbeny expressed his theories and ideas about 'homosexuality' in a pamphlet in protest of the proposition of a new penal code for Prussia that included an anti-sodomy²⁷ law (cf. Greenberg 2007: *online source* 10). The concept has further been largely been influenced by Richard von Krafft-Ebing, a psychiatrist who lived in Germany and Austria. In his book 'Psychopathologica Sexualis' that was published in 1889, he was the first who used homosexuality as a concept in science (cf. Fiedler 2004: 4). Hirschfeld (1914) also contributed to the scientific reception of homosexuality in his work 'Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes'²⁸, released in the start of the First World War.

Until the early 1990s homosexuality was listed in the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) amongst other 'sexual deviations and disorders' such as bestiality, paedophilia, transvestism, exhibitionism, trans-sexualism and frigidity and impotence (cf. ICD-9, 302 *online source* 11). Homosexuality was defined as an “[e]xclusive or predominant sexual attraction for persons of the same sex with or without physical relationship” (ibid.). Homosexuality was only deleted as a 'disease' in the ICD-10 version of 1992.

As a matter of fact, the perception of homosexuality as some kind of sexual perversion still exists today. In literature, homosexuality has been associated with terms such as sodomy, homoeroticism, prostitution, misogyny, paedophilia and so on (cf. Aldrich 2003: 8f). Also in course

²⁷ Sodomy was a popular term for (same-)sexual intercourse such as oral or anal penis penetration or for sexual acts between a person and an animal. It refers to the biblical story of Sodom and Gomorrah (see chapter 5.3.).

²⁸ 'Homosexuality of Men and Women'.

of the interviews, terms such as paedophilia, promiscuity, homosexual prostitution and rape were mentioned, which shows that in some minds there is a persistent link between homosexuality and 'sexual disorders' (cf. MK: 160-174, JDW: 338-345, CC: 487-552).

However, coming back to the history of the term, the presumption that the notion of homosexuality was conceptualized and developed in Europe and thus emerges out of a specific sociocultural and historic context was not always obvious. According to Rubin (2002: 37f), Marry McIntosh's article 'The homosexual role' from 1986 was a pioneer work of contextualising the term homosexuality historically. Martina Kopf, Africanist at the University of Vienna, also points out that homosexuality as well as sexuality are terms which belong to times of modernity and therefore convey a set of 'Western' values and norms (cf. MK 2010: 192-214). As Lewin and William write, the connections between modernity, capitalism and the conception of gender, sex and sexuality were made public by several scientists such as, for example, D'Emilio, Foucault and Weeks:

Many theorists have noted that lesbian and gay are not context-free categories but express subjective understandings of gender sexuality and social location closely linked to the historical emergence of North Atlantic capitalism and to the politics of cultural pluralism during the late modernist period (Lewin/William 2002a: 8).

Blackwood comes to the same conclusion concerning the word lesbian: "(...) using 'lesbian' as a global signifier is problematic, however, because it imposes a Eurocentric term, which connotes a fixed sexual identity, on practices and relationships that may have very different meanings and expectations in other cultures" (Blackwood 2002: 70). This is a very important fact, especially regarding this work which aims to analyse different arguments against homosexualities, more precisely same-sexualities in South Africa. The perception of homosexuality being a 'Western' concept that (initially) was not part of African culture will be crucial.

2.2. Homosexuality: A universal concept?

The question occurs whether homosexuality is a universal and above all useful concept to be applied on African context. First and foremost, there is no such thing as a single form of homosexuality. Homosexualities or same-sexualities in general express themselves in various ways. As Blackwood (2002: 77) points out, "'[h]omosexuality' was the common (and problematic) term applied during that period [1970s and 80s] to all forms of same-sex eroticism and transgender behaviour". Therefore the singular use of the term 'homosexuality' was criticised for portraying a homogeneous image. A plural version of 'homosexualities' was proposed to stress the different manifestations of homosexualities (cf. Aldrich 2003). As Martina Kopf concludes, the characterisation of one certain type of 'African homosexuality' is unrewarding as are all

generalizing forms or descriptions of homosexuality. She further argues that the expressions of homosexualities are dependent on a social and juridical context as well as how people personally deal with their sexual identity (cf. MK: 66-73). According to Leap (cf. 2002: 144f), the fact that homosexuality is applied as a universal category is due to the process of globalisation that has implemented and to some extent even replaced indigenous expressions of same-sexualities. Nevertheless in specific contexts, local terms such as the Afrikaans word 'moffie', or 'stabane' which is originally a Zulu expression but equally used in most other South African indigenous languages are still common.

On the other hand, Martina Kopf remarks that concepts such as homosexuality can be adapted and thus bear a lot of advantages and strengths. Hence they neither should be used nor rejected in any essentialist way. Homosexuality can be an emancipatory concept to talk about same-sexualities, but it is not the only possible way. To stick on this concept can bear the risk of overlooking other expressions of same-sexualities (cf. MK: 44-62, 203-224). Hoad (2007: xxiv) also comes to the conclusion that same-sex practices are so diverse that they hardly can be subsumed under one word. In his book 'African intimacies' he acknowledges the term homosexualit(ies) but, at the same time, questions the advantage of applying it for each and every form of same-sexuality. Instead he proposes a more a distinct definition and use of concepts of same-sexualities. In his argument, Hoad refers to Amadiume's largely discussed critique of lesbian women using African same-sex institutions such as woman-woman marriages to legitimate their sexual orientation by labelling those marriages as 'lesbian' relationships (cf. Amadiume 1992: 7). In her book 'Male Daughters, Female Husbands' Amadiume points out that those marriages between Nngobi women in Nigeria were not sexual relationships but had political and economic purpose (Amadiume 1992: 70, 86).

What we enter here is the struggle of representation and the important question of labelling: Which terminology is the correct one to talk about same-sexualities in African context? Even though I agree to Amadiume's critique that in some cases Western eyes falsely assumed homosexual practices, I still think that the concept of homosexuality can be applied on the African continent. Of course regional specificities and dynamics need to be considered but the same goes for non-African countries. Hence, scholars stating homosexuality to be a Western construction which can only be used for the Western world do not only homogenize same-sexualities in the West, but they also homogenize same-sex practices outside of the West. I therefore will not a priori raze out words such as such as 'gay', 'lesbian' and 'homosexuality' from African continent terminology. In this work I will use these terms for two reasons. First, most of the time these terms were brought up and used by my interview partners. Second, because it

makes sense in some specific contexts to refer to homosexuality as a 'Western' concept. Additionally I decided to use a variety of less meaning-charged terms such as 'same-sexuality', 'same-sex practices', 'same-sex acts', 'same-sex intimacies', 'same-sex identities' etc. to do justice to the variance of expressions of same-sexualities.

The problem of labelling was also expressed in several of the interviews done for this work. In some cases people reject the limitation that those concepts produce as Catherine (CC: 454-471) explains:

I identify as lesbian. (...) But at the same time I also don't like it because it limits you. Cause then you fall into a stereotype. I think it is important for lesbians to have an identity like politically (...). In a perfect world... I wouldn't have to identify as anything, I could just be. But because we need political identities for people to understand. Because people only understand cause they put you in a box. (...) As soon as someone crosses those lines it becomes uncomfortable for society and that's why I think that it is important that lesbians identify as lesbians. But at the same time I wouldn't want to... in a perfect world, I think, I shouldn't have to call myself a lesbian. You understand?

This passage shows the dilemma of a concept that is important for political reasons but at the same time involves the risk of being stereotyped. "I am not sure whether I should say this in terms that I am a lesbian. Yah I am just woman who loves that... my... my woman so... (laughs). That is the surest thing that I can tell you" (DS: 5-7).²⁹

In some cases people engage in same-sex acts but do not label themselves as 'homosexual', 'gay', 'lesbian' or 'same-sexual' because they don't perceive those acts as identity-building.

2.3. Same-sexuality: Between identity and act

In his article on the risk perception of HIV among street boys in Tanzania, Lockhart (2002) describes that so called 'survival sex' is a common phenomenon that can be seen "(...) as the result of peer pressure or the need to fit in, which in turn may have direct implications for acquiring material resources" (cf. Lockhart 2002: 295). Thus, 'survival sex' is important because the street boys' survival is dependent on each other. Single survival and not being part of any group is very difficult (cf. Lockhart 2002: 305). 'Survival sex' largely consists of anal sex (or rape) what the street boys call *kunyenga*. The boys who engage in such practises do not perceive *kunyenga* as 'real' sex because 'real' sex is exclusively heterosexual sex. This further means that those street boys don't identify as 'homosexuals' (cf. Lockhart 2002: 296f).

In course of the interviews several people mentioned the idea that prostitutes who engage in same-sexual activities to earn money or to receive any other kind of reward might not per-

²⁹ Interestingly, not all 'lesbians' identify themselves as women. Nevertheless, butch 'women' who are more likely to identify themselves as men often are recognised and labelled as biological 'women' and therefore become targets of hate crimes. See also chapter VI.

ceive themselves as same-sexual. These cases portray that a distinction between sexual identity and sexual act might be accurate (cf. DB: 107-109). Also Rubin writes:

This pattern of conduct lead Reiss to distinguish between 'homosexual behaviour' and the 'homosexual role' and to think about the mechanisms by which boundaries between 'homosexual acts' and 'homosexual identities' were maintained by the rules governing such transactions (Rubin 2002: 34f).

As we will see in chapter V, the distinction between being 'homosexual' and having 'homosexual sex' was also made in arguments by South African Christians.

The problem is that in many cases it is hard to draw a line between same-sexuality as an identity and same-sexuality as a sexual act. Hoad (2007: xvi) confirms this perspective by defining homosexuality as the "relationship between identity and sexual practice". According to this citation, homosexuality is more than an act, it is an identity (cf. Wrede 2000: 38, Degele 2008b: 86). Still, the sexual act itself is no definite indicator for sexual orientation (cf. MK: 76-85). According to my analysis, the interviews suggest a distinction between 'sexuality' and 'sex'. Whereas 'sex' is the mere act of having sex, 'sexuality' is a conglomeration of how you personally identify in terms of sex and how you conceptualize 'the act' of having sex. Hence, sexuality is part of a same-sexual identity. But this does not mean that people who have same-sexual identities necessarily have to practise sex. Same-sex identity mustn't be reduced to the act of sex and the person's identity mustn't be reduced to her same-sexual sexuality:

You know if you are talking to a group of straight people around sexual orientation that's something that often comes up and immediately the focus goes to the sexual attraction. And I just think, you know I often say to straight people, you know, is that how you define yourself? Is that who you are that's who defines you there? You know. Of course it is not, well it is not for us either, you know. It is so much more than just the physical attraction (SL: 243-248)

Sexual attraction can be an indicator for same-sex identity. But women can identify as lesbians without ever having had sex with another woman as well as men can be gay and not engage in homosexual acts (cf. LT: 133-140).

Whether someone defines her or his identity as 'homosexual' further is dependant on another factor propound in Kendall's article 'Women in Lesotho and the (Western) Construction of Homophobia'. Therein she (cf. 1999: 158) describes how her stay in Lesotho and her interest of research on 'lesbian' women in this country was challenged by the fact that no mosotho³⁰ identified as a lesbian. This is due to the fact that the sexual intimacy which takes place between two women is not perceived as 'sex'. One of Kendall's informants cuts this idea right to the chase of the matter: "It is impossible for two women to share the blankets', she said. 'You can't have sex unless somebody has a koai (penis)[sic!]" (ibid: 162).

³⁰ Expression for a woman in Lesotho.

This citation not only questions the practicability of the term homosexuality in this specific context but also reveals its liaison to another important concept, namely sex.

2.4. Sexuality – Sex – Intimacy

During her search for lesbian women in Lesotho, Kendall (1999) came to the conclusion that there is no universal perception of having sex. The border between sex and 'not-yet'-sex is fluid: A kiss can be very intimate and emotional, but a kiss can also be no more than a salutary act. How long does a kiss have to take and how passionate must it be to become sexual?

As we could see in the citations above, the Lesotho woman Kendall was talking to did not consider intimate acts between women as sexual. Kendall (cf. 1999: 162) concludes that whereas many (not all) lesbians would revolt against this statement, some people narrowly define sex as male-female penis penetration, thus making sex without a penis utterly impossible.

However, Kendall also points out the societal function of this perception: Since 'sex' outside of marriage in Roman Catholic Church is a sin, it is more fortunate for women in Lesotho, a mostly Catholic country, when 'the things women do' cannot possibly be sexual. 'No koai, no sex' means that women's ways of expressing love, lust, passion or joy in each other are neither seen as immoral nor suspect (cf. Kendall 1999: 167, Gunkel 2009: 208f).

Epprecht (2004: 224) adds to this topic: "In part this de facto tolerance of sexual difference and individual non conformity is possible because 'sex' in pre-modern contexts was not sex the way that it is usually construed by modern 'Western' discourse. Real sex was that activity that potentially resulted in pregnancy".

Consequently, 'Western' concepts of sexuality need to be challenged. What is said to be 'sex' in one part of the world can be perceived as 'caring' in another part of the world. Sexual activities most of the time take place in privacy and high intimacy. For this reason explanations of sexuality apart from scientific and juridical definitions will always vary to a personal extent. To solve this problem other terms such as 'same-sex practices', 'same-sex activities' or 'same-sex intimacies' can be used.

The latter has been proposed by Hoad (2007: xxxiii) in his book 'African Intimacies' by arguing: "The vocabulary of intimacy talk bypasses many of the difficulties in talking about the socially mediated experiences of desire and embodiment in a global context (...)".

The uncertainty about when gestures become more than a simple expression of friendship also was expressed in the interviews. Hugs, kisses, touching or holding hands are no clear indicators for a sexual relationship but can also be part of intimate relationships:

Being intimate is certainly it might be touching it might be kissing... but definitely no nakedness. For me, if it goes beyond being intimate means being next together and actually touching each others' genitals and exploring each other makes it sexuality. That's the difference for me between being sexual with someone or being intimate with someone. Being intimate can be in each others personal space, holding each other, lie on each other, emotional warmth, kissing maybe, but nothing further than being naked or touching genitals. That is maybe the difference between being sexual with someone, it is definitely going to the genital area (JDW: 361-367).

In its original focus it [intimacy] is not meant sexually. In its originally focus, I believe, the word is meant to be close. Means to be together, means to be in love, means to be together in one. Intimacy... to be intimate with a person. Intimacy can be a touch, it can be a hug, it can be shoulders rubbing together it can be just leaning together if you want. That's being intimate. Intimacy can also be sexual depending on the context you use it but it shouldn't be used sexually (HIS7: 77-82).

However, in many contexts kissing, hugging, leaning together, holding each other definitely are sexual expressions. This makes it very difficult for people from the outside perspective to categorize relationships as 'friendships' or 'sexual' relationships. As we will see in the chapter on the religion-argument, exactly this distinction is decisive to regard same-sexual behaviour as sinful or not. To some extent the context in which such intimate gestures take place may further suggest whether they have a sexual component or not. But, as the following conversation portrays, in many cases expressions such as kissing and touching are not sufficient indicators for a sexual relationship:

P7: They are in a relationship with each other. Physically you can see those two, they are in a relationship. **JT:** How you see. What are they doing for you to know that they have a relationship? **P7:** Touching, yah touching. **SK:** But eh girls always touch each other in any case. How would you identify a female couple? **P7:** A female couple. No you can say it is the chemistry between them. Like the way they look at each other, the eye contact. You know you can see that okay these people have got something happening (P7: 28-36).

The border between friendship and (sexual) relationship can be fluid. To use the term 'intimacy' thus can be a good way to solve the problem of categorisation. Intimacy is a „close personal relationship esp. marked by affection or love“ (Webster/Gove 1971: 1184). This includes not necessarily a sexual relationship but also can be a „(...) relationship marked by depth of knowledge or broadness of information“ (ibid.). Still, intimacy also is used to paraphrase sexual intercourse. This vagueness can be problematic as the term same-sex 'intimacy' could also refer to mother-daughter relationships or good friendships between two men which sometimes are classified as 'homosocial' relationships. However, as Gunkel (cf. 2009: 210) remarks, homosocial structures which categorically deny the existence of any sexual element as part of such relationships are 'inherently homophobic'.

Terms such as same-sex 'intimacy', 'activities' or 'practises' have the advantage of being general terms but thereby have to deal with a loss of distinct informational value. It therefore would

be best to give 'thick descriptions' (cf. Geertz 1973) of what actually is going on among these people and how they themselves would verbalise such terms.

According to the interviews sex is...

... a natural instinct, something you like to have as a human being, an act that serves reproduction, an act of uniting a man and a woman as one, a way to become one body, a union, a form of soul tying, taking parts from your soul and spirit, something you need trust for, a tie, a bond, a physical gesture of love, an expression of love, the best way to express your love towards somebody, making love, a way to find warmth and closeness, something that can be enjoyed, something that is going to happen when it happens, something you cannot influence, something precious, a way of earning money, a profession, a commodity, something you can be forced to, not 'real sex' or 'false sex' if you are not intimately involved, nothing where you need to be intimately involved, something that brings you intimately closer to your partner, a measure of masculinity, not determined by sexual identity, not spoken about, dirty, a 'hash hash'-thing, a way to get HIV, only spoken about in context of illness and disease, touching of genitals or exploring each other, an (important?) part of a relationship, not allowed outside of marriage, not allowed between two people of the same sex... (cf. all interviews).

Whereas sexuality is...

... a Western concept, not depended on relationship or marriage, not spoken about, only spoken about in context of illness and disease, an idea of how sex should take place, the essence of yourself in terms of sex, something all of us possess, a way of identification, your gender identity, your sexual orientation, whom you are attracted to, what you do, just sex... (cf. all interviews).

Thus, sexuality refers to a more individual concept of identity.³¹ And intimacy is...

... something you have with your partner, what you do in bed (sexual intimacy), the actual act of it, the practical application, perhaps not existing in all of us, to share sex with a girl, the thing that you do, less specific than sex, not just a physical act, originally no sexual word, has been given into sexual connotation, a very special union, deeply emotional, a connection between two people, being in each others personal space, holding each other, lying on each other, emotional warmth, a closeness in a relationship, bringing you closer together with your partner, means to be together, means to love, means to be together in one, can be touching and kissing, can be kissing maybe, can be a touch, can be hug, can be shoulder rubbing together, can be leaning together, no nakedness, no touching of genitals or exploring each other, nothing further than being naked or touching genitals, can be sexual depending on the context you use it... (cf. all interviews).

As this diversity of impressions demonstrates, these terms do not have a common usage in daily practise. Because of this, it is very important to further investigate those concepts by asking additional questions about the patterns, use and representations of a certain relationship in connection to sex, sexuality and intimacy. Unfortunately, shame, taboo and language problems can make it difficult to talk about such personal issues.

³¹ Foucault understands sexuality as "(...) an individual matter: it concerns hidden private pleasures, dangerous excesses for the body, secret fantasies; it came to be seen as the very essence of the individual human being and the core of personal identity" (Dreyfus/Rabinow 1983: 171).

2.5. Same-sexuality, sex and gender

What has homosexuality got to do with sex and gender? Similarly to the concept of homosexuality, the idea that the human species can be divided in exactly two types of biological sex, leading further to the idea of complementary genders, is a modern and 'Western' invention (cf. Oyěwùmí 2002). Industrialisation and the emergence of bourgeois family units in the course of the 18th century lead to the construction of binary opposed genders (cf. Degele 2008a: 60, Wrede 2000: 34). Homosexuality as well as heterosexuality³² are terms that need to be seen within the context of this historic process (cf. Hark 1999: 83f). Not only Western men but Western feminists as well often disregard this fact (cf. Arndt 2002: 43).

The definition of sexuality as 'homo' or 'hetero' thus seems to be a logical consequence and a result of the differentiation between 'male' and 'female' (cf. Hark 1999: 83). Often these constructions were further legitimated by biological argumentations to naturalise gender binarity (cf. Wetterer 2004: 126, Degele 2008b: 87, Wrede 2000: 39). The sexual unification of men and women in a heterosexual relationship was declared as a complete unit that leads to ideal harmony (cf. Hausen 2001: 170) whereas homosexuality became an 'abnormality' (cf. Degele 2008b: 87). According to Butler's heteromatrix, there still is a strong link between biological sex, social gender and sexuality in modern societies (cf. Butler 1991: 487).

These kinds of naturalisations have been criticised by feminist scholars. Research in non-Western societies pointed out that 'Western' gender characters as well as the idea that there exists a certain typically male/female behaviour or gender specific tasks are Western constructions which do not exist all over the world. Hence, they cannot be 'natural' but rather are socially (per)formed (cf. Rubin 2002: 48). Such insights lead to the differentiation between biological sex and social gender – a very useful analytical tool to request gender-stereotypes.

Further, the social construction of male and female in several societies is not necessarily built upon or determined by sex (cf. Schröter 2002: 129) but is constructed and reproduced in a process of interaction – a theoretical approach that came to be known as 'doing gender' (cf. West/Zimmerman 1987, Villa 2001: 63, Meißner 2008: 8f). On the other hand the separation between sex and gender was criticised to be artificial because it works with sex and gender as two distinct entities and thus oversees the interdependency of social gender and biological bodies (cf. Meißner 2008: 3f).

³² As a matter of fact the term 'heterosexuality' came up after and only in opposition to the notion 'homosexuality' (cf. Degele 2008b: 86).

In her book 'Gender Trouble' Butler (1999) not only questions gender as a natural fact but tries to explain that even the interpretation of our bodies as 'female' or 'male' are products due to a certain perception. Therefore biological distinctions of sex too are no natural conditions but discursive effects. As Degele (2008a: 62) further explains, there are different possibilities (chromosomal, gonadal, hormonal and morphological) to define sex biologically, but even those cannot always be used as clear indicators. For example there are cases where gonadal criteria (ovular and testicles) does not match the set of chromosomes (XX, XY).³³

Natural science often uses hormones to explain 'typically' male or 'typically' female behaviour and thereby oversees that their research objects also have undergone the process of socialisation. When it comes to morphological sex, especially these characteristics are also influenced by a certain sociocultural lifestyle. I am not interested in illegitimizing biological sex or even denying its existence, but there still remain many questions concerning this topic. Also seemingly 'objective' natural sciences are not free from bias and often use unquestioned premises from everyday-world (cf. Wetterer 2004: 127). One of the most important questions is why sex has become a basic structural feature in 'Western' as well as in many 'non-Western' societies.

Apart from all the inquiries and challenges of what sex and gender actually is, in some societies there exist forms of 'third sex' and 'third gender'. These terms, suggested and introduced by Gilbert Herd to emphasise the fact that there often exist more than just two sex-categories, sometimes are used as synonyms for gay and lesbian. Lewin and William (2002a: 9) critically state:

Unfortunately, some researchers working within this frame tend to overlook Herdt's caution and use 'third gender' as an inclusive category for all forms of nonreproductive, nonheterosexual, gendered identities, rendering 'third sex' and 'third gender' as synonyms to 'same sex' or 'lesbian' or 'gay' and not as alternative usage at all.

The fact that some societies are not structured the way we differentiate between female and male, leads to the question how terms such as homosexuality and heterosexuality are challenged by expressions of third sex and third gender. In her article 'Wer oder was ist eigentlich homosexuell?'³⁴ Lang (cf. 1997: 66ff) asks from an anthropological point of view what homosexuality in consideration of sex and gender(variance) actually can be and how expressions of homosexualities can vary in culturally different constructions of gender identities. This question will accompany us along this work. The construction of gender concepts will be crucial, especially in chapter VI that talks about homophobia and the crisis of masculinity.

³³ In such cases terms such as XX-men and XY-women are applied.

³⁴ 'Who or what actually is homosexual?'

2.6. Homohostility and homophobia

One of the most popular terms to assign negative reactions on homosexualities is the term 'homophobia'. It consists of 'homo' which means same and 'phobia' which stands for the fear of something. Boswell (cf. 1981: 46) criticises the fact that 'homo' stands for any kind of sameness, not only sexual sameness and thus is not a precise notion. Instead he suggests to use 'homosexophobia', a term that did not really become prevalent in scientific writing. Another problem occurs with homophobia as some people misinterpret the term as 'irrational fear of human beings'.

The second part of the term 'phobia' was further challenged by Siraj (2009: 42) who writes: "However, the term 'phobia' is problematic as it suggests that individual prejudice is based on irrational fears which, like other 'phobias', escapes moral responsibility or political critique". In logical consequence, homophobia becomes something that 'happens' to someone who has no alternative other than reacting the way his 'phobia' forces him to.

As we will see, the term 'homophobia' does not match most of the argumentations that will be analysed in the second part of this work. Several of these arguments are not expressions of passive and irrational fear but manifestations of completely conscious and structured hatred. I therefore invented the term 'homohostility' to emphasise the active part of these arguments.

Résumé

Clarifying terminologies is an indispensable part of work that sometimes even can lead to interesting and important results. Thus we know from this chapter, that the word 'homosexuality' is a relatively new terminology developed within a 'Western' context. Therefore the unquestioned use of this expression in other contexts bears difficulties and dangers. On the other hand it is one of the most wide-spread and well-known terms and hardly any other alternative term raises a comparable level of awareness, even if it may be more accurate. This especially applies to people who are not focussed on LGBTIQ-issues.

Furthermore, this chapter discussed different patterns of same-sexualities and thereby distinguished between people who identify themselves as same-sexual and people who engage in same-sex acts but might not necessarily perceive themselves as same-sexual. Their sexual acts have no direct impact on their sexuality which subsequently raised the question about how there can be drawn an exact distinction between sexuality in terms of identity and sex in terms of the act of having sex. In the course of this discussion also the term 'intimacy' played a central role.

This chapter also broached the impact of diverse sex- and gender systems on the perception of same-sexualities. The naturalisation of sex and gender not only was revealed as a 'Western' construct, but we equally learned that several societies are based upon social structures with more than just two genders. Additionally not all societies have defined sexuality as a basic social stratifier. Such new perspectives also challenge the binary opposition of hetero- and homosexuality.

In the last part of this chapter the term 'homophobia' came under critique as it mitigates the severity of homophobic acts as result of (passive) irrational fears. Alternatively the term 'homophobia' was proposed.

The following chapter now will outline different theories about the origin of same-sexualities.

CHAPTER III: ON THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES REVISED – THE EMERGENCE OF SAME-SEXUALITIES

Several hypotheses were articulated by the interviewees concerning the origin of same-sex practices. The question where 'homosexuality' comes from can be answered on two different levels. The first level is the persona-level: How did same-sexual desire emerge within a person? The second level is about the development of same-sex practices as a historical phenomenon. As the second level will be covered in chapter IV, this chapter will only deal with the first level.

To investigate how people think that same-sexuality is 'produced' or even is biologically 'determined' will be crucial to understand the different argumentations used against, as well as in favour of sexual diversities. The interviewee's answers can be put in mainly three types of explanations:

- Those who perceive it as something caused by social components,
- Those who theorise about biological reasons and ideas that 'homosexual' desire might be some kind of illness, a hereditary disease or that homosexuals are mentally sick.
- Those who are not sure about its origin or assume a kind of combination of social as well as biological factors that cause homosexuality. Additionally this type also includes arguments that ascribe homosexuality on reasons that cannot clearly be put in social or biological categories.

According to Seidman (cf. 1996: 14), the question whether same-sexuality is a biological or a social phenomenon is a 'core question' among social sciences. He further explains that only recently, social sciences claimed the species called 'homosexual' as an object of research. Before that, the origin of same-sexuality was reduced to mere biological and psychological reasons.

As the interviews show, the difference between biological versus social origin basically aligns the differentiations between being and becoming homosexual. This leads to the conclusion that same-sexuality, if it is for biological reasons, is what you are. Such people were perceived as 'real' homosexuals. Whereas same-sexuality caused by social factors is seen as something you become, something you can choose to be or not to be. This idea is going to be very important when it comes to the question of changing or 'correcting' someones homosexual orientation.

What additionally comes into play within this context is the relationship between sexual orientation and sexual identity. We briefly touched upon this topic in the previous chapter. Sexual identity and sexual orientation are strongly connected to each other. Sexual orientation is part of one's sexual identity. At the same time the sexual self-perception and identification has an impact on how sexual orientation is defined. Am I 'homosexual' because I am in love with a transgender man who has not been operated yet? Do I become heterosexual only after his surgery? What about two people who biologically were defined as 'female' but consider themselves as different genders beyond the societal options of binary male/female differentiation? Should they still be called same-sexual? Can modes of third sex or third gender, which do exist in several ethnic groups, be characterised as tolerance towards 'homosexuality' or is it rather an expression of the acceptance of multiple genders? (cf. Lang 1997, Lewin/William 2002a: 8f).

This chapter will do a more dense investigation of the ideas around the origin of same-sexuality as a social phenomenon, a biologically-caused development, and finally as something in between those two explanations.

3.1. A social thing? Lesbian and gay lifestyle theories

According to the interviews there are several social reasons that cause people to engage in same-sex acts. One of those reasons was the idea that homosexuality is kind of a lifestyle that people want to try out.

Homosexuality I would say, is the ignorance of people who want to try out all those things (TM: 56-57).

Yah sometimes you know in life we are so curious. We have to experience things. As I have said. Not everyone is homosexual of those who say they are homosexual. It is just because they want to experience those things (M8: 121-123).

These two citations express the same idea: people are not 'real' homosexuals but just want to try it out, or experience same-sexualities. But when it comes to *how* those two statements express this idea, there is a huge difference. Whereas the first labels same-sex intimacies as 'ignorance', the second statement is a simple observation. The second citation further distinguishes between those who *really are* 'homosexual' and those who *pretend* to be 'homosexual'.

Many interviewees mentioned the idea of homosexuality being a kind of life style, something people want to 'try out'. This image is refined further by the belief that those people are not 'real' homosexuals (cf. P3: 53-54). McIntosh also discusses theories about when a person can be defined as a 'real' homosexual. She writes:

To cover the cases where the symptoms of behaviour or of felt attraction do not match the diagnosis, other writers have referred to an adolescent homosexual phase or have used such terms as 'latent homosexual' or 'pseudo homosexual' (McIntosh 1996: 34).

In the interviews, this belief further contained the idea that at the end of the day those 'false homosexuals' will come back to 'normal'. They will have heterosexual relationships, will be married and have kids (cf. M8: 89-93, 97-102). Same-sexuality thus is seen as a period of life, nothing ultimate as the following citation portrays:

Of course they all think that I am still young and grow up and get a man and get married and have my own kids and stuff. But as I was growing, now they see: okay this is a lesbian. They couldn't change anything about that because I grew up like that (DS: 123-126).

I think they [two feminine girls] are more accepted. (...) It is seen as a phase if two feminine girls are together (CC: 145-147).

Apart from the very problematic imagination that there is something such as 'real' and 'false' 'homosexuality', the argument portrayed in the upper citations also bears the thought that 'homosexuality' is kind of a choice. As Denise explains, the perception that same-sexuality is a choice and not a biological thing is one of the sources of homophobic behaviour:

I think the reason why it is so ostracised in Africa is because people think that it is not genetic. Or the behaviour is abnormal because they try to be a certain type of thing that they are not (D: 177-178).

The perception of homosexuality as a lifestyle, as something you can choose to be or not, seems to be a very public argument used against homosexual people who in their turn emphasized the fact that: "Being gay and lesbian is not something we do – it is who we are. It is not a lifestyle" (SL: 237-240). I will discuss the problematic of this counter position as well as the analytical consequences resulting from this 'doing' versus 'being'-differentiation in chapter V and VII of this work.

3.2. Disappointment, bad experiences with the opposite sex and lack of discipline

According to some interviewee's explanation people become homosexual because something bad has happened in their lives or they had been disappointed by a person of the opposite sex and therefore now prefer homosexual relationships.

You can look at people and can wonder why?... Maybe there was something happening in their life or... I do not personally understand why two men or two women want to go together when it is not meant to be (T: 14-16).

Sometimes like most of those people, if ever the person was disappointed by a guy or a girl, then she decides, you know. There are few gay people or lesbians in this world (P3: 53-54).

The idea that bad experiences with the opposite sex lead people to same-sex relationships is a very interesting hypothesis.

Doris Burtscher remarked, especially in patriarchal societies, where women after marriage are completely subordinated to and often suppressed by their husbands, more and more women prefer not to marry at all (cf. DB: 261-265). According to some interviews even AIDS has an impact on women deciding not to be with men because the risk of infection in heterosexual relationships seemingly is higher than among lesbian couples (cf. MK: 423-425, CC: 565-572).³⁵

Whether these really are crucial reasons for people to prefer same-sex relationships to heterosexual relationship is still unexplored and therefore questionable. However, these ideas exist in public discourse and therefore also produce reality to some extent. Apart from that, there also exist political reasons why some women, especially feminists, prefer same-sexual relationships. In chapter VI we will see how increasing liberalism among women has questioned the concept of patriarchal African masculinity – a concept which legitimises violence against effeminate men, lesbians and women.

Sexuality between the same sex thus is perceived as a result of the loss of (patriarchal) traditional values in education and emerging liberalism. The Post-Apartheid constitution of South Africa is only one of the signs of this process. According to one person I interviewed, liberalism and lack of responsibilities are reason why nowadays there are so many gay people.

I am sure that that is why now there are many more gays and lesbians. It's because South African people they think, you know, this is a free country. There is no one who is stopped from doing whatever they want to do (P3: 99-102).

Missing restrictions and limitations, the liberality of the South African constitution stands in stark contrast to the moral values of church and tradition. This discrepancy and the difficulty to reconcile South African national identity with (African?) traditional or religious identity came up in several interviews.

It is a taboo to me as to Africans. But in the city Johannesburg, there is a lot of stuff. But I don't... I don't have no need. But as a democratic country we will try to the human beings to say to them: You can do whatever we feel like doing. For you as you are a woman now you wanna have sex with another woman they say, our democratic right that has been voted for, may allow you to do such. But me personally, I would never do it. It's forbidden in the Bible and in most religion... It is in conflict with most religion (L: 21-26).

Broken down from state level to family level the idea exists that 'right' education might prevent children from becoming homosexual. Same-sexual involvement is thus perceived as a lack of education: "Cause some of them, there is no one who is telling them: You know this is not right" (P3: 217-218).

³⁵ Since the mid-1980s the biomedical discourse declared lesbians as least at risk of HIV contamination. Most lesbian sex practises, apart from sharing sex toys, unprotected cunnilingus during menstruation or bleeding are perceived as safe (cf. Richardson 2000: 38f). However, as Richardson points out, this perception also bears the risk of downplaying or even neglecting any likelihood of HIV transmission among women having sex with women, which in turn increases the possibility of infection. For a critical analysis see Richardson (2000).

The opposition between traditional values and the new Constitution of South Africa as well as the idea that homosexuality is not part of 'African' culture will be crucial in chapter IV.

3.3. Homosexual prostitution, forced sexuality and same-sex environments

Economic reasons or social pressure can bring people to engage in same-sex encounters. According to the interviews, people are involved in homosexual relationships or sex because homosexual prostitution is one way of earning money and thus being able to sustain a family or achieve a better standard of living (cf. P3: 65-66). As discussed in chapter two, those commercial sex workers, don't necessarily perceive themselves as 'homosexuals' even though they have 'sex' with the same sex (cf. DB: 107-109). Also Rubin (cf. 2002: 34f) writes about the situation of a male prostitute who gets money for engaging in same-sexual activity and does not perceive himself as 'homosexual' but considers the man who makes use of his service as 'homosexual'.

However, the perspective on same-sexual prostitution as a possible way to economic well being further is connected to South Africa's past and the still pertinent difference between black and white in terms of economic positions. South Africa went over a long history of racial segregation that included distinct social and economic stratification. Many of the aspects of stratification and impacts from Apartheid are still visible today (cf. Gevisser 1995: 82). As Catherine puts it, "(...) class is often defined by race because of our past" (CC: 132). This intersection between race and class in consequence is also connected to the idea of forced homosexuality. It thus implies a racial-hierarchical component that manifests itself in bi-racial relationships. White women are said to be persuading black woman to be in a relationship (cf. D: 353-360). As Aarmo (1999: 255) writes: "Homosexuality is seen as an import product to Africa by foreigners. Black people do it only because of the money they get for sex".

The impact of economic factors is of particular interest because homosexuality is rumoured to be a characteristic of rich people. Several interviews mentioned the idea that homosexuality is something that mainly exists or at least is much more accepted among economically well situated people (cf. CC: 233-238).

Another reason why people finally land up in homosexual relationships apparently is group pressure. A homosexual-friendly social environment can cause someone to try out homosexuality even though one isn't really interested in doing so:

(...)sometimes it can be a pressure, you see. If all my friends are lesbians the way they talk about it... you know they feel like, they say it is something you can enjoy in your lifetime. And (...) somewhere at the end I end up saying I should just try this thing, maybe it is nice, you know. And even if I don't enjoy it, now because I have agreed to do it, I have to do it even if I

don't want, you see. It is not fair! I think it is not something that should be... allowed to be happening (P3: 66-71).

Such kind of group pressure especially occurs in places where there is only one sex, such as boarding schools, the army, prisons. Several interviewees were of the opinion that homosexuality has its origin in situations...

(...) where there is a lack of the opposite sex, maybe like in army, in monastery or nunnery. Maybe in a place where they can't find someone of opposite sex to pair with (as it should be) then people would start having homosexual relations. Because that is what people want to do: have sex... it's a natural instinct (T: 26-29).

Army, monastery, nunnery, but also prisons and boarding schools were named as places where people more likely start having sexual relationships with the same sex. Besides the question if sex is a natural instinct or not, there is no doubt that human beings are social beings and therefore to some extent have the need for social and emotional warmth and closeness.

One interview carries this thought further into a hypothesis of how homosexuality started as a historical practise:

They put you away and lock you up in jail and your wife is not here and probably you got there for life and as you will be... we are human beings, you like to have sex and you are only turn up with men, then you can try that things on you. Have sex with fellow men there in prison... And (...) when the time came to get out and come back into community, (...) I think like they tried a new thing and they feel like everything is good and I like it. So they continue doing those things. (...) That is my own theory how those things started. I am not sure, how it started (L: 165-175).

3.4. A biological thing?

Apart from social factors people in the interviews also considered biological factors such as hormones or genes as causes of same-sexual desire. Seidman (1996: 14) writes:

For much of this [20th] century, homosexuality was seen as a natural, biologically rooted, psychological condition. It was said to define an individual's biological, psychological, and even social nature. It was often assumed that some people were simply born homosexual or become homosexual at a very early age.

The idea that the origin of his sexual orientation is biological rather than social was carefully expressed by Johan: "Its difficult to say. I believe I was born that way, I think it is genetic. I don't think it is something that you can acquire along the way" (JDW: 202-216).

As already outlined before, 'homosexuality' as something biologically determined also was used to counter the 'homosexuality as a lifestyle-argument'.

For me to be a lesbian it is not about choice. If it was a choice believe me I don't would be a lesbian. (...) So for me to be a lesbian it is either you like it or not but you cannot ignore the fact that I am a lesbian, either they change people or not. Either they rape me or do whatever... And, it won't change the fact that I am a lesbian because it is not my choice, you know (DS: 100-106).

Both statements consider same-sexuality as resulting out of biological factors. However, the juxtaposition of those two statements is interesting as it shows that the same argument becomes much more manifest in the context of political legitimization strategies of same-sexuality.

Several of the 'non-homosexual' interview partners had their theories about how children with biological predisposition for 'homosexuality' can be recognised. Such children were described to behave differently from other children and usually act in a manner that is typical for children of the opposite sex:

As I have said there are some other kids, you can see them when you grow up (...) This guy, this little boy is not playing with guns, with cars, he plays with puppies and whatever. (laughs) (...) You know, instead of buying her a puppy and him a gun and a scooter, you can rather go buying poppies. You can't match them on a thing. That's a biological thing (M8: 229-236).

This perception is not only articulated by non-homosexual people but also often comes up in gay and lesbian biographies.

I was inclined to my feministic qualities. I was very artistic, I studied music, I played the piano at school, I was very involved in arts and culture, so I didn't do the typical heterosexual things that boys did. When they were playing sports I studied the piano (...). A lot of things that I did were more feminine inclined to my emotional side than what boys usually should do or had to do. In that sense I felt a bit out, out of the crowd, because I enjoyed music a lot and I enjoyed art a lot and because I was always very good friends with girls instead of boys. I had a very close presence towards girls because I got in touch with my feminine side. So I had a lot of girls as friends more than boys (JDW: 75-83).

Yah since I was young I'll tell you because I was like five. There was five boys. I was the only girl. And I am not saying because of them or anything that is why I am lesbian. I just don't feel anything for boys. You know. I just thought okay, I am also like this, my brothers. Because I didn't see any difference in doing things, doing things the same (DS: 111-114).

Very similar accounts are given by Morgan and Wieringa (cf. 2005: 68f, 128f, 200f, 268f). Most of the tommy boy's life stories presented in their book include some form of boyish behaviour such as playing soccer, lolling around with boys or being bored by 'girls' stuff', that started from early childhood.

As we will see in chapter VII, the biology-argument, this 'naturalisation' of 'homosexuality' by 'homosexual' people sometimes happens in a very essentialist manner that equally needs to be challenged. All the more, considering the fact that the argument saying homosexuality is due to biological factors such as 'deviant' genes or hormone levels can also head off into another direction, as we are going to see immediately.

3.5. Diagnosis: 'homosexual'

"To me it is like a sickness", was the introduction to one of the remarks offered by an elderly lady from Cape Town (HIS4: 71):

Okay. It is like when you got cancer (...) To me I can't believe that you are born with it, okay. You are not born with it, okay, something that just sort of automatically. The chromosomes or whatever in your body. Female organs and male organs or whatever (...) we all got the same chromosomes. They are healthy now in their body, and at the end of the day it doesn't work out, you know what I am saying. So it is almost like a cancer really, you get, like a leukaemia. Where the one source over-covers the one source (...). To me homosexuality is the same (HIS4: 73-81).

(...) it's in-heritage because you might, your kids might not have it then your grandchildren might have it then your great grandchildren might have it. It's a generation sort of thing (HIS4: 85-86).

These citations show how biological sciolism is used to construct a theory about the origin of same-sexuality. 'Homosexuality' is constructed as a 'disease' and thus is a pathological behaviour. Further this statement once again approves that biology and natural science still have a strong position within the discourse of sexualities.

In other interviews the perception of homosexuality as a kind of disease might not be that obvious but still noticeable. For example when people were referring to heterosexual orientations as 'healthy' or 'normal' (cf. L: 30, 72-77, 105). In consequence of a binary opposed perception of sex and sexual orientation, homosexuality is assigned to be 'unhealthy' and abnormal.

Then there is a number of statements that characterise homosexuals to be psychologically confused, insane or disturbed (cf. L: 50, T: 51-52, P3: 194-195). As Laurent explains:

(...) some people, they believe, they are only sick in their... mentally sick or sick in their mind. Some people they think so. Rural people especially. They think that gay people like are possessed by the bad spirits they think that threw the repetition of prayers they are going to change (L: 72-77).

The idea that 'homosexuals' are possessed by bad spirits or a product of witchcraft was also pointed out by Epprecht (cf. 1998: 636) and Reid (cf. 1999). Aarmo explains that in some cases homosexuals are even accused to be witches themselves, an assumption that can have fatal consequences. She (1999: 265) resumes:

There will always be some people who do not 'fit' into the cultural norms. Such a person is suspected of being possessed by an evil spirit or of being a witch. Rituals must be performed to make the person conform to the norms. If this is not successful, the person must be evicted from the community of killed because she or he poses a threat to the collectivity. Homosexuality is explained as possession by a spirit of the opposite sex.

Again, such imaginations include a lot of social constructions of disease and illness, which shows that there is not always a clear line between biological and social factors that lead to same-sexual desires.

Résumé

The question of the origin of 'homosexuality' was one of the most central subjects for the 'homosexuals' as well as for the 'non-homosexuals' that were interviewed. Within the history of human science this question goes down as the dispute between two major paradigms: according to social constructionist views, homosexual identity must be embedded in historical and regional circumstances; essentialism, on the other hand, seeks to find a deeper trans-historical determinant of homosexuality such as biology (cf. Hoad 2007: xvii).

Most of the interviewees offered to give their own speculation about how homosexuality emerges. Still, many times people expressed doubts about their own theories and whether they could be applied for each and every person who engages in same-sex acts (cf. D: 177-182, L: 291-292, JDW: 202-216, MK: 378-383). In turn several respondents were interested in my personal point of view. To them, someone who is doing research on this topic must know the answer to such an elementary question. My answer, however, tended to be a 'Nothing is yet scientifically proved'-excuse. Nevertheless the conversations show how diverse and at the same time ideologically weighted the ideas and different theories around the causes of same-sexuality are. The people's brisk interest in this topic points out that the origin of same-sexuality has an important significance within the discourse of sexualities. One of the questions this work seeks to answer, is *why* the origin of this certain sexual identity has become so important? Not for no reason there hardly exist any considerations about why people are 'heterosexual'.

To conclude, I want to resume Johan's thoughts about how people become 'homosexual':

Certainly everyone of us gets born genetically with a certain in-script and it depends usually in life on how we improve our intellectual capabilities, how we improve our mental capabilities and how we can actually balance our intellect and mental side in mind between our heart and emotional feelings. It is difficult for me to think where homosexuality comes from. I certainly think that it is something that has so many different combinations of things happening at once that it is difficult to say (...) where does homosexuality come from or lesbianism for that matter (JDW: 202-216).

Relying to what Johan was saying, in the end, sexual orientation seems to be a combination of many different elements. Thus it is hard to put homosexuality down to exclusively biological, social or any other reason. To a great extend this fact is also related to the acknowledgement that there is not only one single type of homosexuality but a plurality of homosexualities.

**PART TWO:
ARGUMENTATIONS**

CHAPTER IV: 'A WESTERN THING, A WHITE THING' – THE 'UN-AFRICAN'-ARUGMENT

In her article, 'How Homosexuality became 'un-African'', Aarmo (cf. 1999: 262) analyses the media discourse on homosexuality in Zimbabwe after President Mugabe's famous speech at the Zimbabwean International Book Fair in 1995, where he compared homosexuals to animals and declared homosexual acts to be 'un-African'. Aarmo writes:

Much of the arguments focused on the homosexual threat to the institution of the family, because homosexuals allegedly do not get children. Black homosexuals were accused of 'doing it for money', and of being seduced by white people. They were lumped together with child abusers, rapists, serial killers, and other kinds of people performing perversions and crimes. Homosexuality was described as a taboo in 'our cherished culture,' and further as 'sinful, dirty, shameful, unchristian, alien to African culture.' It was said to be a white 'thing' imposed on blacks, contribution to the damage and delay of black culture and its values, a result of colonialism and the 'Western' influence of today (Aarmo 1999: 263f).

More than fifteen years have passed since those ideas were expressed in Zimbabwean newspapers. Mugabe's public statements against homosexuality caused an outbreak and were largely discussed within the international LGBTIQ community. Still today, the argument of homosexuality being something 'un-African' is dominant in current debates on same-sexuality not only in Zimbabwe but in South Africa and many other African countries as well (cf. Hoad 2007: xii, Gevisser 1999: 961). Several of my interviews confirmed the idea that homosexuality is a 'Western thing' from Europe or America (TM: 93-101, MK: 51-59, CC: 320-328, D:37-47, P7: 10-19, 90-93). Furthermore this view came along with the impression that same-sexuality in general is more accepted in Europe than in Africa (cf. P7: 228-229, JDW: 21-27) – a picture that seems to enforce the idea that initially there was no homosexuality in African cultures.

The following chapter will analyse this idea, used as an argument against same-sex practices. First, we will get in contact with a concept of 'African traditional culture' and have a look at same-sex practises in colonial and pre-colonial history of Southern Africa. Thereby I refer to authors such as Epprecht, Aarmo and Kendall. Even though their works are focused on Zimbabwe and Lesotho, I follow Epprecht arguing 'that there are parallels' especially among anglo-phone African countries (cf. Epprecht 2008: 29).³⁶ The last part of this chapter will illustrate the situation of 'homosexuals' in Post-Apartheid South Africa – socially as well as juridically defined by the new constitution.

³⁶ Additionally it makes not much sense to strictly rely on today's national frontiers when talking about same-sexualities in pre-colonial Africa.

4.1. Homosexuality – the continuance of 'Western' colonialism?

We already came to the point saying that 'homosexuality' indeed is a very young concept, not only in an African context but also in a European context. Regarding this information, the argument of 'homosexuality' being something 'un-African' has two very different modes of interpretation as Martina Kopf points out correctly (cf. MK: 192-207). First, the argument can be seen as an emancipatory project typical for a post-colonial society expressing the need to find autonomous 'African' expressions for 'African' same-sexual practices. Second, homosexuality being something 'un-African' can also be used to convey a static concept of 'African' culture that is essentially different from 'Western' culture. The latter perspective frequently contains a pack of negative implications. Some of them perceive homosexuality as a threat to traditional African values and some others even state that homosexuality is kind of a continuance of Western colonisation as the following citations demonstrate:

For me, I have always said that everything comes from the Occident: the bombs, the weapons, the homosexuals... (TM: 93-94).³⁷

Here in Africa, we are ordered about, we are directed by the Occident. Because in Africa, people have limited resources. We tend to follow the occidental influence. But as Africans, we should know that there are histories which can be adopted and histories which cannot be adopted. So we have to stay away from... bombs and bad things (TM: 101-105).³⁸

The idea of 'Western' imperialism imposing 'Western' norms upon 'African' traditions has also been noticed by Hoad (cf. 2007: xvii). Furthermore, this is no Africa-specific perception but applicable to other countries that experienced colonialism and missionary purpose, such as India and Northern America (cf. Berghold 2005: 17, 31, 62, Ryan 2003: 40). In some cases this argument is accompanied by the theory that HIV too is a 'Western thing' (cf. TM: 42-46). As Doris Burtscher points out, some victimising argumentations even go as far as stating that HIV was brought into Africa with the purpose of depleting the African population (cf. DB: 235-247). Alternatively, not all interview statements that used the 'un-African'-argument implied such negative judgements. Some of them even appreciated the idea of accepting 'modern' and 'alternative' ways of living (cf. P7: 90-93).

Still, Aarmo's accurate collection of arguments cited above shows that the discussion on 'homosexuality' in many cases does not stay on a merely theoretical level but goes far further than that. Homosexuality not only is seen as something 'un-African', it is perceived even as a

³⁷ Original text: "Non enfaite pour moi, enfaite j'ai toujours dis, tout viens de l'occident: les bombes, les armes, les homosexuels..."

³⁸ Original text: "Alors l'Afrique ici, nous sommes... nous sommes commandés, nous sommes dirigés par les occidentaux. Alors en Afrique les gens sont un peu limité par des choses. Nous suivons plus l'influence d'occidentaux. Nous recopions les occidentaux. Mais nous étant Africains, nous devons savoir que l'homme ait des histoires qu'on peut recopier et des histoires on ne peut pas recopier. Donc on puisse... les bombes et les mauvaise, on puisse donc laisser."

threat to African tradition. This point of view is strongly based on a heteronormative thinking and not only excludes homosexual relationships but all kind of same-sex relationship patterns. “It is because of the patriarchal you know system, because of the culture, that... okay, a man is supposed to be with a woman and a woman is supposed to be with a man. There is nothing like gay (...)” (DS: 37-47).

How in South Africa ideas such as patriarchy and heteronormativity are used as an argument against same-sexualities will be outlined in chapter VI, the 'masculinity'-argument, which will also demonstrate the importance of initiation ceremonies to maintain traditional values, norms, social positions and institutions. As for the moment, it is important to acknowledge that a static concept of 'African traditional culture' exists, that it excludes same-sexual identities and, furthermore, that it is used as an argument against same-sexual acts. To continue within this logic, homosexuals are accused to be a threat to 'African culture' or as Aarmo (cf. 1999: 262) demonstrates in her article, even are called 'cultural prostitutes'. This idea was also expressed in the following interview-statements:

Okay, it [homosexuality] can be dangerous because above all it is not our culture, which is African (TM: 107-108).³⁹

They [homosexuals] bring a new culture (...) Which is not good for the next generation, for babies and the little brother. So this already is a bomb. A bomb to the society. This bomb will destroy the people. So this is already a huge problem, in short (TM: 144-148).⁴⁰

These two citations not only denote homosexuality to be something dangerous, but also raise the question what 'African culture' actually is.

4.2. Where has 'African traditional culture' gone?

First of all, the diversity of African cultures hardly can be subsumed under one single concept of African traditional culture. Nevertheless, the discussions on homosexuality being 'un-African' produce an image of a single African culture and thus construct discursive reality.

The following paragraphs portray the discursive concept of African culture or tradition.⁴¹

³⁹ Original text: “Oké ça peut être danger parce que d’abord ce n’est pas notre culture, étant africaine.”

⁴⁰ Original text: “Ils [les homosexuels] amènent une nouvelle culture (...) Qui n’est pas très bon pour la génération montante. Pour les bébés, pour le petit frère. Donc c’est déjà une bombe. Une bombe à la société. La bombe détruit en fait les gens. Donc c’est ça un très grand problème, bref.”

⁴¹ In course of the interviews the terms 'culture' and 'tradition' often were used interchangeably. Therefore I decided to use them as a complex that emphasises the correlation between both terms in a similar way as Radcliffe-Brown (1949: 510f) has put it: “The reality to which I regard the word 'culture' as applying is the process of cultural tradition, the process by which in a given social group or social class language, beliefs, ideas, aesthetic tastes, knowledge, skills and usages of many kinds are handed on ('tradition' means 'handing on') from person to person and from one generation to another”. In theory though, tradition and culture often are distinguished and seen as two separate concepts.

As will be outlined in chapter VI, patriarchal and heteronormative social structures and binary opposed gender structures are basic elements of this concept and often used to deny the existence of same-sexualities in traditional Africa.

Where I come from, I come from a village, (...) deep in the rural areas, we grow up normally under a mum and dad, a mother and a father. And we grew up nicely. There is no way you could see a man and another man being involved in a sexual relationship. As well for a woman with another woman. It is a taboo to me as to Africans (L: 18-21).

We can call the process of defining an identity upon saying what it is not, instead of describing what it is 'negative identification process'. 'African traditional culture' is defined by dissociation of – in this case – 'Western culture'. Used as an argument against homosexuality, 'African traditional culture' likewise is put in opposition to 'Western modernity and technology'. Even though, as Aarmo (1999: 269) rightly remarks, being a black lesbian does not necessarily mean to be pro-Western. Still, "[w]e find this kind of homophobia within most nation states, but perhaps especially in the former colonies, where homosexuality is often conceived as an aspect of colonialism and Western imperialism" (Aarmo 1999: 255).

According to Martina Kopf (cf. 192-194) negative identification by demarcation of 'Western values' is a common process happening in most post-colonial societies. Aarmo (1999: 276) further links this idea to the process of nation building.

In public rhetoric black gay and lesbians come to represent the 'ultimate transgressors' of culture. Gay men and lesbian women contest the naturalness of masculinity and femininity as defined in the traditional male gender role. They 'betray' the 'laws' that demand procreation. (...) They thus serve as a 'perfect other' in a context where definitions of culture seem to be crucial for the construction of the modern Zimbabwean national identity.

Thereby Aarmo cites Yuval Davies' theory of constructing nationalism either by referring to a symbolic heritage such as language, religion, customs, traditions that further is defined as the essence of a nation, or by common origin. The second possibility, common origin, is difficult in Zimbabwe because of the diversity of ethnic groups that live in those countries (cf. Aarmo 1999: 255f). The same accounts for South Africa. National identity strongly refers to the idea of the African traditional family that is not compatible with same-sexual relationships. People in South Africa who openly express their 'deviant' sexual identity were accused to be 'ignorant' and 'creative' because they want to 'try out new things' (cf. TM: 56, L: 314).

When they [South Africans] see something that is released everything that is new, they want to have that thing. They always want to get involved with those things you know. They are always looking for better things, if something new comes along they want to be part of that thing (P3: 97-99).

Homosexuality too, is perceived as such a 'new' thing. The interviewee further explained how this curiosity leads people to 'destroy their own future':

It's because South African people they think, you know, this is a free country. There is no one who is stopped from doing whatever they want to do. So they think I can do whatever I feel like doing (...) I mean school kids, they are smoking, they do else whatever because they think they have the freedom but are destroying their own future. (...) sometimes you see those people. They end up regretting. Because, you know, maybe they want to have kids and they want have their own kids, especially women. But they can't because they are lesbians (...) (P3: 96-107).

This citation is very interesting as it accuses the South African constitution to promote the demise of 'African' traditional values. There will be more information regarding this issue later in this chapter. What is more important right now is the perception and idea of what tradition is. Laurent explained:

I think tradition is (...) a habit that has been kept on before, but also came before us. (...) I think tradition is one pertinent way of doing things, is the practices that have been performed on for a several amount of years and we used to be... that's not when we are doing it, you know, that's kind of automatically, it brakes out: You have to pray, you have to go to take a shower. You know that's tradition for me (L: 139-150).

To the question, if there can be 'creative' things in tradition Laurent came to the following conclusion: "But yeah in tradition there can be creativity but our traditions like most of us is a nation. It is very hard to come with new things, they stick to what their fore fellows have been doing. You know they are so exorbitant and strong, but yah" (L: 226-229).

Interestingly, Laurent characterises tradition as something very powerful that rather grimly 'sticks' to ancient habits. This picture, however, does not fit to several statements that express the loss of 'traditional values and morals', such as the waning importance of initiation schools (cf. P7: 309-317), the development of sexuality as commodity (cf. L: 368), the new patterns of family structures or alternative and non-normative gender identities, to name a few.

When it comes to maintaining a continuance of traditional values, education and initiation ceremonies play a significant role. The masculinity-chapter will amplify how initiation schools contribute to construct a 'heterosexual African male identity' that not only is in conflict with same-sexuality but perceives gay men and lesbian women as a threat to their masculinity.

4.3. The implantation of 'European homophobia' into 'African traditional culture'

As a matter of fact, many times when 'African tradition' or 'African culture' is used as an argument against homosexuality, God is called up for witness, and it certainly is no godhead that emanates from traditional African believes. However, most interviews did not either use the concept of African tradition or religion as an argument against homosexuality but referred to a mix of both of them. As Denise points out: "However, they always refer back to the Bible as UN-cultural. The Bible is also a European thing, something that was brought to Africa by missionaries. It is kind of a contradiction" (D: 50-55).

This citations shows that the construction of 'African culture' has largely been influenced by 'non-African' ideas such as the morals and values of Christianity which is the most dominant religion in South Africa. How religious morals and values are used as an argument against same-sexuality will be particularized in chapter V, the 'religion'-argument. Right now it is important to notice that the concept of African traditional culture is used against same-sex practices by declaring it to be 'Western' and, at the same time, refers to 'Western' religious values.

Concepts such as heterosexuality or monogamy are examples of 'Western values' that were 'imported' to Africa by missionaries. Robert Moffat, a British missionary who lived among the Zulu in South Africa, reports about the nakedness of the *ndebele* people: "I strongly recommended him [the king of the *ndebele*] to change the costume of his nation, and told him that naked men and women were a sight which grieved us: that God intended man to be covered (...)" (Father Prestage to Father Kerr, letter in 1891, AJ, U/9 after Sauerwein 1999: 62). This is not the only one example for missionary's reaction on 'primitive' culture. Concerning same-sexual behaviour most missionary's writings tend to circumscribe or condemn what they called 'sodomite acts'. "The language used varies form 'disgraceful sin' to 'unnatural acts' to 'unbridled heathen obscenity' to 'shameful passions'" (Hoad 2007: 7).

But same-sex practices not only were a threat to Christianity and therefore feared by missionaries. Same-sex behaviour was also used to legitimate white intrusion and the colonial regime. McClintoc (cf. 1995: 22) points out that colonial conquest has a lot of similarities to sexual appropriation. Sexualised terminology such as the 'penetration' of 'virgin' land as well as the baptising act of naming new found land are some examples of such parallels between sexuality and colonialism. Further, exotic pictures of 'primitive' sexual behaviour in the colonies were used to prove European superiority. "Another area to explore is the potential instrumentality of the perceived presence of 'deviant' sexual practices in the justification of extending colonial rule" (Hoad 2007: xx, 1).

The 'instrumentality' of homosexuality for colonial rule can be described as follows: At the end of the 19th century homosexual practises were about to become official in many European countries. Famous European writers such as Oscar Wilde and Gustav Flaubert broached the issue of homosexuality in their works (cf. Hayes 2000: 23ff). As a dissociation of such 'immoral' acts, the colonial powers defined homosexuality as a 'primitive' African tradition that needed to be criminalized⁴². „The advent of colonial rule then made deviation from the heterosexual norm explicit and criminal“ (Epprecht 2001: 122, cf. Gevisser 1999: 962). Ac-

⁴² For a more detailed description and analysis of how South African's legal system treated 'homosexual' alias 'sodomite' acts see Botha and Cameron's article (1997) in West and Green's book 'Sociolegal control of homosexuality: a multi-nation comparison'.

According to Castro Varela and Dhawan (cf. 2009: 71ff) the colonies served as a projection surface of all the denied problems of the West. Deviant sexuality was one of those problems that were used to legitimate colonial power. The image of 'perverse' sexual behaviour, sexual laxity, excess and eroticism of indigenous women served as a counter image to moralistic, monogamous, passive and secluded lives of Western women (cf. McClintoc 1995: 22, Stoler 2003: 43f). Through this, 'Western' countries were able to save their moral predominance. The committal of same-sex activities thus was perceived as primitive and served to prove indigenous sustainability (cf. Hayes 2000: 34f and Epprecht 2001: 131).

In this context, president Mugabe's statement that homosexuality is a 'Western' invention suddenly gets another significance. Christian moral values and colonial legitimization strategies have done 'effective' work to characterise homosexualities and same-sex practices as something evil and primitive. When Mugabe uses Christian arguments to revolt against homosexuality as a colonial import he completely overlooks the links between Christian missionaries and colonial regime. Why didn't he condemn Christianity as something 'un-African'? One possible answer is delivered by Aarmo (1999: 264) who writes:

The conceptualization of sexuality, procreation, and gender roles found in this tradition 'fits' the definitions of gender and sexualities required in Zimbabwean nationalism. Christian sexual morality and the value of children in traditional society is used to exclude homosexual practices.

According to this citation, a patriarchal and heteronormative mindset was used to define 'African' tradition – a concept that became increasingly important in times of the nationalist movement and liberation from 'Western' dominance. Also Epprecht (cf. 2005: 260) gives important information concerning this topic: Robert Mugabe as well as other national leaders have been educated in missionary schools and therefore strongly believe in Christian faith and morals.

Already four years earlier Epprecht (2001: 133) remarked that not homosexuality but homophobia was introduced to Africa by white men during colonialism.⁴³ And also Kendall (1999: 174) comes to the conclusion "(...) that homophobia is far more likely to qualify as 'un-African' than (if it were not essentialist to use such a word) homosexuality, that homophobia is the product of peculiar (Western or northern-hemisphere) cultures".

It thus can be said that 'Western' homophobia was implemented into the concept of 'African traditional culture'. This homophobia consequently blinds out ever existing and partially even accepted institutions of 'traditional' same-sexuality in another history of 'African culture'.

⁴³ Hayes (2000: 35) remarks that homosexuality cannot be constructed without constructing heterosexuality at the same time. Accordingly, colonialism cannot import the concept of homosexuality to Africa without indirectly importing the concept of heterosexuality as well.

4.4. Another history: Same-sex institutions in pre-colonial Africa

The existence of same-sex practices in several African ethnic groups before the European intrusion is scientifically proven (cf. Gevisser 1999: 961f, Miescher 2004: 250).

And then we have tribes in Africa where they have a queen that has wives and everything else. We had homosexual princes, but that is not seen as homosexual. I mean we have had men kings that were in polygamous relationships and then they had between ten and something wives in history. (...) Obviously the wives would live in a compound together and em indulging in homosexual acts (...) [b]ecause they only had one husband. Even in the mines they had homosexuality. So it is not a new thing, but it is used as an excuse. As a thing that Europeans brought to South Africa (D: 37-47).

As Denise accounted, there are several examples of same-sexuality in African history. Nevertheless those acts are not perceived as 'homosexuality'. According to Epprecht (1998: 632f) one of the reasons why homosexuality often is denied in oral history is because people do not know what 'homosexuality' is and thus do not label such acts as 'homosexual' (cf. MK: 76-85). Denise came to the same conclusion when I asked her how the 'homosexuality is un-African'-argument can sustain given the historical evidence of pre-colonial same-sexualities:

I have no idea. Because well they look at it as culture, but it is not. Because the queen herself is not perceived as a woman she is perceived as a man in a woman's body, which is somehow homosexual. I mean really. It can be seen as transgendered or anything else. But people, they just don't want to label it as gay (D: 50-53).

What finds expression in this citation is the distinction between the queen's body (sex) and her social recognition as a man (gender). As we could see in chapter 2.5. the relation between sex and gender has an impact on the perception of same-sexuality. Denise's interpretation that the relationships between such 'false' kings and their wives can be defined as 'homosexual' is far too simple as it blinds out the importance of gender. By doing so, she refers to an understanding of same-sexuality that is reduced to biological sex⁴⁴ as foundation of homo or heterosexual orientation. As Lang (cf. 1997: 74, 81) clarifies, the occurrence cited above is not about the institutionalisation of 'homosexuality' but rather an indicator of multiple genders.

Of course, regional differences within Africa exist. Multiple genders or same-sex practices were not institutionalised and accepted all over the whole African continent, but they existed in many pre-colonial ethnic groups. Murray and Roscoe's book 'Boy-Wives and Female Husbands' gives several examples of same-sex patterns in indigenous African ethnic groups (cf. Murray/Roscoe 2001). As we see, most of those societies have their own indigenous terminology to define same-sex behaviour. Therefore, people who engaged in such acts would not have called themselves 'homosexual', nor would their social environment have declared them as 'homosexuals'. Instead they used terms out of their own languages to describe same-sexuality

⁴⁴ As outlined in chapter 2.5. also biological sex is kind of a discursively produced, social construction.

(cf. Gevisser 1999: 961, Miescher 2004: 250, Gunkel 2009: 208). As we saw in chapter II, still today the usage of terms such as 'homosexual', 'lesbian' or 'gay' are rejected by some people to define their sexual identity (cf. Kendall 1999).

According to Martina Kopf (cf. MK: 266-278), one possibility to practise same-sexual desires without loosing acceptance of their social environment is by taking on traditional 'models' of same-sex identities. Sangomas, traditional healers, are one example of such a 'model' that has been existing in South Africa's past and still is practised today (cf. Miescher 2004: 250, Nkabinde 2008). The sangoma tradition redefines same-sexual desire to be a 'special gift' (cf. Reid 1999: 157). In her book, Nkunzi Zandile Nkabinde, a South African lesbian, describes her story as a traditional healer in South Africa (cf. Nkabinde 2008). By being a sangoma, she has found a way to combine her male and female qualities and to legitimate her sexuality in front of her social environment. Nkunzi Zandile is not the only one who has chosen this path (cf. Telela 1995: 35).

Another institutionalised model by which 'lesbian' women could live out their same-sexual desires are traditional marriages among women as indicated by Denise's citation above. Such kind of marriages have been existing in several African ethnic groups (cf. Kendall 1999: 167, Blackwood 2002: 75, Amadiume 1992). According to Amadiume, those 'female husbands' as they are called among the Ngobi in Nigeria, do not engage in any sexual relationships with their wives. Further Amadiume states in the introduction of her book that:

There are already some indicators that Black lesbians are using such prejudiced interpretations of African situations to justify their choices of sexual alternatives which have roots and meaning in the West. Black lesbians are, fore example, looking into African women's relationships and interpreting some as lesbian (Amadiume 1992:7).

Although I partially agree with Amadiume's critique that in some cases Western eyes falsely assumed homosexual practices, I completely go along with Martina Kopf's objection that in most cases we just do not know what really happened between those women (cf. MK: 286-302). Women-women marriages might not be an accurate indicator to reason that these women had sexual intercourse. Nevertheless, one should not definitely rule out the possibility of same-sexuality being part of these marriages (cf. Gunkel 2009: 210).

African men holding hands is another example of 'Western' eyes misinterpretation. 'Holding hands' in most cases is a common gesture among male friends in Africa. It is no clear indicator for 'more' happening between them (cf. DB: 176-181). As hand-holding is a rather unusual mannerism among male friendships in European countries, such acts among African men were interpreted as 'homosexual' behaviour. However, Burtscher accounts that there also

might be some kind of 'sexual experimentations' between African men that do not necessarily include a homosexual self-perception (cf. DB: 83-91).

As mentioned before, the idea that same-sexualities are 'un-African' implies the thought that homosexuality among black Africans is a new and 'modern' phenomenon.

4.5. 'Old Thing' – 'new thing' and the 'culture of discretion'

The perception that homosexuality is a 'new thing', came up in several interviews.

It's so much unusual, I not even want to be unique. Initially here in this country, South Africa, before we gained those independence (...) we never had such issues like in terms with, like especially our brothers or black brothers, there were no such things as gay things. But now (...) things are going so crazy, you know (L: 63-66).

This is a new concept in our YOUNG democratic country in South Africa (...) So in Southern African... it is something where we are not used to, something really we have never seen. Its unconventional, it does not know how it came here, something different (L: 116-119).

(...) probably for South Africa as a whole homosexuality is not accepted in religion and out of religion too. That's that... they're just spoken against. But South Africa is starting to experience more homosexuality now (T: 8-10).

Whereas these statements clearly assign homosexuality to be something 'unconventional' that 'South Africa now starts to experience', some other statements describe homosexuality to be something that has started a long time ago. "I believe that homosexuality once in the start of time that in Sodom and Gomorrah there was homosexuals there. That is not a new generation. Even though people now think it is new generation they are lying to themselves" (HIS7: 41-43). And one interview even recognises this contradiction:

It is just because here in South Africa it is something... it is new. It has been happening for a long while but it comes out recently, you know. (...) They experience it freely now, you know. People were not free in those days... (M8: 140-144).

This argument explains that even though same-sexuality has been existing for a long time, it now expresses itself more openly. By the end of Apartheid, people more and more started to demonstrate their sexual identity in public, whereas before, same-sexuality either was practised under the guise of accepted institutions or took place secretly. This leads to another very important concept, namely the 'culture of discretion'.

Another way to understand the silence on same-sex issues has been issued by Epprecht (1998). In his article he explains the very common 'don't ask, don't tell – technique' in Zimbabwe. This means that, as long as nobody talks about it, it will be accepted. He states that in traditional Africa it was not at all common to talk about intimate subjects. „Indeed, homosexual behaviours among black Zimbabwean men remained deep in the closet (secret, compartmentalised, unmentionable) until the late 1980s“ (Epprecht 1998: 632). By 'intimate subject' Ep-

precht not only refers to sexuality but includes all kind of disapproving family issues that were strictly kept in silence. Epprecht (cf. 1998: 636) calls this way to cope with such situations '*de facto* tolerance of sexual eccentricities': By saying this he means that same-sex practices were 'accepted' as long as nobody openly talked about it, even if its existence was a commonly known fact.

'Culture of discretion' is a possibility to explain why same-sex practices in Africa often are denied. One of the interviewees came to the same conclusion:

P7: But long ago it has just been a secret. When you had that kind of relationship. They had to keep it a secret. Especially for black people. They wouldn't let people see what. **SK:** And nowadays? **P7:** Nowadays they can reveal it, but there are some people out there. There are people who just call them names and stuff but. Nowadays they just don't care (P7: 114-118).

The emergence of the first gay communities in Johannesburg's Township can be traced back to the 1980s (cf. Gevisser 1999: 962). Only since then a homosexual lifestyle, as we might know from Europe or America, became public in South African context. Weeks (1977: 35-37 after Rubin 2002: 38) writes on homosexual subcultures:

Homosexuality has everywhere existed, but it is only in some cultures that it has become structured into as sub-culture ... A sub-culture does not arise in a vacuum. There needs to be both the felt need for a collective solution to a problem (group access to sexuality in this case) and the possibility of its satisfaction. And it is the growth of towns with large groupings of people and relative anonymity which provides the possibly of both.

Several interviewees noticed the impression that present-day South Africa is experiencing much more homosexuality than in the past (cf. L: 8-14, T: 8-10). The new visibility of same-sexuality leads to new forms of homophobia (cf. Hoad 2007: xviii). Gevisser (1999: 962) concludes:

Mugabe is right about one thing: while homosexuality in Africa predates the colonization of the continent, the advent of a gay subculture - of people taking on identities as 'gay' and 'lesbian' and demanding their rights - is without doubt a new 'Western' import.

On the other hand 'culture of discretion' can also be applied as a strategy. Staying in the closet is a way to avoid social stigmatisation and the risk of becoming the target of hate crimes (cf. Rubin 2002: 30, Kendall 1999: 173). This is also one of the critiques addressed to the new constitution which prohibits discrimination against homosexuals only when they come out and exercise their right (cf. Cock 2003: 38). The new constitution and the proclamation of gay rights stand in contrast to the culture of discretion among traditional expressions of same-sexuality (cf. Gevisser 1999: 962) which opens up a dilemma in same-sex identity politics.

4.6. Post-Apartheid Constitution or how South Africa became a 'Western' country

The Interim Constitution of South Africa was implemented in 1994 after a long period of Apartheid and extreme social and racial segregation. It was the first constitution in the world that prohibited any kind of discrimination against people on base of their sexual orientation (cf. Cock 2003: 35). This confession towards same-sex practices in South Africa came to be known as 'the gay rights clause' which in further consequence, was implemented in the current Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996.

Tracing back history, the legal status of homosexuality during colonialism was race-dependant. As Epprecht (1998: 639ff) explains, in most of their colonies the British "(...) erected a dual legal system that differentiated between 'civilised' people on the one hand (Europeans, Asians, so-called Coloureds, and Africans who lived in town) and 'natives' on the other. Roman-Dutch law applied to the former while codified versions of 'customary' law applied to the latter". According to Botha and Cameron's historical revision of 'anti-sodomy'-law's handling in South Africa, this 'dual legal system' was maintained in times of Apartheid (cf. Botha/Cameron 1997: 13ff).

Racial segregation and discrimination also translated into gay communities. In 1982 the Gay Association of South Africa (GASA), the first national gay organisation, was founded (Gevisser 1995: 48f). Croucher (2002: 317) remarks:

Like many of the smaller, regional organisations that preceded it, GASA functioned primarily as a social meeting ground for white, middle-class gay men. In fact, GASA's mission statement emphasised the organisation's conscious decision to eschew politics, and to provide a 'non-militant non-political answer to gay needs'.

This apolitical position in times of Apartheid soon caused a stir about racial discrimination. As the case of Simon Nkoli shows, GASA did not identify with the situation of black gay men and therefore did not support its black members in their fight against the Apartheid regime.⁴⁵ The organisation's non-confrontational, racist and patriarchal characteristics lead to GASA's expulsion of the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA) in 1987.⁴⁶ In the late 1980s and early 90s more and more black gay and lesbian movements emerged and took political stances (cf. Croucher 2002: 318). Those organisations also were important during the transition phase and had influence on the formulation of the new Post-Apartheid Constitution of South Africa as we can see in its result:

⁴⁵ For more information on the case of Simon Nkoli see Gevisser 1995: 48ff, Cock 2003 and Mack 2005.

⁴⁶ Interestingly, only one year before at the ILGA XIII World conference in Copenhagen, they had changed their name from IGA to ILGA and thus officially recognised Lesbians as part of their organisation (cf. Careaga/Curzi 2009: 8).

The state may not unfairly discriminate directly or indirectly against anyone on one or more grounds, including race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996, Section 9, Clause 3).

The gay rights clause was accepted by all political parties except from the African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP) (cf. Botha/Cameron 1997: 29). Precondition for the implementation of the clause was the fact that already before the end of Apartheid, Lesbian and Gay organisations had started to cooperate with the African National Congress (ANC). As a result, issues such as sexual orientation were raising awareness within the ANC which in 1992 officially acknowledged gay rights (cf. Cock 2003: 36, Dunton/Palmberg 1996: 47).

The new constitution not only provided equal laws in terms of race and sexual orientation but in general was a very progressive approach to prohibit any kind of discrimination. As Johan describes:

There was a big tense with the end of Apartheid and especially since 1994 and the new constitution, there was an overall sense of equality. (...) I think in South Africa after the Apartheid with the new regime it definitely had a big impact because not only were people starting to feel equal between the different races and colours but also between sexualities. South Africa certainly was the first country in the world that introduced same privileges to same-sex relationships than any other country in the world (JDW: 242-255).

In regards to sexual rights, the 1996 South African constitution remains one of the most liberal constitutions in the world. The label of South Africa being a 'rainbow' nation symbolises acceptance and pride of the country's diversity. As Cock (2003: 36) states, "The 'rainbow' emerged (and remains) a strong collectivist and inclusive symbol defining unity among the diverse peoples of South Africa and a source of national pride".

The constitution also puts South Africa in special position among many other African countries that, in turn, have a very restrictive legislation concerning same-sexual acts (cf. Gevisser 1999: 961, Ryan 2003: 40). The South African liberal constitution even provokes 'homosexual' people from other African countries to migrate to South Africa, where they expect to experience more acceptance. Most of the time, however, they end up in townships where homophobia as well as xenophobia is prevalent (cf. SL: 409-418).

The interviews also thematised South Africa's exceptional role among other 'real' African countries (cf. DB: 26-31, MK: 121-136):

So gay normally in Africa is not allowed but here, South Africa, is the only place where those guys are safe (L: 13-14).

So whilst we have a very progressive constitution in this country and everybody thinks that it is wonderful, and it is, it is a wonderful constitution, but that is just a piece of paper and the realities of people are very different or can be very different. So it doesn't always translate. In this case it doesn't translate at all. All it does give us is some form of legal protection. But there of course is just in this country and then you have the rest of Africa which in some

places is extremely homophobic. In some places the death sentence is what you can get (SL: 14-31).

Additionally the first statement expresses that 'normally' in Africa homosexuality is not allowed. The South African constitution thus stands in direct opposition to the conception of what is 'normal' within the concept of 'African traditional culture' discussed above.

This circumstance raises the question whether research on homosexuality in South Africa, especially in an urban context, has a lot to do with 'homosexuality' or same-sexuality in 'general' Africa and whether the label 'African homosexuality' can be accurately applied on such a context (cf. DB: 128-132). Doris Burtscher is right in asking this question. The legal situation of homosexuality without any doubt has an impact on how homosexuality can be lived and this impact needs to be taken in consideration – in South Africa as well as in any other country. This is not about applying cultural relativism, but to contest the usage of the label 'African' in a South African context means to enforce the idea that something like a homogeneous 'African culture' exists. Furthermore, South African 'African' culture is presented as a contradiction to 'African culture'. Such arguments indirectly confirm the idea of African culture being something static and therefore deny African cultures' ability to change without losing their authenticity.

This leads to the question as to why South Africa has such an exceptional position regarding sexual rights. Why is it that South Africa became the first country that distinctly and officially condemned discrimination against 'homosexuals'? According to Graham Reid, one of the reasons for this successful South African gay rights movement was the possibility to put their concerns into a larger context of opposing any form of discrimination (cf. Cock 2003: 36). As he explains, the National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality (NCGLE), which was created in 1995 to coordinate and represent lesbian and gay issues in this fight for recognition, had to refer and use terms such as equality instead of explicitly speaking of gay rights (cf. Cock 2003: 37). Also Botha and Cameron (cf. 1997: 37) conclude that South Africa's new progressive constitution is the result of this specific history of legally justified discrimination.

Still, as a matter of fact, a lot of people agree to the perception that the South African constitution contradicts 'African traditional values'. This idea became obvious in several interview statements that criticise South African's freedom of choice as lack of limits and responsibilities:

They always fall like: Oh you know, everyone has the right to anything! They have a right to do this. But rights also have responsibilities. They don't remember that. They always forget it, they always think of their right, not the responsibilities (P3: 137-140).

They can't stop people from doing whatever they want, because they have the freedom of choice, see. Don't tell them, that... You know, there is nothing you can tell them because the constitution of this country says I have a freedom of choice to do whatever I want to do, see. So they can't stop them (P3: 161-169).

But as a democratic country we will try to the human beings to say to them: You can do whatever we feel like doing. For you as you are a woman now you wanna have sex with another woman they say, our democratic right that has been voted for, may allowed you to do such. But me personally, I would never do it. It's forbidden in the Bible and in most religion... (L: 18-26).

As we can see, even though the constitution in some cases successfully protects same-sexualities in South Africa, socially there are still many reservations expressed about such practises. Additionally, most lesbian and gay people don't really have any benefits, as day to day discrimination remains prevalent in certain social contexts (cf. Cock 2003: 39ff).

4.7. Constitution – more than just a piece of paper?

The values transported by the new constitution in a lot of cases do not reflect the people's values in society (cf. Careaga/Curzi 2009: 40). As a consequence, this produces a discrepancy between law and reality.

I think that South Africa was forced into accepting homosexuality. I think they were forced into doing it because of our constitution. Our constitution says you can't discriminate against anyone because of something you can't control like race, gender,... And then when the first case came up in gay-gay marriage, Africa was kind of forced to say yes because the constitution says yes. But I think had it been up to the personal decisions of the politicians, they would be completely against it. A lot of the politicians even the first time they made homophobic remarks. But I think South Africa was just like politically they were forced to kind of accept homosexuality but I think that they don't actually... It is not a really accepted thing (CC: 297-304).

But it, it only frowns me when it comes to safety as such because hate crimes are very high really in South Africa (LT: 233-234).

I think society in certain aspects and maybe still in certain areas of countries want to reform you religiously or socially through hospitals or medication or psychology, psychologies. So I think society in that sense although I think it is far less than it has been it still exists. They still want to change you like you are not normal. You are not normal when you are a homosexual so they would try to indoctrinate and intimidate you by religion or, well, social structures like chemicals or medication or drugs or psychology. So although I think it's been diminished by far and that the world has become more tolerate, I think it still exists (JDW: 315-321).

Ideas of 'healing' homosexual people, 'corrective' rape, social stigmatisation hate speech, the usage of words such as 'stabane', 'moffie', 'lessie' or other derogative notions are part of the reality of gay and lesbian lives in South Africa, especially in rural areas and townships. To many of them the South African constitution is no more than 'a piece of paper' as Sharon Ludwig has put it (cf. SL: 14-31).

The South African government walks a tightrope being accused of doing nothing against this unacceptable homosexual behaviour (cf. MK: 385-425) and at the same time being criticised

of denying hate crimes and not adhering to the sexual rights as they are announced in the constitution (cf. CC: 297-310, M8: 49-53, 274-278).

Often our government are not, you know, supportive enough for us to stop this violence against lesbian or women. It means there is nothing that South Africa at this time is critically in its view (...) like me and someone from African countries who is fighting for women rights or the legislation to have this beautiful life as a lesbian or as a gay person. I'm fighting, I am still fighting for that even though it is there you know. So there is not difference here in South Africa maybe and other African countries that are still fighting for the legislation or all the hate crime legislation or all of that. Because here in South Africa every now and again you hear that a lesbian has been raped or has been bashed or... although they think that our constitution is protecting us. But those are happening and the government continues doing anything. (...) It is not that they don't see a problem. They do see the problem but they deny and ignore it. Hence it's like happening each and every time, you know (DS: 70-90).

The paragraph shows that legal protection alone is no guarantee for safety. This reality-gap is caused by several discrepancies that stand in connection to the Post-Apartheid South African constitution: 'traditional African values' on the one hand and social experiences on the other. Even though many of the ideals in this constitution do not translate into social life, this constitution needs to be seen as an opportunity to open up minds and, in the long run, to lead towards more tolerance and acceptance, as one of the non-homosexual interviewees explains:

That's why I am saying, at the end of the day we must learn to respect somebody's choice. And at the same time, as I have said. Academically we are very good in education. But socially, we are still (...) far behind (M8: 274-278).

The discrepancy between 'traditional African values' and the constitution is further connected to the difference between rural and urban South Africa. Many interviewees expressed the fact that homosexuality is common in the big cities such as Johannesburg, Durban and Cape Town, but in rural areas, where most of them originally come from, openly lived homosexuality is unthinkable:

Yah, am basically it is a big difference if you are living in big cities like Cape Town or for instance Johannesburg or Durban or other cities. The area where I am from, the Free State and Bloemfontein is very much Afrikaans. (...) There is a big difference between social acceptance and a religious acceptance to what there is in bigger cities (JDW: 21-25).

But if you go there in Township and different places far away from this city, from Joburg. You know, there are many places and if you go and interview a black man (laughs), (...) They will not support it (P7: 239-245).

This rural-urban discrepancy is not an 'African' phenomenon but exists in 'Western' countries as well. It is due to the fact that 'African tradition and culture' is much more marked in a rural context as the following citation shows: "Yeah rural because of their culture and thinking. The tradition, that's... like the culture they grew up with. Like I said, it's supposed to be man and woman so don't..." (DS: 154-155). Even though it cannot be generalized that all people in rural areas are homohostile and all people in the cities are open and accepting (cf. LT: 198-208), there are several social stratifications that increase the possibility of homohostile incidences.

To a large extent, these social stratifications are connected to the past. Almost twenty years have passed since the beginning of the Anti-Apartheid struggle but race remains as a social marker far from being neutral:

[Y]ou can't even say it [racism] is gone away because for the most part it is the same thing as what I was saying before about your constitution or your paper that is saying one thing and the reality is being another thing. Racism in this country is still rough. There is still a lot of racism in this country, a lot. (...) It would be a complete error to state that racism is gone because Apartheid is gone. It is definitely not (SL: 143-150).

I think in South Africa, class is often defined by race because of our past and I think among the wealthier upper class people, I think that it [same-sexuality] is more accepted. It is more like a modern thing you know. It is okay. But then I think as you move lower down the class lines, people would become more conservative, less liberal and more conservative and I think there especially (...) it is accepted very negatively. It's actually not accepted at all and it is something to be ashamed of. And I also find it depends... I find that in the more English liberal side of things people are fine with it, but towards the more Afrikaans conservative side it is frowned upon. But I say most of the Africa doesn't accept it because most of South Africa is not liberal. Our constitution is liberal but socially people aren't (CC: 132-140).

Even though this calculation might not apply to all cases, the citations show how intermingled different social factors such as class, education, race and gender are with the acceptance of same-sex practices. The intersection between those structural features also might be the reason why homosexuality often is seen as a 'white thing' (cf. TM: 114-116) and therefore less accepted as a sexual identity for black people as Denise explains:

When you walk down say for example you go to Rosebank the shopping centre lane (...) you'd see gay white couples, but would never see black couples actually walking hand in hand. (...) People don't care if you are white and you are in a relationship. (...) I mean it is a European thing you know, then people just say. But if you are black and walking down the street, maybe two black people, a couple. And you are walking down the street, say maybe in Soweto (...) they literally like attack you (...) *** It is quite weird (D: 350-360).

Soweto is a township in the Southwest of Johannesburg where many black people were settled during times of Apartheid. Soweto remains a predominantly black township. Denise explains that the way township lesbians express their sexual identity is different from the way students at WITS (University of the Witwatersrand), who come from so-called 'proper families', express their sexual identity. Whereas the first often take on a butch⁴⁷ identity, the latter often do not exhibit a distinct 'lesbian' look (D: 154-159).

Apartheid has left a lot of marks on South Africa's society. Inter- or biracial relationships are rare even within gay social spaces (cf. CC: 66-73, 77-81). But apartheid has not only left social segregation but also awareness for political tools of segregation. It is no wonder that many interviews came up with comparing mechanisms of social discrimination to the mechanisms of discrimination of deviant sexualities.

⁴⁷ For more information about the meaning of 'butch' see chapter VI. Usually this term is used for very masculine-looking and -behaving lesbians.

I mean you can't say that em in black communities homosexuality is wrong you can't say that. It is the same as to say that it is wrong for a black person to be in a white person's presence. I think in that sense em for me it is abhorred really, to think that in black communities with their history of culture that homosexuality is still not accepted. It is the same principle as Apartheid, yes (JDW: 264-269).

And the same people who stand up and purport today, and preach this hateful message around homophobia, were the same people who are preaching that God wanted it this way. That God somehow felt that white people were the supreme race and we should stick to ourselves and live in our own areas and worship in our own churches (SL: 97-104).

Résumé

In this chapter we learned how a discursive concept of 'African traditional culture' that has a Christian, patriarchal and heteronormative base, is used to construct South African's national identity. Thereby the concept blinds out the existence of multiple genders and same-sex institutions in many pre-colonial African countries. Furthermore the values transported by this concept stand in opposition to ideas of 'Western' liberality and modernity and also are in conflict with certain regulations of the Post-Apartheid Constitution of South Africa 1996, the first constitution that prohibits discrimination against same-sexuality. Finally, we saw that even though legal protection is assured, South African society is not free of any forms of homophobia.

The following chapter will pick up the idea that instead of 'homosexuality', 'homophobia' is far more likely a colonial import and the product of evangelisation. Therefore we will have a closer look at Christian religious arguments used against same-sexual behaviour.

CHAPTER V: ADAM AND STEVE IN PARADISE – THE RELIGION-ARGUMENT

One of the most powerful arguments against homosexuality in Africa is religion. According to Hekma (cf. 2007: 159) homophobic elements in religion are common among most 'Third World' countries.⁴⁸ They are so powerful because religion is of high importance in the African context (cf. MK: 331-353).

5.1. Religion in Africa and elsewhere

As Martina Kopf points out, the position of religion is part of daily life in many African societies. Religious institutions such as churches often work as important social places. Thus many people participate in 'religious' activities. At the same time, however, this is no indicator that people in general are more religious than in Europe where many social activities were 'outsourced' from a religious context. The fact that religious institutions in Africa carry out important social tasks might be one explanation why secularism as well as atheism is scarcely spread among African countries (cf. MK: 331-353). Further, religious statements have a high influence on the perception of current public issues. Sexuality and homosexuality as well as AIDS are only some examples where the impact of religious morals becomes obvious (cf. DB: 590- 591, D: 214-217).

The two most important religions in the African context are Islam and Christianity (cf. MK: 230-235, D: 58-64). In the course of the past century, Islam and Christianity have largely spread over the continent (cf. Sanneh 2009: 15f, DB: 200-225). They became increasingly important and to some extent usurped or influenced traditional concepts of spirituality. Regarding Christianity, especially since the 1980s, the explosive diffusion of so-called 'African independent churches' preludes a new wave of religious fundamentalism accompanied by a high level of evangelisation (cf. Kamphausen 1999: 63f, Anderson 2001).

The religious landscape of South Africa is not homogeneous but consists of different religious beliefs and congregations as well as different traditions of churches. In South Africa almost 80% of the population is Christian (Statistics South Africa 2004: 28).⁴⁹ Therefore this work will focus on Christian arguments that are used against same-sexualities.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, Telela's (cf. 1995) article on lesbian coming out and religion in South Africa shows that even

⁴⁸ There has been much criticism around the term 'Third World' country as it is basing on a 'Western' concept of development.

⁴⁹ Yuval-Davis (2006: 5) draws attention to the fact that such categorisations can bear difficulties as people might commit to two religious believes, for example traditional forms of believes and Christianity.

though scriptures of Christianity, Hinduism and Islam may have different conceptions of same-sexual acts, the experiences of homophobia is very much the same.

For this work especially the 'Dutch reform church', a very dominant church among Afrikaans people, and the 'His People Church', an English church that strongly promotes family values will be central. Apart from that there also are 'gay churches' such as the 'Good Hope Metropolitan Community Church' in Cape Town (cf. *online source* 12) and the 'Hope and Unity Metropolitan Community Church' in Johannesburg (cf. Reid 1999). The idea of those Metropolitan Community Churches is to offer "(...) an environment for gays and lesbians to integrate their sexuality and faith" (Grace/Rhamey et al. 2007: 118). As Martina Kopf explains, religious institutions and churches play an important role in African societies; therefore, it is no wonder that gay and lesbian people also want to be religiously accepted (cf. MK: 370-377).

According to Sharon Ludwig, who is in the leadership at Good Hope MCC and responsible for pastoral care and the development coordination in Africa, many Churches in contemporary South Africa officially accept gay and lesbian members:

The Methodist church and many churches, Methodist church, Anglican church, up to that come to my mind, will make public statements and say: We fully accept our gay and lesbian membership. You are absolutely welcome in this space. And most of them mean it. But it also is very dependent on who the minister is in the particular church because even though the church issue's statement, the denomination issue's statement just say: We accept gay and lesbian people within our congregation. You might have a very homophobic minister in this specific church who has no problems, every now and again, preaching something about homophobia (SL: 165-175).

As Ludwig explains, there still are ministers in some churches who openly show their disregard. Also when it comes to questions such as 'gay-marriage', religious reality is still far from treating homosexual people equally (cf. SL 165-175, 197-208). The issue of 'gay churches' was also brought up in several interviews, most of the time regarded with suspicion as the two following citations express:

Strange sub-churches accept it. There is homosexual churches where they praise God and they say that they are Christians, but then they have changed certain verses and things that are said against homosexuality to suit themselves. So that's not good. But it will always be going to change. Things always have changed (T: 101-104).

But you know what the problem is. In these days there are so many churches, there are so many different names that sometimes I don't even understand. Some of those churches they are no true churches of God, they are pretending. So the church tells them, you know: if they think this thing makes you feel good. (...) That is what they tell each other (...) And you know what? If one goes to a certain church and in that church they preach against this bisexual

⁵⁰ For further information on same-sex practises in Muslim context I recommend books such as 'Hijab: Unveiling Queer Muslim Lives' (Hendricks 2009), Siraj's (2009) article 'The construction of the homosexual other by British Muslims heterosexuals', Shannahan's (2009) article on 'Sexual ethics, marriage, and sexual autonomy: the landscapes for Muslimat and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered Muslims', 'Islamic Homosexualities' by Stephen O. Murray and Will Roscoe (1997) and 'Homosexuality in Islam' by Scott Siraj al-Haq Kugle (2010).

people, they won't go there again. Or one of them comes here and the person finds us talking about them, you know, not liking it or something or we just say something that doesn't involve them, they feel pissed off and they won't come here again. Cause they know that it makes them feel guilty or very bad (P3: 256-265).

Those and many other statements show that people do not think that same-sex practices can be combined with faith. Before we look at the statements on how 'homosexual' people indeed manage to conceal their sexual orientation with their faith, we will first outline the most important religious arguments that are used to stigmatize homosexual behaviour.

5.2. Religion and homosexuality in Africa

First of all it must be said that religious arguments applied in an African context do not really differ from religious arguments against same-sex intimacies in other parts of the world. It rather makes sense to distinguish between the different religious denominations and beliefs than the countries where those beliefs are acted out (cf. MK: 319-328). As said already, what makes a difference is the fact that African societies are much more religiously soaked than most European societies and therefore religious arguments have a stronger impact than they can have in 'Western', tendentially secular countries. The importance of religion among other 'ideologies' is approved by Phumi Mtetwa, a South African 'lesbian':

Ideologies such as evangelical religion; retreat to tradition, ethnicity and tribalism; conservative forms of morality; etc., get multiple responses: solidarity groups, social capital, on the one side, and crime, domestic violence, poverty, disease and ignorance, in essence, on the other side (Careaga/Curzi 2009: 40).

As outlined in chapter IV, Africa has a long history of homophobic messaging. The missionaries imposed a set of 'Western' perceptions onto indigenous societies such as patriarchal thinking, binary structured gender-role systems and monogamous and heterosexual relationship patterns. According to Amadiume (cf. 1992: 119ff), formerly 'female' Gods were reinterpreted and became masculine because such beliefs were not compatible with male-centred Christian morals and values.⁵¹ Indeed, Christianity as well as Islam have strongly influenced indigenous African societies. The same accounts for same-sexuality.

The story of king Mwanga of Buganda shows that homophobic messaging too was part of the missionaries' moralising instructions (cf. Hoad 2007: 1-20). As a matter of fact, this story still has power in current discussion on (same-)sexuality in Uganda (cf. MK: 498-531). Today's leverage of the missionary's implementation of heterosexual morals into Africa is still visible as Ryan (2003: 38) explains:

Much of this homophobia lies in the Western influences that these cultures have had forced upon them throughout the centuries, as well as the influence of the moral teachings of organ-

⁵¹ Berghold (2005: 65) accounts the same for India.

ized religions. Their natural ways of life were indelibly altered by the imposition of what the western [sic!] world thought was civilized and righteous. (...) Many Christian denominations teach intolerance to homosexuality based on Biblical scriptures. In many of the African cultures both Islam and Catholicism play an important role in society (Ryan 2003: 38).

Such findings lead several scientists to the conclusion that not homosexuality but rather homophobia should be called a 'European import' (cf. Kendall 1999: 174, Epprecht 2001: 133). When we look at contemporary South Africa, the impression that religion in general does not appreciate homosexual practices came up in almost all interviews and thus seems to be a very common perception in South Africa:

South Africans... probably for South Africa as a whole, homosexuality is not accepted in religion and out of religion too. They're just spoken against. But South Africa is starting to experience more homosexuality now (T: 8-10).

But me personally, I would never do it [same-sex acts]. It's forbidden in the Bible and in most religion... It is in conflict with most religion (L: 25-28).

Well I just felt like 'ok, if they wanna do it', you know. They can go on and do it. But then, in my culture I don't think that's a good thing. Christianity and just my tradition in general. I don't think that 's good, I would never do that (P7: 4-6).

But it is different from families. Like it depends on what your family believes in. You find that somebody comes from a very religious family and they believe that: no, it's wrong according to the bible (...) (LT: 190-193).

The kids that come from very strict religious backgrounds like the Muslim kids, they are homophobic (CC: 238-239).

[T]he gay and lesbian and transgender persons, most of us in this country have been brought up in churches. So most of us have some kind of religious or spiritual foundation. And nearly all of us, I can almost say all of us, who have this, have a very homophobic bases, that we were taught and have grown up with. And so we've heard that homosexuality is sinful that God hates gay and lesbian people, that it is an abomination, that we are going to hell... So all of us have grown up with that in our minds, which makes it especially difficult when gay and lesbian people come out (SL: 33-39).

These arguments that are so diverse and abundant with interpretative content, all come down to the same conclusion: religiously spoken, same-sexuality is not accepted. In some statements homosexuality was also assigned to be something caused by the devil:

But religious, if you think it's the devil in it, ah in that work (L: 197).

Yah, it is possible because you know the devil works in different ways. The way somewhere God operates at the same way the devil is trying to operate and he is coming in very different ways, you know. That is so attracting, you know I think I feel like: I really need this think in my life, I can't do without this. But deep down, you know that is wrong you see, we can't control it (P3: 242-246).

This assertion occurred in the context of questions such as why God would produce something as strong as love between two people of the same sex, if at the same time he does not accept homosexual practices. The answer was that “[g]ood things come from the Devil as well. Or

well what we consider, what the world considers as good" (HIS7: 117-123). Further discussion clarified that especially seduction and lust are devil's work (cf. HIS7: 137-142, 164-172).

In some cases the perception of same-sexuality as a sin even goes as far as explaining AIDS as a punishment for ungodly behaviour (cf. DB: 233-236). The fact that HIV was first detected among homosexual men in the United States is seen as a confirmation first, that God does not agree to same-sexual behaviour and therefore penalised homosexuals by sending them AIDS and second, that homosexuality is something 'Western' because it initially started in America (cf. TM: 33-39).

However, a more detailed consideration of those religious arguments shows that they easily can be adapted to reinforce any kind of theory. This thought also was expressed in some interviews where people came to the conclusion that it is not really religion that prohibits same-sexuality. Instead, religion is used as a tool to spread homophobic messages and to demonstrate and legitimate religious power (cf. MK: 141-150).⁵² Catherine theorises:

I think, mostly because people see it as unnatural, (...) like a sexual abnormality. It is kind of taboo. That's where a lot of it comes from. It makes you feel completely uncomfortable because it is out of the ordinary... And I think religion pushes it a lot. I think people, they justify it by using religion, but the way it actually comes from is peoples' sense of being uncomfortable with it. I don't think it stems from religion because we are into this lots of things and people don't do everything religion tells them. But because it makes them feel uncomfortable it is an easy way using religion to justify. It's easy for them. (...) And they use religion just to justify it, you know. To kind of back up the argument (CC: 475-485).

There are lots of examples where in the past, religious morals and the Bible were used to legitimate hierarchies of power such as the inferiority of women, to justify slavery or, during times of Apartheid, to legitimate white superiority and racial segregation (cf. SL: 93-114, Russell 2008: 9ff). This leads to the conclusion that religion to some extent mirrors discriminations that takes place in society. Another example is given by Sharon Ludwig (cf. 361-380): Even though the Bible itself does not differentiate between male and female homosexuality, preachers of homophobia very well might have and express different perspectives on lesbian relationships and gay men's relationships. This shows that not only religion has an influence on society but vice versa. According to Hoad (cf. 2007: 1f) the discourse on (homo)sexuality is embedded in national, racial and religious contexts. But as we see, history and society also have impact on the way religious perceptions and interpretations of biblical scriptures are going to be used. Therefore I will now analyse the arguments against same-sexuality that referred to the Bible as a document of proof.

⁵² Harm set harm get: In the light of the current sex abuse scandal in the Catholic Church this strategy seems not to work out.

5.3. Homosexuality in the Bible

According to the Bible it is wrong. But now it is like... when the person says: You can't stop things from happening, you know (P3: 191-192).

We normally have Bible studies where we are being taught of things with God and all those type of things used to be in the book. And also as the Bible says having sex with a fellow men is for that case a sin before God. I would say it is unusual to me because I saw it here in the city when I came here. It is very much unusual, that's why I said unhealthy, but it is not what I am go saying. They are also people with their own feelings (L: 118-123).

The Bible is one of the most cited documents to legitimate homohostile opinions. The Bible is perceived to be the written word of God and thus comprises the basic principles of Christianity, whereas 'religion' rather is seen a collection of rules that do not directly come from God and hence are open to social and historical influence (cf. HIS7: 106-115). The idea that the Bible is free from any social influence and its content can be understood as a direct guide from God was objected in several interviews with 'homosexual' South Africans. Denise for example, comes to the conclusion that the Bible has a lot of interpretational room which can be used against anything: "Religion, well. Religion I mean in the Bible you have, I feel religion is selective reading according to some people" (D: 58-59). According to Sharon Ludwig, the problem is that most of the time Bible passages are preached out of their context and thus are not seen in relation to history (SL: 84-93).

You know, I can say for Christianity that there are seven, six or seven texts in the Bible, that are taken completely out of context. And those will be used to bash gay people and those will be used just in isolation. They won't look at anything else, surrounding, the verse or the passage or the context. They just take that verse in isolation and not even really look beyond those few lines to see where that comes from and what it actually means. And even when the term homosexual started being used. I think if I am not mistaken it was only somewhere in the 1940is translation in the Bible, did that word start being used. So much has been lost in translation of words (...). And so people will take out what they want to use against people and totally disregard others.

Sharon Ludwig further states that most scriptures in the Bible contains a very male-centred, patriarchal thinking, which again explains the fact why the Bible does not mention anything about lesbian relationships but most of the time talks about men (cf. SL: 361-364). The fact that women are not directly spoken about in the Bible does not change the fact that lesbian relationships are not accepted either:

Well obviously in a number of scriptures it says man and then people would say that it is mankind, not just males or females. So they wouldn't exactly separate that from. So the same goes for women. If it is man, if they say no man should lie with another man, because you usually call it mankind and not womankind or something like that. So it is seen as a procreate, everything has a man (D: 71-75).

Furthermore Denise states that Bible scriptures are often used to backup the 'un-African'-argument I have analysed in chapter IV: "They always refer back to the Bible as un-cultural.

However, the Bible is also a European thing, something that was brought to Africa by missionaries. It is kind of a contradiction” (D: 53-55). This critique did not only come up in my research but is a very popular critique made by several authors that work on same-sexualities in an African context. Epprecht (2005: 260) for example writes:

(...) almost all the Zimbabwean nationalist leadership, was the product of Christian mission schools. Robert Mugabe, notably, was educated at a Catholic mission school, run by the Canadian Marist Brothers. (...) Their education not only provided them with anti-homosexual arguments from the Bible, but also left them with a deep ambivalence toward African custom.

Coming back to the six or seven 'clobber-passages' mentioned by Sharon Ludwig, there are several passages in the Old and the New Testament that supposedly refer to same-sexual behaviour. The exact number of those passages varies between seven and a dozen (cf. Lull 2005: 1).⁵³ In course of the interviews there were three major biblical passages cited to declare same-sexual acts as ungodly:

The **first** one was God's creation theory out of Genesis.

Personally, I mean if you read in the Genesis, the first chapter of Genesis and it says God made man and woman. And one thing I learned from our pastor, our semi pastor many years ago and it was actually a joke he said: God was making Adam and Eve not Adam and Steve! (HIS4: 10-12).

Adam and Steve... this very popular word-wrap alluding to God's creation of Adam and Eve again shows how male-centred religious arguments against homosexuality are.⁵⁴

And I think that is why God does not want us to be homosexual, that is not how he designed us (T: 16-17).

Even God certainly would not agree with this. He created two, two, a man and a woman. So why should I go for another man? I wouldn't do such (L: 51-55).

I think it is ungodly, because God created man and woman. So in a relationship should be man and a woman. In the Bible it is got a man or it is woman. I think it is against Gods creation (P3: 19-21).

Yah, it is against Gods creation and it is against so many religions like Christians, they don't support that. (...) I just don't understand why people should be in love with the same sex (P3: 25-27).

The bible definitely says that God created Adam and Eve. But the suggestion that this automatically means that relationships between the same sex are against God's creation, because he could have created two men or two women is a doubtful conclusion made by an elderly lady:

⁵³ Such 'clobber passages' are: Genesis 1-2 and 19, Judges 19, Leviticus 18:22, Leviticus 20:13 and Deuteronomy 23:17) in the Old Testament and Mark 10:7-8, 1 Corinthians 6:9-10, 1 Timothy 1:9-10, Romans 1:21-31 and Jude 1:6-7 in the New Testament (cf. Lull 2005:1).

⁵⁴ Only in one context, an exhibition at the Museum Africa in Johannesburg, I came upon the version 'Madam and Eve' which does not refer to a sexual relationship between two women but is a popular cartoon by Stephen Francis & Rico criticising racial stratification and Apartheid (cf. *online source* 13).

And He said. While He saw Adam was on His own He said: Let me give him a partner! And if God wanted to he could have made two men or he could have made two women. But he chose to make one man and one woman. So and this is what we are to try and figure out, that if God made man and woman, then automatically it is not right for them to do what they are doing (HIS4: 58-66).

According to Doris Burtcher this is a popular belief among Christians (cf. DB: 544-547). In his booklet 'The Bible and Homosexuality', Bishop David Russell (2008: 22f) accounts how the Christian creation theory and Christian anthropology are used to illustrate heterosexual partnerships and marriage as the only accurate way of living. He then starts to invalidate this perception by giving examples of famous figures in religion who do not fit into this concept:

Did Apostle Paul fall short of his full humanity because he remained unmarried? Did St Catherine of Siena remain incomplete as a human being because 'she resisted her parents' efforts to persuade her into marriage'? And what about Jesus? (Russell 2008: 22).

Russell finally concludes:

We grow towards our full humanity in Christ through relationships with other human beings, whether they be of the same sex or not. There is not decisive argument against faithful homosexual relationships on the basis of the creation narratives (Russell 2008: 22).

The question occurs why sexual characteristics became the decisive factor to differentiate between Adam and Eve instead of other factors such as, for example, age difference or body size. One of the reasons is that those arguments are deeply connected to the idea of reproduction (cf. M8: 31-37) and the concept of binary opposed sex and gender systems as the following statement shows:

It is impossible. If God creates you as a man you will be a man. You will be a man, you can't change it. Whether you like it or not. You can go for sugary you can do whatever you do but there are certain things that might not experience for example go to the period. You can't go to a period because God didn't create those things to you (M8: 156-159).

Thus according to this perception of sex, the shift from a male to a female body is not possible. Interestingly, a contrasting statement was made by a person who, in other respects, does not shroud her disagreement towards same-sexualities. She explains the idea that God sometimes creates women in male bodies as well as men in female bodies, to justify the occurrence of effeminate men: "But when God created him, he said he wasn't to be a man but a woman" (P3: 89-91).

The **second** Bible-passage used against same-sexuality is the story of Sodom and Gomorrah:⁵⁵ God had decided to destroy the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah because as he said "(..) the outcry against Sodom and Gomorrah is great and their sin is very grave" (Genesis 18.20). In the

⁵⁵ A slightly different version of the story of the prophet Lot in Qur'an equally is used as an argument against homosexuality by Islamic followers (cf. Georg 2008: 32ff).

evening before the cities were destroyed, two angels had come to Sodom and Lot offered them to stay in his house (cf. Genesis 19. 1-3).

But before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, both young and old, all the people to the last man, surrounded the house. And they called to Lot, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us, that we may know them." Lot went out to the men at the entrance, shut the door after him, and said, "I beg you, my brothers, do not act so wickedly. Behold, I have two daughters who have not known any man. Let me bring them out to you, and do to them as you please. Only do nothing to these men, for they have come under the shelter of my roof." But they said, "Stand back!" And they said, "This fellow came to sojourn, and he has become the judge! Now we will deal worse with you than with them. Then they pressed hard against the man Lot, and drew near to break the door down (Genesis 19, 4-9).

In the end the angels rescue Lot and suggest him to take his family and to leave Sodom for they would destroy the city by daybreak (cf. Genesis 19. 10-25). In connection to the cross references these passages were interpreted as an argument against same-sexuality.

G3: But there is Sodom and Gomorrah (laughs) **G2:** Sodom and Gomorrah! (...) That was why Sodom and Gomorrah was destroyed, because there were gay people. Now the world is going to be destroyed because there are gays in those days, oh my God! (laughs) (P3: 310-326).

I believe that homosexuality, once in the start of time, that in Sodom and Gomorrah there was homosexuals there (HIS7: 32-33).

Genesis 19 has been very much discussed in literature. The central question is, whether this biblical segment really condemns same-sexuality. Lull (2005: 1) writes: "If the 'other side' were to be fair to us, they should take off Genesis 19 and its parallel in Judges 19, which are not about homosexual intercourse but about heterosexual rape".

However, as far as I see, 'both sides' to apply Lull's terminology, are reading this story in their favour. As a matter of fact, Lot offers his daughters to be raped by the men of the city and still gets rescued by God. Hence I see no way of interpreting this story as an argument against rape. On the other hand 'getting to know someone' is no real indicator for 'wanting to have sex with them' (cf. Eastman 1990: 2). Another point made by Eastman is the fact that God already had decided to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah before the Bible writes about supposedly homosexual acts happening in the city (cf. Eastman 1990: 2).

The **third** and last direct reference to the Bible that came up in one interview is the story of Noah's Ark and the great flood. According to the book of Genesis 6:19, God said to Noah: "You are to bring into the ark two of all living creatures, male and female, to keep them alive with you". Similarly to the creation of Adam and Eve, this biblical story was interpreted as confirmation of heterosexuality being God's design for a 'normal' way of living (L: 51-55).

Apart from reference to the Bible, Christian religious morals and values were also used to assign homosexuality as something that contradicts religious beliefs.

5.4. Religious morals against sexual liberality in the South African Constitution

Kapsula (2006: 68) writes in her_his article on cross-dressing in Africa :

In Malawi, the year 2005 saw a significant increase in public media debates on issues such as homosexuality, cross-dressing and transvestitism. (...) Homosexuality is the most hotly debated, with debate focusing on its 'morality'. Opposition to homosexuality is usually couched in terms of religion and culture.

Most of those morals refer to ideals such as heterosexual, monogamous marriage and the start of a family, which are major values of Christianity (cf. MK: 364-366). Accordingly, “[e]ach woman has a man. You are supposed to love him forever” (L: 339-347) and “God made the act to reproduce he made us watch side one another” (HIS4: 21-22). These perspectives clearly show the aspired function of relationship and sexuality according to religion. The importance of reproduction is also expressed in a statement where women, who in general were described as more accepting, most likely would use Christian ideas against same-sexuality: “(...) in fact their argument is that if you are a woman you should have babies you should get married, that is the way God wants it” (LT: 121-125). As we can see, the religious conception of relationships is linked to a certain idea of sexuality, namely a heteronormative and monogamous sexuality that primarily is done in the purpose of reproduction. I will discuss the importance of reproduction within the homosexuality-discourse in Africa in chapter VI. Right now, it is interesting to figure out what sexuality means in a religious context.

Many interviewees describe sexuality to be a taboo in religion.

I think they [the churches] keep away from subjects like that. I think when you do hear anything about sex or sexuality that's in the context of HIV. Which is sad because you know, it then makes sex and sexuality somehow just spoken about in the context of illness and disease (SL: 272-275).

In a radio feature, Martina Keller (2001: 1) cites Ian Swartz who explains:

Most people in African society including myself have been risen very strong religiously, God was in front and God was in the middle and he was in the back, he was just everywhere and God did not allow us to speak about sex, it was a total taboo subject.

As sexuality is seen as a taboo subject and something that basically serves to reproduction (cf. HIS4: 21-22) it mustn't be done out of merely personal satisfaction and lust. As the young man at HIS People Church explains, having sex with a woman due to a lack of resistance against her seductive behaviour is a sin:

Well how can I ... in a man's world for a guy, very good looking, lustful women have that point in life where I am about to fall to them. Or I am about to get their number and something really, really sexual indulgence can happen. At that point the devil is being here to me... (HIS7: 120-122).

Sexuality only is permitted as part of the religious institution of marriage, otherwise sexuality is something indulgent, something that comes from the devil. Interestingly these religious judgements are eluded by Lesotho women by labelling their acts of intimacy as not being 'sex'.

Since 'sex' outside of marriage in Roman Catholic Church is a sin, then it is fortunate for women in this mostly Catholic country that what women do in Lesotho cannot possibly be sexual. No koai, no sex means that women's ways of expressing love, lust, passion, or joy in each other are neither immoral nor suspect (Kendall 1999: 167).

Interesting as well is how the people from a religious background started to differentiate between 'friendship' relationship, 'intimate' relationship and 'sexual' relationship when they tried to explain the 'sinful' behaviour of same-sex acts.

Well I basically tell him that I am not homosexual, so I can't... I don't step those boundaries. Okay we can still be friends if he wants me to be, but I don't think that there can be anything for that matter. And if he well speak about it, if he wants to speak or pray I will be there for him. But there is nothing that can generate other than friendship. So that's basically it (HIS7: 56-60).

I think they are wrong to have sex with the same sex, because you can have a best friend or a best boyfriend or a best girlfriend and you call it my girlfriend or my boyfriend but as soon as you start having sexual feelings... That is wrong (T: 42-44).

However, all these ideas of religious sex-morals stand in contrast with sexual liberty and the freedom of choice proclaimed in the new South African Constitution of 1996. The interview with Laurent expresses this discrepancy:

It is a taboo to me as to Africans. (...) But as a democratic country we will try to the human beings to say to them: 'You can do whatever we feel like doing'. For you as you are a woman now you wanna have sex with another woman they say, our democratic right that has been voted for, may allow you to do such. But me personally, I would never do it. It's forbidden in the Bible and in most religion... (cf. L: 21-26).

The conflict between the Constitution and religion also came up in the same-sex marriage case. Marriage has an important position within religious thought, word and deed. According to conservative interpretation, marriage is the only institution where sexual acts are allowed to take place. It thus is no wonder that the legalisation of same-sex marriage caused heavy discussions within the South African society. Sharon Ludwig accounts:

[T]he same-sex marriage case was very publicised. It was ongoing it was long, engaged public hearings around it so people could have a voice in it and so that it was seen to be democratic. And I think when those kind when people start standing up for their rights, then you start having the religious backlash happening. That is certainly what happened around homosexuality, you know. Certainly 2004/2005/2006 was the years around the same-sex marriage case. It was passed in 2006. You saw all of a sudden a lot of media attention on same-sex marriage and so you had the religious oppression run I think or the religious conservative religion rising as well, you know. It remains contentious. (SL: 154-161).

In November 2006 South Africa enacted the Civil Union Bill, which officially permits gay and lesbian couples to marry. In this concern, South Africa once again is among the pioneer countries previous to most states in the Northern hemisphere.

The same-sex marriage is no substitute or alternative such as the civil partnership for homosexual couples but is completely equal to heterosexual marriage (cf. SL: 185-189). Nevertheless, disapproval not only comes from conservative sides (cf. *online source* 14) but also from within the LGBTIQ-community. According to Hekma (2007: 163) the acceptance of same-sex marriage can result in discrimination against 'alternative forms of cohabitation'. And also Catherine and Christine still perceive marriage as a 'heteronormative thing' (cf. CC: 261-269). On the other hand, from a juridical perspective, same-sex marriage can be attractive because of legal protection (cf. Hekma 2007: 159). Religiously too, same-sex marriage is still not fully accepted. As Sharon Ludwig explains, gay couples will not find one single church in South Africa where they can get married in. Instead, they need to find alternative places to carry out a marriage sermon (cf. SL: 172-195).

The new Constitution also was put in a larger context of the process of modernisation and globalisation. Science and technology were criticised for questioning the greatness of God (cf. TM: 153-158). The 'homosexual' too is perceived as a 'modern' thing and thus a threat to traditional and religious values.

However, as pointed out already, religion and society are no distinct entities. Thus the transforming process of the constitution to some extent also translates into churches and their perspectives on religious values. According to the following citations, monogamy and heterosexuality still are part of Christian values. The perception of sexuality though, once reduced to serve reproduction, in some latest interpretations became more open and is now seen as a 'physical gesture of love' (HIS7: 65) that not necessarily leads to pregnancy. As a result, reproduction and having children lost importance and became more optional:

Well sexuality in religion is important because as soon as you have chosen your partner, which is supposed to be the opposite sex, the best way that you can express your love towards somebody is by having a sexual encounter. It is believed in the Christian faith/religion, that people are designed to find a partner of the opposite sex and stay with them, not to change partners whenever, then to express our love to them by having sex with them and to reproduce, have children - if that is what you feel you want and if you can - together. So I think that's where homosexuals have made the confusion - because you're having sexual encounters with same sex (T: 46-52).

When it comes to forced-marriage-issues, the Post-Apartheid Constitution, that often was criticised for being too liberal (cf. P3: 164-169), is used to justify women's freedom of choice:

JT: Because you were saying that God created man and woman to be together. Do you think that a woman should be forced to marry a man if she doesn't want? **G2:** No, we all have a freedom of choice like here in South Africa. Everyone has a choice to do whatever they want, so I don't think that there is a reason why one should be forced to do that. Even being involved in a relationship is not a forced matter. The person can't do something which is against your conscience. That is not fair, see. I think one has to do what is not against their conscience (P3: 72-78).

5.6. Rules versus spirituality: Concepts of personal believe

Many homosexuals in the interviews explained that they could conceal faith and sexual orientation by turning their back to religious institutions and converting to a more spiritual way of believing. As Catherine accounts:

I think I used to be very religious but now I kind of... everyone says this, but I have become more spiritual than religious. I have a personal relationship, I believe, with God but I am not as religious as I used to be. I used to be very strict when I was very strict Catholic. Now I do respect a lot of the Catholic ideals, like I still pray the rosary and all of that... But I don't believe in all the... Like I pray the rosary for my personal side because I feel it makes me feel comfortable, but I don't believe in all the man-made rules of the catholic church like that there only men can be priests (CC: 271-277).

Part of this transformation is also questioning religious ideals and rules that condemn homosexuality. Johan explained how he started to look for other explanations to come to terms with his own sexuality:

I believe I am spiritual and I don't really believe in one certain aspect of religion. So I have, through the years been fascinated and interested by religion. I have read and studied lots of different religions. (...) So I started to realize that actually we know nothing about our ancient history. From what we can know, about religion we know about 6000 years work of history if you go according to most scriptures of religion, from the Bible to the Koran or to the Buddhism. So I've been fascinated and I read a lot about archaeology and factual information about discoveries a 100 000 years ago and more than 100 000 years ago. I have always been in treat and fascinated by: 'why we are here' and 'what is our purpose on this planet'. So for me scientifically I have also managed to uncover a lot of things of myself which guarded me on a way to spirituality. I do believe in a higher existence, I do believe that you go somewhere when you die and I do believe of the old God and the universe and the universe is part of us. In that sense I think I believe that we are God and God are us and everyone of us is a part of God. But if it comes down to its free radical views in religion I don't want to say that I am religious in that sense. (...) For that I would say, my beliefs have become more spiritualised rather than religious. (...) [A]lthough from what I've discovered from a lot of research about civilisations and archaeologists and geologists and biologists and all of them that there is certainly always some form of control that exists in any kind of religion. And especially in Christianity I think, there is a lot of things that is doubtful when it comes to the scriptures and what exactly is true and how these scriptures should be read especially concerning Jesus' life on Earth (...) And being spiritual has less to do with religion than it has to do with self awareness, really (JDW: 141-179).

This citation shows how instead of religious belief spirituality has become important. Another interesting life-story recorded by Rosalee Talela (cf. 1995: 35) is the case of Thembi Nkosi. After she had found out about her sexuality and could not reconcile it with her Christian faith, she turned her back to the church and started to look for alternatives. Tracing back her roots she came across the tradition of traditional healers in Southern African cultures, so called 'sangomas'. Using this as an alternative, Thembi Nkosi decided to become a sangoma.

According to Sharon from gay-supporting Good Hope MCC, religion is 'dogmatic', 'man-made' and something that 'gives God a bad name' (SL: 342-355). Interestingly this characterisation of religion is strikingly similar to how a young man from HIS People Church puts it:

I believe that religion was developed by the devil. (...) Because religion divides, religion puts a divide between all people were it never was supposed to be divided. Religion has caused people to fight, religion has caused people to get opinions that are about God. I believe that they are about God. There is no such thing as religion and we shouldn't believe in religion. But what we should have is a relationship with God (HIS7: 7-16).

Instead of religious rules and norms, it is important to have a relationship with God. If you are connected to God, he will tell you the right thing to do.

Conversely this interpretation of belief is also used as an argument against 'homosexual' people. According to Laurent and Tarryn, religious people who engage in same-sexual acts might not have a deep relationship with God for they are doing things against God's will:

Some, they do go to church. There are religious and pray to God but you know the people, they are brothers they are sisters. They were formed by God and also God he would not like disown him. They are his kids. They go to church, they are spiritual, they pray. And I think probably they are not that spiritual than the guys who are not gay (L: 259-264).

Because when you have a relationship with God – God is the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit – then the Holy Spirit lives in you and He is like conscience. He will be telling you, if you do something wrong or do something right. Maybe the relationship is just not there; maybe they are not being guided by the Holy Spirit from within that what they are doing is wrong. So they can believe that they can serve God but be in a homosexual relationship at the same time. Maybe they are not in a relationship with God. It is more just norms and religion, that if they follow the rules of religion, well most of them, and change a few here and there that don't suit them, then that's ok (T: 33-40).

The second citation further says that homosexuals change the scriptures and interpret them according to their sexual orientation. In this chapter, we already came across these mutual reproaches which, regardless of content, to me first and foremost need to be seen as discursive elements within a struggle of legitimation.

Another accusation made against homosexual people was that they 'pretend to be someone else' and that they 'show other parts to other people' (cf. P3: 36-38). This idea was further elaborated: Due to the fact that homosexual people 'lie', people don't know what they can expect from them and thus perceive them as dangerous (cf. CC: 511-514). On the other hand it is no wonder that people 'lie' or better say 'hide' because homophobia and homophobic messaging makes it very hard for people to come out, not only in a church environment but also in their communities (cf. SL: 38f, 216-224).

Bashing against homosexuality in a religious context has a negative effect on the lives of gay and lesbian people. For one, most things that are said in a religious context have high impact on what society thinks (cf. D: 214-216). Another effect of homophobic preachings is so-called 'internalised homophobia' (cf. SL: 42): Religiously educated (indoctrinated) people realise that their personal sexual orientation is not accepted in religion. They thus cannot combine their

religious identity with their sexual identity. This problem was expressed by several homosexual people in the interviews.

And what was at that stage, in an early age, acceptable, socially and religiously, it was a big... judgement for me to realise that everything that I felt and that I thought about, was in stark contrast to what social norm or religious norms (JDW: 29-32).

Yah it certainly was a disconcility. When I realized growing up and taught to believe you have faith in God and especially in such a Dutch Reform Religious kind of manner. And we were always told to not ask why. Don't ask God why, don't ask further than a certain level you know, just accept. And when I started realizing that everything that I could feel in my heart and think about is in certain contrast to religion. Religion definitely at that stage it did not accept homosexuality, that was like an out-course, you were not normal when you were having thoughts and feelings towards the same sex. So certainly then I started asking the questions I shouldn't be asking: Why? And I think that basically put me in the path and and and put me in a chain-reaction to actually trying to find out what is religion. Why do they have rules and why do they accept certain things and don't accept certain things? (JDW: 183-200)

A quantitative research by Wells and Polders (2004) on the lives of gay and lesbian people in Gauteng, a province of South Africa, found out that this kind of internal conflict is more prevalent among blacks than white people. Otherwise, discrimination against sexual orientation by religious authorities is more strongly experienced among white lesbians and gays (cf. Wells/Polders 2004: 13). This interesting reverse might be due to different handling with ones own sexual orientation and levels of outness. As we can learn from this survey, more white than black respondents came out to their families, friends, work and communities (cf. Wells/Polders 2004: 13), which can be an explanation why black people tend to struggle with the compatibility of religion and sexual orientation within their own, whereas white people are more openly accused for their sexuality.

However, religious, homohostile norms put lesbian and gay people under pressure. This fact becomes clear when people in the interviews talked about their coming out. Fiedler (cf. 2004: 99f) writes that the process of coming out often is accompanied by symptoms of stress that can be enforced by a stigmatising social environment. Denise accounts from her own coming out:

The one thing that worried me was my family because my dad is a preacher and my uncles and my grand parents you know. They founded one of the churches (...) I think it is like Catholic. It is another division of the church of Christianity (D: 223-226).

Such fears are justified, as in some cases the family's reactions can be very difficult. This can be very problematic especially when the person who came out is still young and depended on her_his family. Sharon Ludwig reports from her work at Triangle Project:

I can tell you a while ago, I had a situation where parents brought in a young person here and the young person was clearly gay and was denying it. I have never seen a parent rage as much as this parent raged. And it went on and on and on and he was furious and he was not going to accept his son and his son would immediately leave home and go wherever. He didn't care. He was gonna put him on the street. And I then said to him: 'What fuels your hatred like this'.

You know I mean for a parent to loath, you know, to really loath, maybe hate is a strong word, but to loath their child. What drives you? And he slammed his hand on my desk and said: 'I am a Christian, you know'. And I thought: Where is your Christ? To me that is the the real negative impact it has on people. At least if you are older and you are working you can make your own way in the world and you can move out of home and move to a different part of the city or whatever. But for young people, particularly who still live at home, who are still at school and who still are dependent on their parents... that is where we see a lot of the attempted suicides. And you know people being put out of home or at least having to live under horrible circumstances because of their parent's feelings towards it (SL: 35-81).

Yet there are several possibilities for lesbian and gay people to accept their sexual identity. As outlined before, some of them turn their back to the church (cf. SL: 49-50, P3: 255-266). Some others, even though they might criticise the man-made rules of religion, have kept some form of spirituality. As the example of Johan shows, to read about other perspectives on humans' existence and creation theory and to occupy oneself with alternative philosophies can help to come to peace with ones own sexual identity. Other people, such as Sharon Ludwig, stay within close religious context but go out and look for denominations that are open to homosexual members (cf. SL: 316-320), whereas some others might stay in their church but don't come out within their church community (cf. TM: 165-167).

Most of these possibilities are a compromise. According to one of the interviewees this is not acceptable. "(...) [O]ur God has to come first" (P3: 92-94), because "(...) when it comes to God, we don't have to compromise!" (P3: 310). Further from this religious point of view, God is all-knowing and therefore homosexual people cannot hide their identity from God. "Sometimes you know, when they are hiding it they forget that there is a God who is looking at them while they are doing that. They only think of the people around them" (P3: 188-190).

5.7. God's creatures and Christian love

One of the arguments used in favour for homosexual people was that they are 'human beings' and as such 'children' or 'creatures of God' (cf. Reid 1999: 224, SA: 88-93, MK: 174-337). To condemn homosexual people thus would be equal to question God's creation.

I am not who... I am, who can judge to say you are wrong, you are right. Because at the end of the day each and every person is a creature, is an image of God. (...) If I say that this person is wrong, should I mean God was wrong to create the person (M8: 252-2259).

Among tendentiously homohostile interview partners, the argument that homosexual people are human beings created by God often came up in connection to the idea of Christian, unconditional love. Notwithstanding the perception of homosexuals being God's creatures as well, this was not accepted as an excuse for 'abnormal' same-sexual behaviour: "Love them! Because it is a sickness. To me it is like a sickness. (...) love them love them and don't stop loving them. Cause they are human!" (HIS4: 71, 98-99).

The importance of Christian love was also emphasised by Sharon Ludwig. According to her, however, this unconditional love is not as unconditional as it says to be.

You know if (...) churches would only stop that [homophobic messaging] and be true to what God was about. To be true to Jesus' ministry, that was about love. You know. The first commandment and the greatest commandment is to love God and the next is to love your neighbour as yourself. And the other are all kind of incidental. They are important, but you know on a faith, on a religion that is based in love it is extremely unloving to tell people that they are hated by God (SL: 211-224).

Even though the person who is homosexual will be part of God's love and thus is accepted by many Christian believers, the acceptance does not include what homosexual people do, namely: "(...) have sex with the same sex (cf. T: 42). This distinction between 'who they are' and 'what they do' is expressed by a young man at HIS People Church:

I don't have a problem with the people. That's far from it. Homosexuals think we have a problem with them. We don't have a problem with them. We have a problem with the act of it. I am called to love them and I love them. Think of them. But the act of it goes against the principles of God. God gave us this one commandment to love everybody and that's what we do (HIS7: 47-53).

Interestingly, Hoad (2007: 17) writes about the World Conference of Anglican Bishops that unlike polygamy, they condemned homosexuality because it is more than a sexual act. Following this argument, religious problems with homosexuality are not restricted to 'the act of it' as proposed by the preceding citation. Furthermore the young man's statement reveals how spurious this conception of love is: To love someone because God says this is what they should do, from a human perspective, is almost a contradiction: As human beings, children of God and good Christians they must love their homosexual brothers and sisters but at the same time they condemn the act of having same-sex intercourse. According to Sharon Ludwig this split between what you are and what you do makes no sense:

Often you will hear ministers, who are homophobic saying that they and God love the sinner but hate the sin. Maybe this makes them feel a little better about themselves. This argument makes no sense at all because what they are essentially saying is that God loves you, but hates what you do. Being gay and lesbian is not something we do – it is who we are. It is not a lifestyle (SL: 237-240).

This statement further opposes the idea of homosexuality being a simple 'act' and therefore something that can be stopped because you one choose to behave like that or not.

Once again this argument refers to the theory that homosexuality is a kind of lifestyle and that they were not created by God as homosexuals but only developed this habit afterwards (cf. P3: 310-326).

As for Johan, love often is restricted by structures such as race, religion, class, sex etc. which is a misconception of whatever kind of love.

I think love certainly crosses all boundaries it crosses boundaries of religion, it crosses boundaries of race, it crosses boundaries of sex even and I think a lot of times people attach a certain kind of label onto love. They believe love is only possible if you are a heterosexual between man and women, they believe love is only possible towards the same race, they believe that love is only possible if you believe in the same religious structures and I think over all love is so an undefinable quality and an emotional feeling that over all people have a misconception when it comes to love. (...) I think if people were more in tune with love in an open acceptable way there wouldn't be a need for structures. This social structures, religious structures, sexual structures. I think the world can be healed in a big way when people start to see love more as (...) something that should be enjoyed freely (JDW: 374-385)

The following statement one more time expresses the importance of love:

What I am saying about this: love is still love. That's the main thing: love. And that's what I think, it is not what next person thinks. But I love them. I mean, honest, you gotta pray that God that... (HIS4: 122-126).

... that God does what? The elderly lady who 'loves' homosexual people did not finish her sentence but what she wanted to say can be guessed by an idea she had expressed in an earlier statement:

With God all things are possible. And if it's a thing that they are just trying to, you know... what they say em 'work out' or 'try'. For they are just trying new things. So if there is a faith that guides while they..., God forgives I'd say. And I mean then I would forgive them because what from God comes are beautifully things, you see? (HIS4: 52-56).

According to this citation, God is great. He will forgive people who understand their 'misbehaviour'. Intensive prayers and having a deep relationship with God will help people to be 'cured'.

5.8. Only God can help

In his article 'Unnatural Vice in South Africa' Epprecht (2001: 134) writes, according to 'numerous witnesses' claims', missionary propaganda had succeeded in convincing the workers in the mines to stop such 'abhorrent' behaviour of having sex with fellow men. They admitted to have had same-sexual relationships before but now would not do it any more for God's written word says it is wrong. Epprecht's use of words – the workers 'claimed' to 'have given up such relations' – expresses his own doubts about whether they really stopped their engagement in same-sexual acts.

The idea that God is the last entity, able to help homosexual people and to bring them back to the 'normal' path, was expressed in many interviews (cf. TM: 87-91, M8: 29-30):

[T]his people, they need prayers, they should be prayed, you see. Only God can take control of that. You may find out that those people don't do it because they want to do it, they can't control it themselves, they just can't control it, see. Like God can do anything, isn't it. There is nothing impossible for him, so we also have to pray for this people, see. That is all I can say (P3: 211-215).

I think society in certain aspects and maybe still in certain areas of countries want to reform you religiously or socially through hospitals or medication or psychology, psychologies. So I

think society in that sense although I think it is far less than it has been it still exists. They still want to change you like you are not normal. You are not normal when you are a homosexual so they would try to indoctrinate and intimidate you by religion or, well, social structures like chemicals or medication or drugs or psychology (JDW: 315-320).

These citations show that homosexuality is perceived as something that needs to be controlled or 'cured'. Praying to God and asking him for forgiveness is seen as possibility to change homosexual people into 'normal'.

Résumé

As we could see in this chapter, religious arguments not only are connected to several other arguments but further need to be positioned within a larger socio-political frame. "These cultural beliefs form part of a framework people use to interpret acts and events as natural or unnatural, normal or abnormal"(...) (Aarmo 1999: 266). This insight can be an explanation for heavily polarized and ideologically tinted use of religion against but also in favor of same-sexualities.

According to Fiedler (2004: 17) the acceptance of homosexuality needs to be accomplished on three levels: science, state of law and religion. In South Africa, the new legislation recognises homosexuality as an equal way of life. Scientific work on same-sexuality in Africa is prospering, whereas religiously there are still many reservations about that issue. Religion thus might be the missing link to overall acceptance and equality of same-sexualities in South Africa.

Religion has a huge impact on the perception of same-sexuality in South Africa as well as in many other countries. As we will see in chapter VI, patriarchal Christian morals of distinct gender roles and the heteronormative family also have affected the image of 'traditional African masculinity'. Same-sexual orientation, the idea that gender is not determined by biological sex and other aspects outlined in the following chapter pose a threat to this concept of masculinity.

CHAPTER VI: ABOUT BEING A 'REAL' MAN – THE MASCULINITY-ARGUMENT

One of the reasons why homosexuality and same-sex practises in general are stigmatized is that they question certain perceptions of 'African male identity'. Same-sexuality is perceived as a threat especially in patriarchal societies. The idea of this 'threat' works in different and to some extent even contradicting ways. Furthermore it is strongly connected to concepts of patriarchy, patrilineality and heteronormativity, violence and the assumption of binary opposed gender role models. All these concepts are embedded in something that I call the 'tradition-culture-religion'-complex, outlined in the previous two chapters.

Lemon (1995: 63) points out that the gay liberation movement was one out of four factors that contributed to the 'crisis of masculinity'. Connell (2005: 84) remarks that 'crisis' might not be an appropriate term because it "(...)presupposes a coherent system or some kind, which is destroyed or restored by the outcome of the crises". As masculinity rather is "(...) a configuration of practise *within* a system of gender relations", he proposes to speak of 'crisis tendencies'.

Of course masculinities within an African context are diverse and thus it is hard to picture 'African male identity'. By talking about it as a concept I don't want to ascribe a certain behaviour onto African men, but recognise the fact that it is used as an argument against same-sexual identities. Hence 'African male identity' is constructed as discursive reality within this argument.

The following pages at first will outline in which way lesbian women and gay men talk about and challenge the concept of 'African male identity'. Second, this chapter will demonstrate how patriarchal structures and heteronormative norms in the 'tradition-culture-religion'-complex not necessarily cause but stand in a close relationship to such assumptions. This is an occurrence that might further explain the different reactions from men and women towards same-sexuality.

6.1. Lesbian women

The interviews indicate two different ways of how lesbians endanger African masculinity. First, lesbians are seen to be taking on the men's role. This perception specifically refers to butch lesbians who dress and behave in a very masculine manner (cf. LT: 62-63, D: 97-102).

According to the arguments, men assume that butch⁵⁶ women not only behave like men but want to be men and thus try to compete with them:

(...) if you walk down the street and you get a remark like: 'Ok, now you think that you can take my woman, now you think you are a man', you know. And obviously those are ideas that they think: Okay, she wants to compete with us this time. And for you as a lesbian it is not that way. But for an other, it is what you want to. It is what you do (LT: 85-89).

This citation clearly shows how some men see lesbian women as rivals. Additionally, as a matter of fact, butch women do not have a penis and therefore in some men's perception cannot be 'real' men. The manly lifestyle of lesbians is therefore seen as a kind of insult to male identities.

I remember one time I was crossing by and some guy just said to me oh no you are acting like a man that means you have a dick down there, you know like... Why do I have to need a dick for me to be a man. Or why are you acting like a man why are you... you know things like that. So sometimes you can just be very negative (LT: 177-180).

This is not about stating in a generalising way that all men perceive lesbians a threat. Nevertheless, the preceding paragraphs clearly express the difficulties and a certain unease men can have in assessing butch lesbian women. In turn, this is one of the reasons why many butch women become targets of hate crimes.

Now she wants to be the man, you know. That is how they see that relationships. You find that most gay guys in townships they can walk freely. Okay there are some that are attacked but they can walk freely they can date they can do that. But you are a lesbian, you are walking down the street with your girlfriend, they start teasing you: Okay you think you are a man now, you think you can have our women now. That is why I feel more lesbians have been tiger tipping than gay guys (LT: 79-83).

Not all lesbian women are butch women though. One explanation why butch women rather become targets of hate crimes is that by presenting their masculine identity, they seem much more a threat than a female looking lesbian (cf. D: 97-101). Another explanation is that butch women are an easy target because they can be identified as 'lesbians' more easily (cf. SL: 294-299). On the other hand there are lesbians who do not try to imitate male behaviour but, according to Denise (cf. 107-108), butch women are the typical stereotype of how lesbian women appear in South Africa.

The second way in which lesbians subvert male identity is by rejecting men. They do not show any interest in their attempts to be attractive. In some cases this is perceived as a personal affront against their masculinity (cf. MK: 248-258). Another interesting theory which is related to the rejection-argument was brought up by Martina Kopf based upon a personal encounter in South Africa: Due to the AIDS crisis women now start to prefer relationships with other wo-

⁵⁶ 'Butch' is a biological female who identifies as male. Often this term is used for/by lesbian masculinity (cf. Halberstam 1998: 120)

men instead of men, because of the danger of contamination (cf. MK: 422-425). To what extent this reasoning really has an impact on the decision to have same-sexual relationships would be an interesting topic of further research.

At the same time, women who engage in sexual relationships with other women do not accept a subordinate role to men and thus become 'their own masters' (cf. Evans-Pritchard 1970: 1432). The idea of harmed male identity because of the rejection by lesbians stands in contrast to sexualized presentations of two feminine lesbian girls kissing each other. Even though this image to some extent contradicts the rejection-argument, it is equally rooted in a very patriarchal mindset that reduces women to sexual objects without taking their interest into consideration:

I think it is because lesbianism is very sexualized for men, you know (...) I think it is a patriarchal thing. Because a man, when he sees two women or lesbian they think they can inject themselves into that situation. (...) I don't think that they realize that they are not wanted. (...) It is a complete like a dominating thing. (...) I think it [lesbianism] is more accepted because men feel like it is for THEM. You know and I wonder if it's two men that there is nothing appealing about it for them. For two women, they find it more appealing (CC: 424-443).

A very similar view was expressed by Sharon Ludwig (cf. 369-378) about her impression that men more likely accept lesbian women whereas they find gay men 'repulsive'. In return, women often have gay friends but disapprove of lesbians.

6.2. Gay men

Again two reasons came up as to why heterosexual men have problems with homosexual men. The first reason is that straight men are afraid of homosexual men being interested in having sex with them. Therefore they sense homosexual men as a threat to their personal environment.

I think homosexuality is also seen as threatening their environment. You know what I mean, like it is a threat to them as a person. Like gay... ah... straight men are very afraid of homosexual men because they see it as... what if they eat on me. It is a kind of threat to their space (CC: 511-514).

The fact that homosexual men often are interested in straight men has also been stated by the last man in the park :

M8: One day I asked one of my friends: 'Why gay people look for someone who is straight?' They say you can't go for someone who is... you know, because according to them they are girls (...) So, they say: 'If we meet someone, to fall in love we need someone who is straight, a real man'. **JT:** (...) How do they define a 'real' man? **M8:** Real man... (laughs). Somebody who cares for them, who can take care for them, who is not afraid, you know. Who can do whatever a man can do (M8: 74-83).

This account leads up to the second reason why gay men or, precisely put, 'effeminate' gay men dilute male identity. Two men having sex with each other are perceived as unmanly (cf.

DB: 163-170). Lemon (1995: 62) summarizes Brod's (1987) analysis of masculine identity in industrial societies as follows:

In industrial societies 'real men' defined themselves in three ways. Firstly they earned money in the public work force and supported their families through that effort (the man as provider and breadwinner) Secondly they (should) have had formal power over women and children in those families (the man as head of the house). And finally, 'real men' were unquestionably heterosexual.

Lemon further states that the shift to post-industrial societies has questioned this perception of masculinity (Lemon 1995: 62).

Whether this analysis can be applied in post-colonial societies such as South Africa is an important question. Indeed several indicators suggest that these three factors of masculinity-construction also exist in African societies. Epprecht, for example, explains how the shift from a colonial to a post-colonial society in Zimbabwe lead to a new construction of 'African masculinity'. The colonial rule and implementation of 'hegemonic masculinities'⁵⁷ had an impact on traditional gender-roles and affronted the patriarchal order of the Zimbabwean society. White men perceived themselves as superior to black men. „Averting their eyes from their own transgressions, meanwhile, white men assumed for themselves the power to talk about, define and legislate black sexuality as if blacks were another decidedly inferior species“ (Epprecht 1998: 641). Hoad (cf. 2007: 9) further describes how in the second half of the 19th century, the British clerical eye of masculinity interpreted African traditional institutions such as the kabaka (king) of Mwanga as traits of femininity. This emasculation of African men was further supported by the new possibilities black women had received through colonialism. The independence of town women questioned traditional patriarchal systems. Colonialism destroyed female inferiority and the marital basis of traditional African masculinity. Land shortages due to colonial rule prohibited young men from access to land which was necessary to get adult status (cf. Epprecht 1998: 641).

This challenge to the 'traditional African male identity' lead to a new concept of masculinity: 'African' masculinity was defined by having sex with women. Homophobia was used to maintain a distinction between African men and a) white men and b) modern, (black) women (cf. Epprecht 2005: 259f). The new concept of African masculinity culminated in the mass rape of young women during the national independence struggle in Harare in 1956 (cf. Epprecht 2001: 142).

⁵⁷ According to Cornwall and Lindisfarne (1994: 3), "Hegemonic masculinities define successful ways of 'being a man; in so doing, they define other masculine styles as inadequate or inferior".

Not all independence movements in Africa developed male identity on such a hierarchically structured gender division. As Bernal's article on the liberation movement in Eritrea points out, the backlash into patriarchal gender-role models in some cases only was developed after nationhood, whereas the liberation movement itself had been based on egalitarian gender structures (cf. Bernal 2001). However, the convulsion of 'traditional African masculinities' due to colonialism and the crisis tendencies of masculinity are appropriate answers to explain why homosexual men often are perceived as a threat to 'masculine identity'. Not only because of some gay men have female mannerisms, but also because they don't show any (sexual) interest in women and thus don't 'fulfil' their masculine duties. They are seen as weak people who don't venture to approach women (cf. TM: 57-62). This account confirms this point of view:

(...) especially in Soweto so I can say, they don't like those people, they really hate them. They would tell you, you know. I don't... most of... these days, if they meet a gay guy, ne, especial guys(...). If they meet a gay guy they would say: Oh, he is afraid of girls, see. And if you say to that person in Zulu: esaba intombazane - being afraid of girls, they would look as a pig, see who is talking. Because they know, people in the community they don't like it (P3: 174-179).

Also the interview with Laurent shows how completely inexplicable it is for him that another man does not develop any kind of sexual feelings towards another women, even though she is naked, but still prefers fellow men (cf. L: 193-195).

Most of such homohostile insults more likely concern effeminate men because they obviously do not fit into the existing ideal of masculinity (cf. MK 406-411, JDW: 47-84). "If two men can still maintain their masculinity I think that's more accepted than if two men are effeminate. For that is also seen just as a complete reversal over all. I think that upsets people. People can't trust them" (CC: 160-162). This kind of degradation of so called 'unmanly' men on the one hand and the idea of one 'right' version of being an African man is a typical case of 'hegemonic masculinity'.

As Connell (cf. 1995: 76ff) writes, hegemonic masculinities are always connected to power. They define apparently 'right' and 'successful' answers to the crisis tendencies of masculinities. In some cases they refer to ideals of masculinity that are based on surreal fantasy figures which do not respect reality. At the same time masculinities who do not fit the ideal are characterised as 'inferior' and 'subordinate'. Following Connell (1995: 78), homosexual men also belong to this kind of 'subordinate variants' of masculinity: "Oppression positions homosexual masculinities at the bottom of a gender hierarchy among men". As one of the interview partners explained (cf. TM: 119-121) effeminate men try to be or even think they 'are' female and

therefore 'voluntarily' occupy an inferior position in a patriarchal society. In return, Denise questions this perception:

You know men should be masculine should be rough they should be tough. Two men shouldn't be together and a man should have a wife and kids and everything else. It is seen as disgusting. I know a number of people who said: 'Gay men are trying to be woman'. You know a woman is seen as a very inferior part of society in Africa. So they think that that man is less a man if he is going to be gay or something like that (D: 87-92).

Of course this image of 'masculinity' is no universal and stable entity. Rather it must be understood as something 'situational' and 'fluid' as Cornwall and Lindisfarne (cf. 1994: 3f) explain. There are important differences among men and conceptions of masculinities. The notion 'masculinity' contains various, partly contradicting or even competing images and behaviours (cf. Cornwall/Lindisfarne 1994: 19, 12). This idea was also expressed by Johan. Even though gay men in many cases might correspond to the stereotype of being 'queens', he comes to the conclusion that there also can be homosexual men who do not feel the need to openly display their female qualities. They can be intact with their masculinity and thus construct a new expression of masculinity:

Men have for a long time felt the need to express themselves in a female matter like cross-dressing or em putting on women's clothes and make up or talking in a really high voice or having lots of mannerisms (...) or acting like females. So in that sense it is actually it has had an effect where a stigma has been attached to it. Certainly a lot of homosexuals that are making love have always said to me that I don't act like a gay person. So for them according to media according to what they see as gay people: A man that is highly feminine. So that would dress very feminine, that would talk very feminine, that would have acts and mannerisms that are very feminine. So I think that has also been in a great way changed, because certainly heterosexual people and especially men are seeing more that you don't have to be like a female to be a gay person. You can still retain your masculinity. You can still be a man AND be homosexual. So you don't need to use women's clothes or women's make up or act like a woman. So I think in that sense it has been a big stigma and I am gonna use the word 'Queens' because that is what the usual heterosexual person think about (...) (JDW: 273-285).

This citation is rich on interpretative material. It clearly shows how a collective image of gay men is designed. As to that, media seems to play a crucial role (cf. D: 311-337, JDW: 327-330). This collective image of how homosexual people behave and look like was affirmed by many people in the interviews. Such acts of attribution further illustrate how the process of defining 'deviant' sexual identity, to a great extent, is dependent on labelling certain mannerisms as norm-deviant behaviour. Hence it can be said that same-sexuality becomes something abnormal, because it is defined as such, which is basically how labelling theory explains the occurrence of deviant behaviour. As Tannenbaum (1953:17 after Lamnek 1996: 219) best describes: "The young delinquent becomes bad because he [she] is defined as bad". Due to this demure, same-sexuality later became thematized by constructionism and deconstructionism (cf. Stein/Plummer 1996: 131).

But female mannerisms are no definite indicator for same-sexuality as one of the interviewees explained, "(...) there is this feminine, side (...) Even though he is not homosexual but you can see the way he do things the way he behaves. He doesn't behave like real man" (M8: 216-218). To compare the social position of those effeminate straight men to homosexual men and to find out in which way their image differs would be an interesting question for further investigation.

As outlined above, male identity to some extent is based on a certain conception of sexuality and a distinct idea of how sexuality has to take place. Conversations with men in West Africa lead Doris Burtscher (cf. 163-170) to the conclusion that men value the quantity of sex per night higher than the quality of sex. Laurent (cf. 371-373) additionally described how young men try to impress other people by saying how many girls they have had. Interestingly the image of promiscuous gay men (cf. JDW: 340-345) is not seen within this potency concept of male identity that strongly relies on the quantity of sex a man has or can have. The importance of sexuality in a relationship is voiced in the following statement:

I know some other people they say in a relationship you don't have to have sex to love a woman, they say you don't really have to. But eventually it is also comorting to a for a relationship. There are some other guys who say no, no if a woman doesn't want to sleep with me. (...) I'll move on and find another one (L: 377-381).

Sexuality and how a real man has to be, is also one of the subject matters of traditional initiation rites.

6.3. Masculinity in traditional initiation schools

Institutions such as initiation schools play an important part in defining the concept of 'African' masculinity, sustaining heterosexual social structures and finally, fostering the stigmatisation of same-sexualities in Africa. Initiations or so called 'rites of passage' (Van Gennep 2004) have taken place in several pre-colonial African societies (cf. Uchendu 2008: 7ff). As Doris Burtscher remarks, initiations still play an important role for the reproduction of traditional, heteronormative gender role identities even though they are less important today than they used to be:

A relationship has to be between a man and a woman. That's how they grew up, that's what they have learned. That is what they learn in the course of initiation: How a woman needs to be in a relationship, how a man needs to be in a relationship. The man has to be strong and vigorous, he tells the woman how to go. It is this old role models again and again... And those initiations still take place although they became much shorter today (DB: 183-188).⁵⁸

⁵⁸ Original citation: Eine Beziehung muss zwischen Mann und Frau sein. Und so sind sie aufgewachsen, das haben sie gelernt. Das lernen sie in der Initiation: Wie hat eine Frau zu sein in der Beziehung, wie hat ein Mann zu sein in der Beziehung. Der Mann muss stark sein, kräftig sein, der sagt der Frau wie es geht. Also es ist, dieses alte Rollenmodell, das immer wieder... Und, ich meine diese Initiationen finden ja noch immer statt, obwohl sie viel kürzer geworden sind.

In the more recent past such generalising statements in many cases quite rightly came under heavy post-colonial critique. This critique especially concerned Western interpretations of sexual stereotyping that applied Western categories on 'other' cultures and thus delivered false conclusions that in turn often were used to legitimate hegemonic power (cf. chapter 4.3.). Still, this statement makes a point: Whatever concepts of genders and identities really exist, initiation schools are the places where such concepts are handed down from one generation to the next. This fact also is expressed in the following conversation, which not only emphasizes the relevance of initiation but also understates 'tradition' as an explanation for the different reactions of men and women towards homosexuality.

P7: But if you go there in Township and different places far away from this city, from Joburg. You know, there are many places and if you go and interview a black man (laughs), (...) they will not support it. Some women may but men... **JT:** Why do you think that men are more against it than women? **P7:** I think it is from way back, the tradition and stuff. They have the traditional initiation. Have you heard of it? (P7: 239-249).

Even though initiation ceremonies are practised in South Africa's rural areas, they recently have lost of importance (cf. P7: 251-256). Also Doris Burtcher witnessed the decline of traditional initiation in Western Africa (cf. DB: 191-192). According to one interview, the reason for this decline is the process of modernisation as well as the influence of liberal, Western countries (cf. P7: 282-283).

Still these initiations are an important marker of maturity and common among many South African ethnic groups (cf. Ndandgam 2008: 211f) – a fact that was confirmed by one of my interview partners. However, none of the people I interviewed could tell me first-hand what exactly is happening in the context of such initiation rites. Usually the boys who take part at such rites are between 15 and 25 years old (cf. Ndandgam 2008: 212). One of the interviewees further explains about those initiations:

Yah they go to the bushes and they do things. They claim that, you know, you become a man like turn from a boy to a man. Because you gonna be experiencing a lot of hardships and a rough environment out there. Also they are like talk a lot about women and stuff. Yah I don't think they'd support that [same-sexuality] (P7: 251-256).

From what he has heard, because he did not participate in any of those initiation ceremonies, they go and live in the bushes without blankets and food, they make fires and live according to special rules. Those who do not follow the rules will be beaten up. They also undertake corporal procedures such as cutting the foreskin (cf. P7: 266-268). This account complies more or less with Ndandgam's description of initiation ceremonies among the Xhosa, one of South Africa's ethnic groups:

These rituals include the seclusion period and the coming-out ceremony to mark the return of the initiates. (...) During the seclusion period, initiates' diet and fluid intake are restricted

for the first eight days. Initiates are not allowed to drink water, and only hard food is consumed (...). The cutting of the prepuce (done without anaesthetic), followed by the period of seclusion, is viewed as demonstrating bravery and instilling endurance and discipline in initiates. The bulk of the seclusion period is used to teach initiates how to be proper men in accordance with societal and cultural expectations. On leaving the bush, the hut where the initiates lived during the initiation, clothing worn during the initiation period and other artefacts used during the rite are all burnt. This is a symbolic act to signal the parting with the past. Huge feasts are organized to welcome the initiates when they leave the initiation school. The presentation of gifts to the amakrwala (new men or recently circumcised men) and advice from older men is part of the coming-out ceremony (Ndandgam 2008: 212).

Additionally the initiates are ordered to keep strict secrecy about everything that happens in the bushes. This not only complicates research on initiation but also is used as control mechanism to find out which men actually participated in traditional initiation rites. Circumcised men, who cannot provide detailed information are reconsigned as 'inauthentic' (cf. Vincent 2008: 436).

Even though male circumcision is a central part of those initiations, only lately this practise was vehemently discussed in South African media as boys repeatedly suffer from infections, blood poisoning or even death. Nevertheless, circumcision within a clean hospital environment is socially not recognised as a safe alternative (cf. Vincent 2008: 435). Ndandgam (2008: 218) concludes from her discursive analysis of the media debate:

State regulation of the practise through instituting age limits and 'rescuing' ill initiates by taking them to the hospital is seen by some traditionalists as sanitizing the ritual. The result of such a discourse is the perpetuation and sustenance of an idealized manhood (...) Real men (*amadoda*) are those who can stand the pain of having their prepuce removed without anaesthesia, and who shun the sanitized environment offered by modern medical facilities.

Hence, those initiation ceremonies basically come down to 'create' a stereotype of 'African' men such as Denise explains: "You know men should be masculine should be rough they should be tough. Two men shouldn't be together and a man should have a wife and kids and everything else" (D: 87-89). Homosexual men who fundamentally oppose those values would never be allowed to take part in such ceremonies if they were not willing to change into 'normal'.

They'd say: come in. And after all this you will change to a normal person. (...) They don't support homosexuality. * And if you go and tell someone who has been over there that you are homosexual and stuff they think you (...) are not normal. (...) [T]here are also people who get beaten up. Yah they sport you doing this sort of things. There are people... just summon other people to go and get you and then they beat you up and try to tell you to stop things like that. They tell you about the culture... (P7: 296-303).

Ethnographic research in other parts of the world has documented that not all initiation rites base upon heteronormative concepts of masculinity. Some even integrate same-sexual acts, such as boys who have to drink the semen of other men. The purpose of this act is to transfer the old men's force into the boy (cf. Godelier 1996: 52f, Herdt 1993). Even though these are no African examples, they show that different types of initiation exist.

6.4. Women, patriarchy and the 'crisis tendencies of masculinities'

As already outlined before, one of the reasons why 'gay' men and 'lesbian' women have to endure insults and sometimes even physical attacks is because the former apparently want to be women and thus voluntarily take on an inferior position, whereas the latter switch into a male identity and thus claim a superior position within a patriarchal society, where a majority of women are underprivileged (cf. CC: 585-588). Consequently, the perception of gay men and lesbian women as a 'threat' is not only about the erosion of traditional gender role patterns but needs to be seen in the context of power. The change of power relations has weakened the dominant role of men within the structures and institutions of a patriarchal society (cf. Lemon 1995: 69f). The 'crisis tendencies of masculinity' correlate with the decline of patriarchy.

Lemon (1995: 65) explains the existence of few publications on the crisis of masculinity among South African men by stating that “[t]his is understandable since South Africa is one of the most patriarchal countries in the Western world”. Disregarding the indeed very interesting fact that Lemon once more labels South Africa as a '*Western*' country (cf. the discussion concerning this subject in chapter 4.6.) she makes a good point: Even though the South African constitution explicitly condemns sexual discrimination against women (cf. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996, Section 9, Clause 3), in South African reality there are still many situations where women's suppression becomes obvious. One recently very much discussed praxis of women suppression is the rape of lesbian women to 'take their fear of a penis' (cf. LT: 35-38). This practice called 'corrective rape' is a dominant topic in the current media discourse on same-sexuality in South Africa (cf. *online source* 15, Hames 2011). As Laurent explains:

They call it corrective rape. They say they are raping them to correct them to convert them to their normal senses. They sleep with them forcefully, so that this feeling, what they are feeling, and they hope that these people convert to the normal (...). I think it is crime. That is what the law says. I think it is crime. They should let them be what they want to be. They should not force. If someone doesn't want they cannot force to that (L: 83-86).

There is something in this country called 'corrective rape' we don't like, the term 'corrective rape'. (...) [T]he thinking amongst men, it's a very patriarchal kind of thinking, is that they can correct the woman, a lesbian (SL: 10-14).

Even though the number of women (not only lesbians) raped in South Africa is one of the highest in the world (cf. Vetten 2011: 169ff), the government is not putting enough effort to stop such crimes as one representative of the Forum of Empowerment of Women stated in the interview (DS: 79-84). Additionally, due to social stigmatisation, rape has a high number of unreported cases in South Africa as well as in many other countries in the world (cf. Vetten 2011:

171, Posel 2005: 241ff).⁵⁹ According to Catherine and Christine corrective rape is a huge problem in South Africa:

And it [corrective rape] is quite a problem. Apparently a woman is raped every day (...) [L]ike it happens so often and often isn't reported and some women in the community actually marry a man and then are lesbians behind their back. They see women behind their husband's back because of that. Actually women are raped and they go kind of conform and they marry men and then they have sex with other people. Which I think is also a big threat to the lesbian community in terms of AIDS (CC: 562-569).

As explained in this argument, the fear of being raped causes some lesbian women to live their sexual desires in secrecy: On the surface, they adapt a lifestyle according to social norms: they marry and have children. This kind of 'culture of discretion' in turn affirms the belief among rapist men that women effectively can be 'cured'. Another problem lined out by Catherine above is that this practice increases the HIV contamination risk among 'lesbians'. Due to the fact that there is a low level of HIV in vaginal secretions (except for the time of menstruation) there is a lower possibility of biological transmission of HIV in female same-sex acts (Dolan 2005: 4). However, this does not lead to the conclusion that same-sexual women have no risk at all. Johnson (cf. 2007: 39ff) points out that socially 'lesbian' women are of high risk because they are forced into marriage, often have no option to refuse unprotected sex or even are raped. Further AIDS prevention often neglects to address same-sexual women because of the myth that they are not at risk anyway. All these circumstances lead Johnson to the conclusion that "(...) women who have sex with women may be the most 'at risk' group of all, not due to biological susceptibility, but to sheer neglect" (Johnson 2007: 40f).

Women's violation also takes place within the institution of marriage and thereby often is not regarded as 'rape'. In many cases women simply accept the fact that they have to sleep with their husbands whenever he wants to (cf. DB: 329-334). As Kendall (1999: 160) accounts from her research in Lesotho, "[a]ccording to precolonial tradition, a man claimed a woman as a wife by raping her, and this custom is still common in the mountain areas". The connections between rape, marriage and sexual discrimination against women also are expressed in the following conversation:

Chris: I read about this one culture in upper South Africa (...) If a man rapes a woman then the woman can't report it if the man is going to marry her straight after. (...) Lets say I am a man and I raped you, you can't report it or do anything about it because I am ready to marry you in like two weeks time... **Cath:** It's terrible! (...) I also think in terms of lesbians it is a big threat. Not only because of homophobia but because of gender discrimination, it is a double crime (CC: 576-583).

⁵⁹ In her very interesting article on baby-rape and manhood, Deborah Posel (cf. 2005: 245) also draws a connection between the AIDS pandemic in South Africa and the myth that having sex with a virgin would cure HIV-positive men.

Catherine's answer further displays intersections between homophobic discrimination and gender discrimination. Even though current literature on intersectionality lately criticized the idea of summing up factors of discriminations because the reality of how those different social factors play together is much more complex than a simple addition, it is very important to take variables of social stratification into consideration (cf. Yuval-Davis 2006: 197).

Domestic violence and women's suppression in heterosexual relationships is a big problem in many societies, not only in an African context. As we saw in the previous chapters, elements of a patriarchal society are revealed in many daily practices not only in the Christian fantasy of a "face-to-face, man on the top of woman in monogamous marriage" model (Hoad 2007: 5). Because of this reason, more and more women nowadays prefer not to marry at all. In many cases marriage goes hand in hand with the loss of women's autonomy (cf. DB: 261-272). Therefore women properly choose whom they want to marry and do not easily agree to proposals of marriage which is another supportive factor to the 'crisis of masculinity' in Africa. Laurent explains that modern African women, especially in urban areas, prefer men who have a lot of money.

As I said that men, women here in South Africa especially here in the city, in Johannesburg, you have to be with money for them for you to sustain them. I don't blame them. At the same moment they want to be secured. They want to know is this guy gonna be around, will me and this guy have money for four or five years or so. But with a bit money they don't are comfortable with that (L: 329-333, cf. L: 203-207).

Marriage not only is an example of how patriarchal structures can find expression, but is also a deeply religious institution. Hence, a lot of patriarchal thinking has been implemented into religious norms and morals.⁶⁰ Referring to Christianity which is the most influential religion in South Africa (see chapter 5.1.), the Bible too contains a very male-centred and women-excluding perspective as Sharon Ludwig states:

Well, I think lesbians get off very easy in the Bible because Bible does not actually mention anything about lesbians, doesn't it. It's all about sodomy, and you know, when these seven scriptures are talking about men lying with men, now MEN gets used generically in the Bible, you know. The language in the Bible is very patriarchal, very male orientated, and in our society it is the same (SL: 361-365).

The conversation in one interview even got as far as designating women as something that comes from the devil.

Good things come from the Devil as well. Or well what we consider, what the world considers as good. Money comes from the devil, woman come from the devil, well... (...) ... in a man's world for a guy, very good looking, lustful women have that point in life where I am about to

⁶⁰ According to Shannahan who investigates the Qur'an in respect of gender equality and sexual autonomy, once a Muslimat is married she sexually ranks an inferior position to her husband. By referring to Ali (cf. 2006: 61) Shannahan explains that "[m]en are equated with the active, dominating aspect of sexual relations and interactions, and women are defined in relation to them, as passive and non-assertive" (Shannahan 2009: 62).

fall to them. Or I am about to get their number and something really, really sexual indulgent can happen. At that point the devil is being here to me (HIS7: 117-123).

Even though the interviewee immediately corrected his own statement, it confirms that the biblical metaphor of the original sin, of the devil working through Eve seducing Adam to eat from the forbidden fruit, is still working.

All those examples may be not sufficient to label South Africa as an overall patriarchal society. Still they illustrate that different expressions of patriarchal structures exist in South Africa. In turn, those patriarchal structures not only legitimate women's inferior position in society but can be seen as an explanation why several interviewees mentioned the fact that women in general are more acceptant of homosexual practises.

JT: Who do you think are the people that have problems with lesbians? **DS:** Men obviously. **JT:** Women usually don't? **DS:** Woman, I don't know, but I hardly fear the people being women... Is still men who want to, you know, experiment and want to test that. **JT:** What kind of men (...)? **DS:** Yeah rural because of their culture and thinking. The tradition, that's... like the culture they grew up with (DS: 148-155).

(...) woman are more understanding when it comes to this things. I mean it could be one or two maybe that will feel that: 'no what you are doing is wrong'. But generally I feel that woman are the more understanding people (...) because even at home you find that if I come out and say 'I am lesbian', the first person that is gonna accept is my mother rather than my father maybe (...) Obviously they gonna have a problem but they are more understanding. They don't act in that more violent way than guys do. They understand I think. (...) But you don't find many woman say that homosexuality is wrong. (...) You have women's organisation supporting us (LT: 104-110, 125-126).

This general impression cannot always be translated to family-situations. Some of the 'lesbians' I interviewed explained that their fathers had less problems with their sexual orientation than their mothers (cf. CC: 92-95, 106-107). One possibility to explain such cases is that sexual feelings in father-daughter relationships are taboo.⁶¹ Therefore fathers do not feel their daughter's lesbian identity as a direct threat to their masculinity.

Still it is hard to draw patterns of how people react to this subject. My invitations to the interviewees to describe or typecast the people who are homophobic resulted in a collection of contradictions: While many interviewees located homophobia foremost among rural people or people living in small environments such as township communities, Sharon Ludwig (cf. 14-18) explained that also cities such as Johannesburg or Cape Town are not safe places for same-sexual people to freely express their sexual identities. Also in the cities, especially in a church context homophobia is still prevalent. Here again, one must not claim all religious people to be homophobic as there are also churches who support homosexual people. Some put forward

⁶¹ According to Janeway, patriarchal societies in the West have constructed two primary figures of women: Mary, and Eve (cf. Blackwood 2002: 71). From a male's point of view, these two figures correspond to two different kinds of relationships: The asexual relationship to one's mother and the sexual relationship to one's wife. Interestingly there is no figure applying to daughters.

the hypothesis that old people or people from certain areas where openly expressed homosexuality is rather uncommon are more homophobic because they have not been exposed to such alternative same-sex patterns and therefore simply do not know what homosexuality is (cf. CC: 241f, MK: 446-451, DB: 240-247, JDW: 227f). Such people were said to persist on homophobic traditional or cultural values. On the other hand, several of the lesbians I interviewed emphasized the fact that their grandmothers were very supportive when they came out (LT: 206-208, D: 236). Well-educated, modern, liberal, privileged and wealthy South Africans were tendentially drawn as more acceptant than conservative and poor underclass members (cf. JDW: 21-27, TM: 69-75, P7: 49f, 328-329). However, also a University campus which is supposed to be a space full of educated people is not a homophobia-free zone (D: 19-25, CC: 28-30). According to Catherine, in South Africa class often is defined by race. In consequence African races or coloured and mixed people will more likely be against homosexuality than white South Africans:

I hate speaking in terms of race, but I suppose, although Africa has passed this difficulty to speak in terms of race, it [homophobia] tends to be more prevalent among, like African races and mixed races' people and Afrikaans people. More than it is around affluent, rich people like English speaking, white people. I think, it is more accepted. Also I think the higher you get up the class line, regardless of race, people look at it more liberal. All the rich kids on campus are fine with it, but the kids that come from rural areas, from the poorer areas, they kind of have a problem with it. The kids that come from very strict religious backgrounds like the Muslim kids, they are homophobic. (...) People who are wealthy have an education and because of the education, and also because they have met a lot of people they are not as homophobic as people who come from very small towns and don't have an education and nearly haven't mingled with homosexuals. I find that I can categorize it that way (CC: 232-244).

The statement that white people rather do not have any problem with homosexual people, seen with different eyes, confirms the popular idea that homosexuality is a 'white' and Western thing (cf. chapter IV).

All these different opinions and explanations clearly show how difficult it is to integrate homophobic characters into one portrait. For sure there are certain factors which, in a certain combination, might foster homophobia. However, generalising ascriptions are neither appropriate nor can they effectively be a useful way to analyse homophobic arguments. A perspective that has been approved by Lesego Tlhwale:

Well we can't really generalize and say poor family they don't accept or rich families they accept. I mean I come from a middle class family, you know, and you might find somebody who comes from a rich family and they don't agree, they are well educated, they know everything but they don't agree. You find somebody who comes from a township, their parents don't work or whatever but they don't have a problem with it, you know. People, maybe they are not even exposed to things like to read about homosexuality or whatsoever, but you find that they accept that their kids are like that. So my family it is a middle class family. My mother you can say she is well educated and she didn't have a problem with it, she understands it. My grandmother, she is very old, but still understand that nowadays people do it like this you

know. And it depends from what your family thinks about it. It doesn't have to be class or because you are poor or you are rich. (...) It depends on what they believe in, you know. If they believe it is wrong than it doesn't have to be classified by anything. If they believe it is wrong then that's their believe. It doesn't have to be about race or class or whatsoever (LT: 198-212).

Coming back to the link between masculinity, patriarchy and homophobia, within the context of family also the concept of patrilineality plays a key role. According to this concept, sons will carry on the family name, whereas daughters, once they have married, will take their husband's name. In case of a man being gay, he cannot fulfil his family's expectation which leads to a lot of pressure, especially if he is the only son (cf. D: 292-296). Johan accounts:

Where I come from it is so controversial because it has been generations and generations of our family that has gone the same line. I'm the oldest and only son that can give the generational line going. So there was even more pressure in that sense, for me not having a marriage, a family and kids for the De Wet's surname to go on. For the whole circle to be sustained. Certainly I think it stops with me. (...) But in all facts where I come from and where I grew up I should have a wife and children. I should have let the line go on (JDW: 411-422).

The importance of having children and contributing to biological reproduction will be further explained in the next chapter, the biology-argument. This chapter, however, will focus on homophobia in connection to patriarchy and the construction 'African male identity':

Significantly, fear of homosexuality (homophobia) is an integral component of the male-sex role and patriarchal ideology. To many heterosexual men, the increasing visibility of homosexuality is regarded as a threat to hegemonic masculinity and the maintenance of the patriarchal status quo. In short within a patriarchal (essentially homophobic) society, homosexuality poses a fundamental challenge to conventional understandings of masculinity and femininity, and the assumptions by which heterosexuality is socially and culturally constructed as the 'natural' order of things (Lemon 1995: 64).

The importance of heteronormative relationship models as part of a patriarchal ideology will be discussed on the following pages. However, Connell (2005: 85) remarks that these crisis tendencies do not necessarily lead to the process of enforcement of heteronormative patterns. "While tensions lead some men to the cults of masculinity just mentioned, it leads other to support feminist reforms". We all are part of the process and also can make use of the crisis and try to change settings.

6.5. Heteronormative projections and family conceptions

As outlined before, the hegemonic variant of African masculinity is strongly related to religious as well as traditional gender stereotyped role-models that conform to a heteronormative thinking. Simply put: A man has to be with a woman. This logic was expressed in most interviews either as a perception of 'how this social norms are produced'...

Their argument is that if you are a woman you should have babies you should get married, that is the way God wants it (LT: 123-124).

It is because of the patriarchal you know system, because of the culture, that... okay, a man is supposed to be with a woman and a woman is supposed to be with a man.(...) So for me it is the patriarchal society that leads to the homophobia (DS: 39-44).

Socially you had to be a heterosexual man and it was generally accepted and acknowledged to be or to have feelings for the opposite sex and to think about getting married one day and having children and holding a family and basically living your life in a heterosexual way (JDW: 46-48).

... or as an expression of moral values and ideas of 'what is normal':

For one I believe that a man and a woman are supposed to be together. Just biologically the way the woman's body is made, and the way the man's body is made (T: 12-13).

There is a man and then there is a woman. The woman behaves in a different way from the behaviour of the men. So when it is two people of the same sex, who of them is going to be different from the other and stuff like that. (...) It is so strange (P7: 23-26).

(...) because in rural area, when you are a boy they would force you to do what boys do, you know. When you are a girl they would force you to what to do what girls are doing (M8: 201-203).

The last citation once again calls attention to the differences between rural and urban areas concerning the conception of gender-norms. Interestingly, heterosexual role models as described in the citations above of how the man shall behave differently from the women, to some extent also translate into lesbian relationships as Denise remarks:

If you are like feminine and you are all girlie and you wear dresses and everything else. And then if you are butch then you are masculine and you wear pants which is... And the funny thing is, we find that butch women mostly date feminine women so it has that kind of thing it looks like a heterosexual relationship so. Yah (D: 197-200).

Nevertheless, ascriptions of a heteronormative setting within a (lesbian) relationship sometimes are imposed constructions that do not match reality. Catherine unmasks this idea as a 'patriarchal logic' that misinterprets patterns of dominance in relationships. Thereby this 'patriarchal logic' wrongly understates a kind of heteronormative thinking in which the more masculine person is perceived as the 'patriarch':

I don't necessarily agree with that. Em, I think a lot of people assume... Whenever you were asked which one is the man, which one is the woman. I think people assume that homosexuals adopt heteronormativism, em, towards heteronormativ gender identities. But I don't necessarily agree that (...) it actually happens. I think people assume it happens, but not always. I think that maybe we do get one as more dominant, but that does not necessarily mean they are more masculine. You get what I am saying? (...) (CC: 163-171).

I think people assume that there is a patriarch you know, a more dominant one that makes all the decisions. (...) I think people assume that. It is not fair to assume it though because it doesn't have that. * The only thing is that lesbians are guilty by assuming that too. It is not only straight people. I think that lesbians also assume (CC: 192-196).

Whereas this citation refers to lesbian relationships, the construction of heteronormative homosexual relationships among men as well is utterly interesting. Femininity and masculinity are interpreted as two opposite roles within sexual intercourse where the feminine man is act-

ing the passive position of being penetrated while the masculine man takes the active part penetrating. McIntosh (1996: 37) explains:

The radical distinction between the feminine, passive homosexual and his masculine, active partner is one which is not made very much in our own society, but which is very important in the Middle East. There, however, neither is thought of as being a 'born' homosexual, although the passive partner, who demeans himself by his feminine submission, is despised and ridiculed while the active one is not.

This is a very informative argument as it shows how hegemonic masculinity is constructed upon the active part in a sexual relationship. Often this contraposition of active and passive goes hand in hand with social divisions and stratifications such as age, class and race. As Murray and Roscoe (2001: 6ff) explain, in some cases the person who takes the active part of penetration is not perceived as homosexual which leads to the conclusion that activity or passivity within a same-sexual relation has an impact on how people perceive same-sexual identities. The authors call this the 'gender-based' homosexual relationship pattern⁶² that strongly relies on the perceptions of binary opposed gender roles.

As explained in chapter 2.5. Western concepts such as binary opposed gender roles are not universal and therefore cannot smoothly be transferred to African societies. Constructions of genders always are happening within a social frame and thus need to be understood in context of each society. Oyěwùmí (2002) not only challenges the use of Western gender conceptions in an African context, she further heavily questions the idea that gender in itself works as a social division in all societies. According to her, Western concepts of gender discrimination strongly rely on a 'Western' institution, namely the nuclear family. "Thus the fundamental category of difference, which appears as a universal from the confines of the nuclear family, is gender" (Oyěwùmí 2002: 3).

Motherhood, a topic that was addressed in some of the cited statements, is also influenced by this family concept because "[t]here seems to be no understanding of the role of a mother independent of her sexual ties to a father. Mothers are first and foremost wives" (Oyěwùmí 2002: 4). According to Oyěwùmí, most African societies do not define nuclear families as their basic social institutions, but have developed alternative concepts of 'being a mother'. In turn those concepts usually are not dependant on the concept of 'father'. Hence, the woman's identity as a mother is not characterised by her sexual relationship to a man but by the relationship she has with her child.

⁶² Apart from the 'gender-based' pattern, they introduce two further same-sexual relationship patterns. The 'status differentiated' pattern of 'homosexuality' that is structured along social stratifications such as class, age, race, etc. and the 'egalitarian' pattern, common among present-day gays and lesbians in Europe and North America, in which such stratifications are not important (cf. Murray/Roscoe 2001: 6ff).

Oyěwùmí's objections are very important and show how easily we run the risk of applying generalized structures onto societies without questioning the genesis of those structures and the concepts that lie behind. The concept of homosexuality is another example that needs to be seen in this regard. However, there remain two things that must be clarified.

First, when it comes to anti-homosexuality arguments in Africa, the concept of motherhood based on her relationship to progeny equally comes into use, as the reproduction-argument (cf. chapter 7.6.) will show. Even if a lesbian woman has children and therefore fulfils her social obligations this is no guarantee for acceptance. For, in some cases, the lesbian identity is perceived to be more substantial than being a mother (cf. Aarmo 1999: 272).

Second, most African states have a long history of missionary work and colonialism. As can be stated for South Africa, many apparently traditional social structures and norms have been influenced by Western rule. The un-African-argument as well as the religion-argument have revealed that discursive concepts of 'African tradition' contain internalised Christian morals and values. The same accounts for patriarchal family ideals. Consequently, in many cases slightly adapted 'Western' concepts can be applied onto present-day African societies.

Résumé

In the course of this chapter we saw in which way masculine, 'lesbian' women as well as effeminate 'gay' men challenge the concept of hegemonic 'African masculinity'. Modernity, feminism, the visibility of same-sexual identities and relationships are interpreted as a lapse of a patriarchal gender system which includes a certain ideal of masculinity. As pointed out in previous pages, such crisis tendencies have, at the same time, led to the reconstruction and enforcement of this ideal. It is an ideal that is promoted by traditional initiation schools and further promotes heterosexuality as the single acceptable sexuality. Same-sexual desires do not fit into the dominant picture of 'African masculinity' that often is used as an argument to legitimate homophobic incidences. Despite or precisely because of the crisis tendencies, patriarchal and heteronormative violence is still strong in South African society.

The next chapter now will have a look at how biology is used as an argument against same-sexualities. Thereby also reproduction and once again the concept of motherhood will be important.

CHAPTER VII: ALL ABOUT BODIES AND REPRODUCTION – THE BIOLOGY-ARGUMENT

Biology was used as an argument on 'both' sides: By people to justify their homohostile views as well as by 'homosexual' people to 'naturalise' their sexual orientation. Before I will continue the analysis on reproduction and motherhood, the following chapter first will try to explain how exactly the biology-argument is applied in different ways by different people which leads to different results in favour of different aims.

7.1. The 'racial' component of black and white

Homosexuality being a 'white' thing and something that initially was not there among 'black' people were some of the persuasions I precisely analysed in chapter IV – the 'un-African'-argument.

Initially here in this country, South Africa, before we gained those independence (...) we never had such issues like in terms with, like especially our brothers our black brothers, there were no such things as gay things. But now (...) things are going so crazy, you know (L: 63-66).

Back then I have put such statements into a historical socio-cultural context that strongly challenged the idea of 'African traditional culture' as an inflexible and homogenizing concept. Besides from this 'cultural' aspect, the argument also is linked to racism. This racist connotation was pointed out by Johan:

Well of course I don't agree with that at all. I think it is wrong to actually draw and compare sexuality with any kind of race. It's just bad, it is Apartheid. I mean you can't say that in black communities homosexuality is wrong you can't say that. It is the same as to say that it is wrong for a black person to be in a white person's presence (...) to think that in black communities with their history of culture that homosexuality is still not accepted. It is the same principle as Apartheid (JDW: 264-269).

The reference to Apartheid is a commonly used side-swipe by gay people to raise awareness of how similar the argumentation logic between the suppression of black people during Apartheid and the current discrimination against LGBTQI people is. Actually the same argument was used as a strategy to implement sexual orientation in the bill of rights of the Post-Apartheid Constitution of South Africa (cf. Cock 2003: 38). Hence biology is also used to counter the argument on homosexuality being an exclusively 'white' thing.

SK: (...) I mean, if you are saying to us, you know biologically... You know it is not all black and white, I (...) I mean there are many grey scales. You've got people with all sorts of different hormone levels, things like that. It would be unfair. **M8:** You come with a very valid point (...) It shows that this thing doesn't belong to a certain group, a certain race. (...) It's happening in each and in every race: White, Coloured, Indian, Blacks, you know (M8: 242-254).

However, it is hard to distinguish whether the idea of homosexuality as a 'white' thing is meant as a racist argument that understands the notion of 'race' as a biological entity or whether the differentiation between 'black' and 'white' is referring to 'black' and 'white' culture instead of a genetic inscribe of skin colour.

7.2. 'Homosexuality disease' and concepts of 'healing'

The figure of both male and female 'homosexuality' was further frequently undertaken in terms of race and gender, often employing evolutionary vocabularies of 'arrested development' and 'degeneration' as well as the language of miscegenation, 'sexual half-breeds', and so on (Hoad 2007: 8).

As outlined in the chapter of the origin of homosexualities, several statements in the interviews heavily pathologized the idea of falling in love and having sex with the same sex. Heterosexuality was seen as the 'healthy' way of living (L: 105-106). Instead, homosexuality was said to be an 'illness' comparable to leukaemia or cancer, a 'hereditary disease' that spreads over to the next generations or a 'chromosomal dysfunction' that has caused people to engage in such behaviour (cf. HIS4: 71-86, P7: 178-188).

Apart from those rather physical 'disorders', people also think that same-sexual people are 'mentally ill' (cf. Rubin 2002: 29) or confused people who might be possessed by bad spirits (cf. L: 72-80, T: 51-52, P3: 294-295, Epprecht 1998: 636). Doris Burtscher (cf. 386-434) points out that it is not possible to draw a clear line between physical and mental disease. This kind of separation is a Western concept that does not respect reality in which psychology and physiology are strongly connected and thus must be understood in a holistic way. This notion explains why sometimes people feel ill, although they don't have any scientifically measurable disease. This phenomenon refers to the concept of Kleinman who differentiates between illness and disease. Illness is the patient's perspective and interpretation of being ill. Illness thus also contains a social environment's perceptions and reactions. In contrast, disease is the medical explanation of a biological or psychological process that is taking place. Both of them always are connected to each other (cf. Kleinman 1981: 72ff).

Furthermore Burtscher explains that sorcery and the possession of bad spirits are cultural patterns that are deeply rooted in a social function in society. Bad behaviour or being the object of jealousy are possible explanations as to why people are afflicted by ghosts and bad spirits. This social component is often disregarded in 'Western' medicine. Being 'ill' thus not only is a personal matter but also refers to the social community. In turn being 'healthy' subsumes also your social environment being 'healthy' (cf. DB: 386-434).

How can such concept of illness, disease and spirit possession contribute to understanding the arguments brought up against same-sexuality? They can explain why the perception of 'homosexuality' as a 'sickness' is no mere individual problem, but a social problem and thus needs to be seen in the context of community. Within this context, the 'culture of discretion' outlined in chapter 4.5. and the fear that members of the extended family might discover someone's sexual orientation becomes more clear. Furthermore, these perceptions also have an impact on the different concepts of 'healing' and the idea "[t]hat there is something wrong with you which can either be treated by drugs or psychological counselling, that it basically is not an acceptable sexuality" (JDW: 67-68). 'Corrective' rape is another idea, and maybe one of the most cruel ones of how same-sexual people can be 'cured'. Apart from that there are people who were sent to traditional healers (cf. Cock 2003: 42f, Aarmo 1999: 270). Then there also are medical and psychological therapies. Johan, who has personally experienced such 'healing' measures accounts:

I think there was sort of initially, when I was about twelve, they [his parents] realized that something was different with me and something wasn't quite right so they took me for some tests to Pretoria where they did an EEG on me, where they put electrodes on your head and they had a psychologist interview me and it was all serious a test. After the test they decided to put me in a clinic in Pretoria for about two weeks where they used medication on me and they help you there. And I have never... they [his parents] have never opened up and told me why they did that but I suspect that the psychologists after the test – they talked to my parents alone, without me - and I suspect that they told my parents that they think that I am homosexual and that they might be able to cure me and they advised them to put me in a clinic and put me on some medication and drugs to see whether it won't make a difference in my (...) feelings and thoughts (JDW: 101-111).

As Cock (cf. 2003: 40) writes, the South African Defence Force during Apartheid took measures such as 'electric shock aversion therapy' to 'treat' same-sexuality within the military. Psychiatric counselling was also a common therapy used against homosexuals' 'disordered mental condition' (cf. Botha/Cameron 1997: 27). Methods of 'healing', and the idea that homosexuality is pathological is not an 'African' particularity but also was (and in some cases still is) a common perception in 'Western' societies as well (cf. Rubin 2002: 21).

7.3. Bodies – a biological sex cage?

'Bodies' was another argument that came up against homosexuality. The following citation shows how the idea of the notion of 'bodies' unspecifically is used to draw a line between accepted sexuality and homosexuality as well as to differentiate between friendship and sexual relationship.

Like again I say there is bodies, there is bodies. I have got a lot of girlfriends, and I have got a lot of guy-friends and I... it doesn't matter if they are male or female. (...) But there is bodies. I mean don't go over that borderline (HIS4: 27-29).

Persistent gender role models and the perception of the biology of human bodies were used to normalise heterosexual and denormalize homosexual behaviour:

For one I believe that a man and a woman are supposed to be together. Just biologically the way the woman's body is made, and the way the man's body is made. For me a man and a woman should be together (T: 12-14).

In the previous chapter I explained how heteronormative thinking was constructed as part of 'African traditional culture'. According to Judith Butler's (1991) heteronormative matrix, this relationship pattern is grounding on a binary logic of two types of biological sex that brings about two genders, namely male and female. All alternative figures of sex, gender and relationship patterns are assumed to be norm-deviant. The construction of one's gender depends on the construction of the biological sex one is born with. Shifting sexes do not fit into this principle as the following conversation shows:

JT: (...) Do you think it is possible for a guy to become a girl? **M8:** It is impossible. **JT:** Why? **M8:** It is impossible. If God creates you as a man you will be a man. You will be a man, you can't change it. Whether you like it or not. You can go for sugary you can do whatever you do but there are certain things that you might not experience for example go to the period. You can't go to a period because God didn't create those things to you. (...) Men cannot have this. **JT:** So but for example all the women who don't have any periods any more, do they become a man (...)? **M8:** No that's... there are certain things that are there. For example what they call a 'womb' (M8: 152-167).

This citation further shows that biological sex basically is defined by sexual characteristics such as a womb, a period or in the 'male' case, a penis. The next statement requests this definition: "I remember one time I was crossing by and some guy just said to me: 'oh no, you are acting like a man. That means you have a dick down there!' You know like... why do I have to need a dick for me to be a man?" (LT: 177-179).

The construction of biological sex and the assumption that there either is a man or a woman, and further that those two categories are clear-cut and unchangeable is one of the arguments used against same-sexuality. As discussed in chapter I, current findings in biological research indicate that the idea of two 'opposing' biological sexes cannot be sustained. Sex needs to be understood as a continuum with lots of grey scales, instead of two contrasting poles of black and white (cf. Degele 2008a: 62).

7.4. Grey scales: What Castor Semenya did to South Africa

As Degele (2008a: 62) points out correctly, there are different possibilities to determine biological sex (chromosomal, gonadal, hormonal and morphological). Due to the diversity within each pole of the binary structured sex-model, it has become more accurate to organise biological sex by using scales. This not only concerns *social* gender identities but also *biological* sex.

I mean, if you are saying to us, you know biologically... You know it is not all black and white, I (...) I mean there are many grey scales. You've got people with all sorts of different hormone levels, things like that (M8: 242-244).

In the past few years, scientific work has made clear that the sexual opposition between male and female not only on social but also on biological base must be abandoned. Man and woman can no longer be seen as two distinct entities. These insights also question the naturalisation of the heteronormative matrix and force to open the 'biological sex cage'. In a South African context, Caster Semenya is one such example that recently has been identified as an intersex person. After Semenya had won the Woman's 800 meters World Championship in 2009, her physical condition caused debates about her sex. Her case was largely discussed in the South African media and the rest of the world.

JT: Have you ever seen people where you were not sure if this person is a male or a female?
M8: (laughs) yes. (We all laugh) **JT:** Tell me about the situation. **M8:** No, I'll give you one example. I'll use the famous one: Caster Semenya. (...) You know: Man-lady. Besides she has been female since so on and so on, even if she came across you you can't say if it is a girl or ... or if it is a boy. You don't think she is a boy. **SK:** She looked exactly like a man! **M8:** But the way she behaved the way she do things... the way she wears... (...) I have heard that she has got some other things inside. They looked for male things that give her power. (...) He is got internal man and external female (...) but at the end of the day (...) when you get a child you just look at the organs so she is a girl, he is a boy (M8: 170-192).

What did the case of Caster Semenya do to South Africa? She greatly challenged normative structures of sex and gender. However, whereas binary structured social genders as well as biological sex came under critique, the differentiation of same-sexuality being something 'biological' (and thus natural?) or something social (and thus unnatural?) remains important. As the following statement shows:

I would say sometimes it can be a social thing, homosexuality. But sometimes (...) as I have said there are some other kids, you can see them when you grow up. (...) This guy, this little boy is not playing with guns with cars... he plays with puppies and whatever. (...) You can't match them on a thing, that is a biological thing (M8: 229-241).

The interviewee further explains that 'homosexuality' also can happen in boarding schools where there are only boys or only girls. In these cases, same-sexuality is not perceived as a 'biological thing' but as a 'social thing' (cf. M8: 229-241). The question once again occurs why there is such an interest in tracing back homosexualities to social or biological causes. As I outlined before, categories of 'biological' and 'social' are not distinct entities either. Whether someone engages in same-sex practices must be seen as a complex intermingling and combination of factors that hardly can be distinguished into clearly 'biological' or definitely 'social'.

Apart from referring to grey scales to justify 'deviant' sexualities that go beyond distinct categories of male and female or heterosexual and homosexual, the biology-argument also is used by same-sexuals to counter the idea that homosexuality is a lifestyle and thus a choice.

7.5. Counter the lifestyle-theory

In chapter III of this work, I demonstrated the idea of homosexuality being a 'lifestyle'. But what exactly does such a lifestyle look like? As outlined in chapter II, the homosexual, defined as a person with a special sexual identity, only was 'invented' in the 19th century. "Foucault suggests somewhat polemically that the homosexual becomes a species around 1870" (Hoad 2007: xvi-xvii). Further, it must be said that there is no such thing as one typical homosexual lifestyle but different ways to express ones sexual orientation. However, there might be several images and stereotypes that possibly come into our minds when talking about homosexuals. In a discursive view, these images and stereotypes construct something like a 'homosexual lifestyle'.

When it comes to Africa, same-sex activities in many cases do not correspond to the drawn image 'Western, average, present-day people' think of. Many 'homosexuals' in Africa as well as in Europe are engaging in same-sex activities but continue to live their 'casual' lives: They work, they marry, they found families etc. By staying in the closet and fulfilling their social responsibility of child-bearing and family-caring, they sometimes can evade social stigmatisation. As explained in previous chapters, several African leaders state that homosexuality is a 'Western' import and initially did not belong to 'African' culture. According to Gevisser (1999: 962), "Mugabe is right about one thing: while homosexuality in Africa predates the colonization of the continent, the advent of a gay subculture, of people taking on identities as 'gay' and 'lesbian' and demanding their rights - is without doubt a new 'Western' import".

This new experience of an openly lived homosexuality is connected to the common idea that it can be reduced to a kind of lifestyle and thus is no more than a personal choice (cf. Fiedler 2004: 76). In her article 'How Homosexuality became un-African', Aarmo (1999: 276) accounts that some gay and lesbian informants were objecting this lifestyle-theory by stating their same-sexual orientation to be biological and therefore natural. Aarmo comes to the conclusion that "[t]hey thus naturalize their 'deviance', just as the government and the church naturalize power and inequality".

Several interviews confirmed this biologicistic reduction of homosexuality:

I think the reason why it [homosexuality] is so ostracised in Africa is because people think that it is not genetic or the behaviour is abnormal because they try to be a certain type of thing that they are not. So I think that is why it is frowned upon, because they [lesbians] are seen as trying to be men (D: 177-179).

I am being raped because this society thinks that I'll become straight, because they think that I am scared of a penis. So if I get that, I would enjoy it... Forget about that. It is not about that... For me to be a lesbian it is not about choice. If it was a choice believe me I don't would be a lesbian. (...) So for me to be a lesbian it is either you like it or not but you cannot ignore the

fact that I am a lesbian, either they change people or not. Either they rape me or do whatever... And, it won't change the fact that I am a lesbian because it is not my choice, you know (DS: 100-106).

Being gay and lesbian is not something we do – it is who we are. It is not a lifestyle (SL: 237-240).

These statements express that sexuality is neither a social, nor a mere biological 'thing'. It is more than that. It is who they are – their identity. The idea that same-sexual orientation is not a social 'thing' but has some kind of biological base and therefore cannot be reduced to mere cultural patterns as well as the fact that black people also engage in same-sexual acts without ever having had contact to white people, are popular arguments used against the 'homosexuality' is a colonial import-argument (Aarmo 1999: 270). Even in the phase of transition from Apartheid to Democracy, the NCGLE's⁶³ strategy to implement the 'gay rights clause' was to state that equally to race, sexual orientation is a 'natural phenomenon' and just as skin colour cannot be 'changed' (cf. Cock 2003: 38). Indeed it seems that homosexuality is more accepted when it is traced back to 'natural' causes:

You know that the most animal species also have homosexuality, most of them, within them. (...) I mean you find those kind of practices. It could just be sort of a perfectly natural thing (SK in M8: 135-138).

Interestingly, the comparison with animals is also used by the 'other' league. In his homophobic speech at the Heroes Day in 1995 Robert Mugabe, president of Zimbabwe, compared homosexuals to animals. As Aarmo writes, he stated that homosexuals are even 'worse than pigs and dogs' because same-sexuality does not exist among animals. "He added that animals do not copulate with mates of the same sex but turn to the opposite sex in order to procreate" (Aarmo 1999: 262).

However, this exclusive way of using 'biology' as a counter argument to 'naturalise' homosexuality involves difficulties as it reacts to the separation of 'real' and 'false' homosexuality and thus reproduces this picture. Homosexual identities that do not base on a proved and stable sexual orientation are 'falsified' and 'denaturalised'. According to Hoad (cf. 2007: xvii), this reflects and challenges the dispute between social constructionist views that see homosexuality emerging out of larger socio-cultural context and essentialist ideas that try to root homosexuality within a 'transhistorical determinant'. 'Biological essentialism' is one of two dominant forms of generalising homosexual identities in sexual politics, as Cock (2003: 42) writes:

There are two forms of essentialist views involved in contemporary sexual politics. A biological essentialism that asserts homosexuality as an intrinsic condition is not the only problematic form this takes. There is also a form of political essentialism which asserts that the

⁶³ NCGLE: National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality. For more Information see chapter 2.6.

homosexual identity 'trumps' all other identities and claims that homosexuality necessarily implies a intrinsic commitment to a revolutionary and transformative agenda.

It is important to keep in mind that same-sexualities and their causes can vary even though this fact might not be considered by most homohostile attackers who tend to lump all those different kinds of same-sexualities together.

7.6. Reproduction

Another argument which came up in the interviews was the idea that 'normally' same-sexual relationships cannot produce offspring. The argument thus refers to biological reproduction to explain that a heterosexual way is the 'normal' way of living. As Hoad (2007: xvi) writes, "[w]ithin biologies, homosexuality is definitionally nonprocreative and thus is difficult to convey as a metaphor of social reproduction". This citation shows that reproduction has a biological as well as a social component. In the following pages, I will focus on the biological part of the reproduction-argument. The social reproduction-argument will be issued in the next chapter.

The fact that biological reproduction is essential for life and, therefore, homosexuality is not right came up in many interviews.

Socially you had to be a heterosexual man and it was generally accepted and acknowledged to be or to have feelings for the opposite sex and to think about getting married one day and having children and holding a family and basically living your life in a heterosexual way (JDW: 46-48).

Because lets say * if God want to create people to be... to be so homosexual. I am not going to make a baby with another guy, you know. I must meet a girl so that I am able to make a baby (M8: 35-37).

It is believed in the Christian faith/religion, that people are designed to find a partner of the opposite sex and stay with them, not to change partners whenever, then to express our love to them by having sex with them and to reproduce, have children – if that is what you feel you want and if you can – together. So I think that's where homosexuals have made the confusion – because you're having sexual encounters with same sex (T: 47-52).

God made the act to reproduce he made us watch side one another (HIS4: 21-22).

The basic system of life before was: Adam and Eve a man and wife reproduces and within that, a family comes. (...) And currently the family system has been broken where there is no more man and wife, but it is a man and a man, and a woman and a woman. And in that lesbian-bisexuality where it is normally just man and woman but it is men that is kept sexual with the man as well as a woman. (...) That has become a deformation of the temple of God which is the human being (HIS7: 33-39).

(...) in fact their argument is that if you are a woman you should have babies you should get married, that is the way God wants it (LT: 123-124).

These citations show how the gender dichotomy is defined by sexuality which is further reduced to a reproductional purpose (cf. Nganda 2007: 54). According to Nganda (2007: 55)

“(…) in almost all parts and cultures of Africa, all sexual acts that do not fulfil the conditions of marriage and childbearing are condemned as deviant and severely punished (…). These are monosexual acts such as masturbation, homosexuality, rape and incest”.

Another idea is that reproduction is necessary to keep the family line going. Children are perceived to be the “(…) representation of my genes and stuff. I'll carry on the generation” (L: 96). The ideal of family and reproduction seemingly is not compatible with homosexual relationships. This might be the reason why according to Aarmo's observation of Zimbabwean society, fertility is a very important factor in marriages which for their part mainly serve to connect two lineages and to reproduce. Hence, marriage is an important extended family matter and cannot be seen as a mere personal purpose (cf. Aarmo 1999: 264). In some cases the value of children in society is expressed more subtle:

Some [mothers] they might just feel it [same-sexuality] is wrong because they are afraid what people outside are gonna say, you know: I have a daughter and now my daughter prefers to be lesbian that gonna means that I am not going to have any grandchildren (LT: 217-219).

Because of this, children, especially sons, (as we talk of a patriarchal structured society) are expected to reproduce and to pass on the name of their family. This can put homosexual men into a difficult position:

Especially in African families, males are, should be [reproducing]. Because they are the ones that carry the family name. Then it is a big deal I suppose when you are gay and you are a guy. (...) The family name is just gonna stop. Especially if you are the only son (D: 293-296).

Apart from genetic reproduction and keeping the family line going, in many African societies children play an important economic role of economic and social precaution.

In one case, the argument of reproduction was hefted on a meta level of population:

We were born because people who brought us up they were not gay. So we should ?keep having sex? so we can have more people in this country. And also – sorry – and also maybe because of Aids. If we are all becoming gay, we have to reproduce and yah, so that the human-kind continues (L: 129-132).

About the same argument that homosexuality is a 'threat' which leads the human race to die out was brought up by Ruth Mompoti, member of the National Executive Committee of the ANC in 1987 (cf. Cock 2003: 36). The argument can also be used out of patriotic purpose. The Zanu (Zimbabwe African National Union) women's league supports the idea of women being the carriers of tradition and the reproducers of the nation (cf. Aarmo 1999: 262). The idea that the right of adoption for homosexual couples might be a solution to the many orphans resulting from the AIDS crisis was rejected by Laurent (313-326):

I also think gay or being homosexual is not a cure to the trouble of overpopulation here in the world. Because you can adopt kids, you can be a normal person and with your partner prob-

ably adopt one kid, maybe one or two, that would be fine. But I think gay men... I think it is morally it is out of... it is not sound. So in Southern African... it is something where we are not used to, something really we have never seen. Its unconventional, it does not know how it came here, something different. And it's been ?...?. Just imagine my parent would be gay I wouldn't be here. I wouldn't be talking to you right now. If both our parents were gay.

As two men or two women are not able to 'naturally' reproduce without insemination or social constructs such as 'adoption', these issues were often launched in interviews. Same-sex marriage and adoption by same-sexual couples were some of the most emotional topics that came up in course of discussion.

Additionally, motherhood plays a very important role in many African ethnic groups. In several cases, women's social position to some extent is dependent on her position as mother. Because of this, childlessness is very unusual among many traditional African ethnic groups (cf. (cf. Oyěwùmí 2002, MK: 100-102). Whereas Western feminists dismantled the woman's role of being mother as a reduction to their reproductional service for the benefit of a patriarchal society,⁶⁴ black Feminists have criticised this 'anti-children'-attitude. They argue that the ideal of motherhood and female gender in Western societies is strongly embedded in the concept of the nuclear family – a concept that rarely exists in African societies. As post-colonial theory points out, Western feminists simply proceeded on the assumption that the nuclear family is a universal institution and thus motherhood needs to be universally condemned. Instead, 'being a mother' in Africa does not necessarily go hand in hand with female subordination to patriarchy.

However, according to Martina Kopf (cf. 102-110) and several other statements in the interviews lesbianism often is put on a level with childlessness. Lesbian relationships often are seen as non-reproductive and thus seemingly don't fit into this conception of motherhood. This idea is also expressed in the next two citations:

[T]hey think they have the freedom but are destroying their own future. Sometimes you see those people, they end up regretting. Because maybe they want to have kids. They want to have their own kids, especially women, but they can't because they are lesbians (P3: 104-107).

Because some of them (women) they have got girlfriends. I used to have a friend, who is a girl. Sometimes you can, when you are strong you can go for another lady you know, but now... guess what, because today she has got a child! (M8: 89-93).

As the second citation explains, a child automatically indicates that the 'former lesbian' now has become heterosexual – a view that bases upon the idea that lesbians in general do not

⁶⁴ In course of the Industrial Revolution sexuality more and more has been reduced to its reproductional purpose (cf. Wrede 2000: 35, Degele 2008b: 85). "According to this [radical feminist] perspective, women's sexuality was the result of a long period of history in which men had power over women and thus define and controlled their sexuality" (Blackwood 2002: 70). In turn the women's societal role mainly was conceptualized by being sexually passive, producing baby and being mothers (cf. Wrede 2000: 37) – perspectives that were vehemently criticised by Western feminists.

want or cannot have children. This perception, however, does not respect reality. Some of the 'homosexual' interviewees expressed their wish to have children: "I love children very much. I have five godchildren. The children like me and I love children. No, I have thought about it many times. I would like to have children, yah" (JDW: 427-429, cf. CC: 335-387).

Résumé

The biology-argument chapter has outlined different ways of how biology is used as an argument in the discourse of same-sexual desire. Thereby I discussed parallels between racism and the idea that 'homosexuality' is a 'white' thing. Further we came across arguments that see same-sexuality as something pathological like a disease such as cancer or a chromosomal disorder. Thereby many homohostile arguments refer to concepts of complementary biological sex that need to be questioned.

On the other hand, biology is also used as an argument by same-sexual people to naturalise their desires and to legitimate their sexual identities. One can say that the biology-argument is strongly connected to certain ideas of how people become 'homosexual'. Finally, I talked about the importance of procreation in Africa and the assumption that same-sex relationships pose a threat to families as well as to the entire population because they cannot naturally reproduce.

Adoption is one possibility for 'homosexual' couples in South Africa to build family units. But in many cases adoption is no real alternative because, as Martina Kopf points out, in many African societies motherhood is very much based on pregnancy and birth (cf. MK: 181-186). Additionally the right of homosexual couples to adopt children is very much frowned upon because people fear that those children will grow up being confused or start to copy this 'unnatural lifestyle'.

This leads to the next chapter that, in a way, still has to do with reproduction but will focus on the socio-cultural side of this argument, namely the reproduction of cultural heritage and the question of education. Thereby the question of socialisation and education and the reservations made against same-sexual parenthood will be discussed.

CHAPTER VIII: FALSE PARENTS, WRONG EDUCATION – THE SOCIAL INFLUENCE-ARGUMENT

Apart from biological reproduction which I discussed in the last chapter, also socio-cultural reproduction was used as an argument against same-sexuality. Back then, we have learned that heteronormative thinking is strongly connected to religious values and a concept of 'African tradition and culture'. The logic of this argument is that homosexuality threatens these values by opposing them. Additionally, due to the fact that homosexuals now start to openly express their sexual identity, they further might influence other people, especially children to copy such 'bad habits'. This perception once again strongly relies on the idea that homosexuality is a lifestyle and thus something that can be socially learned.

The 'social influence'-argument puts education in a central position. In the interviews, parents and public education at schools were mentioned, but there was also a focus on media and social environments, such as community, church and friends, as basic authorities of education. One of the primary issues we broached already in the end of the last chapter is the discussion around adoption and the question of whether same-sexual couples should be allowed to adopt children.

8.1. Adoption and 'gay' parenthood

As we saw in the chapters IV and V, according to the concept of 'African tradition' and Christian religious values, children ideally grow up in heterosexual family structures under a mother and a father. Laurent explains: "Where I come from, I come from a village (...) deep in the rural areas, we grow up normally under a mum and dad, a mother and a father. And we grew up nicely" (L: 18-20).

Several people in the interviews heavily criticised the right of gay and lesbian couples to adopt children (cf L: 99-104, 249-257). As a matter of fact, South Africa is one of those countries where 'homosexual' couples are allowed to adopt children (cf. Botha/Cameron 1997: 34ff). Against the wide spread myth that homosexual people don't want to have any children (cf. John 1999: 343) some of the 'homosexual' interview partners expressed their wish to have children (CC: 335-359).

Cath: You know we definitely would like children, definitely. **JT:** Okay, but adopt them..., I mean not having like semen...? **Cath:** No, I wouldn't do that. I am very much for adoption because there are so many kids who need homes. And why go through all that trouble to have your own children when there are children who desperately need a home. (...) **Chris:** And personally when I say child it doesn't have to be a baby, it can be as like six years old. (...) The

huge problem is that people only adopt babies. (...) **Cath:** And also another thing is, like Chris-sie was saying, if you want to have an artificial insemination... We don't want a child to look like, I mean to like be white or to be only black. We want to mix children, because people will assume that the child is her child or the child is my child, not that it is our child.

As this citation shows, insemination and adoption are two possibilities for 'lesbian' couples to form family units. Male same-sexual couples can adopt children or arrange themselves with a female friend. The latter was the case by Neville John (1995: 334) who accounts in his testimony about 'gay parenthood', “[w]hile gay adoption is not explicitly prohibited by law, gay men and lesbians find that adoption agencies refuse to let them adopt children regardless of the fact that they would provide excellent homes for the grand number of children waiting to be adopted”.

Besides general educational problems that do not differ from any other parent's situation, gay parents additionally have to cope with situations of social stigmatisation due to their sexual orientation. As John explains, there is a pack of educational unease and a lot of questions connected to the idea that 'homosexual orientation' might cause any of the problems you want to keep from your child (cf. John 1995: 345f).

Many of these fears (or rather scepticisms) are equally shared by people who strongly condemn same-sexual couples of having a child. One of the girls in the park for example, expressed her personal point of view that lesbians should not be allowed to adopt children or have kids at all (cf. P3: 201-209).

However similar the fears are, the arguments that are used do not point to the same direction. Gay parents, on the one hand, are aware that most of the norms and values promoted by their same-sexual lifestyle stand in contrast to socially expected family models. To a large extent, their fears and problems are caused by the restrictive and conservative social environment they live in and could be diminished if this social environment only was more acceptable towards alternative ways of living. On the other hand, the idea that lies behind the restrictive perspective of prohibiting any form of gay parenthood is that homosexuality can be caused by social influence. Following this idea, if your parents are gay, children might think that same-sexual relationships are 'normal'. As Laurent explains:

I can try only to encourage the way to stop them [homosexual couples to have children]. Cause for example the kid that's being raised by Elton John and the other guy, partner. The kid will grow up being confused. He don't know who is called mummy or daddy. (...) Like if it was me, if I was a child being brought up under such circumstances I would be very much confused. Even the kid when it grows up and then wants to start his own family, being full of such things that he had been taught from his father, or don't know the 'father'...? Taught from his parents that were allowed to be gay. So it is not good (L: 249-256).

There further exists the perception that homosexuality is something that can be transmitted via education, hence can be 'learned'. Among the theories of 'deviant' behaviour this is called the theory of learning which assumes that becoming 'deviant' is an interactive process and therefore everybody can become 'abnormal' if he_she is 'trained' in a certain way (Lamnek 1996: 189ff). The same idea was also articulated by Plummer as Seidman (1996: 15) writes: "Plummer argued that individuals are not born, but become homosexuals. Same-sex desires may be innate but it is only in social interaction that people learn that such desires indicate a homosexual identity". This perspective also stands in strong connection to the concept of self control (cf. Wells 1978: 191) which leads to the idea that 'right' education prohibits children from engaging in same-sex activities. This belief was expressed in two interviews:

Cause like for my family * like the way we are raised. People... the way people are raised, we were always told what is wrong and what is right, you know. The kids were always told: 'yeah people have choice but there are certain things that you mustn't do. You don't have to do these' (P3: 201-209).

I would still, still have to love my child the way parents are supposed to love their child, but obviously not that behaviour they show. If they were brought up with you, your child would know that it is not the thing to do. But if they make a mistake in their life. For whatever reason and they go into a homosexual relationship I would just... speak to them. But there is only so much talking you can do (T: 55-63).

Such assumptions further lead to the conclusion that 'homosexual' behaviour can be caused by a 'lack of education'.

8.2. Lack of education

'Lack of education' and therefore not to know how to behave according to heterosexual values was explained to be one reason why people become 'homosexual'.

G2: 'Cause some of them, there is no one who is telling them: You know, this is not right. They don't have anyone who tells them that... **JT:** So it is a lack of education? **G2:** Sometimes so I can say (P3: 217-220).

However, this idea stands in contrast to the perception that homosexuality is more accepted among higher educated people (CC: 236-244). This contradiction occurs because education is no static entity but refers to different contents of what has been taught. The statement that homosexuality has higher acceptance among well educated people also refers to the thought that such people in general have been more exposed to openly lived same-sexuality and therefore are used to it:

I think also in terms of education. People who are wealthy have an education and because of the education, and also because they have met a lot of [homosexual] people they are not as homophobic as people who come from very small towns and don't have an education and nearly haven't mingled with homosexuals. I find that I can categorize it that way (CC: 240-244).

Doris Burtscher comes to the same conclusion that homophobia might be caused by the fact that some people simply don't know what homosexuality is (cf. DB: 180-181, 240-247).

Often there exist generalized images of homosexuality that lead to false perceptions. One example of such misinterpretations is pointed out by Lesego Tlhwale from the organisation Behind the Mask:

I don't know if maybe if they [homophobic men] were explained to that we're not trying to be man, we're not trying to take your women, we are just living our life and we are trying to have a relationship as a normal person. (...) Because I feel that it is just them * having that lack of knowledge (...) (LT: 94-101).

A non-homosexual also comes to the conclusion that socially there is still a lot of non-acceptance in South Africa:

That's why I am saying, at the end of the day we must learn to respect somebody's choice. And at the same time, as I have said. Academically we are very good in education. But socially, we are still (...) far behind (M8: 274-278).

Even though social stigmatisation might still be prevalent in many South African communities, several people explained that in the past few decades, South African society has become more tolerant in respect to same-sexuality and also has been experiencing more openly lived same-sexual behaviour. This also can be seen as an indicator for rethinking certain hitherto unquestioned norms. Education once again is an important and discrepant key factor in discussion. Education authorities largely influence perceptions on 'deviant' sexualities. Their position within the debate shall now be reconstructed.

8.3. Representation of same-sexuality in the media

One of those education authorities is media. According to Johan, media has played a big role in making same-sexuality more acceptant.

There has been a lot more information a lot more exposure. There has been a lot more education from magazines and films and TV and * and some associations and and I think society in generally is farther to become more acceptant than it was used 20 or 30 years ago. I think 30 years ago it was wildly more controversial than what it is today. I think today it is, you have to compare it to thirty years ago, society is generally being more educated being more forced to think about it and intellectually be put face to face with it, really. I think that has a lot to do with media, it has a lot to do with scriptures and yah. (...) I think foremost film and television and magazines (...) have definitely played a big role in society being more educated and being more acceptant than what it was (JDW: 227-241).

The African continent is not spared from globalisation. Openly lived homosexuality, a supposedly 'Western' lifestyle, more and more becomes known among African people through international media. Especially in an urban context, young people start to adopt the expressions of liberal sexuality they watch on television (cf. DB: 250-257).

Sexual relationships between the same sex have also been themasized in 'African' television, in a very popular soap called 'Generations'. According to Denise, the introduction of this same-sex-couple in South African TV resulted in very controversial discussions. Denise has no clear opinion concerning this topic but she criticised the way these 'homosexual' figures have been presented:

I mean little things bother me. For example how they are represented as two masculine guys. Nobody would even suspect that they are gay.(...) They are just normal. It looks like something that is genetic (...). And then I had problems of how the families reacted. How the guy's parent's reacted. (...) You found them in bed together, right two guys and then they [one guy's family] came in (...) and they started beating them up. I mean what is that going to say society about how parents should react when they find out their kids are gay. Because in South Africa everything that happens in 'Generations', people immediately think we have to do that. People look up to the characters in 'Generations'. That's why it has such a high following if one watches it (D: 310-339).

Also Johan, even though he values that same-sexuality to some extent became more accepted because of media, he still mentions the fact that in comedy rude and embarrassing jokes on same-sexuality can happen (cf. JDW: 323-330). Aarmo's analysis of the media debate on homosexuality after Mugabe's speech at the Book Fair in Zimbabwe shows that media not only represents positive images of same-sexuality but in some cases also declares homosexuality as a threat (cf. Aarmo 1999: 263f). Thus media also can have a negative impact on the acceptance of same-sexualities for example when 'homosexuality' is compared or even put on a level with sexual 'perversions' such as paedophilia, sexual rape and others (cf. MK 160-174).

As we learned in the chapter on the religion-argument, sexuality in general is a taboo subject, not only in a church-context but in society in general (cf. Kendall 1999: 165). However, media and public education has become more open towards sexuality-topics, which to some extent is due to the AIDS pandemic. AIDS prevention is one major reason for the increase of sexual education at school. Interesting in the context of the AIDS epidemic, is the fact that HIV was not that much publicised as a 'gay' disease in most African countries. In many Western countries, originally there was a strong association between homosexuality and HIV. In an African context, to the contrary, many HIV and AIDS programs are based on heterosexuality and thus tend to overlook the risk of infection among same-sexual people (cf. Johnson 2007).

Furthermore, there is a lot of taboo coming from religious institutions. As Mauro and Joffe (2009: 47) write, "The Religious Right's appeal to traditional moral values and its ability to create moral panics about sexuality are addressed, specifically with regard to abortion and sexuality education". Ideas such as a heterosexual, monogamous lifestyle is a sufficient measure against HIV as well as religious arguments against the use of condoms are highly problematic. The fear of promoting condoms is that they might lead to a series of bawdy behaviour (cf.

Schmid 2005: 6). The stiff preservation of heterosexual and monogamous ideals even lead to statements implying that HIV is a punishment for immoral behaviour, such as homosexuality (cf. Schmid 2005: 4). Importantly, religious morals promoted 'abstinence-only' education at schools (cf. Mauro/Joffe 2009, 72ff). This kind of HIV-prevention came under critique as it does not respect reality.

We can reason from those paragraphs that the church is another education authority in Africa:

Maybe if it is said, especially in Africa, if it is said in a church environment, if it is said by preachers that homosexuality is wrong and then everyone starts believing it. And initially it becomes a plaque, you know like Apartheid or slavery (D: 214-217).

As Sharon Ludwig explained, religious statements against homosexuality often have disastrous effects on homosexual people because they cannot combine their faith with their feelings and therefore experience so-called 'internalised homophobia'. Additionally, families often legitimate their anger and the way they punish their same-sexual children by referring to religion. However, I will not extensively discuss the impact of religion as education authority in this point because the importance of religion within the discourse of same-sexuality was thoroughly explained in chapter V.

8.4. Sexual education at schools

Apart from religion and the media, school is another education authority that strongly influences perceptions of same-sexuality.

According to religious views (in the past), sexual education at schools was claimed to promote "(...) promiscuity, abortion and homosexual recruitment and that those who opposed such education presented a responsible, morally appropriate position" (Mauro/Joffe 2009: 72). Nowadays and with the crisis of AIDS, this standpoint can hardly be maintained. According to Catherine and Christine, sex education at South African schools now starts from an early age. Still, they criticise the way those issues are spoken about. Sexual education is very much focussed on heterosexual couples and thus transports heteronormative thinking. In turn, it is difficult for 'homosexual' people to come out at school.

I don't think it should be part of it as in the need to be taught specifically about.(...) I think they should make it, so that children were comfortable with the idea. (...) There is often this pictures you know, which show you this couples together. And they are always a heterosexual couples. I think in that kind of mainstream, there should also be like a homosexual couple or a lesbian couple. It's just that children can see that it's normal. (...) Whenever there is a story about AIDS or a story about people losing their virginity, learn about these things, it is always a male and a female, never ever a homosexual couple. (...) If they had those kind of examples at school it would be easy for people to come out of the closet at school (CC: 413-423).

Another situation experienced by Catherine and Christine shows that homosexuality at school remains a taboo subject.

I was hanging around with Catherine and Catherine was out already at school. Because I was hanging out with her it was a big thing and everyone started talking and then we became a couple. And then the school phoned my parents and my mum set us down and I came out to my mum... (CC: 101-104).

The question arises if the school would have acted equally if Catherine and Christine weren't two girls but a heterosexual couple. The school's intervention demonstrates that even though homosexuality is more and more accepted as an interesting subject of debate and thereby taboos regarding these topics partly get removed, contact to or confrontation with same-sexual behaviour at school still involves a lot of unease of how to handle the situation. Consequently I can say, the detabooization of homosexuality on a theoretical level does not necessarily translate into respective acceptance on a practical level.

According to Catherine and Christine, the reason why the school had called Christine's parents was because they perceived Catherine as a bad influence on Christine. By separating them, they hoped that Christine would come back to 'normal'. As Christine accounts:

Well people thought that the reason why I was now lesbian was because Catherine was influencing me. People didn't know that I had a girlfriend before Catherine and so they just thought if I would not hang onto Catherine then I wouldn't be gay. And I think they were just trying to warn my parents so my parents could take me away from her and then I would be fine again (CC: 112-116).

The idea that friends have an influence on the development of sexual orientation or that some people even might be urged to engage in same-sexual activities because of social pressure to demonstrate their membership was hypothetically expressed by one of the girls in the park:

If all my friends are lesbian, the way they talk about it... you know they feel like, they say it is something you can enjoy in your lifetime. And (...) somewhere at the end, I end up saying: 'I should just try this thing, maybe it is nice', you know. And even if I don't enjoy it, now because I have agreed to do it, I have to do it even if I don't want. It is not fair! I think it is not something that should be... allowed to be happening! (P3: 66-71)

Friends and school certainly play an important role, especially in the phase between being a child and becoming a young adult. Thus it is no wonder that exclusively boy or exclusively girl boarding schools are seen as one explanation as to why people develop same-sexual behaviour (TM: 34-35, M8: 229-241, see chapter III). The transitional phase between childhood and adulthood in many cultures is marked by rites of passage. Initiation and the importance of initiation schools were largely discussed in course of chapter VI. They play a key role in transmitting 'traditional' values from one generation to the next generation. In such initiation schools, young boys as well as girls get prepared for their later role within society as 'real' men and good wives and mothers. The pictures of gender roles constructed within this kind of

schools is hardly compatible with same-sexual gender identities. Because of this, 'homosexual' black people are excluded from such rites (cf. P7: 290-291). However, the contents taught in such initiations vary and are dependent on how same-sexuality is embedded within the social structure of the community.

8.5. Dangers and concerns of coming out to the community

Because of the idea that same-sexuality is something that can be 'learned', openly lived homosexuality is perceived as a threat to the community. In many communities social pressure and control is high, as Johan explains from an Afrikaans community where he had grown up:

The Afrikaans upbringing was stone age Calvinistic. And of course I grew up in a very religious house. My parents were Dutch Reform and religious followers and my mum was the organist in the church and in town and my dad was like a clergyman in the church. So in that small environment there was a lot of religious pressure especially the way you were brought up and it was not accepted religiously to be homosexual. The church, the Dutch reform church at that stage, they didn't acknowledge or accept homosexuals as part of God's plan. Socially it was also very much frowned upon. If there were talks that you were a homosexual or what the Afrikaans word is, which is quite derogatory, the Afrikaans have a word for it which is 'moffie' (JDW: 50-58).

'Moffie' is a common term in South Africa to call 'queer' people, 'faggots' or 'flickers'. As Johan pointed out it has a strong pejorative meaning. Never the less, it also is used by some gay men with the intention to reappropriate the term (cf. Chetty 1995: 127). Furthermore, this citation once again shows that religion and culture are very much intermingled. Another factor mentioned was the 'small' environment and the social pressure caused by this intimate and private atmosphere. This point also was verbalized by another interviewee who explained that people can express their same-sexuality in 'places like Joburg', in open and rather anonymous contexts, whereas in rural areas, social pressure and expectations are so intense that people 'didn't even manage to become homosexual', as the interviewee stated (M8: 198-208).

Of course 'homosexual' people also exist in rural areas, but a coming out in such a context most of the time is more risky than in cities where same-sexual identities in general are more visible. Furthermore, the close neighbourhood and the extended family play an important role in most African lives. Outing thus bears the risk of losing acceptance among this important social environment (cf. LT: 216-226).

In some cases outing and social control by the community even can lead to harsh reactions such as rape. Lesego Tlhwale accounts:

I mean if you look at all those cases of hate crime and corrective rape and all that, if that person was from Soweto and she went to Alex and she was working in Alex but she stayed in Soweto she gets raped where she stays, in Alex or in Soweto. And sometimes we find that they know that person who did that to them. They would say it was so and so and the guy who is this way. It is people who know you, people who see what your daily base is, you un-

derstand? It is not just people that... you are just gonna be walking on the street and they start attacking you, they wouldn't do that (LT: 35-57).

Following this argument, most of the time lesbians are attacked or raped by people who know them more closely. In some cases even 'friends' (cf. Gunkel 2007: 5) or family members (Reid 1999: 164, Morgan/Wieringa 2005b: 317) force lesbians to have sexual intercourse with men in order to be 'cured'. Such examples show that coming out in certain community environments can be very dangerous. It is easier to come out and take on different identities in places where people 'mostly keep to themselves' and 'don't really know each other' (D: 14-16). But as Denise explains, in townships and other places with a small neighbourhood it is very difficult to openly live your same-sexual identity without being recognised (cf. D: 110-112).

The community pressure also complicates the process of coming out within the immediate family. Even though her mother accepts her sexuality, Denise (256-258) accounts about her mum's initial fear of the entire extended family getting to know about it. "She [her mum] is very uncomfortable with that. With everyone knowing, her neighbours her friends, you know". According to Lesego Tlhwale the problem is that people care too much about what other people say. Instead of forming their own point of view, their opinions and reactions are influenced by what the communities think.

People, you know, are most influenced by the, I could say, the outside world. That influences people a lot. I mean if you are a person who doesn't care what people think, you gonna make your own decisions according to you. But if you care a lot about what your neighbours gonna say or whatsoever (...) you are thinking: my daughter told me she is gay, what does my neighbourhood think? (LT: 216-226).

Evidently, the idea that social environments can have a negative influence was used by 'both' sides as an argument. The homohostile version stated by one of the girls in the park works as follows:

You don't have to adopt other people's lifestyles. Live your own life the way God wants you to, or the way you think you think you can please God, see. So if I allow my kid to go and adopt things from other children. Then I cannot blame him or her for that. I should blame myself for that I never taught her the right thing. But if I taught her everything I would really be angry (P3: 201-209).

By saying 'lifestyle' the interviewee refers to a 'homosexual' lifestyle. The quotation expresses the fear that children might adopt such 'immoral' behaviour. This is also the reason why especially openly lived same-sexuality is said to have a bad influence on the new generation (cf. TM: 44-48, 72-82). The girl in the park further explains:

Yah the fact that they are influencing others in a very big way, especially kids. So there are so many kids that are going after and if they are seeing gay people they feel like: Ah, it is normal! (P3: 142-143). (...) You know kids can be easily influenced. If they see something being done by elder people they think maybe it is the right thing to do. And they copy that even if it is not right (P3: 115-117).

Whereas some people have concerns about the liberal expression of same-sexuality and fear that such kind of behaviour might become 'normal' this is exactly what LGBTQI activists fight for. Sharon Ludwig explains about her personal aims of activism:

[B]ecause of my feminism and because I am a woman, (...) lesbians and the lived realities of lesbians are foremost what I do and what I am passionate about changing in the world. And I think for me it is about transformational activism, you know. More than just standing up and taking a stand and getting my voice out there and saying, that it is time to make a difference and try to change the structure or the society or the community so it is different in the future for another generation (SL: 326-332).

What we witness by reading all the upper citations, is a collision of two very different positions and views on same-sexual behaviour. However, they demonstrate quite well the tensions in current South African policy concerning same-sexual rights.

Résumé

As demonstrated in the course of this chapter as well as the previous chapters, same-sexuality in many cases is perceived as a 'social thing'. Thereby the process of socialisation was declared as a very relevant factor explaining why people develop same-sexual desires. This perspective further causes many reservations about public 'homosexuality'. In some cases arguments go as far as to completely forbid the existence of same-sexual people because their lifestyle might 'badly' influence other people. Especially children could start to think that same-sexuality is 'normal'. Also 'lesbian' or 'gay' parenthood and their right for adoption came under strong critique as it might produce 'confused' children.

Nevertheless, South Africa in many regards has become more accepting of same-sexualities. To some extent this is due to the impact education authorities, such as the representation of 'homosexuality' in the media or the implementation of sexual education at schools, have on society. Still, especially when it comes to social praxis, media, the school, religious education, initiation as well as openly expressed homophobia or the popularity of hate crimes in certain areas have negative consequences for same-sexual lives.

This was the last argument analysed and explained in this work. The following chapter now will try to draw conclusions from my findings.

PART THREE: CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER IX: ARGUMENTATIONS AGAINST SAME-SEXUAL DESIRES IN SOUTH AFRICA

This work's purpose was to find out in which way and for what reason same-sexual desires in South Africa are declared as a 'deviant' and 'unnatural' or even 'pathological' behaviour. In favour to answer this question I analysed different homohostile arguments which were brought up in the interviews I had conducted during my investigations in South Africa in 2011. Additionally these arguments were compared and contrasted to existing, scientific literature on same-sexualities in the African context.

Within this work, argumentations against same-sexualities came up with various thoughts and ideas such as: 'Homosexuality is un-African', a 'Western import' and 'the continuance of imperialism'. It is an 'immoral behaviour', an 'act against God's creation'. Same-sexual identities further are 'threatening' the ideal image of 'African men', patriarchy and heteronormative social structures. 'Homosexuals' are 'caused by chromosomal dysfunctions' that make them 'oppose the biologically determined function of reproduction'. They further are 'mentally sick, confused or possessed by bad spirits'. And finally, 'homosexuality is a wrong lifestyle' that was 'caused by a lack of educational control' or even 'wrong education'. As it can 'influence other people' to take on such a 'scandalous habit', it must be prohibited.

On the basis of the interviews and literature investigation, five superior arguments against same-sexualities in South Africa were distilled. The 'un-African'-argument, the religion-argument, the masculinity-argument, the biology-argument and the social influence-argument.

Having separately analysed and explained these arguments in part two of this work, I now will come back to the questions formulated at the beginning of this work and see to what extent these questions can be answered. Thereby Foucault's works on the production of anomalies, his concepts of discourse, genealogy, and power will be useful tools of interpretation.

9.1. What ideas and concepts are the basis of these arguments?

Each one of the five arguments is premised on a certain body of thought. The 'un-African'-argument is founded upon the construction of 'African traditional culture', the religion-argument upon religious morals and values, the masculinity-argument upon a certain image of how a 'real' man has to be, the biology-argument upon the idea that biology is a determinant for sex as well as sexual orientation, and the social influence-argument upon the belief that same-sexuality is something that can be learned and thus, a kind of lifestyle.

As already remarked in the relevant chapters, concepts such as 'African tradition' or 'African culture', do not genuinely exist, nor is there something like a 'real' African man. Instead, these concepts are constructed as substantial elements within the discourse on same-sexualities in the African context. Thereby also historical, regional and social differences within Africa need to be considered. To which extent the idea of 'African traditional culture' leads to homohostile acts, for instance, is dependent on whether one speaks of rural or urban areas. As this work has pointed out, same-sexual behaviour becomes an easy target in traditional and conservative, small environments such as rural areas or township communities, whereas in 'modern', liberal, big and anonymous cities openly lived same-sexuality (especially among white people) is more accepted and practised. This, of course, does not mean that same-sexual people in the cities are completely safe from homohostile incidences.

Another influential example of how certain ideas have high impact on the perception of same-sexualities is the discursive construction of sexuality, binary opposed sex and homosexuality (cf. Foucault 1983a). In chapter IV, the 'Un-African'-argument I argued that 'homosexuality' did not exist in pre-colonial African ethnic groups, not because I agree to Mugabe's idea of same-sexuality being something 'Un-African', but simply because back then, the idea of the homosexual as a 'species', as Foucault puts it, did not exist. Indigenous African societies most often had their own terms to define patterns of same-sexuality or multiple genders. Thus the ascription of a Western concept such as 'homosexuality' onto African institutions of third sex/gender, female husbands, or mummy-baby relationships came under post-colonial critique (cf. Amadiume 1992, chapter II and IV).

Foucault's concept of discourse is characterised as the connection between speaking and thinking. This begs the question as to how one can speak about a discourse on same-sexuality' when in almost all chapters of this work I emphasised the fact that sexuality is a taboo subject and 'homosexuality' belongs to the 'culture of discretion' (cf. chapter 4.5). Not allowing to speak about something as well as the so-called 'don't ask, don't tell'-technique not necessarily indicate that there is no discussion about it at all. To the contrary, taboos and interdiction need to define what exactly must not be spoken about. Hence, silence is an integral part of the discourse. This is what Foucault tried to explain in the second part of his book 'History of Sexuality'. He states that the predominant repressive hypothesis of sexuality is misleading. Instead, he explains that sexuality has not become less a subject of conversation but only the way to talk about the subject has changed. Besides most of the time there exist certain realms where talking about sexuality is possible or even requested as Foucault points out by referring to the Christian rites of confession (cf. Foucault 1983a: 21ff). In reference to this work, such realms

can be initiation rites or education authorities such as the media or schools (cf. chapter VIII). However, the discourse on same-sexuality retains its shady shape: Theoretically preached equality of homosexuality in sexual education lessons at school and the legal protection of same-sexual orientation affirmed by the current South African constitution do not guarantee overall acceptance of same-sexualities in everyday reality. Hence, to a large extent same-sexual desires remain a taboo subject.

Another very important element of the discourse is its materialising function (cf. Ruoff 2009: 91f). For this reason, a discourse becomes 'real' as it produces certain images of truth and reality which again have 'real' impact on the society. The same goes for all the arguments visualised in this work. They not only belong to the discourse on same-sexuality but they also shape it and thus construct reality. Just to mention one most evident example: The reality of 'corrective' rape not only relies on the idea that same-sexuality can be 'cured' but also is produced by the discursive construction of gender-roles, by certain images of how a 'real' African man should be and which kind of sexual behaviour suits 'African' tradition or religious morals.

In his lecture 'orders of discourse' Foucault (cf. 1981: 51ff) further describes a discourse as something that ensnares people, something that is encompassing. One cannot flee from a discourse and one can never stand beyond it. Following Foucault, a discourse not only is a mean of suppression, it is a tool of structural power⁶⁵, a notion he uses to emphasise the productive element instead of reducing power to its negative and destructive side. According to him the discourse does not *explain* history but the discourse *is* history (cf. Foucault 1981: 52f). Therefore it is important to remark that not only the homohostile side participates in the discourse on same-sexuality in South Africa but LGBTQI activists' arguments equally contribute to the discussion. Let's have a look at how the diverse arguments as well as the concepts these arguments are founded upon are associated with each other.

9.2. How are such ideas and concepts related to each other?

The different impressions, ideas and beliefs expressed in the arguments cannot be seen as separate theories but are interdependent. For example, the concept of 'African traditional culture' is strongly connected to religious morals and values as well as to patriarchal and heteronormative relationship patterns. Traditional initiation schools foster the picture of same-sexual behaviour being inconsistent with hegemonic variants of African masculinity. Reproduction, in the sense of cultural as well as biological perpetuation came up in the idea of sustaining 'African traditional culture', in the reproductive purpose of sexuality in religion, in patriarchal

⁶⁵ The consequence of such a conception of power will be discussed later in this chapter.

figures of women's and men's reproductive purpose to keep the family line going, and also in terms of population growth.

The concept of family was also issued in almost all arguments as the ideal of a traditional African family in chapter IV, in course of the Christian family morals in chapter V, as the patriarchal family in chapter VI, as the families purpose of biological reproduction in chapter VII and finally as an important education authority. Education also plays a key role in almost all arguments to transmit tradition, culture, religious morals, gender identities and stereotypes from one generation to the next. In course of the interviews most of the time a combination of arguments was used to explain homohostile views.

However, apart from the connections and coherence between those arguments, there also are differences between and variations within the argumentations. Sometimes there even appeared contradictions. The 'un-African'-argument for instance rejects any kind of 'Western' influence and at the same time contains some very 'un-African' religious homohostile elements. Thus by referring to Epprecht and Kendall I argued that instead of homosexuality, Christian homophobia must be declared as a 'Western' imported product (see chapter V). Christian religious hate speech on the one hand refers to a whole set of Bible scriptures to assign 'same-sexuality' as ungodly and devilish, but on the other hand argues with Christian love that almost forces them to accept homosexual people as human beings and God's creation but not their ungodly behaviours. This distinction between being versus doing, analysed and discussed in several chapters turned out to be an important strategy for both sides to either condemn or to legitimate same-sexual identities.

Another contradiction is that 'homosexual' people often were criticised for the fact that they cannot biologically reproduce without medical intervention and thus do not fulfil their obligations such as forming families. But at the same time, adoption by same-sex couples was heavily condemned. Additionally, some arguments refer to homosexuality as a genetic disposition or malfunction, whereas others perceive homosexuality as a lifestyle and therefore something that is caused by socialisation. Furthermore the arguments are not clear about whether same-sexuality is a rather new or an old phenomenon. According to the 'un-African'-argument it is a new habit that only recently was brought into South Africa by colonialism or the influence of Western lifestyle. Then again, religious argumentations refer to scriptures from the Old Testament to explain their rejection of same-sexual behaviours.

All these examples lead to the conclusion that the diverse argumentations used against 'homosexuality' are not built upon one common and secure ground but more likely are adapted and

bent into shape. This we could see in chapter V, the religion-argument, when some single Bible scriptures were taken out of context and interpreted in favour to confirm homohostile arguments. Suddenly AIDS is declared to be God's punishment for unnatural vice. At the same time similar techniques are applied by same-sexual people who often characterise themselves as 'spiritual' instead of 'religious' to combine their beliefs with their sexual identity.

9.3. In which way are the arguments used to stigmatize 'homosexuals'?

The arguments base upon different foundations, such as the partially contradictory theories about the origin of same-sexualities, whether homosexuality is some kind of lifestyle or caused by biological predisposition. Consequently the argumentations are not referring to the same 'species' of the 'homosexual' to put it in Foucault's words (cf. Foucault 1983a: 47). The fragility of these foundations is further reinforced by the fact that some of the arguments also are used by 'homosexual' people in order to legitimate their own existence. As the discussion in chapter 7.5. has demonstrated, same-sexuality tends to be more likely accepted when it is perceived as 'genetically inscribed' and thus as 'normal'. In contrast, the idea that homosexuality is a sort of lifestyle often includes the perception that it can be 'cured' simply by abandoning homosexual mannerism. Because of this, some of my homosexual interviewees stressed that their sexual orientation is not a lifestyle but what they are and that they cannot be changed.

Moreover, the arguments refer to various techniques that are used to stigmatise same-sexualities. The description of various technologies and techniques play a central role in Foucault's analysis (cf. Foucault: 1980: 183ff). In several of his works, Foucault demonstrates how over the course of time society has dealt with 'delinquencies', expressions of 'madness', (sexual) 'anomalies' and norm-'deviant' behaviours. He investigates the mechanisms of torture, punishment, disciplining and control, exclusion, inclusion, repression, rites of confession, biologizing, psychologizing, etc. (cf. Foucault 1977, 1983a, 1981). By looking at the technologies he tries to understand why they came into being at this specific point of time and what mindset lies behind each technique.

As for this work, some of the techniques analysed by Foucault also can be found in the argumentations against same-sexuality: There is the denying of 'African' homosexualities in the 'un-African'-argument, the forced confession and condemnation of homosexual acts in the religious argument, the biologizing of same-sexuality as pathology in the biology-argument, the idea of disciplining 'immoral' and 'untraditional' sexual behaviours in the social influence-argument, the denial of certain LGBTIQ-rights such as adoption as well as finally the social exclu-

sion from families and communities when they find out about a person's same-sexual identity. Additionally as pointed out in several previous chapters, there are various discourses of how to 'heal' homosexual people by using distinct degrees of violence. Either by sending them to traditional healers, by leading their way to God's grace, by physical violence such as raping them, by using psychological and medical treatment, by social pressure or by teaching them the 'right', heterosexual way of living. Thus, the arguments in this work refer to a set of techniques all more or less leading to the pathologization and denormalising of same-sexual desires and as a consequence thereof, to normalise heterosexuality.

9.4. How does the production of heterosexual norms work within this frame?

According to the results of this work, the pathologization of same-sexualities takes place on two levels: a biological denormalizing of 'bodies' and sexual desires, and a cultural pathologization that denotes 'homosexualities' to be something 'un-African', 'ungodly' or 'immoral'. In reference to Mary McIntosh, Steven Seidman (1996: 14) explains

[t]hat societies establish a homosexual role or identity in order to distinguish acceptable from non acceptable behavior. Specifically by defining homosexuality as impure or polluted, heterosexuality is defined as pure and desirable. The homosexual role functions to both segregate 'sexual deviants' and normalize heterosexuality.

This consideration reflects the discursive excluding mechanisms of the production of truth described by Foucault (cf. 1981: 52ff). The three procedures of exclusion are 1) the prohibition: Same-sexuality is forbidden (if not legally then at least morally or traditionally), 2) the reason/madness binary: 'Homosexual' people are put in the realm of madness and therefore cannot be trusted and finally 3) the opposition and the demarcation between the truth and the wrong: Heterosexuality is defined as the compulsory right and true sexuality. These three mechanisms are crucial in understanding how the figure of the 'homosexual' is used to produce a discursive truth of heteronormativity. Interestingly the heterosexual norm is so deeply rooted in society that even same-sexual relationships often take on heterosexual gender-role patterns (see chapter VI).

The production of norms are also a central theme in Foucault's book of his university course 'Abnormal' (cf. Foucault 2007a). As part of his lectures, Foucault tries to trace back the history of the figures and conceptions of anomaly. He writes about the dangerous individual, the human monster, hermaphrodites, women who live as men, the moral monster, the targets of witchcraft and possession, the masturbator and other 'sexual monsters'. Thereby he embeds all these figures into a genealogy of the 'abnormal'. According to Foucault (2007b: 64f), a genealogy is...

(...) something that attempts to restore the conditions for the appearance of a singularity born out of multiple determining elements of which it is not the product, but rather the effect. A process of making it intelligible but with the clear understanding that this does not function according to any principle of closure (...) because the relationship we are attempting to establish to account for a singularity as an effect, this network of relationships must not make up one plane only. These relationships are in perpetual slippage from one another (...) Therefore, schematically speaking, we have perpetual mobility, essential fragility or rather the complex interplay between what replicates the same process and what transforms it.

Foucault aims to demonstrate these processes of replication and transformation. He points out the connections between important shifts in the past and the changing mindsets and terminology of 'anomaly' in 'Western' societies of the early 17th to the 20^{iest} century. In doing so, he states that the process of normalisation is based on the effectiveness of norms to impose certain demands. Norms never are defined by 'nature'. Furthermore, norms refer to power as they can be used as a political tool of legitimation (cf. Foucault 2007a: 71f).

Even though the figures of madness as well as the historical background cannot be transferred to an African context, Foucault's approach is of major importance in my work. The question occurs how the figure of 'the homosexual' fits into the specific frame of post-colonial and Post-Apartheid South Africa. As Hoad (2007: 1) explains, the terms 'African cultures' and 'male homosexuality', "(...) far from being neutral descriptors, perform extremely complex ideological labor by masking a set of imbrication relations between more volatile social abstractions such as capital, religion, race, and masculinity". I thus argue that it is no coincidence that the public problematisation of same-sexuality plunges into a time of societal turmoil and change at the end of Apartheid when social inequality no longer could officially be justified upon 'race'. This assumption gets enforced when we draw upon the similarities between the discourse on racism during Apartheid and the debate on homosexuality in present-day South Africa.

Moreover, it is obvious that almost all arguments refer to other important historical occurrences such as evangelisation, colonisation and independence struggle. Hence, the discourse on homosexuality in South Africa must be seen and analysed in consideration of history and historical change in particular. This work posited that homophobia in South Africa is the product of certain historical shifts. Discursive concepts such as 'African' tradition or 'African' male identity have incarnated colonial suppression. They result from the quest of independence and must be seen as demarcation from Western ideals or as rejection of Western paternalism. Especially today, homophobic arguments need to be seen in the context of Post-Apartheid identity struggles that do not only concern race, but likewise ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation.

In addition, ethnicity, race, class and gender role concepts still are important social parameters to realise what the image of the 'homosexual' is about in African context. Yuval-Davis (2006: 104) writes,

(...) feminist theory, enriched as it has been by the interventions of Southern-based feminists, is an insistence on being constantly alert to the politics of location and diversities of class, race, culture, religion and sexuality. Feminist epistemology also seeks to build an understanding of the connections between the local and the global, between the micro-politics of subjectivity and everyday life and the macro-politics of global governance and political economy.

There is a reason why women's reactions differ from men's reactions when it comes to deal with same-sexual behaviour. As I argued in chapter VI of this work, patriarchal structures in society are one of the reasons why women are said to be more tolerant towards same-sexual people, whereas the crisis tendencies of masculinity in some cases may cause men to perform aggressive and violent attacks on homosexuals. Also the social environment, whether someone comes out in a city like Johannesburg, in a township like Soweto or in a small, rural village often, but not always has a significant impact on the degree of homohostile experiences.

The analysis of the arguments against same-sexuality in the second part of my thesis was mainly focused on the micro-level of these argumentations. I now want to go a step further and have a look at how the arguments as elements within the discourse of sexualities are part of a global policy and a tool of power.

9.4. To what extent are those norms connected to power?

According to Foucault a discourse not only describes history, it *is* history and therefore it is very powerful. In 'Order of Discourse' he says:

Here is the hypothesis which I would like to put forward tonight in order to fix the terrain – or perhaps the very provisional theatre of the work I am doing: that in every society the production of discourse is at one controlled, selected, organised and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality (Foucault 1981: 52).

On this account, the argumentations against same-sexuality and the reactions to the arguments need to be seen in the context of power.

Thereby it is important to notice that Foucault's notion of power is not repressive and negative. To him, power needs to be seen as a net of relationships, something that unfolds between the subjects and therefore cannot be under control of one subject. Power is nothing that one can possess. It is not something that is used against other people due to the fact that everybody is part of it. Power is productive as it creates the individual. Foucault (1983b: 212) explains:

This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him by his won individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power which makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings of the word *subject*: to subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to.

In my work, several of the interviewees have asserted, that it is not religion nor is it 'African tradition' that have problems with same-sexuality. Same-sexuality equally is not per se incompatible with 'African' masculinity. But rather religion, the concept of 'African tradition' and masculinities are *used* to legitimate homophobia. Further I suggest that these concepts not only are used to denormalise same-sexuality, but at the same time legitimate and strengthen these concepts. In her work on lesbian lives in India, Berghold (2005: 137) comes to the very same insight, that homophobia is a political tool to legitimate and enforce very specific interests such as the protection of the family ideals or religious dominance.

What does this perspective mean in the case of same-sexuality in South Africa? It means that the 'homosexual' serves as a controversial figure and a useful tool to perform policies of power. The figure of the 'homosexual' is connected to a historical shift: the end of Apartheid in South Africa and the rise of liberalisation, modernisation and globalisation. As I portrayed in the second part of my thesis, discursive concepts such as 'African' traditional culture or hegemonic masculinity and religious morals have a sceptical stance towards these changes. They are in conflict with certain aspects of the rainbow nation and the current South African constitution, which both reflect the process of transition from Apartheid to a new South Africa. Within this process the 'homosexual' has taken a central position in the quest of legitimation in a 'renewed' country of South Africa.⁶⁶ Additionally, in other African countries, "(...) questions of sexuality are used to police both national and racial authenticity" (Hoad 2007: xvii).

According to Phumi Mtewa (2009: 40) hate crimes and homophobia in South Africa

(...) are some of the indicators of a country going through an extreme social and economic crisis. In the past five years in particular, the poor and the working class are perpetually in a cycle of rot, marginalisation, thin social capital, vulnerability. Out of these conditions various ideologies get reproduced, and responses to the crisis also develop. Ideologies such as evangelical religion; retreat to tradition, ethnicity and tribalism; conservative forms of morality; etc., get multiple responses: solidarity groups, social capital, on the one side, and crime, domestic violence, poverty, disease and ignorance, in essence, on the other side.

Following Hoad's analysis of Mugabe's speech, bashing against same-sexualities seemingly was used to "(...) deflect attention from the collapsing Zimbabwean economy and his increas-

⁶⁶ In confirmation of this Aarmo (1999: 268) writes about the erosion of the concept of family in the case of Zimbabwe: "The meaning and social function of this kind of family [extended family] has partly vanished and changed due to colonialism and processes of modernization and globalization".

ingly autocratic rule and that homosexuals were merely a convenient scapegoat for the failures of decolonization" (Hoad 2007: xii).

Why exactly is it the 'homosexual' and no other figure that causes such polarisation? One possible answer to this question is offered by Foucault in his book 'History of Sexuality'. In the last few chapters he describes how a new mechanism of defining relationships came into being: the *dispositif* of sexuality.⁶⁷ Whereas formerly the dispositive of alliance prescribed relationships on the base of marriage, kinship and heritage, now, sexuality becomes the central object of relationships. This process is connected to the industrial revolution and the idea that the human body is a mean of production and human reproduction needs to be controlled. Foucault largely exemplifies his theories on governmentality by referring to the development of the idea that there is something like a population and the emergence of statistics to describe and normalise the population.

Furthermore, this perception also involves a shift in politics. Prior, sovereign power was constituted by "the right to let people live or to make them die". Now, power has become a new right: "the right to let people die and to make them live" (cf. Foucault 1983a: 132ff). The mechanisms of controlling the human body, its life and procreation is central in what Foucault calls 'biopolitics'. As we saw in relation to this work, the figure of the 'homosexual' contradicts the normalisation and the reproduction of the population, at least in a norm-immanent way. The same-sexuality-pion works so well as a policy maker because it affronts a central issue in society. In the context of the AIDS-crisis in most African countries, biopolitics becomes even more manifest.

Prospects

This diploma thesis has tried to give more insights into the production, manifestation and legitimization of heterosexual norms in Southern Africa. Thereby I outlined some basic arguments that are frequently used against same-sexuality and put them into a larger context of history and power.

Still this analysis cannot cover all the work that needs to be done to understand how different argumentations play into each other, nor can this work give any big solutions to mechanisms of stigmatisation and discrimination. Several interesting questions came up during my research.

⁶⁷ Foucault defines *dispositif* as "(...) a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, law, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions – in short, the said as much as the unsaid." (Foucault 1980: 194). I decided to stick to the original, French term, as the English translation 'dispositive' lacks meaning.

As the empiric foundation of this work took place in urban South Africa, future works might deliver more information about how these arguments work among people in rural areas. Important as well would be to continue my investigation into the question of who are the people that use one certain argument in favour to de-naturalise same-sexual desires – a question that is not about ascribing and locating power but that is important to understand subtle dynamics of power relations. Concerning the religion-argument, the inclusion of various religious perspectives, not only a Christian one, would be extremely valuable. Another fascinating area to explore in more detail are the concepts of 'healing' as they contain additional information about the pathologization of certain kinds of sexualities. And finally, research on homophobia must not remain on the mere level of argumentations but needs to be intensified by including lived experiences of homophobia.

Apart from that there are still many areas, especially in the African context, where expressions of same-sexualities and the societal acceptance of such behaviour is still rarely researched. However, I see this work as a modest but important contribution to the study of normalisation and power in a non-Western context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aarmo, Margrete (1999): How Homosexuality became "un-African". The Case of Zimbabwe. IN: Blackwood, Evelyn/Wieringa, Saskia E. [Ed.]: *Female Desires. Transgender Practices across Cultures*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 255-280.
- Al-Haqq Kugle, Scott Siraj (2010): *Homosexuality in Islam. Critical Reflection on Gay, Lesbian, and Transgender Muslims*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications.
- Aldrich, Robert (2003): *Colonialism and Homosexuality*. Routledge: London, New York: Routledge.
- Aldrich, Robert [Ed.] (2007): *Gleich und anders. Eine globale Geschichte der Homosexualität*. Hamburg: Murmann, pp. 333-364.
- Ali, Kecia (2006): *Sexual Ethics and Islam: Feminist Reflections on Qur'an, Hadith, and Jurisprudence*. Oxford: Oneworld.
- Amadiume, Ifi (1992): *Male Daughters, Female Husbands. Gender and Sex in an African Society*. London: Zed Books.
- Anderson, Allan H. (2001): *African Reformation. African Initiated Christianity in the 20th Century*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, Inc.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony/Gates, Henry Louis, JR. [Ed.] (1999): *Africana. The Encyclopedia of the African and African-American Experience*. New York: Basic-Civitas.
- Arndt, Susan (2002): *Perspectives on African Feminism: Defining and Classifying African-Feminist Literatures*. IN: *Agenda*, No. 54, pp. 31-44.
- Becker, Ruth/Kortendiek, Beate [Eds.] (2004): *Handbuch Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung. Theorie, Methode, Empirie*, Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.
- Berghold, Barbara (2005): *Lesbische Lebenswelten in Indien*. Wien: Universität Wien.
- Bernal, Victoria (2001): *From Warriors to Wives: Contradictions of Liberation and Development in Eritrea*. IN: *Northeast African Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 129-154.
- Blackwood, Evelyn (2002): *Reading Sexualities across Cultures: Anthropology and Theories of Sexuality*. IN: Lewin, Ellen/Leap, William [Eds.]: *Out in theory. The emergence of lesbian and gay anthropology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 69-92.
- Blackwood, Evelyn/Wieringa, Saskia E. (1999): *Female desires. Same-Sex Relations and Transgender Practices Across Cultures*. Columbia University Press: New York.
- Böhm, Andreas/Mengel Andreas/Muhr Thomas [Eds.] (1994): *Texte verstehen. Konzept-Methoden-Werkzeuge*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.
- Boswell, John (1981): *Christianity, social tolerance, and homosexuality: Gay people in Western Europe from the beginning of the Christian era to the fourteenth century*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Botha, Kevan/Cameron, Edwin (1997): *South Africa*. IN: West, Donald J./Green, Richard [Eds.]: *Sociolegal control of homosexuality: a multi-nation comparison*. New York: Plenum Press, pp. 5-42.

- Brod, Harry (ed) (1987): *The Making of Masculinities. The New Men's Studies*. Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Butler, Judith (1991): *Kontroverse Heterosexualität*. IN: Doye, Sabine/ Heinz, Marion/Kuster, Friederike (Ed.) (2002): *Philosophische Geschlechtertheorien: ausgewählte Texte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. Stuttgart: Reclam, pp. 480-496.
- Butler, Judith (1999): *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Careaga, Gloria/Curzi, Patricia [Eds.] (2009): *Lesbian Movements. Special Issue ILGA*.
- Castro Varela, Maria do Mar/Dhawan, Nikita (2009): *Gendering Post/Kolonialismus, Decolonising Gender – Feministisch-Postkoloniale Perspektiven*. IN: Kurz-Scherf, Ingrid/Lepperhoff, Julia/Scheele, Alexandra [Eds.]: *Feminismus: Kritik und Intervention*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, pp. 64-80.
- Chetty, Dhianaraj (1995): *A Drag at Madame Costello's. Cape Moffie Life and the Popular Press in the 1950s and 1960s*. IN: Gevisser, Mark/Cameron, Edwin [Eds.]: *Deviant Desire. Gay and Lesbian Lives in South Africa*. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 115-127.
- Cock, Jacklyn (2003): *Engendering Gay and Lesbian Rights: The Equality Clause in the South African Constitution*. IN: *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 35-45.
- Coffey, Amanda (1999): *The Ethnographic Self. Fieldwork and the Representation of Identity*. London: SAGE.
- Connell, R.W. (2005): *Masculinities. Knowledge, Power and Social Change*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press/Camebridge, Oxford: Polity Press.
- Cornwall, Andrea/Lindisfarne, Nancy [Ed:] (1994): *Dislocation Masculinity. Comparative Ethnographies*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Croucher, Sheila (2002): *South Africa's Democratisation and the Politics of Gay Liberation*. IN: *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 315-330.
- Degele, Nina (2008): *Gender/Queer Studies. Eine Einführung*. Paderborn: W. Fink Verlag.
- Degele, Nina (2008a): *Geschlecht als Strukturkategorie*. IN: Degele, Nina: *Gender/Queer Studies. eine Einführung*. Paderborn: W. Fink Verlag, 60-66.
- Degele, Nina (2008b): *Doing sexuality, constructing heteronormativity*. IN: Degele, Nina: *Gender/Queer Studies. Eine Einführung*. Paderborn: W. Fink Verlag, 84-93.
- Dolan, Kathleen A. (2005): *Lesbian Women and Sexual Health. The Social Construction of Risk and Susceptibility*. New York: The Haworth Press.
- Doye, Sabine/ Heinz, Marion/Kuster, Friederike (Ed.) (2002): *Philosophische Geschlechtertheorien: ausgewählte Texte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. Stuttgart: Reclam.
- Dreyfus, Hubert I./Rabinow, Paul (1983): *Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dunton, Chris/Palmberg, Mai (1996): *Human Rights and Homosexuality in Southern Africa. Current African Issues, Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, Vol. 19*.
- Eastman, Donald (1990): *Not A Sin, Not a Sickness: What the Bible Does and Does Not Say*. Los Angeles: Universal Fellowship Press.

- Epprecht, Marc (1998): The 'Unsayings' of Indigenous Homosexualities in Zimbabwe: Mapping a Blindspot in an African Masculinity. IN: *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 24, No.4, pp. 631-651.
- Epprecht, Marc (2001): „Unnatural Vice“ in South Africa: The 1907 Commission of Enquiry. IN: *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 121-140.
- Epprecht, Marc (2004): *Hungochani. The history of a Dissident Sexuality in Southern Africa*. Montreal: McGill-Queens Univ. Press.
- Epprecht, Marc (2005): Black skin, 'Cowboy' Masculinity. A Genealogy of Homophobia in the African Nationalist Movement in Zimbabwe to 1983. IN: *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 253-266.
- Epprecht, Marc (2008). *Heterosexual Africa? The History of an Idea from the Age of Exploration to the Age of AIDS*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press.
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. (1970): Sexual Inversion among the Azande. IN: *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 72, No. 6, pp. 1428-1434.
- Fiedler, Peter (2004): *Sexuelle Orientierung und sexuelle Abweichung. Heterosexualität – Homosexualität – Transgenderismus und Paraphilien – sexueller Missbrauch – sexuelle Gewalt*. Basel: Beltz Verlag.
- Foucault, Michel (1977): *Überwachen und Strafen. Die Geburt des Gefängnisses*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Foucault, Michel (1980): *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel (1981): The Order of Discourse. IN: Young, Robert: *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Boston, London: Routledge, pp. 48-78.
- Foucault, Michel (1983a): *Der Wille zum Wissen. Sexualität und Wahrheit 1*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Foucault, Michel (1983b): The Subject and Power. IN: Dreyfus, Hubert L./Rabinow, Paul: *Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 208-228.
- Foucault, Michel (2007a): *Die Anormalen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Foucault, Michel (2007b): What is critique? Translated by Lysa Hochroth. IN: Lotringer, Sylvère [Ed.]: *The politics of truth*. Los Angeles CA: Semiotext(e), pp. 41-81.
- Froschauer, Ulrike/Lueger, Manfred (2003): *Das qualitative Interview. Zur Praxis interpretativer Analyse sozialer Systeme*. Wien: WUV-UTB Verlag.
- Geertz, Clifford (1973): *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Georg, Klaudia (2008): *Die Vertreibung aus dem Serail. Europa und die Heteronormalisierung der islamischen Welt*. Hamburg: Männerschwarm Verlag.
- Gevisser, Mark (1995): A Different Fight of Freedom. A history of South African Lesbian and Gay organisation from the 1950s to the 1990s. IN: Gevisser, Mark/Cameron, Edwin [Eds.]: *Deviant Desire. Gay and Lesbian Lives in South Africa*. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 14-89.

- Gevisser, Mark (1999): Homosexuality in Africa. an Interpretation by Mark Gevisser. IN: Appiah, Kwame Anthony; Gates, Henry Louis, JR. [Eds.]: *Africana. The Encyclopedia of the African and African-American Experience*. New York: Basic-Civitas, pp. 961-962.
- Gevisser, Mark/Cameron, Edwin [Eds.] (1995): *Deviant Desire. Gay and Lesbian Lives in South Africa*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Gläser, Jochen/Laudel, Girt (2004): *Experteninterviews und qualitative Inhaltsanalyse als Instrumente rekonstruierender Untersuchungen*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Godelier, Maurice (1996): *The Making of Great Men. Male Domination and Power Among the New Guinea Baruya*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grace, Joshua/Rhamey, Christopher et al. (2007): *Coming Out Gay, Coming Out Christian. The Beginnings of GLBT Christianity in San Diego, 1970-1979*. IN: *The Journal of San Diego History*. Vol. 53, No. 3, pp. 117-125.
- Gunkel, Henriette (2007): "What do we see when we look at ourselves?" – Visual Dissidence Towards Post(colonial) Sex/Gender Organisations within Post-Apartheid South African Culture. IN: Robbins, D. et al. [Eds.]: *Yearbook I - PhD Research in Progress, July 2007*, London: University of East London.
- Gunkel, Henriette (2009): "What's Identity Got To Do With It?" Rethinking Intimacy and Homosexuality in Contemporary South Africa. IN: *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 206-221.
- Halberstam, Judith (1998): *Female Masculinity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hames, Mary (2011): *Violence against black lesbians: Minding our language*. IN: *Agenda: Empowering women for gender equity*, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 87-91.
- Hark, Sabine (1999): *Deviant Subjekte. Die paradoxe Politik der Identität*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Hark, Sabine [Ed.] (2001): *Dis/Kontinuitäten: Feministische Theorie*, Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Hausen, Karin (2001): „Die Polarisierung der Geschlechtscharaktere“. Eine Spiegelung der Dissoziation von Erwerbs- und Familienleben. IN: Hark, Sabine [Ed.]: *Dis/Kontinuitäten: Feministische Theorie*, Opladen: Leske + Budrich, pp. 162-185.
- Have, Paul Ten (1999): *Doing Conversation Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Hayes, Jarrod (2000): *Queer Nations. Marginal Sexualities in the Maghreb*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hekma, Gert (2007): *Die schwul-lesbische Welt: 1980 bis zur Gegenwart*. IN: Aldrich, Robert [Ed.]: *Gleich und anders. Eine globale Geschichte der Homosexualität*. Murmann: Hamburg, pp. 333-364.
- Hendricks, Pepe (2009): *Hijāb. Unveiling Queer Muslim Lives*. Cape Town: Inner Circle.
- Herdt, Gilbert [Ed.] (1993): *Ritualized Homosexuality in Melanesia*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- Herdt, Gilbert [Ed.] (2009): *Moral Panics, Sex Panics. Fear and the Fight over Sexual Rights*. New York: New York University Press.
- Hirschfeld, Magnus (1914): *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*. Berlin : Marcus.

- Hoad, Neville (2007): *African Intimacies: Race, Homosexuality, and Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Institut für Afrikakunde/Hofmeier, R. (Ed.) (1999): *Afrika-Jahrbuch 1998*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich.
- Jäger, Siegfried (2004): *Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einführung*. Münster: UNRAST Verlag.
- John, Neville (1995): *Pretended Families*. IN: Gevisser, Mark/Cameron, Edwin [Eds.]: *Deviant Desire. Gay and Lesbian Lives in South Africa*. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 342-347.
- Johnson, Cary Alan (2007): *Off the Map. How HIV/AIDS Programming is Failing Same-sex Practising People in Africa*. New York: International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission.
- Kamphausen, Erhard (1999): *Gesellschaftliche Umbruchprozesse und neue religiöse Bewegungen im afrikanischen Christentum*. IN: Institut für Afrikakunde/Hofmeier, R. (Ed.): *Afrika-Jahrbuch 1998*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich, pp. 63-71.
- Kapsula, Jessie Kabwira (2006): *Challenging Sexual Stereotypes. Is cross-dressing 'un-African'?* IN: *Feminst Africa*, Vol.6, pp. 68-72.
- Keller, Martina (2001): *'Ich liebe diche, Daddy!' About Homosexuality in Namibia*. Radio Feature on Deutschlandfunk, January 30th, 2001, ONLINE: <http://www.comedia-hamburg.de/martina/namibia3.pdf> [30.06.2011].
- Kendall (1999): *Women in Lesotho and the (Western) Construction of Homophobia*. IN: Blackwood, Evelyn/Wieringa, Saskia [Eds.]: *Female Desires. Same-Sex Relations and Transgender Practices Across Cultures*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 157-178.
- Kleinman, Arthur (1981): *Patients and Healers in the Context of Culture. An Exploration of the Borderland between Anthropology, Medicine and Psychology*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- Kurz-Scherf, Ingrid/Lepperhoff, Julia/Scheele, Alexandra [Eds.] (2009): *Feminismus: Kritik und Intervention*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.
- Lamnek, Siegfried (1996): *Theorien abweichenden Verhaltens*. München: W. Fink Verlag.
- Lang, Sabine (1997): *Wer oder was ist eigentlich homoseuxell? Reflexionen über Gender Variance, Homosexualität und Feldforschung in indigenen Gesellschaften Nordamerikas*. IN: Schein, Gerlinde/Strasser, Sabine [Eds.]: *Intersexions. Feministische Anthropologie zu Geschlecht, Kultur und Sexualität*. Milena Verlag: Wien, pp. 67-110.
- Leap, William (2002): *Studying Lesbian and Gay Languages: Vocabulary, Text-making, and Beyond*. IN: Lewin, Ellen/Leap, William [Eds.]: *Out in Theory. The Emergence of Lesbian and Gay Anthropology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 128-154.
- Legewie, Heiner (1994): *Globalauswertung von Dokumenten*. IN: Böhm, Andreas/Mengel Andreas/Muhr Thomas [Eds.]: *Texte verstehen. Konzept-Methoden-Werkzeuge*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag, pp.177-182.
- Lemon, Jennifer (1995): *Masculinity in Crisis?* IN: *Agenda*, No. 24, pp. 61-71.
- Lewin, Ellen/Leap, William (2002a): *Introduction*. IN: Lewin, Ellen/Leap, William [Eds.]: *Out in Theory. The Emergence of Lesbian and Gay Anthropology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 1-16.

- Lewin, Ellen/Leap, William [Eds.] (2002): *Out in Theory. The Emergence of Lesbian and Gay Anthropology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Lockhart, Chris (2002): Kunyenga, "Real Sex," and Survival: Assessing the Risk of HIV Infection among Urban Street Boys in Tanzania. IN: *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 294-311.
- Lotringer, Sylvère [Ed.] (2007): *The Politics of Truth*. Los Angeles CA: Semiotext(e).
- Lull, David J. (2005): *Jesus, Paul, and Homosexual*. Annual Conference, Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York. June 3. Reconciling Ministries Network, New York.
- Mabe, Jacob E./Förster, Till [Eds.] (2004): *Das Afrika-Lexikon. Ein Kontinent in 1000 Stichwörtern*. Sonderausg. Stuttgart: Hammer; Metzler [et al.].
- Mama, Amina (2005): *Gender studies for Africa's transformation*. IN: Mkwandawire, Thandika [Ed.]: *African intellectuals. Rethinking Politics, Language, Gender, and Development*. Dakar: CODESRIA Books, pp. 94-117.
- Maticka-Tyndale, Eleanor/Tiemoko, Richmond et al. [Eds.] (2007): *Human Sexuality in Africa: beyond reproduction*. Auckland Park: CTP Book Printers.
- Mauro, Diane di/ Joffe, Carole (2009): *The Religious Right and the Reshaping of Sexual Policy: Reproductive Rights and Sexuality Education during the Bush Years*. IN: Herdt, Gilbert [Ed.]: *Moral Panics, Sex Panics. Fear and the Fight over Sexual Rights*. New York: New York University Press, pp. 47-103.
- Mayring, Philipp (1994): *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse*. IN: Böhm, Andreas/Mengel, Andreas/Muhr, Thomas [Eds.]: *Texte verstehen. Konzepte – Methoden – Werkzeuge*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag, pp. 159 – 175.
- Mayring, Philipp (2008): *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz Verlag.
- McClintoc, Anne (1995): *Imperial Leather. Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*, New York: Routledge.
- McDowell, Linda (2008): *Trans-national Migrants. Thinking Through Work: Complex Inequalities, Constructions of Difference and Trans-national Migrants*. IN: *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 32, No.4, pp. 491-507.
- McIntosh, Mary (1996): *The Homosexual Role*. IN: Seidman, Steven [Ed.]: *Queer Theory/Sociology*. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, pp. 33-40.
- Meißner, Hanna (2008): *Die soziale Konstruktion von Geschlecht – Erkenntnisperspektiven und gesellschaftstheoretische Fragen*. ONLINE: http://web.fu-berlin.de/gpo/pdf/meissner/hanna_meissner.pdf. [20-06-2012].
- Miescher, Stephan. E. (2004): *Homosexualität*. IN: Mabe, Jacob E./Förster, Till [Eds.]: *Das Afrika-Lexikon. Ein Kontinent in 1000 Stichwörtern*. Sonderausg. Stuttgart: Hammer; Metzler [u.a.].
- Mkwandawire, Thandika [Ed.] (2005): *African intellectuals. Rethinking Politics, Language, Gender, and Development*. Dakar: CODESRIA Books.
- Mohanty, C. (2002): 'Under Western Eyes' Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles. IN: *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 499-535.

- Morgan, Ruth/Wieringa, Saskia (2005a): Introduction. IN: Morgan, Ruth/Wieringa, Saskia [Eds.]: Tommy Boys, Lesbian Men and Ancestral Wives. Female Same-Sex Practices in Africa. Auckland Park: Jacana Media, pp. 11-22.
- Morgan, Ruth/Wieringa, Saskia (2005b): Present-day same-sex practices in Africa: Conclusions from the African Women's Lives Story Project. IN: Morgan, Ruth/Wieringa, Saskia [Eds.]: Tommy Boys, Lesbian Men and Ancestral Wives. Female Same-Sex Practices in Africa. Auckland Park: Jacana Media, pp. 309-324.
- Morgan, Ruth/Wieringa, Saskia [Eds.] (2005): Tommy Boys, Lesbian Men and Ancestral Wives. Female Same-Sex practices in Africa. Auckland Park: Jacana Media.
- Mtewa, Phumi (2009): Multiple Identities and multiple Discriminations. Interview of Phumi Mtewa by Patricia Curzi. IN: Careaga, Gloria/Curzi, Patricia [Eds.]: Lesbian Movements. Special Issue ILGA, pp. 39-41.
- Murray, Stephen O./Roscoe, Will [Eds.] (1997): Islamic Homosexualities: Culture, History, and Literature. New York, London: New York University Press.
- Murray, Stephen O./Roscoe, Will [Eds.] (2001): Boy-Wives and Female Husbands. Studies on African Homosexualities. New York: Palgrave.
- Ndangam, Lilian N. (2008): 'Lifting the Cloak on Manhood': Coverage of Xhosa Male Circumcision in the South African Press. IN: Uchendu, Egodi [Ed.]: Masculinities in Contemporary Africa. Dakar: Imprimerie Saint-Paul, pp. 209-228.
- Nganda, Scholastica (2007): Sex Education: Do Our Teens Need It? IN: Maticka-Tyndale, Eleanor/Tiemoko, Richmond et al. [Eds.]: Human Sexuality in Africa: Beyond Reproduction. Auckland Park: CTP Book Printers, pp. 53-66.
- Nkabinde, Nkunzi Zandile (2008): Black Bull, Ancestors and Me. My Life as a Lesbian Sangoma. Auckland Park: Jacana.
- O'Reilly, Karen (2005): Ethnographic Methods. London: Routledge.
- Oyèwùmí, Oyèrónké (2002): Conceptualizing Gender. The Eurocentric Foundations of Feminist Concepts and the Challenge of African Epistemologies. IN: Jenda: A Journal of Culture and African Women Studies, Vol. 21, ONLINE: <http://www.codesria.org/IMG/pdf/OYEWUMI.pdf> [20-06-2012].
- Pincheon-Stanford, Bill (2000): An Orthography of Silences: Race (Homo)sexualities, and a Discourse of Africa. IN: African Studies Reviews, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 39-58.
- Posel, Deborah (2005): The Scandal of Manhood: 'Baby Rape' and the Politicization of Sexual Violence in Post-Apartheid South Africa. IN: Culture, Health & Sexuality, Vol. 7, No. 3 - African Sexualities, pp. 239-252.
- Radcliffe-Brown, Alfred R. (1949): White's View of a Science of Culture. IN: American Anthropologist, New Series, Vol. 51, No. 3, pp. 503-512.
- Reid, Graeme Charles (1999): Above the skyline. Integrating African, Christian and gay or lesbian identities in a South African church community. MA Thesis (M.A.). Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.
- Richardson, Diane (2000): The social construction of immunity: HIV risk perception and prevention among lesbians and bisexual women. IN: Culture, Health & Sexuality: An International Journal for Research, Intervention and Care, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 33-49.

- Robben, Antonius C. G. M./Sluka, Jeffrey A. [Eds.] (2007): *Ethnographic Fieldwork. An Anthropological Reader*. Malden, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Robbins, D. et al. [Eds.] (2007): *Yearbook I - PhD Research in Progress, July 2007*, London: University of East London.
- Rubin, Gale (2002): *Studying Sexual Subcultures: Excavating the Ethnography of Gay Communities in Urban North America*. IN: Lewin, Ellen/Leap, William [Eds.]: *Out in Theory. The Emergence of Lesbian and Gay Anthropology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 17-68.
- Ruoff, Michael (2009): *Foucault-Lexikon. Entwicklung – Kernbegriffe – Zusammenhänge*. Paderborn: W. Fink Verlag.
- Russell, David (2008): *The Bible and Homosexuality. What is the Spirit saying to the Churches?* Cape Town: Salty Print.
- Ryan, Bill (2003): *A New Look at Homophobia and Heterosexism in Canada*. Ottawa: Canadian AIDS Society.
- Sanneh, Lamin (2009): *The Return of Religion: Currents of Resurgence, Convergence, and Divergence*. IN: *The Cresset, Trinity*, Vol. LXXII, No. 5, pp. 15-23.
- Sauerwein, Astrid (1990): *Mission und Kolonialismus in Simbabwe 1840 - 1940. Kollisionen, Konflikte und Kooperation*. Univ., Diss.--Giessen, 1989. Giessen: Focus-Verlag.
- Schein, Gerlinde/Strasser, Sabine [Eds.] (1997): *Intersexions. Feministische Anthropologie zu Geschlecht, Kultur und Sexualität*. Milena Verlag: Wien.
- Schmerl, Christiane/Soine, Stefanie/Stein-Hilbers Marlene/Wrede, Brigitta [Eds.] (2000): *Sexuelle Szenen. Inszenierung von Geschlecht und Sexualität in modernen Gesellschaften*, Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Schmid, Barbara (2007): *Sexuality and Religion in The Times of AIDS*. Cape Town: Africa Rectional Sexuality Resource Centre.
- Schröter, Susanne (2002): *FeMale. Über Grenzverläufe zwischen den Geschlechtern*, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Seidman, Steven (1996): *Introduction*. IN: Seidman, Steven [Ed.]: *Queer Theory/Sociology*. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, pp. 1-30.
- Seidman, Steven [Ed.] (1996): *Queer Theory/Sociology*. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell.
- Shannahan, Dervla Sara (2009): *Sexual Ethics, Marriage, and Sexual Autonomy: The Landscapes for Muslimat and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Muslims*. IN: *Contemporary Islam* No. 3, pp. 59-78.
- Siraj, Asifa (2009): *The Construction of the Homosexual 'Other' by British Muslim Heterosexuals*. *Contemporary Islam*, No. 3, pp. 41–57.
- Statistics South Africa (2004): *Census 2001: Primary tables South Africa: Census '96 and 2001 compared*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa, [Report No. 03/02/04 (2001)].
- Stein, Arlene/Plummer, Ken (1996): *'I Can't Even Think Straight': 'Queer' Theory and the Missing Sexual Revolution in Sociology*. IN: Seidman, Steven [Ed.]: *Queer Theory/Sociology*. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, pp. 129-144.

- Stoler, Ann Laura (2003): *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power. Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tannenbaum, Frank (1953): *Crime and Community*. London: Routledge.
- Telela, Rosalee (1995): *Lesbianism and Religion*. IN: *Agenda*, No. 25, pp. 34-37.
- Uchendu, Egodi [Ed.] (2008): *Masculinities in Contemporary Africa*. Dakar: Imprimerie Saint-Paul.
- Van Gennep, Arnold (2004): *The Rites of Passage*. London: Routledge.
- Vetten, Lisa (2011): *Paradox and Policy: Addressing Rape in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. IN: Westmarland, Nicole/Gangoli, Geetanjali [Eds.]: *International Approaches to Rape*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 169-192.
- Villa, Paula-Irene (2001): *Sexy Bodies. Eine soziologische Reise durch den Geschlechtskörper*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Vincent, Louise (2008): 'Boys will be boys': traditional Xhosa male circumcision, HIV and sexual socialisation in contemporary South Africa, *Culture, Health & Sexuality*. IN: *An International Journal for Research, Intervention and Care*, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 431-446.
- Wakabi, Wairagala (2007): *Homophobia is fuelling the AIDS epidemic in Africa*. IN: *News* 23/10/2007 pp. 1017, <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2025607> [12.07.2010].
- Webster, Noah/Gove, Philip Babcock [Ed.] (1971): *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged. With seven language dictionary*. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc.
- Weeks, Jeffrey (1977): *Coming Out. Homosexual Politics in Britain, from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*. London: Quartet.
- Wells, Helen/Polders, Louise (2004): *Levels of Empowerment among lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender [LGBT] People in Gauteng, South Africa*: JWG.
- Wells, L. Edward (1978): *Theories of Deviance and the Self-Concept*. IN: *Social Psychology*, Vol. 41, No. 3, pp. 189-204.
- West, Candace/Zimmerman, Don H. (1987): *Doing Gender*. IN: *Gender and Society*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 125-151.
- West, Donald J./Green, Richard [Ed.] (1997): *Sociolegal Control of Homosexuality: A Multi-Nation Comparison*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Westmarland, Nicole/Gangoli, Geetanjali [Eds.] (2011): *International Approaches to Rape*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Wetterer, Angelika (2004): *Konstruktion von Geschlecht. Reproduktionsweisen der Zweigeschlechtlichkeit*. IN: Becker, Ruth/Kortendiek, Beate [Eds.]: *Handbuch Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung. Theorie, Methode, Empirie*, Wiesbaden, pp. 122-129.
- Wietersheim, Erkia v. (2001): *Lackmustest für Menschenrechte. Der Umgang mit Homosexualität im südlichen Afrika*. IN: *Neue Züricher Zeitung*, 13. 03. 2001, pp. 10-11.
- Witzel, Andreas (2000): *Das Problemzentrierte Interview [25 Absätze]*. IN: *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(1), Art. 22, <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0001228>, [30-06-2011].

Wrede, Brigitta (2000): Sexualität als ideelle Konstruktion und als historisch geformtes Phänomen IN: Schmerl, Christiane/Soine, Stefanie/Stein-Hilbers Marlene/Wrede, Brigitta [Eds.]: Sexuelle Szenen. Inszenierung von Geschlecht und Sexualität in modernen Gesellschaften, Opladen: Leske + Budrich, pp. 32-43.

Young, Robert (1981): Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader. Boston, London: Routledge.

Yuval-Davis, Nira (2006): Intersectionality and Feminist Politics. IN: European Journal of Women's Studies, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 193-209.

ONLINE SOURCES

- online source 1: <http://ilga.org/ilga/en/organisations/ILGA%20AFRICA> [06-04-2011].
- online source 2: <http://www.univie.ac.at/afrika/mitarbeiterinnen/kopf.htm> [15-06-2011].
- online source 3: <http://www.aerzte-ohne-grenzen.at/hilfeinsaetze/alle-einsatzmitarbeiterinnen/details/burtscher> [15-06-2011].
- online source 4: <http://www.gala.co.za> [15-06-2011].
- online source 5: <http://www.mask.org.za/who-we-are> [14-04-2011].
- online source 6: <http://activatewits.weebly.com> [22-05-2012].
- online source 7: <http://www.few.org.za> [15-06-2011].
- online source 8: <http://www.hispeople.org/HisPeopleCapeTown> [15-06-2011].
- online source 9: <http://triangle.org.za> [15-06-2011].
- online source 10: <http://motherjones.com/politics/2007/08/gay-choice-science-sexual-identity> [13.10.10].
- online source 11: ftp://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Health_Statistics/NCHS/Publications/ICD-9/ucod.txt [21-04-2011].
- online source 12: <http://www.marriagealliance.co.za> [25.05.2011].
- online source 13: <http://www.madamandeve.co.za/> [27.5.2011].
- online source 14: <http://www.pmg.org.za/docs/2006/061016hispeople.htm> [25-05-2012].
- online source 15: http://www.consultancyafrica.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=886:interrogating-the-notion-of-corrective-rape-in-contemporary-public-and-media-discourse [28-05-2012].

APPENDIX

Table of interviews

AUTHORIZED INTERVIEWS
ANONYMOUS INTERVIEWS

Date	Person		Duration
10.12.2010	Dr. ⁱⁿ Mag. ^a Martina Kopf (MK)	Expert for Genderstudies in Africa (Vienna)	70'
26.01.2011	Dr. ⁱⁿ Mag. ^a Doris Burtscher (DB)	Anthropologist working at the Doctors Without Borders (Vienna)	50'
31.01.2011	Lesege Tlhwale (LT)	Spokes person of Behind the Mask (Johannesburg)	33'
01.02.2011	Denise, Neo Rapitsi (D)	Chair Person from Activates at WITS (Johannesburg)	40'30"
05.02.2011	Laurent (L)	Student of counting science (Johannesburg)	38'
06.02.2011	Three girls in a park (P3)	Park (Johannesburg)	28'15"
06.02.2011	Mining engeneering student (P7)	Park (Johannsburg)	30'
06.02.2011	Last guy (M8)	Park (Johannesburg)	26'15"
08.02.2011	Dikeledi Sibanda (DS)	Forum of the Empowerment of Women (Johannesburg)	18'
18.02.2011	Johan (JDW)	Hairdresser (Cape Town)	56'30"
20.02.2011	Tarryn from Johannesburg (T)	HIS People Chruch (Cape Town)	10'30"
20.02.2011	Elderly lady (HIS4)	HIS People Chruch (Cape Town)	16'
20.02.2011	Teddy Mukumbi from Congo (TM)	HIS People Church (Cape Town)	21'30"
20.02.2011	Young man (HIS7)	HIS People Church (Cape Town)	17'45"
20.02.2011	Catherine and Christine (CC)	Lesbian couple (Cape Town)	72'15"
21.02.2011	Sharon Ludwig (SL)	Good Hope MCC and Triangle Project (Cape Town)	~50'

Interview guide – Example 1

Hello, my name is Johanna Treidl, I'm student of cultural and social anthropology at the University of Vienna. Currently I am writing my diploma thesis on same-sex practices in sub-Saharan Africa. For this reason I would like to hear your personal experiences and thoughts concerning same-sex practices in your country (of origin). If there are any questions you don't want to answer – no problem! Of course the interviews will be used only with your agreement and exclusively for my diploma-thesis. So I won't use any unauthorised information. You will stay anonymous, if you want to.

START: Will you mind, if I record this interview?

- Could you please introduce yourself? (name, origin, age, sex, work, social position)
- How and when did you recognize your sexual orientation?
- What urged you to leave your country?

MAIN PART: I would like you to think of your personal or your friend's experiences...

- How do people of your country treat homosexuals (in general)?
- What arguments do they use to discriminate against homosexuality? - KONKRET/MIKRO ---> **HYPOTHESES!**
- What criteria has an impact on how they treat homosexuality? (active/passive, age, gender, public/private, social position...) ---> **HYPOTHESES!**
- In your opinion, why are people of your country acting this way? (Do you have any idea what use these arguments could be? What are their reasons to discriminate against homosexuality) - ABSTRAKTER/MAKRO (for example politics, patriarchy etc.?) ---> **HYPOTHESES!**
- Who are those people?
- Do those people differentiate between female and male homosexuality? When yes - in which way? (different reactions? Different arguments)

measures

- What does coming-out mean in your society?
- How did your family and friends react on your sexual orientation?
- Which measures does society take against homosexuality in your country? (healing, suppressing, denying, hiding etc.) ---> **HYPOTHESES!**

homosexuality

- How do you define homosexuality?
- Is there any expressions for homosexual men/women in your language?
- Can you explain this word/these words to me?

gender

- We already distinguished male from female homosexuals. Do you personally think that there are any differences between male and female same-sex relationships? Please explain!
- What impact have traditional gender-roles on the acceptance of homosexuality?

normality

- You said that several people see homosexuality as something „unnatural“ or „abnormal“. Do you have an idea what they mean by using these words?
- Who defines what is normal and what not? ---> **HYPOTHESES!**

sexuality

- What importance does sexuality have in your country? ---> **HYPOTHESES!**
- What is the difference between sexuality and love?

END: I am coming to my last few questions:

- What does your sexual orientation mean to you? (is it a part of your identity, or is it more than identity?)

Thank you for this conversation. Is there anything else you would like to tell me, you think is important for my work?

Shall I send you the transcription of this interview (so that you can do corrections etc.)? Where shall I send this transcription to?

May I contact you in case I have some more questions or uncertainties?

Do you know anyone else who would like to tell me his/her opinion on same-sex practices in your country?

HYPOTHESES

Colonialism: You already mentioned „un-African“ can you explain this to me?

- What do they mean by saying that homosexuality does not exist in Africa/ is “un-African”?
- What are the differences between homosexuality in Europe and homosexuality in Africa?

Reproduction: You said a problem to people is that homosexuals cannot get children.

- Why is this a problem?
- (You are mainly talking about male homosexuality, how do arguments differ when we talk about „lesbian“ relationships?)
- What about adoption?
- Why is reproduction so important?
- Would it be okay to be homosexual if the person would still have a family and children?

Religion: Another argument used against homosexuality is religion...

- How does religion prohibit homosexuality? Which kind of homosexuality/sodomy exactly is against faith?
- Do these religious laws concern female same-sex practices in the same way?
- For which reasons does religion prohibit same-sex intimacies?

Disease: Some people see connections between homosexuality and AIDS...

- What effect has AIDS on the perception of homosexuals in your country?
- Are there any ideas of “healing” homosexuality and how does this “healing” work?
- In which way does the AIDS-argument work on lesbians?

Interview guide – Example 2

I'm a student of cultural and social anthropology and I'd like to ask you some questions on same-sex practices in your country?

Will you mind, if I record this interview?

- Could you please introduce yourself? (name, origin, age, sex, work, social position)
- Can you tell me of situations where you heard of or witnessed same-sex practices in South Africa?
- How do people of your COUNTRY treat homosexuals in general?
- What do you think, why are some people of your country acting this way?
- Why do you see those people homosexuals that way? GENDER!

homosexuality

- How can you recognise a homosexual person? How does a homosexual person behave?
- Is there a word for homosexuals in your language? GENDER!
- Can you explain this word to me?

gender

- We already distinguished male from female homosexuals. What is the difference between male and female same-sex intimacies?
- How does society make this difference?
- What impact have traditional gender-roles on the acceptance of homosexuality?
- What is a 'real' man/'real' woman like?

origin

- Where does Homosexuality come from? How do you define homosexuality? (behaviour, lifestyle, inherent congenital, learned)
- Apart from their sexual identity, who are those people who are/become homosexual? (class, race, age, culture, ethnic group ...)

sexuality

- What importance does sexuality have in your country? GENDER
- What is the difference between sexuality and love?
- What does intimacy mean to you/Definition?

normality

- You said that several people see homosexuality as something „unnatural“ or „anormal“. Do you have an idea what they mean by using these words?
- Who defines what is normal and what not?
- What in your opinion is the difference between normal and natural?
- Is deviant always seen as something negative?

measures

- How does society handle deviant behaviours? Which measures do they take? (healing, suppressed, culture of discretion)
- Is homosexuality in your society a public or a private topic? CULTURE OF DISCRETION?
- What does coming-out mean in your society?

HYPOTHESES**Colonialism**

- You already mentioned „un-African“ can you explain this to me?
- What are the differences between homosexuality in Europe and homosexuality in Africa?
- What about historical prove of same-sex practises in pre-colonial Southern Africa?

Reproduction

- You said a problem to people is that homosexuals cannot get children.
- Why is this a problem?
- You are mainly talking about male homosexuality, how do arguments differ when we talk about „lesbian“ relationships?
- What about adoption?
- What about „normal“ people without children?
- Why is reproduction so important?
- Would it be okay to be homosexual if the person would still have a family and children?

Religion

- Another argument used against homosexuality is religion?
- How does religion prohibit homosexuality?
- Do this religious laws concern female same-sex practices in the same way?
- For which reasons does religion prohibit same-sex intimacies?
- Which kind of homosexuality/sodomy exactly is against faith?
- Can a homosexual still be faithful?

Disease

- What effect has AIDS on the perception of homosexuals?
- How can homosexuality be healed?
- How can lesbians contribute to the spread of AIDS?

Which other reasons do you know why homosexuals in your country are discriminated against?

What criteria has an impact on how they are treated? (active/passive, age, gender, public/private, ...)

Category System

- 1 Information about Interviewee
 - 1.1 Information about organisation/background
- 2 Dealing with HS people
 - 2.1 General information
 - 2.1.1 Who is homophobic?
 - 2.1.1.1 Different levels (State, Community, Person/Family)
 - 2.1.1.2 Different categories (religious, urban/rural, 'race', 'class', etc.)
 - 2.2 personal level (experiences)
 - 2.2.1 Family --> family/children/reproduction --> Religion
 - 2.2.2 Territory, neighbourhood
 - 2.2.3 Education/bringing up as prevention
 - 2.3 Community
 - 2.3.1 Hate speech
 - 2.3.2 Corrective rape → masculinity
 - 2.3.3 Culture of discretion
 - 2.4 State
 - 2.4.1 Liberal Constitution/freedom of choice
 - 2.4.2 Development/Education --> Education/bringing up
 - 2.4.3 Laws against HS
 - 2.4.4 Power and minorities
 - 2.5 concepts of 'healing'
 - 2.5.1 Only God can help --> Religion
 - 2.5.2 Education (talking)
 - 2.5.3 Medical Therapies (psychological and hormonal)
 - 2.5.4 Corrective rape → Community
 - 2.5.5 Traditional healers
 - 3 Arguments/Dangers
 - 3.1 Masculinity/Patriarchy
 - 3.2 "Un-African"/Colonial Import
 - 3.2.1 Constitution
 - 3.2.2 African tradition and values
 - 3.3 Religion
 - 3.3.1 Religion in Africa
 - 3.3.2 Genesis-Adam and Eve
 - 3.3.3 Ungodly, against Bible, sin --> AIDS
 - 3.3.4 Religious family morals --> family/children/reproduction
 - 3.3.5 Differences within churches (Afrikaans, HIS People Church, MCC Hope)
 - 3.3.6 Faith combined with HS
 - 3.3.7 God's creatures
 - 3.3.8 Only God can help

-
- 3.4 Biology
 - 3.4.1 Reproduction
 - 3.4.2 Bodies

 - 3.5 Family/Children/Education
 - 3.5.1 Religious family morals --> Religion → Education
 - 3.5.2 Sexuality, Intimacy, Friendship
 - 3.5.3 Sexual Perversion → Education

 - 4 Who is attacked?
 - 4.1 Visibility
 - 4.2 Gender

 - 5 Strategies of HS people
 - 5.1 Not come out/hide --> culture of discretion
 - 5.2 Take over existing and accepted forms of transgender
 - 5.3 Not exclusive way of living (still getting children and marry)
 - 5.4 Organise

 - 6 Concepts
 - 6.1 Homosexuality
 - 6.1.1 Origin
 - 6.1.1.1 Social
 - 6.1.1.1.1 Forced homosexuality (money, family, group pressure)
 - 6.1.1.1.2 Try out/lifestyle
 - 6.1.1.1.3 Bad experiences
 - 6.1.1.1.4 Homo-environment (prisons etc.)
 - 6.1.1.2 Biological
 - 6.1.1.2.1 Normal
 - 6.1.1.2.1.2 Chromosomes/hormones
 - 6.1.1.2.1.3 Illness
 - 6.1.2 How homosexuals are/behave
 - 6.1.2.1 Recognise
 - 6.1.2.2 Pretend
 - 6.1.2.3 Else
 - 6.2 homosexuality and gender
 - 6.2.1 Intersex --> biology
 - 6.2.2 Gender roles --> behaviour --> biology --> Family
 - 6.3 Sexuality
 - 6.3.1 Sexual act
 - 6.3.2 Sexual identity
 - 6.3.3 Sexual orientation
 - 6.3.4 Intimacy

Discourse Analysis

1 Information about the interviewee

- 1.1 Who is it?
- 1.2 Biography?
- 1.3 Occupation?
- 1.4 Fields of expertise?
- 1.5 Discourse position?
- 1.6 Intention of interviewee in the interview?
- 1.7 Motivation of interviewee for the interview?
- 1.8 Which organisation does the interviewee belong to?

2 Organisation and near context

- 2.1 Positioning of this Organisation?
- 2.2 Formation of the Organisation?
- 2.3 Finance?
- 2.4 Principles?
- 2.5 Connections to other Organisations?
- 2.6 Aims of the Organisation?
- 2.7 Position within a scene, within society?

3 In the interview

- 3.1 Are there any synchronities, discontinuities, gaps, cause and effect-theories, implications?
- 3.2 Which stylistic elements are often used and out of what purpose? (jargon, linguistic ornaments, misguidances, trust-tryings, convincings)?
- 3.3 What degree of knowledge is assumed by the interviewee?
- 3.4 Does she_he use any collective symbols?
- 3.5 Gaps and problems in explanations and listings? (What does he/she NOT talk about?)
- 3.6 Which (subtle) norms and values are expressed?
- 3.7 Which norms, habits, regularities are not used or even spoken against?
How are the answers connected to power?

Abstract

Homosexuality is 'un-African', a 'Western' import and the continuance of imperialism. It is an immoral behaviour, an act against God's creation. Same-sexual identities furthermore are 'threatening' the ideal image of 'African men', patriarchy and heteronormative social structures. Homosexuality is caused by chromosomal 'dysfunctions' that make them oppose the biologically determined obligation of reproduction. They are mentally 'sick', 'confused' or 'possessed' by bad spirits. And finally, homosexuality is a wrong 'lifestyle' caused by a lack of educational control or even 'wrong' education. As it could 'influence' other people, in particular the young, 'African' generation, to take on such a 'scandalous habit', it must be prohibited.

This is a sample of popular arguments against same-sexual desires in modern South Africa – a country which has one of the most progressive and liberal constitutions in the world. South Africa looks back on an intense period of evangelisation, colonial struggles and a violent regime of strict racial segregation. Since the implementation of the new Post-Apartheid Constitution, discrimination not only on the grounds of race, gender, sex, ethnic origin and other social markers, but also on the grounds of sexual orientation is prohibited.

However, in many cases the legal protection of diverse genders and sexual identities does not correspond to the realities of LGBTIQ-people. They still experience a lot of stigmatisation. Physical and psychological violence often is justified by referring to the arguments cited above.

For these reasons, my work aims to conduct a critical investigation on arguments against same-sexual desires in South Africa. What ideas, ideologies and concepts are the basis of such arguments? How are they related to each other and in what way are they used to stigmatize people who openly express their same-sexual identity? How does the production of heterosexual norms work within this frame? To what extent are those norms connected to power? In what way contribute ostensibly more tolerant and modern 'Western' countries to the non-acceptance of homosexual behaviour in South Africa? And finally: Why exactly is it the figure of 'the homosexual' which plays such a crucial role within South Africa's Post-Apartheid discourse.

Guided by these questions, this thesis contributes to the scientific research on same-sexualities in Africa. It is based on the analysis of qualitative interviews mainly conducted during a one-month field-trip in South Africa. The analysis is based on current, scientific debates.

Zusammenfassung

Homosexualität sei 'unafrikanisch'. Die sexuelle Liebe zweier Menschen gleichen Geschlechts ist wider Gottes Schöpfung und verstößt gegen die christliche Moral. Schwule sind keine 'echten' Männer und Lesben nehmen den 'echten' Männern die Frauen weg. Homosexualität ist wie eine 'Krankheit', ein genetischer 'Defekt' oder doch eher ein aus dem Westen kommender 'lifestyle'? Umso mehr stellen Menschen, die ihre 'anormale' Sexualität öffentlich ausleben, eine 'Gefahr' für Südafrika dar. Sei es, weil sie ihre Pflichten zur gesellschaftlichen Reproduktion 'rein natürlich' nicht erfüllen können, weil Kinder einen Vater und eine Mutter brauchen oder weil die junge, 'afrikanische' Generation sich womöglich von solchen 'Moden' inspirieren lässt und gleichgeschlechtliche Liebe dann zu etwas 'ganz normalem' würde.

Solche Argumente prägen den gegenwärtigen Diskurs über gleichgeschlechtliches Begehren in Südafrika – ein Land, das mit der frühen Missionierung, einer mit Machtkämpfen und Kriegen gespickten Kolonialzeit sowie der noch nicht allzu weit zurückliegenden Periode strikter, rassistischer Segregation auf eine spannungsreiche und blutige Geschichte zurückblickt.

Seit dem Ende der Apartheid hat sich jedoch so manches verändert. Südafrikas progressive und äußerst liberale Verfassung sieht neben dem Diskriminierungsverbot von 'race', Geschlecht und Ethnizität unter anderem auch den Schutz vor Diskriminierung aufgrund von sexueller Orientierung vor. Damit ist Südafrika das erste Land weltweit, das eine rechtliche Gleichstellung gleichgeschlechtlicher Lebensweisen in der Verfassung verankert hat. Was jedoch die gesellschaftlichen Realität anbelangt, ist vieles beim Alten geblieben. Nach wie vor werden Menschen wegen ihrer sexuellen Identität mit psychischer und physischer Gewalt konfrontiert. Häufig wird diese legitimiert indem auf die oben angeführten Argumente verwiesen wird.

Darum ist das Ziel der Arbeit, diese Argumente einer kritischen Analyse zu unterziehen. Vielfach handelt es sich um Argumente, die auch im scheinbar toleranteren, modernen und liberalen 'Westen' gebräuchlich sind. Wie jedoch funktionieren diese Argumentationen im spezifischen Kontext südafrikanischer Geschichte? Auf welche Konzepte, Ideologien und Vorstellungen berufen sie sich? Wie werden die Argumente verwendet um heterosexuelle Normen zu produzieren und gleichgeschlechtliches Begehren zu stigmatisieren? Welche Verknüpfungen und Widersprüche befinden sich zwischen bzw. innerhalb der einzelnen Argumentationsstränge? Und schließlich: Warum nimmt ausgerechnet 'der Homosexuelle' eine so dominante Position im südafrikanischen post-Apartheidsdiskurs ein?

Diese Fragen geleiten durch diese Arbeit, die sich als Beitrag zur wissenschaftlichen Erforschung gleichgeschlechtlicher Lebensweisen in Afrika versteht. Analysiert wurden qualitative Interviews die großteils während eines einmonatigen Forschungsaufenthalts in Südafrika durchgeführt wurden. Die Ergebnisse wurden in den aktuellen Stand der wissenschaftlichen Debatten eingebettet.

Lebenslauf

Persönliche Daten:

Name:	Mag. ^a Johanna Treidl	Erreichbarkeit:
Geburtsdatum:	27.03.1986	E-mail: johanna.treidl@reflex.at
Geburtsort:	Innsbruck	Tel.: 0680/3100519

Formale Bildung:

April 2012	Abschluss des Diplomstudiums der Soziologie an der Universität Wien
September 2007 bis September 2008	ERASMUS-Aufenthalt in Lille (Frankreich) an der Université Lille 1
seit Oktober 2004	Diplomstudium der Soziologie und der Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie an der Universität Wien
2000 – 2004	Besuch des Bundesoberstufenrealgymnasiums Fallmerayerstraße in Innsbruck
1996 - 2000	Besuch der Hauptschule Paznaun in Kappl
1992 – 1996	Besuch der Volksschule Galtür

Studienrelevante Tätigkeiten:

Jänner/Februar 2011	Forschungsaufenthalt in Südafrika
Oktober 2008 bis Juni 2010	Studentisches Mitglied der Fakultätskonferenz an der Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften
November 2008 bis März 2010	Studentisches Mitglied einer Berufungskommission am Institut für Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie
Sommersemester 2009	Vorsitzende Studierendenvertreterin am Institut für Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie
März 2005 bis Juni 2009 (mit Unterbrechungen)	ehrenamtliches Engagement in der Institutsgruppe Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie sowie an anderen Einrichtungen der Österreichischen Hochschüler_innenschaft

Sprachkenntnisse:

Deutsch (Muttersprache)
 Englisch (fließend in Wort und Schrift)
 Französisch (fließend in Wort und Schrift)
 Bambara (Grundkenntnisse)

Akademische Abschlussarbeiten/Publikationen:

Treidl, Johanna (2012): Intimität – Zur soziologischen 'Potenz' des Begriffes aus feministischer Perspektive. Universität Wien: Diplomarbeit.

Treidl, Johanna (2012): Es war einmal... die Liebe. IN: Paradigmata – Zeitschrift für Menschen und Diskurse, Nr. 8. (in Vorbereitung).