

Securing the Heterosexual State

A study of the political debate surrounding
homosexuality in Uganda

University of Gothenburg

School of Global Studies

Bachelor thesis in: International Relations

Submitted by: Victoria Blomén

Supervisor: Claes Wrangel

Spring 2012



GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET

ABSTRACT

In 2009 a Ugandan Member of Parliament presented the so called *Anti Homosexuality Bill* to the Ugandan parliament. The Bill offers extensive restrictions in order to combat homosexuality, which is already a crime in Uganda. For example the Bill suggests death penalty for so called “aggravated homosexuality”. This study examines the political debate surrounding homosexuality in contemporary Uganda in order to gain an understanding of how homosexuality can emerge as something that warrants executions by the state.

In this thesis I suggest that it is possible to think of the *Anti Homosexuality Bill* as a part of a heteronormative constitution of the nation-state. The study has been based upon poststructuralist theories concerning national identity, security and heteronormativity. In order to analyze the material I have used Norman Fairclough’s three-dimensional model for Critical Discourse Analysis as a basis for my methodological model.

The results show that in the debate surrounding homosexuality in Uganda, homosexuality has been presented as a learned behavior that is foreign to Ugandan culture. By ascribing heteronormative values on the people of Uganda, homosexuality has been portrayed as a threat to Ugandan national identity and security. Nevertheless, this study also shows that in this debate, there are alternative presentations of homosexuality that challenge the heteronormative constitution of the Ugandan state.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Abstract	2
1. Introduction.....	4
1.1 Background.....	4
1.2 Scientific Problem.....	5
1.3 Purpose and Research Questions.....	7
1.4 Limitations and Plan of Thesis.....	7
2. Theoretical Framework	9
2.1 The Poststructuralist Perspective.....	9
2.2 Securing Identity: Poststructuralist Security Studies	11
2.2.1 Performative Identity	12
2.3 Constructing Sexuality: Queer Theory.....	14
2.3.1 Heteronormativity and the Nation-State.....	15
3. Method and Material	17
3.1 Method of Analysis: Critical Discourse Analysis.....	17
3.1.1 Methodology: the Three-Dimensional Model.....	17
3.2 Discussion of Material	19
3.3 Validity and Reliability	20
4. Analysis.....	21
4.1 Text.....	21
4.2 Discursive Practice.....	23
4.2.1 Intertextuality.....	23
4.2.2 Interdiscursivity.....	25
4.3 Social Practice.....	26
5. Conclusion	30
5.1 Results	30
5.2 Concluding Discussion	31
References.....	32
Literature.....	32
Other sources	33

1. INTRODUCTION

All over the world lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people (LGBTI-people) are marginalized and discriminated against and almost nowhere are LGBTI-people treated equally under law. Homosexuality is criminalized in 78 countries and in seven countries it is punishable by death (ILGA 2012:12-13). While many countries have decriminalized homosexuality in recent years, for example India in 2009, there are other countries that are moving in the opposite direction, most notably Uganda with a bill that suggest death penalty for homosexuality (ILGA 2010:4). When I first heard about *The Anti Homosexuality Bill* (hereafter referred to as “the Bill”) in 2009, it made me think about the stigma that still surrounds homosexuality in many parts of the world and made me question why that is. In this thesis I have chosen to investigate one expression of this stigma in a case study on the political debate surrounding homosexuality in contemporary Uganda. By studying the case of Uganda I hope to gain deeper knowledge and understanding of how and why this stigma still exist.

1.1 BACKGROUND

In 2009, Ugandan Member of Parliament David Bahati presented a controversial bill called *The Anti Homosexuality Bill* to the Ugandan Parliament. The Bill promotes stronger legislation against “any form of sexual relations between persons of the same sex” and “the promotion or recognition of such sexual relations in public institutions and other places” (Bahati 2009:Memorandum). In Uganda, homosexuality is already criminalized in the Penal Code Act from 1950 and is under current legislation punishable with up to life imprisonment (Utrikesdepartementet 2007; Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs 1950: Chapter 120, Section 145). The new bill seeks to enhance and expand laws against homosexuality to include not only the “offence of homosexuality” but also “attempt to commit homosexuality”, “promotion of homosexuality” and “failure to disclose the offence” as offences that can lead to imprisonment (Bahati 2009:Clause 2,4,13 & 14). Furthermore, the Bill provides for “nullification of inconsistent international treaties, protocols, declarations and conventions” and thereby rejects international human right provisions that are “contradictory to the spirit and provisions enshrined in this Act” (Bahati 2009:Clause 18). However, the most controversial and internationally questioned part of the Bill is the proposition to introduce capital punishment for so called “aggravated homosexuality” (Bahati 2009:Clause 3). This means that if the Bill were to pass, death penalty would be distributed to serial offenders, to people suffering from HIV and in sexual relations where someone is less than 18 years old (Bahati 2009:Clause 3).

The Bill received a great amount of national and international attention and it became heavily criticized by LGBTI and human rights organizations around the world. Several international

human rights organizations, including for example Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch (Human Rights Watch 2009), have spoken against the Bill as it would, if enacted, violate human rights such as “the principle of non-discrimination [...] the human rights to freedom of expression, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of association, liberty and security of the person, privacy, the highest attainable standard of health, and life” (Amnesty International 2010). In addition, many influential political leaders of the world, for instance US president, Barack Obama and UK Prime Minister Gordon Brown, have expressed their deep concern for LGBTI rights in Uganda and both the UK Prime Minister David Cameron and the Swedish Minister for Development Cooperation, Gunilla Carlsson, have suggested to withdraw financial aid to Uganda if the Bill were to pass (Strand 2011).

In Uganda the LGBTI movement have through the umbrella organization Sexual Minorities Uganda (SMUG) strongly condemned the Bill, arguing that it is a “repressive bill” which “violates the basic rights to freedom of expression, conscience, association, and assembly, as well as internationally recognized protections against discrimination” (Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009b). Moreover, as a response to the Bill, 28 Ugandan human rights organizations formed a coalition called the Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights and Constitutional Law (subsequently called “the Civil Society Coalition”) in order to prevent the Bill from being endorsed in Parliament (Strand 2011). In a statement from the Civil Society Coalition (2009) the Bill is criticized for violating several articles in the 1995 Constitution as well international human rights agreements and they suggest that the Bill should be called the Anti Human Rights Bill rather than the Anti Homosexuality Bill.

The critique from the national civil society and the international community caused the Parliament to form a commission in January 2010, with the purpose to further investigate the implications of the Bill (Among 2010). The Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Committee’s report suggested some amendments to the Bill but overall the report supported the Bill and death penalty for aggravated homosexuality remained (Human Rights Watch 2011). The report was presented to the parliament in May 2011 but the parliament session was dissolved without a voting on the Bill, leaving the Bill to be reintroduced before the new parliament in October 2011.

1.2 SCIENTIFIC PROBLEM

In his work *Histoire de la Sexualité* Michel Foucault uses death penalty in order to illustrate how power structures has changed with the emergence of the nation-state. In pre-modern society the power over life and death was a privilege of the sovereign prince and it “was conditioned by the defense of the sovereign, and his own survival” (Foucault 1990:135). With the emergence of the nation-state, the main function of power has shifted from deciding over death to administering life of the population. “Hence capital punishment could not be maintained except by invoking

less the enormity of the crime itself than the monstrosity of the criminal, his incorrigibility, and the safeguard of society. One had the right to kill those who represented a kind of biological danger to others” (Foucault 1990:138). Is it then possible to apply Foucault’s analysis on the case of Uganda? Is homosexuality considered to be a biological danger to the Ugandan society? If so, is it the crime, homosexuality, or the perceived criminal, the homosexual, that is dangerous to society?

As this study will attempt to show, there is no clear distinction between the act and the identity, the crime and the criminal, when it comes to homosexuality. The *Anti Homosexuality Bill* in Uganda provides for death penalty on aggravated homosexuality where homosexuality is defined as an act (Bahati 2009: Clause 1). But if homosexuality is an isolated act, how can it be so dangerous to society? The Bill’s definition of a “homosexual”¹ shows how an act can come to identify a person; by participating in, or attempting to participate in, same sex acts one are identified as a homosexual, the act defines an identity (Bahati 2009: Clause 1). Nevertheless, in a close examination of the Bill one can see that by being “a victim of homosexuality”², a person can participate in an act of homosexuality without being a homosexual and without being criminalized by the Bill (Bahati 2009: Clause 5). Moreover, a person does not have to participate in an act of homosexuality in order to be criminalized by the Bill (Bahati 2009: Clauses 7-14). To even think, talk or know about same sex sexual relations can be an offence, one does not have to participate or attempt to participate in a same sex act to be a criminal. It is not only the act of homosexuality or homosexuals that are dangerous but also “aiding and abating homosexuality” and the “promotion of homosexuality” (Bahati 2009: Clause 7, 13). In an interview with the author of the Bill, David Bahati, he argues that the major problem in Uganda is the “promotion” and “recruitment” into homosexuality (Femia 2010). According to this logic one can, through the promotion of homosexuality, be recruited into homosexuality and thus become a homosexual. From this perspective it seems as if it is not the act itself that is dangerous to Ugandan society but it is rather the becoming of homosexuals. However, whether it is homosexual acts, the homosexuals themselves or the becoming of homosexuals that is considered to be threatening it is interesting to question how homosexuality can be regarded as a danger to society. Is it possible to think of homosexuality in terms of national security as a threat to Ugandan society?

According to Liah Greenfeld modern society is constituted through nationalism where nationalism “refers to the set of ideas and sentiments which form the conceptual framework of national identity” (Greenfeld 1996:8ff). The construction of a national identity is hence

¹ In the Bill, a homosexual is defined as “a person who engages or attempts to engage in same gender sexual activity” (Bahati 2009: Clause 1).

² In the Bill, a victim is defined as “a person who is involved in homosexual activities against his or her will” (Bahati 2009: Clause 1).

fundamental to the creation of a modern society in the form of a nation-state. Feminist and queer scholars have pointed out that nationalist ideologies often contain gender norms concerning the role of 'men' and the role of 'women' in society and that these norms help to reinforce heteronormative ideas (Yuval-Davies 1997; Sinha 2006; Nagel 2000). Heteronormativity can be said to be a social norm where it is assumed that 'men' are interested in 'women' and 'women' are interested in 'men'. These notions of normative heterosexuality are inscribed in notions of national identity and thereby also contribute to the constitution of the nation-state. As the existence of homosexuality challenge heteronormative assumptions of opposite sex attraction, it may also pose a challenge to the constitution of national identity and the nation-state as they are based upon heteronormative ideas. I therefore suggest that it is possible to see *The Anti Homosexuality Bill* as a part of the constitution of a heteronormative national identity and state in Uganda; in order to construct a homogenous national identity one must either assimilate or destroy national minorities.

1.3 PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The main purpose of this thesis is to investigate the role of heteronormativity in the constitution of the nation-state in order to understand how homosexuality can emerge as something that warrants a violent, indeed lethal response from the state. By examining the political debate surrounding homosexuality in contemporary Uganda this study seeks to find out how homosexuality has been presented in relation to Ugandan national identity and security. The aim is to understand the political context that enables efforts to eradicate homosexuality through institutionalized execution.

This study further aims to answer the following research questions:

- How has discrimination against homosexuals been supported or challenged in Ugandan political debate?
- In this debate, how are homosexuals presented in relation to national identity and security?
- Is it possible to see the *Anti Homosexuality Bill* as part of a heteronormative constitution of the Ugandan nation-state as I have suggested above?

1.4 LIMITATIONS AND PLAN OF THESIS

Since the main attention of the political debate in Uganda has been regarding homosexuality, this study will mainly focus on how homosexuality has been presented in the debate, thus leaving out other related issues such as bisexuality and transgenderism from this discussion. Furthermore, this thesis will be limited in both time and space as it is a study of the contemporary political debate in Uganda. I have thus limited my search for material to

documents from Uganda between 2009 and 2010, as this is a period of intense debate on the subject in Uganda. A further discussion of choice of material will be made in chapter 3.

This thesis is divided into five chapters where each chapter consists of several sections. In the Introduction I have given a presentation of the research problem and my research questions. The second chapter, Theoretical Framework, includes a general presentation of the poststructuralist perspective as well as theories concerning national identity, security and heteronormativity. The third chapter, Method and Material, is a presentation of the material that are used in my analysis and a description of Critical Discourse Analysis as a method of analysis while the fourth chapter, Analysis, consists of an analysis of the material in accordance with my method of analysis and theoretical framework. In the conclusion I will present the results of my analysis in an attempt to answer the research questions that have been presented in the introduction.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework of this study consists mainly of two theoretical approaches, Poststructuralist Security Studies and Queer Theory. However, these theoretical approaches are interlinked as both are based on poststructuralist perspective. This chapter will therefore begin with a discussion on the basic principles of the poststructuralist perspective and then give a description of the theoretical approaches in the following sections.

2.1 THE POSTSTRUCTURALIST PERSPECTIVE

The poststructuralist school of thought is based on a constructivist perspective and is concerned with how language is used in order to construct social meaning. Poststructuralists argue that our understanding of the world is built upon linguistic preconceptions, or discourses; the world is represented to us through language (Stears & Pettiford 2005:130). However, language is not merely a reflection of an existing reality, instead language can be said to constitute and construct reality as such. That is not to say that physical reality does not exist but rather that it is only given meaning through our use of language (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000:15f). For instance, the nation-state is an example of a discursive construction that to a large extent constitutes our reality. Modern states do not have a natural existence but are political formations which have developed out of medieval political structures; states did not exist before they were said to exist (Greenfeld 1996:20-21). Nevertheless, states have constituted themselves as powerful political institutions and as such they can control social life and our reality. Thus, the word nation-state does not reflect an existing reality but is rather a constituent of reality. This raises the question of how words are given meaning if language is not a reflection reality. That is to say, if words do not reflect reality, how can we then know what they mean?

According to the structuralist thinker Saussure, words or, as he would say, linguistic signs are not given meaning by reality but through social conventions which connect certain words with certain things. Winther Jørgensen & Phillips gives the following example:

The word "dog" has for example no natural connection with the animal that we refer to with the word. The fact that we more or less understand what others mean when they say "dog" is because we have learned the convention that the word "dog" refers to the four-legged animal that says woof.

- Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000:16

Saussure points out that all linguistic signs relates to other signs in a structural network where the signs are given meaning by its difference from other signs in the structure. This network in which linguistic signs relate to and give meaning to each other is the structure of language, or *Langue*.³ The linguistic signs within a *Langue* can then be used by individuals through the practice of language, or what Saussure calls *Parole* (Kress 2001:30f). Within the structuralist perspective, the structure of language is seen as firmly established and stable so that “[t]he individual may make use of the system, in **parole**, but the individual cannot change the system, the language” (Kress 2001:32).

However, whilst poststructuralists draw upon the structuralist notion of linguistic signs as given meaning by each other in a linguistic system, they do not agree with the structuralist perception of language as something stable. They argue that linguistic signs can be used in different ways depending on different circumstances and thus they cannot be fixed in a stable meaning. Hence, language is not organized in one single structure which gives meaning to the linguistic signs but in many different overlapping structures, or discourses, where the meaning of a sign might vary depending on in which discourse it is used (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000:17). If one for example look at the word ‘nation’ it can be a part of a nationalist discourse and refer to a people within a nation-state but it can also refer to a student nation in a University within an educational discourse.

Furthermore, discourses are not seen as unchangeable structures where a sign is given a fixed meaning but it is something flexible which can change over time as the meaning of signs alters in relation to each other. Consequently, discourse is not stable and complete, and as discourse, according to poststructuralists, constitutes and constructs reality in meaning, then meaning cannot be stable and complete. Language can never fully represent reality, yet it is the only means by which we can understand reality (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips 2000:18). Our understanding of reality, what we believe to know and what we believe is true are consequently based on linguistic preconceptions which can never be stable and complete. Hence knowledge and truth are not objective conditions that can be discovered, they are created (Koch 2007:3ff). Poststructuralism thus abandon positivist methods which are concerned with finding truth, and “[i]nstead of asking “what is true,” it asks “how did we come to believe that this position is true, given all the alternatives.”” (Koch 2007:viii). Instead of asking if homosexuality is a threat to the national identity in Uganda, this study asks how homosexuality has been presented as a threat to the national identity in Uganda and how it alternatively can be presented. In order to understand how knowledge and truth are created poststructuralists argue for non-positivist methods such

³ Saussure wrote in French and the French terms for language (*langue*) and word (*parole*) are often used to illustrate Saussure’s theories.

as discourse analysis. In this way the poststructuralist perspective provides not only theoretical but also methodological concepts of analysis. This will be further discussed in the next chapter while the following sections concentrate on poststructuralist contributions to International Security Studies and to Lesbian and Gay Studies.

2.2 SECURING IDENTITY: POSTSTRUCTURALIST SECURITY STUDIES

Poststructuralist Security Studies is critical of traditional assumption that security, threat and danger are objective conditions. They do not see security as a practice in which one is protected from threats and dangers that can be analyzed and assessed objectively. On the contrary, they see security as a discursive practice in which danger and threat are named and thus constituted as such (Buzan & Hansen 2009:142f). The articulation of security implies that there is a danger or threat that one should be secured from, but since danger and threat are not objective conditions, they must be articulated as dangers or threats in order to become dangerous and threatening. Security is thus dependent on 'discourses of danger', that is to say articulations of what one should fear (Campbell 1998:13). The paradox here is that in articulating the need for security, one (re-)produces a 'discourse of danger' which creates fear. In order to be secured there must be a danger to be secured from and subsequently security is dependent on the existence of insecurity (something to fear) and it is therefore impossible to achieve security (Stern 2006:187; Stern 2005:10).

Apart from being critical of the objective view on security concerns, many poststructuralists criticize the state-centrism within traditional security studies as it "constrains the possibilities for other referent objects of security" (Buzan & Hansen 2009:37). In her study of Mayan women in Guatemala, Maria Stern points out that "women and members of marginalized groups (although seemingly assumed to be included as members of the state) have been denied adequate consideration in the formation of security policies" (Stern 2005:6). She argues that Mayan women have different security concerns than the Guatemalan state and that their security narratives have been marginalized and even violently oppressed. Thus, national security of the state does not guarantee security for the people within the state; conversely it can sometimes be the state itself that poses a threat to its inhabitants:

[T]he Guatemalan state [...] has engaged in a particularly violent form of nation-state building; pervasive and brutal national security policies have been designed to homogenize the population, even if this meant killing a large number of them, including many Mayan women

- Stern 2005:7

Nevertheless, whilst poststructuralists critique the state-centrism of traditional security studies, they also recognize that with the emergence of the modern state system, the state has constituted itself as a major actor of security. By articulating itself as the protector of 'the people', the state has gained its position as a bio-political power, and national security has become the main objective of security policies (Campbell 1998:43). The identity of the people, the nation, is thus used to legitimize the state's security policies. However, David Campbell argues that "the state more often than not precedes the nation: that nationalism is a construct of the state in pursuit of its own legitimacy" and "that "the nation" should be understood as an "imagined political community"" (Campbell 1998:11). States are imagined communities in the sense that they "do not possess prediscursive, stable identities"; the identity of the state is a construction (Campbell 1998:12). Poststructuralists thereby argue that national security is not "something that could be assessed through an analysis of which threats a nation confronted, but rather a process through which 'the nation' came to be produced and reproduced with a particular identity" (Buzan & Hansen 2009:143)

The formation of identity, whether it is the identity of a state or any other subject of security, is thus one of the main mechanisms of security; "in order for the subject of security to be secured, it must be named, represented, given an identity" (Stern 2006:192). Campbell further points out that danger "is not a thing that exists independently of those to whom it may become a threat" (Campbell 1998:1), and that by telling 'us' what 'we' should fear, 'discourses of danger' also contain notions of who 'we' are (Campbell 1998:170). Security is hence not only a process of naming threats and danger; it is also a process of identity formation:

Who (we say) we are matters in how we conceive of, strive for, and practice security. Similarly how we 'speak' security, name danger and threats, as well as safety and wellbeing, implies (and indeed informs) a particular expression of our identity, which serves to represent 'us'

- Stern 2005:7

Subjects of security are thus constructed in 'discourses of danger' which by telling the subject what to fear also tells the subject who they are.

2.2.1 PERFORMATIVE IDENTITY

Poststructuralists argue that identities, whether it is gender identity, the identity of the state or that of a national minority, are performatively constituted in relation to difference (Campbell 1998; Stern 2005; Butler 2007). Identity is performative in the sense that it has "no ontological status apart from the various acts that constitute its reality" (Butler 2007:214). In her study of gender identities, Judith Butler argues that sex, as well as gender, is not a categorization of pre-

existing identities but these identities are performatively constituted by incessant and repeated acts which gives the appearance of something natural and real (Butler 2007:185,189). Hence, Butler points out that sex/gender is merely an impression of something real and that if sex/gender is performatively constructed by various acts, it would be possible to construct it differently (Butler 2007:57,199). Identities are thus not stable and constant categorizations of subjects, they can change and alter. Butler further points out that the performative constitution of gender identities are constructed in a system of binary opposition where the categories 'men' and 'women' are given meaning by being different from each other (Butler 2007:59,114). Identity formation is thus not only articulations of who 'we' are but also articulations of who 'we' are not and of who 'they' are. The creation of an identity thereby implies the creation of an 'Other', whom are regarded as different from 'us' and thereby can be excluded from the identity. Hence, in an attempt to secure identity, 'discourses of danger' tell 'us' who 'we' are, as well as who 'they' are, and what 'we' shall fear (Campbell 1998:48-50).

Additionally, Stern argues that identity formation is built upon binary oppositions between 'us' and 'them' where 'we' are given positive descriptions and 'they' are given negative ones which stands in opposition to what 'we' are (Stern 2006:196). In a 'discourse of danger', the subject of security is constituted in opposition to a dangerous 'Other', an enemy, which the subject must be secured from. Identity formation can thus become a violent process:

Attempts to secure a notion of 'who we are' invite violence when these notions are not shared by members of the community in question, when 'who we are' must be forcibly instilled through disciplinary tactics, when 'who we are' also depends on belligerently defining and even killing 'who we are not'.

- Stern 2006:187-188

Moreover, since 'who we are' is not fixed by nature but is performatively constructed in 'discourses of danger', it is always possible to reconstruct the identity of the subject of security in a different way, and sometimes this possibility is enough to be regarded as a threat to that identity. Campbell argues that "[t]he mere existence of an alternative mode of being, the presence of which exemplifies that different identities are possible and thus denaturalizes the claim of a particular identity to be *the* true identity, is sometimes enough to produce the understanding of a threat" (Campbell 1998:3). In short, 'our' identity is threatened by the possibility that 'we' become like 'them'; "[i]t is not what a body is that makes it biopolitically a threat, then, but what a body might potentially become" (Dillon 2007:24). Consequently, if it is

possible to become homosexual, this 'becoming of homosexuals' can be regarded as a threat to the heterosexual identity.

2.3 CONSTRUCTING SEXUALITY: QUEER THEORY

In order to investigate how sexual orientation can relate to national identity and security, I will in this study take departure in a queer theoretical understanding of sexualities. Queer theory developed in the 1980's and 1990's from a poststructuralist perspective on sexuality and "is distinguished by an oppositional stance towards heteronormative readings of sexuality and gender, and a thoroughgoing skepticism towards traditional identity politics and a refusal of the marginal status of homosexuality" (Morgan 2006:22). Queer theory is thus critical of sexual essentialism – "the idea that sex is a natural force that exists prior to social life", and instead argues that that sexualities, like sex and gender, are discursive constructions (Rubin 1984:275). According to Foucault, both homosexuality and heterosexuality are discursive identities that did not exist before the words existed. He claims that there is a difference between the sodomite and the homosexual; "the sodomite had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species" (Foucault 1990:43). Sodomy referred to certain sexual acts while homosexuality is a way of being, an identity. Homosexuality did not exist before the categorization of homosexuality existed, even though same sex sexual practices did exist. Likewise, heterosexuality is also an identity that did not exist before the categorization existed, even though opposite sex sexual practices did (Rubin 1984:285). Hence heterosexuality is neither more nor less natural or normal than homosexuality; they are both discursive constructions.

However, in modern discourse, heterosexuality has been articulated as more "natural" and "normal" than homosexuality and has thus been constituted as a social norm. The constitution of normative heterosexuality is according to Butler linked with the binary construction of sex/gender in what she calls 'the heterosexual matrix'. 'The heterosexual matrix' can be defined as:

[A] hegemonic discursive/ epistemic model of gender intelligibility that assumes that for bodies to cohere and make sense there must be a stable sex expressed through a stable gender (masculine expresses male, feminine expresses female) that is oppositionally and hierarchically defined through the compulsory practice of heterosexuality.

- Butler 2007:54 n6

Butler thus argues that the categories 'men' and 'women' are constructed in order to limit identity formation to heterosexual desire where 'men' are supposed to be attracted to 'women' and 'women' to 'men'(Butler 2007:74-79). Hence, the performative constitution of sex/gender as

binary oppositions both requires and reproduces normative heterosexuality. The constitution of gender norms is thereby a main factor in the constitution of heteronormativity.

Gayle Rubin argues heteronormativity is a part of a system of sexual value where sexual practices are structured in binary oppositions where one is 'good' and the other is 'bad'. For example, heterosexual, monogamous and marital sex is considered to be better than homosexual, promiscuous and un-married sex. According to this system of sexual value, "sexuality that is "good," "normal" and "natural" should ideally be heterosexual, marital, monogamous, reproductive, and non-commercial" and "[a]ny sex that violates these rules is "bad," "abnormal," or "unnatural"" (Rubin 1984:280-181). Rubin additionally argues that this system is hierarchically structured where married heterosexuals are on the top of the hierarchy, followed by other heterosexuals while promiscuous homosexuals, fetishists, pedophiles, among others, are at the bottom. However, Rubin points out that the line between good and bad sex is imaginary and that the hierarchy is not a stable and unchangeable system; for instance, in Modern Western societies "[u]nmarried couples living together, masturbation, and some forms of homosexuality are moving in the direction of respectability" (Rubin 1984:282-283). Nevertheless, even though the hierarchical system of sexual value is not stable and unchangeable, this system is deeply rooted and institutionalized in society and in state regulations. Moreover, Rubin argues that the state works to uphold and maintain the sexual hierarchy through sex laws and bureaucratic regulations (Rubin 1984:291).

2.3.1 HETERONORMATIVITY AND THE NATION-STATE

In modern society the state has gained authority to regulate and control most aspects of social life and have done so in accordance with gender norms and heteronormativity. Nira Yuval-Davies argues that notions of masculinity and femininity are embedded in nationalist discourse, defining the role of 'men' and the role of 'women' in the nation (Yuval-Davies 2008:1, 67). The nationalist discourse hence reinforces and reproduces gender norms and thereby "provides legitimacy to normative gendered constructions of masculinity and femininity" (Sinha 2006:326). Mrinalini Sinha thus claims that national identity and gender identity is mutually constitutive:

[T]he belief in the 'natural' difference between men and women has been fairly constant in the constitution of nations, and the nation itself has helped construct the normative constructions of 'men' and 'women' and of 'masculinity' and 'femininity.'

- Sinha 2006:330

Furthermore, according to Butler's heterosexual matrix, these normative constructions of gender also imply the construction of normative heterosexuality. Hence, the constitution of nations reproduces the binary constitution of gender and in so doing also upholds the heterosexual matrix. Joane Nagel argues that definitions of "correct heterosexual masculine and feminine behavior" have been essential to the constitution of national identity, making heterosexuality one of the most basic norms in the nationalist project (Nagel 2000:113). Nationalism then, does not only reproduces normative constructions of gender as binary oppositions but also helps to reproduce heteronormativity. In this way, gender norms and heteronormativity has been heavily institutionalized in the nation-state through law, education and so forth. For example, an overwhelming majority of states only recognize two legal sexes and in most states gay marriage is prohibited. Heteronormativity has thus been present in the constitution of the nation-state and the state itself has helped to reproduce heteronormativity. By examining the political debate in Uganda, this study aims to investigate the role of heteronormativity in the constitution of the Ugandan nation-state.

3. METHOD AND MATERIAL

The purpose of the study is to investigate the role of heteronormativity in the constitution of the nation-state. Since there is little previous research on the subject, a study with several cases would be difficult and time-consuming and instead this thesis will concentrate the case of Uganda. By examining the political debate surrounding homosexuality in Uganda this study aims to provide a deeper knowledge and understanding of the relation between heteronormativity and nationalism. This study will mainly be based upon literary sources such as official documents and statements that are to be analyzed from a qualitative approach. In the analysis of the material I will use Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a framework for my methodological model. This chapter will begin with a presentation of CDA and a description of my methodological model. Thereafter, I will present the material used in the analysis, followed by a discussion on validity and reliability.

3.1 METHOD OF ANALYSIS: CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The theoretical framework of this thesis is based upon a poststructuralist perspective and this is also reflected in my choice of method. Since knowledge and truth, according to poststructuralist, are discursive constructions it is possible to deconstruct them in a discourse analysis. There are several methodological approaches within discourse analysis where Critical Discourse Analysis is one of them. The reason for choosing CDA in this study is that CDA provides with a methodology that combines textual analysis with social analysis. By combining textual analysis with social analysis one can gain a deeper understanding of the social and political context of the texts.

3.1.1 METHODOLOGY: THE THREE-DIMENSIONAL MODEL

My methodological model is based upon Fairclough's three-dimensional model for Critical Discourse Analysis. However, it is important to note that I use Fairclough's model as a framework for my analysis, not as a complete analytical method; that is to say that I use the parts of the model that I find relevant for my analysis. This section will give a presentation of the general features of Fairclough's three-dimensional model and of the analytical tools I will use in my analysis.

In short, Fairclough's model consists of three dimensions of analysis:

Dimension 1: Text

Dimension 2: Discursive practice

Dimension 3: Social practice

The first dimension is an analysis of the “internal relations” of the text and focuses on the on the linguistic features of the text itself, such as vocabulary, grammar and semantics (Fairclough 2003:36f). In my analysis of the text I have chosen to concentrate on *vocabulary*; how certain words and expressions are used and give meaning to the text. In a text some words and expressions might be more important for the understanding of the text than others, and in my analysis of vocabulary I will use the term *key signifier* as a concept to describe these words and expressions. In for example the sentence “I will go to heaven” the word “heaven” can be seen as a key signifier which gives the sentence more of a meaning than for instance the word “will”. However, a key signifier is in itself not more meaningful than other signs, they are given that meaning in a certain discourse. The word “heaven” is linked to a religious discourse and gives the sentence a more religious meaning than the sentence “I will go to the gym”. Nevertheless, there are always other possibilities of meaning that can question and change the structure of a discourse (Fairclough 1992:185-186). If one for example examines the word homosexuality, it can both be defined as an act or as a sexual orientation and there is a discursive struggle over the meaning of the word.

Through an analysis of the internal relations of the text one can see how the text relates to other texts and discourses. Choice of certain vocabulary, expressions and other stylistic devices reflect how the text is based on other texts and on certain discourses. To identify what other texts and discourses the text relates to is the main focus of the second dimension in Fairclough’s model, the discursive practice. This dimension contains an analysis of how other texts and discourses are used in the production and consumption of a text (Winther Jørgensen & Philips 2000:75). In order to find out how a text is interpreted and perceived by its consumers one can do a perception study but this is something that will not be done here as it would be to extensive for this study. Instead this essay will focus on the use of discourses and other texts in the production of the text. In my analysis of discursive practice I will concentrate on two aspects; intertextuality and interdiscursivity.

In an analysis of *intertextuality* one looks at “relations between one text and other texts which are ‘external to it’, outside it, yet in some way brought into it” (Fairclough 2003:39). This is based on the supposition that all communicative events are built upon previous events and that texts thus relates to other texts in an *intertextual chain*; “a series of texts that are bound together in a chain through the incorporation of elements from other texts into each text” (Winther Jørgensen & Philips 2000:77). This relation can be more or less obvious but this study will concentrate on *manifest intertextuality*; when a text quotes, summarizes or alludes to another text (Fairclough 1992:117). In a statement such as ‘the Bible says that homosexuality is wrong’, that statement alludes to another text, the Bible, and is hence intertextually related to that text.

In this way a text can incorporate the voices of others in order to gain legitimacy for its claims (Fairclough 2003:36). Hence, in the statement ‘the Bible says that homosexuality is wrong’, the authority of the words written in the Bible is used to legitimize the statement that homosexuality is wrong.

The second aspect of analysis, *interdiscursivity*, is an analysis of how certain discourses are represented in the texts. According to Fairclough an interdiscursive analysis is “concerned with identifying which discourses are drawn upon, and how they are articulated together” (Fairclough 2003:128). Different linguistic features represent different discourses and based upon my results in the analysis of the first dimension I will in my analysis of interdiscursivity try to identify the main discourses that are used in the production of the texts and then look at how the discourses are combined with each other in the different texts. Nevertheless, discourses are not stable and firmly defined but are performatively constituted. Hence, the texts can use and express certain discourses but also contribute to (re-)creating the discourse.

The analysis of discursive practice is what Fairclough calls the ‘intermediate level’ between the text itself and other social practices that are external to the text. To look at the “external relations” of the text, that is to say how the text relates to a broader social context, is the focus of the third dimension of Fairclough’s analysis, the social practice (Fairclough 2003:37). In this dimension one interprets the text by applying other relevant social theories in the analysis of the text. In my analysis of social practice I will read the material in relation to the previously mentioned theories of national identity, security and heteronormativity.

3.2 DISCUSSION OF MATERIAL

Finding relevant material has been one of the major challenges for this study as it is relatively hard to gain access to printed material from Uganda when researching in Sweden. Consequently, internet has been the main source for information and material to this study. The search for relevant material has taken departure in the *Anti Homosexuality Bill* since it is in the center of the political debate in Uganda. As the Bill alludes to the *Constitution of Uganda* and to the *Penal Code Act*, these documents are included in the analysis as reference material. In the beginning, my search focused on official documents and political statements on homosexuality in Uganda. However, I have had great difficulty in finding both official documents and speeches or interviews with politicians on the subject. The Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Committee’s report on the Bill only suggested some amendments and did not really contain a discussion on homosexuality. Except from interviews with David Bahati, the author of the Bill, I have only found some brief statements from other politicians quoted in newspapers, most of them in support of the Bill. Since the essay aims to examine the political debate surrounding homosexuality in contemporary Uganda, I wanted to include the viewpoints of political

opponents in the debate. I have therefore broadened my search to include not only official documents and statements by politicians but also documents and statements from civil society organizations in Uganda. In this study I will include an official statement from Sexual Minorities Uganda and a statement from the Civil Society Coalition as these organizations are main actors in the oppositional stance of the debate.

In total, the empirical material of this study consists of four texts that have been selected on basis of relevance for the study. The first text that is to be analyzed is the *Anti Homosexuality Bill* itself, written by Ugandan Member of Parliament David Bahati. This text is a key document in the debate surrounding homosexuality in Uganda and it provides a detailed account of why and how homosexuality should be combatted. In the second text, an interview with David Bahati by Rachel Maddow, Bahati further develop some of his ideas and thoughts about homosexuality and why it should be forbidden. The two other text, the *Official Statement from LGBTI Ugandans and Anti-Homosexuality or Anti-Human Rights Bill?*, have a different viewpoint on homosexuality and represent the oppositional stance in the debate.

3.3 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

I have chosen four texts to represent the political debate in Uganda, three documents and one broadcasted interview with David Bahati. What is important to note here is that we only have access to a limited amount of texts and of their performative expression of discourses. We only have access to one picture of the debate, not to the entire debate surrounding homosexuality in Uganda. Based upon the texts I will try to identify possible general discourses in the political struggle surrounding homosexuality in Uganda. The discourses is an interpretation, there could be other possible discourses in the debate.

However, the task of the study is not to provide the truth, nor the final description of Ugandan debate on homosexuality. Rather the purpose is to understand how homosexuality can emerge as something that warrants a violent, indeed lethal response from the state. Hopefully, by subscribing to a clear methodological and theoretical framework, my interpretations of the situation will have clear and valid ground.

4. ANALYSIS

In order to answer my research questions the material has been analyzed in accordance with the methodological model as described above. In this chapter each dimension of analysis will be presented separately; beginning with an analysis of text, followed by a discursive practice and then concluding with a discussion on social practice.

4.1 TEXT

In the material one can identify several key signifiers that are important for an understanding of the texts. In this discussion I will focus on four central concepts; 'homosexuality'/'homosexuals', 'the people of Uganda'/'Ugandans', 'protect'/'protection' and 'rights'. There are other key signifiers in the texts but in this section I will concentrate on these four as these are prevalent in all of the texts that have been analyzed in this study.

The concept of 'homosexuality'/'homosexuals' is a major key signifier in the texts as it is the main concern of the debate. As previously mentioned this is not an unproblematic concept to define and the different texts use different definitions. In the *Anti Homosexuality Bill* 'homosexuality' is defined as same sex acts and 'homosexuals' as persons who voluntarily commit these acts; one can thus become a 'homosexual' by committing an act of 'homosexuality' (Bahati 2009). Bahati further argues that "same sex attraction is not an innate and immutable characteristic" (Bahati 2009:Memorandum), but it "is a learned behavior and it can be unlearned" (Femia 2010). Hence, sexuality is something that can alter and change, 'homosexual' is not something that you are, it is something you can become. In the *Official Statement from LGBTI Ugandans* on the other hand, SMUG argues that 'homosexuality' is a sexual orientation and that "sexual orientation is not changeable" (Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009a). Homosexual is thus something that one are from the beginning, not something that one can turn into. This distinction is a cornerstone in the political debate on homosexuality in Uganda; if sexuality can change one can potentially become homosexual, but if sexuality is unchangeable this possibility does not exist.

Another very important key signifier in the texts is the concept of 'the people of Uganda'/'Ugandans'. The *Anti Homosexuality Bill* repeatedly refers to 'the people of Uganda' in the arguments for introducing the Bill, and one can for example find the following statement:

The Bill further aims at providing a comprehensive and enhanced legislation to protect the cherished culture of the people of Uganda, legal, religious, and traditional family values of the people of Uganda against

the attempts of sexual rights activists seeking to impose their values of sexual promiscuity on the people of Uganda.

- Bahati 2009:Memorandum

In the quotation above 'the people of Uganda' is described as a relatively homogenous community with a shared culture and common values that differ from the values of the others, the sexual rights activists. 'The people of Uganda' is loosely defined as having some kind of "legal, religious, and traditional family values" that are in opposition to the "values of sexual promiscuity" of the others. In this way, the Bill claims that homosexuals and sexual rights activists have different values from the people of Uganda and by doing so the Bill attempts to exclude homosexuals and sexual rights activists from the people. SMUG and the Civil Society Coalition oppose this definition of the people and instead use the term 'Ugandans' in a more inclusive way. For instance, SMUG frequently uses expressions such as "Homosexual Citizens of Uganda", "Homosexual Ugandans", "fellow Ugandans", and "fellow citizens" in order to point out that homosexuals should be included in the people (Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009a). Instead of being defined by some kind of culture and values, 'Ugandans' are defined as "citizens" or "members of the population" in order to include all people with Ugandan citizenship, disregarding sexual orientation (Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights and Constitutional Law 2009).

The concept of protect/protection is also an important key signifier in the texts as it is used in the texts in order to support or challenge discrimination against homosexuals. The concept implies that there is someone or something that should be protected from someone or something else, something dangerous. Even though all of the texts use the concept, they differ in their opinion of whom or what should be protected and whom/what to be protected from. In the Bill, Bahati argues that 'the people of Uganda' should be protected from the "threat" that homosexuality poses to the "traditional heterosexual family" (Bahati 2009:Memorandum). Furthermore, in the interview with Bahati, he also claims that the main reason for an Anti Homosexuality Bill is to "protect the children who are being recruited" into homosexuality (Femia 2010). In short, Bahati argues that homosexuality is dangerous and that the 'people of Uganda', especially the children, needs to be protected from it. However, SMUG and the Civil Society Coalition disagree with Bahati regarding whom/what should be protected from whom/what. SMUG argues that it is not the people whom should be protected from homosexuality but rather homosexuals who should be protected from discrimination and criminalization by the state (Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009a). Moreover, the Civil Society Coalition argues for the protection of "all its [the states] citizens without discrimination" and

claims that it not homosexuality that poses a threat that one should be protected from but it is rather the Bill itself that is the threat to the human rights of the people (Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights and Constitutional Law 2009).

The concept of 'rights' is another key signifier and the texts often refers to "human rights", "sexual rights" and/or "gay rights". This concept implies that there are specific rights that one is entitled to but the texts have rather different view on what should be included as a 'right'. In the interview with Bahati, he strongly opposes sexual/gay rights and argues that this is not a part of human rights:

We know that homosexuality is a human right here in [the United States of America], but also we need to appreciate the fact that it is not human right across the world, and certainly in Uganda we don't take it as a human right.

- Bahati in Femia 2010

Bahati thus argues that human rights are not universal; something that is regarded as a human right here is not regarded as a human right there, and that homosexuals should not be protected by principles of human rights. The Civil Society Coalition, on the other hand argues for human rights as universal values and claims that one cannot exclude sexual rights from human rights. They argue that one cannot discriminate against homosexuals without violating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of several articles in the Ugandan Constitution, for example the "Right to Equality and Freedom from discrimination" and the "Rights of Minorities" (Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights and Constitutional Law 2009).

4.2 DISCURSIVE PRACTICE

Through an analysis of the internal dimensions of the text one can find that the texts are based upon other texts and certain discourses in their arguments for and against discrimination against homosexuals. In the analysis of discursive practice I will try to identify what other texts and discourses that are used in the production of the text through analyzes of interdiscursivity and intertextuality.

4.2.1 INTERTEXTUALITY

In an analysis of discursive practice one can see that the texts are intertextually linked to each other in an intertextual chain. To begin with, all of the texts refer and/or allude to the Constitution of Uganda as a way to gain legitimacy for their cause. For instance, in order to illustrate that they are Ugandans too, LGBTI Ugandans take use of the Ugandan slogan "FOR GOD AND MY COUNTRY" that is stated in the Constitution (Republic of Uganda 1995; Sexual

Minorities Uganda 2009a). Even though all of the texts use the Constitution in order to support their arguments they interpret it in very different ways. Bahati sees the Bill as consistent with the Constitution as it seeks to “defend the family of Uganda” (Femia 2010) in accordance with the sections “Protection of the family” and “Rights of the family” (Republic of Uganda 1995:Objective XIX, Article 31). The Civil Society Coalition on the other hand sees the Anti Homosexuality Bill as “one of the most serious attacks to date on the 1995 Constitution and on the key human rights protections enshrined in the Constitution” (Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights and Constitutional Law 2009). They argue that the Bill violates several articles in the constitution including Article 21: Equality and freedom from discrimination, Article 29: Protection of freedom of conscience, expression, movement, religion, assembly and association, and Article 36: Protection of rights of minorities (Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights and Constitutional Law 2009; Republic of Uganda 1995).

Additionally, the texts are not only intertextually linked by reference to the Constitution; they also refer and allude to each other. For instance, the statement from the Civil Society Coalition, *Anti-Homosexuality or Anti-Human Rights Bill?*, is a kind of critical review on the *Anti Homosexuality Bill*. Consequently, references to the Bill are frequent in the text and even the title of the statement alludes to the Bill. Moreover, one can find direct quotations from the Bill such as “contradictory to the spirit and provisions” and “aggravated homosexuality” in the text from the Civil Society Coalition (Bahati 2009; Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights and Constitutional Law 2009). The *Anti Homosexuality Bill* is also the main subject in the interview with Bahati and there are frequent references to the “Bill” in the text. However, what is interesting in the interview is that Bahati at one point seems to allude to the *Official Statement from LGBTI Ugandans* in his statement that “even the pro-gay, eh, groups have condemned this [recruitment into homosexuality], eh, so it is something that is factual” (Bahati 2010). Here Bahati seems to have used a part of SMUG’s message, “We strongly and fiercely condemn it [recruitment into homosexuality]”, for his own purposes while ignoring other parts of their message “WE CANNOT, DO NOT, HAVE NEVER, AND WILL NEVER ‘recruit’” (Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009a).

Apart from being intertextually linked to each other, some of the texts also refer to other texts such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Bible. For example, in order to gain legitimacy for their claims, the Civil Society Coalition refers to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and argues that the Bill violates this international document which has been signed by Uganda (Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights and Constitutional Law 2009). Bahati, on the other hand, take use of the Bible in order to legitimize the Bill and he argues that homosexuality “is sin and that it is written in the Bible” (Femia 2010).

4.2.2 INTERDISCURSIVITY

In my analysis of interdiscursivity I have identified one main discourse which is central in all of the texts; the nationalist discourse. In the texts the nationalist discourse is mixed with other minor discourses which are more or less current in the different texts. Three minor discourses have been identified in the texts; heteronormative discourse, security discourse, and human rights discourse. In the analysis of discursive practice I will look at how the discourses are used in the texts and how the texts helps to reproduce the discourses.

A nationalist discourse can be said to be based upon the idea of a sovereign nation-state and of a people with a national identity (Winther Jørgensen & Philips 2000:155f). According to this logic, 'the people' (for example Ugandans) has an identity that is based upon the state (Uganda) and the state has an identity that is based on the people. The texts that have been analyzed in this study frequently refer to "Uganda" and "Ugandans" as basic and relatively unproblematic units and thereby assume that the reader knows that Uganda and Ugandans do exist. By studying the linguistic features of the texts one can see how the texts are built upon vocabulary that is connected to a nationalist discourse, such as "nation", "people", and "citizen". In this way they use a nationalist discourse in order to support or challenge discrimination against homosexuals. Furthermore, the Constitution is one of the main documents in a nation-state and references and allusions to the Constitutions can therefore also be regarded as a part of a nationalist discourse.

The *Anti Homosexuality Bill* frequently uses words that are connected to a nationalist discourse in order to support discrimination against homosexuals. For instance, the Bill talks about "the nation", "the people", and "Uganda" as natural and existing entities and it is generally assumed that Uganda is a nation-state with a Ugandan people. Especially the expression "the people of Uganda" is a key signifier that is closely connected with a nationalist discourse and it is used to assemble Ugandans around a national identity which is built upon an idea of a common culture and common values. In order to exclude homosexuals from the national identity the Bill mixes the nationalist discourse with a heteronormative discourse. For instance, in the Bill homosexuality is connected with words such as "sexual promiscuity", "sexual abuse", "deviation", and "unnatural offences" and is in that way portrayed as something bad, unnatural and abnormal (Bahati 2009:Memorandum). Furthermore, the Bill refers to the "traditional heterosexual family" and one of the objectives of the Bill is to "provide for marriage in Uganda as that contracted only between a man and a woman", suggesting that heterosexuality is and should continue to be a social norm (Bahati 2009:Memorandum). Moreover, by the use of the words "protect" in relation to the people and "threat" in relation to homosexuality, the national discourse is mixed with a security discourse. The Bill argues that it is the "nation's" duty to "protect [...] the people of Uganda" from homosexuality and the "threat" it poses (Bahati

2009:Memorandum). The articulation of homosexuality as a threat to 'the people of Uganda' implies that homosexuality is considered to be an issue of national security. To argue that homosexuality is a threat to national security is a way to motivate death penalty on homosexuality; when homosexuality is a threat to the existence of the state, homosexuality must be eliminated. In this way Bahati uses a nationalist discourse combined with a security discourse and a heteronormative discourse in order to gain support for the Bill.

However, a nationalist discourse can be used in more than one way and in the *Official Statement from LGBTI Ugandans* one can see how a nationalist discourse can be used in order to challenge discrimination against homosexuals. SMUG frequently uses nationalist words such as "Ugandans" and "citizens" in order to assemble the people to oppose discrimination of homosexuals. By use of expressions such as "Homosexual Citizens of Uganda", "fellow Ugandans" and "fellow citizens", SMUG argues for a more inclusive national identity where all citizens, both heterosexuals and homosexuals, should be included in the national identity (Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009a). Similarly, the Civil Society Coalition also uses a nationalist discourse in order to oppose the Bill. By use of expressions such as "all its citizen", "all Ugandans" and "members of the population" they oppose the Bills definition of "the people" and work for a more inclusive national identity (Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights and Constitutional Law 2009). In order to gain support for a more inclusive national identity, SMUG and the Civil Society Coalition combines the nationalist discourse with a human rights discourse. The human rights discourse is based upon the idea of that all humans are entitled to certain rights which are generally assumed to be universal (Diez, Bode & da Costa 2011:89). This discourse is built upon the rights that are stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and words such as "rights", "freedom", and "equality" are examples of words that are connected to a human rights discourse. By combining the nationalist discourse with a human rights discourse they can argue that as "Citizens of Uganda", homosexuals are entitled to "equal rights and protection" against discrimination (Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009a). SMUG also points out that they are a "minority group" and as such have rights according to the Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. A human rights discourse is particularly apparent in the Civil Society Coalition arguments against the Bill, where vocabulary such as "rights", "freedom", and "equality" are frequently repeated in the text. They argue that there are "enshrined principles of human dignity, equality, freedom, and justice for all", including homosexuals and other sexual minorities and thus uses a human rights discourse in order to challenge the Bill.

4.3 SOCIAL PRACTICE

In the *Anti Homosexuality Bill* homosexuality is portrayed as a real and existing threat to national security. However, if one instead sees security from a poststructuralist perspective as a

discursive practice, homosexuality is not an already existing threat; the threat is constituted in the articulation of a threat. By the use of a security discourse in the Bill, homosexuality is articulated as a threat that 'the people of Uganda' must be secured from. The articulation of homosexuality as such (re-)produces a 'discourse of danger' which portrays homosexuality as something dangerous. The paradox here is that in an attempt to gain security, Bahati and the *Anti Homosexuality Bill* (re-)produces a 'discourse of danger' which constitutes homosexuality as a threat and thereby creates insecurity. Moreover, by telling 'the people of Uganda' what to fear, the 'discourse of danger' also contains notions of who 'the people of Uganda' are. By combining a security discourse with a nationalist discourse, the state is articulated as the protector of 'the people of Uganda' and thus the identity of the people is used in order to legitimize the state's security policies. As previously stated, it is generally assumed that 'Uganda' and 'the people of Uganda' are natural and already existing entities with particular values and a specific culture. However, Campbell argues that states are imagined communities which are discursively constructed. From this point of view 'the people of Uganda' do not have an already existing national identity, that identity is constructed.

If one for instance looks at the Constitution of Uganda one can see that the Constitution recognizes that people within Uganda is not a uniform entity:

Every effort shall be made to integrate all the peoples of Uganda while at the same time recognizing the existence of their ethnic, religious, ideological, political and cultural diversity.

- Republic of Uganda 1995:Objective III

According to this statement, there are many "peoples" of Uganda which differ from each other. However, the Constitution seeks integrate these "peoples" into one "people of Uganda" and thereby construct a national identity. 'The people of Uganda' is thus not a natural, already existing entity as the Bill might suggest, but it is a performatively constituted identity. 'The people of Uganda' did not exist before it were said to exist but the expression attempts to establish the impression that this people preceded the utterance. The Bill can thus be regarded as a way to define and constitute 'the people of Uganda' with a particular identity.

Bahati combines the nationalist discourse with a heteronormative discourse in order to define 'the people of Uganda' in a heteronormative way. For instance, Bahati argues that "we believe that man was created to marry a woman and that's the purpose for which God created us, a purpose for procreation and that's the higher purpose that we believe in" [my emphasis] and in doing so suggests that 'we', 'the people of Uganda', are heterosexuals which "does not support

homosexuality” (Femia 2010). One can see that in accordance with Rubin’s hierarchical system of sexual value, marital and reproductive sex seems to be regarded as the best form of sexuality and even as the main purpose of life itself. If one examines the Constitution and the laws of Uganda one can find that the hierarchical system of sexual value is institutionalized in the Ugandan state. For example, the Constitution claims that “the [heterosexual] family is the natural and basic unit of society and is entitled to protection” (Constitution 1995:Objective XIX), while homosexuality is criminalized under “unnatural offences” in Ugandan law (Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs 1950: Chapter 120, Section 145).

Furthermore, ‘the people of Uganda’ is defined in opposition to ‘homosexuals’ and ‘sexual rights activists’ who are trying to “impose *their* values of sexual promiscuity on the people of Uganda” [my emphasis] (Bahati 2009:Memorandum). The construction of a ‘we’, a ‘people of Uganda’, also implies the construction of an ‘Other’, ‘homosexuals’ and ‘sexual rights activists’, which are different from ‘us’. Homosexuals and sexual rights activists can then be excluded from the national identity, as they supposedly do not share the culture and values of ‘the people of Uganda’. Additionally, homosexuals are portrayed as dangerous ‘Others’ who are trying to impose ‘their’ values on ‘us’. The ‘Others’, the ‘homosexuals’ and ‘sexual rights activists’, are described in opposition to ‘us’, ‘the people of Uganda’, where ‘the people of Uganda’ are given positive descriptions and ‘homosexuals’ and ‘sexual rights activists’ negative ones. For example, ‘the people of Uganda’ is connected with words like “cherished culture” and “traditional values” while homosexuality is connected with “sexual promiscuity”, “sexual abuse”, “deviation”, and “unnatural offences” (Bahati 2009: Memorandum). Moreover, homosexuality is portrayed as something foreign to Uganda as Bahati argues that there are “people who are coming from, eh, abroad, investing money to recruit children” and that the Bill aims to ensure that “foreign people do not impose a culture that we don’t believe in” (Femia 2010). The ‘Others’, ‘homosexuals’ and ‘sexual right activists’, can thus be excluded from the national identity by being portrayed as foreign to Ugandan society. However, are the divisions between ‘us’ and ‘them’ static or is it possible that ‘we’ become like ‘them’?

Since homosexuality, according to Bahati, is a “learned behavior” (Femia 2010) it is possible for a heterosexual to become homosexual by learning this behavior. The heterosexual identity is then threatened by the possibility that ‘we’, ‘the people of Uganda’, become like ‘them’, the ‘homosexuals’, if ‘we’ let ‘them’ “impose a culture that *we* don’t believe in” [my emphasis] (Femia 2010). One can then potentially become homosexual and the existence of this potentiality is enough to produce an understanding of homosexuality as a threat to the heteronormative Ugandan national identity. If one potentially can become homosexual, it is, according to this logic, possible that the people of Uganda become homosexual and the heterosexual identity of

the people might be destroyed. Homosexuals thus represent a biological danger to the heterosexual identity of the Ugandan people and attempts to introduce death penalty can be legitimized as self-defense. In conclusion, by the articulation of homosexuality as a learned behavior that is foreign to Ugandan culture, homosexuality has been presented as a threat to the Ugandan national identity and institutionalized execution of homosexuals has been encouraged in the name of national security.

However, this presentation of homosexuality is not the only presentation existing in Ugandan political debate but there are other alternative presentations that challenge this conception of homosexuality. In the *Official Statement from LGBTI Ugandans*, homosexuality is instead presented as a sexual orientation, an innate and unchangeable characteristic. SMUG thus reject the possibility that one can become homosexual and thereby refute that homosexuals are “recruiting” heterosexual Ugandans into homosexuality (Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009a). Hence, they argue that there is no danger of heterosexual Ugandans becoming homosexuals as Bahati suggests and therefore homosexuality should not be considered as a threat to national security. Furthermore, they oppose the conception of homosexuality as something foreign and argue that homosexuals are not “un-Ugandan and un-African” but that they are in fact a part of the Ugandan population (Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009a). By articulating that they are “Homosexual Ugandans” they seek to constitute themselves as a minority group within the Ugandan state in order to gain access to the rights and protections that are entitled to minorities and marginalized groups (Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009a). SMUG thus claims that as a sexual minority, homosexuals are entitled to rights and protections that, at the moment, are not provided by the state.

As Stern points out, marginalised groups can have other security concerns than those of the nation-state and these are often excluded from the formation of the state’s security policies. In Bahati’s attempts to define ‘the people of Uganda’ with a heterosexual identity, homosexual Ugandans are excluded from nation-building process. Moreover, homosexuals are not only excluded from the nation-building process, they are also portrayed as a threat to this process. However, according to SMUG and the Civil Society Coalition it is not homosexuality that poses a threat to ‘the people of Uganda’ but it is rather the Bill itself that poses a threat to its citizens. The Civil Society Coalition points out that the Bill not only concern homosexual citizens but that “this bill targets everybody, and involves everybody: it cannot be implemented without making every citizen spy on his or her neighbours” (Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights and Constitutional Law 2009). Hence, the national security policies of the state do not always guarantee safety for the citizens within that state. Instead the state’s attempts to homogenize the people through national security can be the very thing that threatens the population.

5. CONCLUSION

To conclude, the purpose of this thesis was to investigate the role of heteronormativity in the constitution of the Ugandan nation-state in order to understand the political context that enables efforts to eradicate homosexuality through institutionalized execution. Four texts have been chosen to represent the political debate in Uganda and in order to analyze the material my methodological model has been based upon Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model for Critical Discourse Analysis. In the analysis, the material has been interpreted from a poststructuralist perspective with the help of theories concerning national identity, security and heteronormativity. In this chapter I will first present the results of my analysis in relation to my research questions and then discuss some reflections and final remarks in the concluding discussion.

5.1 RESULTS

In the material one can find that discrimination against homosexuals has been both supported and challenged by different actors in the political debate. In order to gain support for discrimination and the *Anti Homosexuality Bill*, Bahati mixes a nationalist discourse with a security discourse and a heteronormative discourse. In so doing he is able to present homosexuality as a threat to the Ugandan national identity. Furthermore, by referring to the Bible and to Constitution of Uganda he seeks to legitimate claims that homosexuality is wrong and that it is foreign to Ugandan values. Nevertheless, SMUG and the Civil Society Coalition argue against discrimination against homosexuals by instead combining the nationalist discourse with a human rights discourse. They thereby claim that homosexuals is a minority group within the Ugandan state and that they as such deserve state protection rather than being persecuted and discriminated against. By referring to the Constitution of Uganda and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights they seek to oppose discrimination and the Bill as this violate human rights.

In the statements from SMUG and the Civil Society Coalition homosexuals have been presented as a minority group within the Ugandan population, which cannot be excluded from the people of Uganda and the national identity. They argue that all citizens of Uganda are entitled to protection from discrimination and that the Bill is a threat to the security of many Ugandan citizens. In the Bill and the interview with David Bahati, on the other hand, homosexuality is portrayed as something foreign to Ugandan culture and Bahati thus seeks to exclude homosexuals from the national identity. However, this identity is vulnerable to the possibility that the people become homosexuals and homosexuals are portrayed as a dangerous 'Other' that poses a threat to the Ugandan national identity. Homosexuality has thus become portrayed as an issue of national security and thereby a violent response from the state can be warranted.

In this thesis I argue that it is possible to see the *Anti Homosexuality Bill* as a part of the heteronormative constitution of the Ugandan nation-state. By ascribing heteronormative values on the people of Uganda, the Bill seeks to define and constitute the people with a heterosexual identity. If one looks at the Constitution of Uganda one can see that heteronormativity is already institutionalized in the state. Through institutionalized execution, the Bill aims to eliminate the very existence of homosexuality from the Ugandan state and thereby seeks to constitute a heterosexual state.

5.2 CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

In conclusion, this study shows that by the articulation of homosexuality as a learned behavior that is foreign to Ugandan culture, Bahati seeks to constitute the Ugandan nation with a heterosexual identity. The existence of homosexual Ugandans challenge this conception of Ugandans as heterosexuals and homosexuals are therefore described as a dangerous 'Other' that threatens the heteronormative national identity. The presentation of homosexuals as a threat to national identity thus enables efforts to eradicate homosexuality through institutionalized execution. However, this study also shows that there are alternative presentations of homosexuality and national identity in the Ugandan political debate. By combining a nationalist discourse with a human rights discourse, SMUG and the Civil Society Coalition opposes discrimination against homosexuals and challenge the heteronormative constitution of Ugandan national identity. Hence, the political debate in Uganda does not only hold one representation of homosexuality but there are different competing representations.

However, this is not a complete picture of the political debate in Uganda but there could be other representations as well. In order to gain a broader picture of the political debate in Uganda one would need more than only four texts and one would also need to include other actors in the analysis, for example the media and the religious communities. It would also be interesting to compare the case of Uganda with other cases in order to see how homosexuality is presented in other social and political contexts.

REFERENCES

LITERATURE

- Butler, Judith 2007: *Genustrubbel: Feminism och identitetens subversion*. Göteborg: Bokförlaget Daidalos AB
- Buzan, Barry & Hansen, Lene 2009: *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Campbell, David 1998: *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Diez, Thomas; Bode, Ingvild & da Costa, Aleksandra Fernandez 2011: *Key Concepts in International Relations*. London: SAGE Publications
- Dillon, Michael 2007: "Governing Terror: The State of Emergency of Biopolitical Emergence". *International Political Sociology*: Vol. 1, p. 7-28
- Fairclough, Norman 2003: *Analysing Discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge
- Foucault, Michel 1990: *The will to knowledge: The History of Sexuality Volume 1*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd
- Greenfeld, Liah 1996: "Nationalism and Modernity". *Social Research*: Vol. 63, Issue 1, p 3-40
- Jagose, Annamarie 1996: *Queer Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press
- Koch, Andrew M. 2007: *Poststructuralism and the Politics of Method*. Plymouth: Lexington Books
- Kress, Gunther 2001: "From Saussure to Critical Sociolinguistics: The Turn Towards a Social View of Language" in Wetherell, Margaret; Taylor, Stephanie & Yates, Simeon J. (ed.): *Discourse Theory and Practice*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd
- Morgan, Sue 2006: "Introduction: Writing Feminist History: Theoretical Debates and Critical Practices" in Morgan, Sue (ed.): *The Feminist History Reader*. New York: Routledge
- Mutimer, David 2007: "Critical Security Studies: A Schismatic History" in Collins, Alan (ed.): *Contemporary Security Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Nagel, Joane 2000: "Ethnicity and Sexuality". *Annual Review of Sociology*: Vol. 26, p 107-133
- Rubin, Gayle 1984: "Thinking Sex" in Vance, Carole S. (red.): *Pleasure and Danger*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Sinha, Mrinalini 2006: "Gender and Nation" in Morgan, Sue (ed.): *The Feminist History Reader*. New York: Routledge
- Steans, Jill & Pettiford Lloyd 2005: *Introduction to International Relations*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited

Stern, Maria 2005: *Naming Security: Constructing Identity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press

Stern, Maria 2006: "'We' the subject: The Power and Failure of (In)Security". *Security Dialogue*: Vol. 37, no. 2, p

Strand, Cecilia 2011: "Kill Bill! Ugandan human rights organizations' attempts to influence the media's coverage of the Anti-Homosexuality Bill". *Culture Health & Sexuality*: Vol. 13, No. 8 p 917-931

Yuval-Davies, Nira 2008: *Gender & Nation*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd

Winther Jørgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise 2000: *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB

OTHER SOURCES

Amnesty International 2010: *Uganda: Anti-Homosexuality Bill is inherently discriminatory and threatens broader human rights*. London: Amnesty International Publications. Available at: <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/AFR59/003/2010/en/befd26d0-8051-469b-af76-b76858c423ff/afr590032010en.pdf> [accessed 29 May 2012]

Among, Barbara 2010: "Cabinet Debates Homosexuality Draft Law". *The New Vision*; 20 January 2010. Available at: <http://allafrica.com.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/stories/201001210194.html> [accessed 29 May 2012]

Bahati, David 2009: "The Anti Homosexuality Bill". *Uganda Gazette*; 25 September 2009, Vol. CII, No. 47. Kampala: Uganda Printing and Publishing Corporation. Available at: [http://www2.amnesty.se/andranyheter.nsf/0/c8c7a2870b9430edc125766b00375936/\\$FILE/the_anti_homosexuality_bill_2009_uganda.pdf](http://www2.amnesty.se/andranyheter.nsf/0/c8c7a2870b9430edc125766b00375936/$FILE/the_anti_homosexuality_bill_2009_uganda.pdf) [accessed 29 May 2012] or: <http://wthrockmorton.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/anti-homosexuality-bill-2009.pdf> [accessed 29 May 2012]

Civil Society Coalition on Human Rights and Constitutional Law 2009: *Anti-Homosexuality or Anti-Human Rights Bill?*; 23 October 2009. Available at: http://othersheep.org/Uganda_Civil_Society_Coalition_on_Human_Rights_and_Constitutional_Law_Kampala_October_23_2009.pdf [accessed 29 May 2012] or: <http://ebookbrowse.com/09-10-23-anti-homosexuality-or-anti-human-rights-bill-pdf-d76158431> [accessed 29 May 2012]

Femia, Will 2010: *Rachel Maddow/David Bahati -- full interview*; 9 December 2010. Available at: <http://maddowblog.msnbc.msn.com/news/2010/12/09/5614680-rachel-maddowdavid-bahati-full-interview> [accessed 29 May 2012]

Human Rights Watch 2009: *Uganda: Anti-homosexuality Bill threatens liberties and human rights defenders*; 16 October 2009. Available at: <http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2009/10/15/uganda-anti-homosexuality-bill-threatens-liberties-and-human-rights-defenders> [accessed 29 May 2012]

Human Rights Watch 2011: *Uganda: Parliament Committee Backs Anti-Homosexuality Bill*; 12 May 2011. Available at: <http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/05/12/uganda-parliament-committee-backs-anti-homosexuality-bill> [accessed 29 May 2012]

ILGA 2012: *State-sponsored Homophobia: A world survey of laws criminalising same-sex sexual acts between consenting adults*. Available at: http://old.ilga.org/Statehomophobia/ILGA_State_Sponsored_Homophobia_2012.pdf [accessed 29 May 2012]

ILGA 2010: *State-sponsored Homophobia: A world survey of laws criminalising same-sex sexual acts between consenting adults*. Available at: http://www.rfsl.se/public/ILGA_State_Sponsored_Homophobia_2010.pdf [accessed 29 May 2012]

Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009a: *Official Statement from LGBTI Ugandans*; 31 March 2009. Available at: http://www.sexualminoritiesuganda.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=58:official-statement-from-lgbti-ugandans&catid=1:latest-news [accessed 30 May 2011] or: <http://www.iglhrc.org/cgi-bin/iowa/article/takeaction/partners/881.html> [accessed 29 May 2012]

Sexual Minorities Uganda 2009b: *Sexual Minorities Uganda (SMUG) Condemn the Tabled Anti-Homosexuality Bill*; 15 October 2009. Available at: <http://www.iglhrc.org/cgi-bin/iowa/article/takeaction/partners/988.html> [accessed 29 May 2012]

Strand, Cecilia 2011: "Kill Bill! Ugandan human rights organizations' attempts to influence the media's coverage of the Anti-Homosexuality Bill". *Culture, Health & Sexuality*: Vol. 13, No. 8, p. 917-931. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2011.589080> [accessed 29 May 2012]

Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs 1950: *The Penal Code Act*. Available at: http://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text.jsp?file_id=170005 [accessed 29 May 2012]

Utrikesdepartementet 2007: *Mänskliga rättigheter i Uganda 2007*. Available at: http://www.humanrights.gov.se/dynamaster/file_archive/080313/0d740c9db647064d6e34f18aa70db175/Uganda.pdf [accessed 29 May 2012]

Republic of Uganda 1995: *Constitution of Uganda*. http://www.ugandaembassy.com/Constitution_of_Uganda.pdf [accessed 29 May 2012]