

Globalization, Religion and Sexuality: Plus ça change?

Heather Shipley*

Abstract

Although difficult to capture all changes and current experiences regarding religion and sexuality across the globe, this article provides a survey of the ways these two categories intersect across multiple nations at a specific moment in time. In this article, I consider the assumptions that are embedded in public notions about religion and sexuality in relationship to one another in global context (and public policies across nations). I reflect on the ways religion and sexual diversity are framed as inherently in combat, the reasons for this continual framing and the gaps that are often overlooked between policy and identity experiences.

Keywords: globalization; religion, sexual diversity.

Globalização, Religião e Sexualidade: Quanto mais se muda?

Resumo

Embora seja difícil de apreender todas as mudanças e experiências atuais envolvendo religião e sexualidade em todo o mundo, este artigo fornece um levantamento das maneiras pelas quais essas duas categorias se cruzam em vários países em um momento específico no tempo. Neste artigo, eu reflito sobre os pressupostos que estão embutidos nas noções públicas sobre religião e sexualidade em relação uma à outra em um contexto global (e nas políticas públicas de todas as nações). Reflito sobre o modo como religião e diversidade sexual são concebidas como inerentemente em combate, as razões para esta contínua concepção e as lacunas que muitas vezes são esquecidas entre política e experiências identitárias.

Palavras-chave: globalização; religião, diversidade sexual.

* Is Project Manager for the *Religion and Diversity Project*, a SSHRC Major Collaborative Research Initiative at the University of Ottawa. Her research focuses on the construction, management and regulation of religion, gender, sexuality and sexual orientation as identity categories in law, policy and public discourse.

La globalización, la religión y la sexualidad: Cuanto más se cambia?

Resumen

Aunque es difícil de captar todos los cambios y experiencias actuales que involucran la religión y la sexualidad en todo el mundo, este artículo ofrece un análisis de las formas en que estas dos categorías se cruzan en varios países en un punto específico en el tiempo. En este artículo reflexiono sobre los supuestos implícitos en nociones comunes acerca de la religión y la sexualidad en relación unas con otra en un contexto global (y las políticas públicas de todas las naciones). Reflexiono sobre cómo la religión y la diversidad sexual se conciben como inherentemente en combate, las razones de este diseño continuo y las brechas que a menudo son olvidados entre la política y las experiencias de identidad.

Palabras clave: globalización; religión, diversidad sexual.

Introduction

I began writing this article as World Pride 2014 kicked off in Toronto, Ontario. Marveling at all the events, activities, parades and, well, the *pride* in the celebration of sexual diversity, it became clear to me that within a relatively brief period of time, public expression and response toward the LGBTQ communities in Canada had shifted dramatically. Even within my own lifetime, the language and understanding of LGBTQI identities has shifted substantially; correspondingly, the language and public response to religion has also shifted. Whether these changes are necessarily positive or negative remains to be seen. Public awareness of both sexually diverse and religious identities will never be solely positive or negative, however what is striking regarding both is the way the two identity categories are ‘understood’ in their relationship to one another. In this article, I consider the assumptions that are embedded in public notions about religion and sexuality in relationship to one another in global context (and public policies across nations). I reflect on the ways religion and sexual diversity are framed as inherently in combat, the reasons for this continual framing and the gaps that are often overlooked between policy and identity experiences.

This article can only capture a small picture at a specific moment in time of the global experience of both religion and sexuality as it changes, shifts, is constrained and as it is represented in multiple venues. In an attempt to represent *Globalization, Religion and Sexuality*, I believe that Jean-Baptiste Alphonse Karr’s epigram “Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose” fittingly describes the complex and widely differing realities of the relationship between religion and sexuality across the globe. I do not use that saying to be pessimistic, or to minimize the changes that have taken place, but I

am curious about what is meant when declarations of ‘progress’ regarding sexual diversity are made (where? who?) and how ‘progress’ is quantified on a global scale when we talk about religion and sexuality. While bans against same-sex marriage are now deemed unconstitutional in a number of U.S. states, Russia has passed legislation that makes speaking about homosexuality in public illegal. Uganda’s discriminatory (and harmful) policy regarding homosexuality was recently struck down, but by an odd technicality rendering the original decision moot due to a lack of quorum at the time it was made (VOX, 2014). Treatment of religion and sexuality is both different and the same if we consider the global context.

PEW’s “Global Attitudes Project” sheds some light on diverging attitudes toward homosexuality across 40 countries, with at least half of the population in most of those 40 countries saying they think homosexuality is morally unacceptable. I will discuss this, and other data regarding sexual diversity and discriminatory attitudes, more fully later on in this article. But as an opening reflection, there are several important factors to bear in mind here: 1) discriminatory attitudes toward homosexuality or sexual diversity are not ‘religious’ attitudes any more than they are ‘secular’ attitudes; 2) although policies have changed within a number of countries to grant rights to same-sex couples and members of the sexually diverse communities, these policies are also seen to limit who gets access to protection and; 3) there is still a great deal of discrepancy between a policy of non-discrimination and the lived reality of identity, especially for the sexually or religiously ‘non-normative.’

This article will consider academic developments regarding religion and sexuality, in global context, as it will also consider the varied ways that religion and sexuality are responded to, managed, constrained and celebrated across multiple nations. It would be impossible to cover all aspects of the topic in one article, however I hope to provide a survey of current research regarding religious and sexual intersections and to consider policy and legislation that seek to manage and identity categories across a number of nations. The intention of this approach is to reflect on the gap that often exists between scholarship and policy, and the gap that exists between policy and experience.

Theoretical framework: religious identities, sexually diverse identities, normativity

As policies regarding religion and sexuality around the globe have come under scrutiny, much theoretical and empirical work on identity experiences and identity constructs has also been developed, informing the way we think

about the negotiation of our identity categories and the limits placed on them in law and policy. Sexuality studies developed out of feminist studies which in part critiques normative assumptions and the limits of recognition for those considered non-normative. As identity politics took to the streets, through grassroots activism and demands for recognition, the study of sexuality was also flourishing in academia. It is relatively recent that the study of religion has moved from theological study to a scientific analysis of the ways people practice their religious identities (in line or in contrast with dominant teaching) and the ways religion and culture are enmeshed with one another, with law, with politics and with assumptions (again) about normativity. Regarding both the study of sexuality and the study of religion, there are widely varying approaches, methodologies and goals; both fields harbour diverging ‘camps’ of academic critique. I will not attempt to resolve the debates within the two fields, but would like to note that the lack of agreement within the two disciplines signals how diverse the study of religion and sexuality can be, even within geographic boundaries and academic disciplines.

Identity narratives, and the study of identity narratives, offer a complex and not altogether harmonious picture of the ways identities are experienced, lived, constructed and understood (PHELAN, 2005; RITIVOI, 2009; STRAWSON, 2004). Research on lived identity experiences within the social sciences has shown that identity is nuanced and negotiated, sometimes on a daily basis; identities are possessed and expressed both consciously and unconsciously in multiple ways throughout an individual’s lifetime (MCGUIRE, 2008; RICOEUR, 1992). The narrative of identity can be disjointed, as it is lived and told; innovative and established; fact and fiction; what is and what ought to be (RICOEUR, 1992).

These divergences regarding identity – as studied and experienced – mean that policies regarding identity face many challenges in their development. Often policies are seen to restrict at the same time they protect. Where prohibitions regarding discrimination based on sexual orientation are inscribed, the question is often “whose sexual orientation?” (COSSMAN, 2002, 2007) or rather, within what limits? Similarly, with protections regarding religion and religious freedom claims, the standard by which religiosity and sincerity are measured is critiqued for being value-laden and again, the question is raised: whose religion and within what limits? (BEAMAN, 2008, 2013; SULLIVAN, 2005; BERGER, 2008, 2012).

In religious studies, research has demonstrated the discrepancy between religious texts (and religious teachings) and the ways individuals live their religious lives (MCGUIRE, 2008; DAVIE, 1994). Traditional measures of religion, attaching religiosity to institutional adherence, have been enhanced

by the incorporation of non-traditional, non-institutional measures regarding religious identity, creating a more nuanced picture of contemporary Religiosity (Davie, 1994). Further, diversity of practice and religious engagement continues to be expanded, thus enhancing understanding about the ways individuals experience their religious identities in day to day life (MCGUIRE 2008). Diversity within religious traditions increasingly informs our understanding of the multifaceted expressions of religiosity (BEYER; RAMJI, 2013; HUNT; YIP, 2012).¹ The often narrowed categories of religiosity (often tied to church attendance or frequency of prayer) necessarily restrict understanding about religious identity. New modes of discussing religion and religiosity such that they include non-religious and the spiritual but not religious individuals assist in creating a better understanding about the complex interplay of religion with other life expressions and experiences (DAY; VINCETT; COTTER, 2013).

Sexuality is largely regulated, and perceived, by a set of ideals that constitute 'normative' sexuality, with corresponding sets of categorizations that constitute sexual 'deviancy.' Sexual identity is regulated within set parameters, yet research demonstrates that sexuality is lived fluidly in individual experiences of day to day life (as is religious identity) (YIP; PAGE, 2013; YIP; KEENAN; PAGE, 2011; SHIPLEY; YOUNG, 2014; TAYLOR; SNOWDON, 2014; ADAM; MATICKA-TYNDALE, 2011). Foundational theoretical analysis regarding sexual identity posits that sexual normativity and the construction of the homosexual identity have been done through discourses of power and deviation (FOUCAULT, 1978; KINSMAN, 1996). Developing in this framework, LGBT identities have been framed largely as a set of deviations from normative sexuality, embedded with moral and social impositions. In countries where same-sex marriage is legal, this reconstructs the normative/non-normative sexuality binary such that 'normative' lesbian and gay individuals are married and monogamous (COSSMAN, 2007; DUGGAN, 2002). Responding to these imposed notions, research on sexual identity has sought to excavate the multiple sites and spaces in which sexuality, sexual identity and sexual orientation is lived, experienced and is also the space of subjugation. The shift of the category of 'sexually normal' results from both legal decisions and shifting cultural norms, which impacts notions about the 'acceptable' performances of sexual identity (COSSMAN, 2002; 2007) but which also redefines the sexual 'other' or sexual 'deviant' as those who do not conform to the new dominant 'normal.'

¹ There is debate within religious studies regarding the history of the discipline itself, which is argued by some to generate an inherent bias in the study of religion. This debate is outside the scope of this paper, but I acknowledge that I am focusing here on the study of religion as it exists without reference to this problematic.

Queer theory and gender studies have sought to explicate a nuanced approach to identity based on gender and sexuality (FOUCAULT, 1978; BUTLER, 1993; URSIC, 2014). The Queer Theoretical movement has been central in destabilizing static notions about identity. The ongoing exclusion of some sexualities is both the responsibility of the dominant, hegemony *and also* lies at the feet of the queer theoretical movement and politics (LECKEY; BROOKS, 2011; DUGGAN, 2002); increasingly, Queer Theoretical work points to the privilege that exists within minority communities, challenging the creation of a new ‘normal’ sexual citizen (DUGGAN, 2002; COSSMAN, 2007). Although the preponderance of research in sexuality studies has come from ‘Western’ perspectives, it is a growing body of interest for many beyond those geographic boundaries.

Perceptions about religion: public, legal, media

Public attitudes² toward religion and religious identities have changed dramatically in the last several decades (LEFEBVRE; BEAMAN, 2014). In Canada, between 2009 and 2013, three national surveys were conducted measuring attitudes towards the following religions: Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Sikhism. The surveys showed that positive opinions towards all religions have declined during those four years, with Islam faring worst the of the list, followed by Sikhism (GOVERNMENT OF CANADA). The response to religion in public has been influenced by vocal religious actors, often involved as opponents to sexual orientation and marriage equality policies, actors who become generalized to represent ‘the religious’ voice (rather than representing their own group ideologies; see SHIPLEY, 2014a). The ‘professionalization’ of religion in public generates a skewed picture of what ‘being religious’ means in public discourse; as members of the clergy are asked to respond to policy changes, notions about religiosity are dictated by a select few representatives, trained in religious teaching (STRHAN, 2014). Research shows that notions about what it means to ‘be religious’ is often influenced by external norms (YIP; PAGE, 2013).

Additionally, legal frameworks, necessary for making a religious freedom claim, and the representation of religious identities in media create a picture of religious identity that is already skewed (BERGER, 2008; KNOTT; POOLE; TAIRA, 2013). Religious citizenship as defined through law, policy and subsequently public acceptance, permits specific ‘forms’ of religious practices and behaviours. Although the categories of religion have broadened

² A large portion of this article will consider public responses to sexuality and sexual diversity in subsequent sections.

in most nations (due to globalization, diaspora movements and increasingly vocal critiques about hegemonic practice), the standards for normative and non-normative have been redefined, but not removed (BEAMAN, 2008; SULLIVAN, 2005).

Discourse about religion is frequently also discourse about secularism. Current framings of secularism are embedded with notions about the ‘advantages’ of secularism, implicitly and explicitly equating secularism with notions about inclusion, acceptance and equality (and religion is then tied to exclusion, inequality and oppression). Often debates about religious freedom in liberal democracies are debates about the ‘limits’ these freedoms ought to have. However, as will be discussed here, this portrayal ignores the role religion continues to play in the advancement of sexual equality rights as it also ignores the reality of LGBTQI discrimination within secular spheres and secular institutions.

Policies of Non-Discrimination and Same-Sex Marriage

Although a number of differences exist between the countries and continents I am grouping together in this article, I organize them in these categories for reasons of demography and research similarities. However, it is easy to pull out several large and important differences between, for example, France’s policy regarding veiling in public and the way current controversies over religious freedom are responded to in the UK. That being said, for the purposes of this article I intend to provide a broad overview of some of the trends, challenges and approaches that are being undertaken in a North American, UK and European context and then challenges that are being undertaken in Central and South America, Africa and Asia.

North America/UK/Europe/Australia/New Zealand

Same-sex marriage was officially legalized at the federal level with the introduction of the *Civil Marriage Act* in Canada in 2005. This came on the heels of much public debate and tension (DICKY YOUNG, 2012) and shortly after a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada³ specifically dealing with questions about marriage, sexual identity and constitutional rights. Although provincial human rights codes prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation, prohibitions which are also read into the equality rights provision of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, the experience of discrimination based on sexual diversity in everyday life is far from resolved (TAYLOR, 2007; TAYLOR et al., 2011).

³ *Reference to Same-Sex Marriage*, [2004] 3 S.C.R. 698, 2004 SCC 79

In the U.S. a dramatic shift in the tides regarding same-sex marriage has been underway, notably increasing in rapidity since 2008 (which coincides with California's on-again, off-again, on-again response to same-sex marriage legislation). Policies have been changing so quickly that it is difficult to produce an accurate and current statement about how many states recognize or ban same-sex marriage, and which ones instead permit civil unions. In February 2014, the federal government expanded recognition of same-sex marriages in federal legal matters, extending benefits even in states where same-sex marriage is not legal (restricted to federal jurisdictions) (PEREZ, 2014).

In 2013 England and Wales passed same-sex marriage legislation, Scotland did likewise in 2014 while Northern Ireland treats same-sex marriages performed in other jurisdictions as civil partnerships. Ireland is set to hold a referendum on same-sex marriage in 2015. These changes, too, came amid public opposition that included religious opposition (HUNT, 2014; STRHAN, 2014). Public opinion polls in 2004 showed majority approval of marriages for same-sex couples, continually increasing, however the numbers have varied significantly in the last decade (GARDINER, 2012). Ireland's upcoming referendum is being actively supported by the government, with members of government stating that it is important for Ireland to be a 'beacon of light' in a world where many gay people live in darkness (IRISH EXAMINER, 2014).

As I write this, 11 European countries legally recognize same-sex marriages, while many others have a form of civil union or unregistered cohabitation, and many more recognize different types of same-sex unions. The Netherlands legalized same-sex marriage in 2000, the first country in the world to do so, three years ahead of the next country in which it became legal, Belgium. The European Parliament's Intergroup on LGBT Rights recently hosted a discussion on religion, sexual orientation and gender identity as intersectional categories, not mutually exclusive categories. However, twelve countries in the EU currently ban same-sex marriages, defining marriage as a union solely possible between a man and a woman. And, as is the case elsewhere across the globe, the recognitions for same-sex unions have occurred recently, the preponderance occurring within the last several years. Polls in some countries, such as Croatia and Poland from 2013, still show strong opposition to same-sex unions or marriage (TURCESCU; STAN, 2005). For some European countries, their policies regarding homosexuality were forced by their entry into the EU, not popular opinion or through democratic reform (TURCESCU; STAN, 2005). The diversity in public opinion across Europe, regardless of policy similarities, can be partly explained by forced policy acceptance on becoming a member state; many countries in

Europe are seen as socially conservative, an ideology frequently associated with opposition to sexual diversity.⁴

In Australia, often termed to be one of the most ‘gay friendly’ countries in the world, same-sex marriage (proposed numerous times) has been rejected by parliament every time. At this time, same-sex couples are recognized as *de facto* unions and many parts of Australia grant domestic partnership benefits and civil unions to same-sex couples. LGBTI individuals are also protected by anti-discrimination laws, while adoption laws for same-sex couples vary across states. As of the 1993 Human Rights Act, New Zealand established anti-discrimination measures based on sexuality and in 2013 New Zealand officially passed same-sex marriage legislation.

Central and South America/Africa/Asia

LGBT rights in Africa are limited; South Africa currently has the most liberal policies towards gays and lesbians, including the legalization of same-sex marriage and constitutional rights for gays and lesbians. Across most of the rest of the continent, same-sex sexual activity might be legal in some countries (for example Burkina Faso), but in other countries the legality is based on gender (in Ghana, male same-sex sexual activity is illegal while female same-sex sexual activity is legal). In 2005, the president of Uganda signed a constitutional amendment prohibiting same-sex marriage. Since then, Uganda’s policies regarding homosexuality have been under scrutiny, having passed a bill in December 2013 with a punishment of life in prison for ‘aggravated homosexuality’; however, recently this bill was overturned due to a technicality (VOX, 2014).⁵

In Asia, again we see a great divergence regarding equality rights, same-sex marriage and further rights concerning gender identity and expression. In the People’s Republic of China, same-sex sexual activity is legal and transsexuals are permitted to change legal gender, but same-sex marriage is not legal and currently there does not exist any anti-discrimination policy. Pakistan recognizes a third gender (as of 2010) but same-sex sexual activity is illegal (with a punishment varying between 2 years in prison to a life sentence). Thailand has allowed same-sex sexual activity since the 1950’s, although same-sex marriage is not legal. Both Indonesia and the Philippines permit same-sex sexual activity with exceptions; among Muslims within particular cities and provinces it is not considered legal; the rest of the policies in those

⁴ I will expand on this assumption and argue that ‘secularism’ is not inherently more inclusive than religion in subsequent sections of this article.

⁵ Ugandan activists reported difficult, or impossible, experiences attempting to get visas to come to Canada for World Pride in 2014 (KEUNG, 2014).

countries are subsequently separated into general policy and specific to those Muslims in those regions.

Across South America, again, there is a diversity of policies regarding same-sex sexual activity, marriage, adoption and discrimination measures. Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay are among the minority recognizing same-sex marriages and with bans against anti-gay discrimination, while countries such as Ecuador, Paraguay and Venezuela currently hold constitutional bans against same-sex marriage and still others, such as Bolivia and Peru are currently considering recognition of same-sex relationships (though not necessarily same-sex marriage). In April 2014, a petition signed by 10,000 people in Peru was submitted to Carlos Bruce, a legislator who has sponsored the bill in support of allowing civil unions for same-sex couples (VICKERS, 2014).

Although same-sex sexual activity is legal in Guatemala, and has been for over a century, negative attitudes towards homosexuals are widespread. A 2010 poll by Cid-Gallup showed that 85% of those polled opposed same-sex marriage (12% were in support and 3% were unsure) (SAAD, 2010). Reports of ‘social cleansing’ from the United Nations in the 1990s showed that LGBT people were systematically targeted by state and non-state actors, including targeted shootings against activists (*International Gay & Lesbian Human Rights Commission* [IGLHRC]). In 2012, a joint report by numerous NGOs, activist organizations and the UN Human Rights Committee stated that discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and/or gender identity was perpetrated by both State and non-State actors in Guatemala (IGLHRC). Among the numerous findings of discrimination, it was reported that LGBT people were often denied the right to a fair trial, with judges refusing to hear controversial cases for fear of public reprisal (IGLHRC).

This capture shows how varied policies are, even in ‘similar’ nations, and also demonstrates the divergence between policy and public opinion. What also needs to be noted here is that the data is continually changing; policies are not static or unchangeable. And it is important to reflect on the gap between public perceptions in a country and the experience for members of the LGBT community which I will turn to shortly. These varied policy perspectives, and correspondingly public opinions, demonstrate just how difficult it is to make a definitive statement about sexuality around the globe, or even within a nation. This offers a ‘capture’ of some of the current legal and policy standings regarding sexual diversity across the globe. There is clearly much more that could be said on any one country. What this picture shows is the widely varying current status for LGBTQI individuals across the globe *and* the variance in process and response, even within ‘similar’ demographic nations. Grouping together ‘liberal’ western nations shows that

although the perception is often that these nations possess more inclusive attitudes regarding sexual diversity, the reality is that public opinions do not necessarily reflect public policy. I will turn to these gaps later on in this article to reflect on the multifaceted considerations required regarding religion and sexuality in global perspective.

The role of religion: two sides to every story?

The role of religion in public debates and public policies about sexuality has most often been represented from the side of the opposition to equality rights extensions. However, that continued framing offers a limited portrayal of the ways religion is involved in debates about sexuality equality and sexual diversity. While there is clearly strong (and vocal) religious opposition to sexual orientation equality rights, same-sex marriage and sexual diversity, religion is represented on both sides of these debates (though not always equally, accurately or vocally). Further, research regarding LGBTQI discrimination shows that discriminatory attitudes regarding sexual diversity are not relegated to religious individuals or religious spaces. Discrimination is both a religious and a secular problem that needs to be recognized in order to be addressed. What is frequently overlooked when religion and sexuality are brought together in legal or public discourse is the ways religious groups and individuals have been involved in advancing rights for the LGBTQI communities.

In Canada, the strongest voices in opposition to sexual diversity and same-sex marriage have been represented by groups such as the Canada Christian College, Interfaith Coalition on Marriage and Family, and the Institute of Canadian Values (among others). These organizations have been involved as interveners in court cases and are frequently represented in media coverage when religion and sexual diversity 'meet' in public debate or in legal controversies (SHIPLEY, 2014a).

The complexity of religiosity within a tradition, or organization, is often lost in these representations. Demonstrated by debate within the United Church of Canada prior to the Civil Marriage Act, not all members of the church supported same-sex marriage and many felt that their voices were being lost in the shuffle (NEDELSKY; HUTCHINSON, 2008). The Anglican Church has shown the most publicly divided response to issues such as the ordination of gay clergy, with a clear schism in the church itself. Marriage equality litigation in Canada was originally spearheaded by the Metropolitan Community Church of Toronto (MCCI) who had begun performing same-sex marriages in their church through a publication of banns system in the 1970's.

In the U.S. responses to sexual diversity are seen as being represented both by politics and religion, with Republicans placed within the anti-gay

movement. However, organizations such as Log Cabin Republicans remind us that identity is not so neatly divided, neither on religious or political lines. Campaigns by Anita Bryant (Save our Children) have attempted to mark clear lines in the sand regarding morality and sexual diversity. Considering only the vocal religious opponents to sexual diversity as representative of ‘the’ religious view regarding religion and sexuality means ignoring the multiple organizations and individuals who have spoken out in support of LGBTQI rights, some for decades offering support and care (WILCOX, 2010; JAKO-BSEN; PELLEGRINI, 2003).

Numerous LGBT-affirming congregations are also evidenced across North America, the UK and Europe, with religion firmly represented on both sides of the debate about sexual orientation equality and same-sex marriage. While many official organizations might oppose LGBTI relationships (in doctrine), the diverse reality of practice among congregants demonstrates that individuals do not necessarily heed every doctrinal teaching of their faith tradition. In a 2013 study conducted by Jones, Cox and Navarro-Rivera (funded by the Public Religion Research Institute) they found that attitudes among the religiously affiliated in Massachusetts had dramatically shifted over the decade since same-sex marriage was first legalized there.⁶ In Australia, the Uniting Church and Progressive Jewish community have both strongly supported same-sex marriage, as have numerous individual religious ministers and leaders. There has been strong same-sex marriage lobbying from religious groups in Australia, although often the spotlight is given to the opposition and not the supporters.

In many countries, including the Philippines and Indonesia (where laws regarding sexuality vary based on religious identity), the role of religion has been an important factor in determining access to rights for the lesbian and gay communities. Additionally, theocracies, such as Iran, Afghanistan and Nigeria, continue to restrict same-sex sexual activity and marriages, though some recognize third genders.

Religious opposition to rights based on sexual orientation and marriage equality has included some very vocal participants, such as Martin Ssempe in Uganda, who has made YouTube videos ‘about’ homosexuality, and is frequently interviewed regarding his thoughts on homosexuality (his inflammatory statements are often cited to argue against sexual orientation equality). According to Ssempe, and others, homosexuality is a ‘western’ problem, not an ‘African’ one and is the result of colonial missions to Africa (CHINWUBA,

⁶ Interesting to note is that while the poll indicated a majority of Americans support same-sex marriage, most Americans actually wrongly assume the opposite to be true (JONES; COX; NAVARRO-RIVERA, 2013, p. 2).

2014). This attitude permeates the Uganda diaspora. Voices such as Ssempea's are not only influential within Uganda, they influence the beliefs and attitudes for Ugandan's elsewhere in the world (CHINWUBA, 2014).⁷

Catholic bishops in Nigeria congratulated the president for passing legislation which will impose a 14 year jail terms on same-sex couples who marry, and further punishes gatherings of LGBT people and places a 10 year jail term on anyone running an LGBT organization (ADVOCATE, 2014). The president of Nigeria and his spokesman have said that the law reflects the cultural and religious attitudes of the citizens of the country (RELIGION DISPATCHES, 2014). However, the harsh penalties that are imposed on homosexuals in countries like Uganda and Nigeria have caused an unusual split among Catholic Bishops in their stance regarding sexual diversity (RELIGION NEWS SERVICE, 2014).

Chinese, Christian actress and celebrity Lü Liping has received broad support for her denigration of homosexuals, encouraging others to spread the message (CHAN; HUANG, 2014). These sentiments, while critiqued by many after Lü posted them on Weibo, have served to isolate lesbian and gay communities out of fear of openly expressing their sexual identities in the face of government and popular opinion (CHAN; HUANG, 2014). The role of religion in China is complex, where the spread of liberal Protestant attitudes through globalization has meant an increase in support for the sexually diverse (CHAN; HUANG, 2014, p. 172).

Brazil offers an interesting case study, with protections for LGBT individuals extended and the legalization of same-sex marriage in 2013. However, an increasingly popular Charismatic Protestant movement has seen Brazil become one of the "centres of Pentecostalism worldwide, with the second largest population of 'practising Protestants'" (ROSAS; DE CASTRO, 2014, p. 218, citing FRESTON). And although education is seen to be secular in the public school system, discriminatory attitudes towards sexual transgressors (the sexually 'different') are very much in force (LIMA; SIQUEIRA; DE SÁ, 2014), requiring the sexually diverse to find their own space within the 'secular' school system. And recently, Latin American Catholics were surveyed about their opinions on Catholic doctrine; while many supported Pope Francis, high percentages of those surveyed stated they did not support particular Catholic doctrines, such as prohibitions on birth control or attitudes toward same-sex marriage (UNIVISION, 2014). However, there are still high levels of discrimi-

⁷ See "Sexuality, Politics and Religion in Africa," a research centre at the University of Edinburgh. Available at http://www.cas.ed.ac.uk/research/grants_and_projects/current/sexuality_politics_and_religion_in_africa.

nation against members of the LGBTQI communities and very few countries in Latin America have put forth policies or protections for the sexually diverse.

According to the Pew Global Attitudes survey on the subject of gay marriage and homosexuality, the predominant attitude around the globe is that homosexuality is morally unacceptable. Some countries, such as Japan, have seen a nearly even division between individuals who see it as morally acceptable (38%) and those who see it as morally unacceptable (31%), with the remaining respondents indicating they do not see it as a moral issue. However, these attitudes do not necessarily reflect state or national policy. Respondents in South Africa (where same-sex marriage is legal and constitutional rights for the lesbian and gay community are extended) predominantly felt gay marriage and homosexuality were morally unacceptable (62%), with 18% saying it was morally acceptable and 12% indicating it was not a moral issue.

Religion plays a role on both sides of the debates and controversies regarding rights extensions for the LGBTQI communities and marriage equality. And yet 'religion' is most commonly represented as an opponent to rights and equality. This representation continues to place religion and sexual diversity in static and combative roles, but more problematically assumes that the 'harm' to LGBTQI communities is inherently religious. As will be discussed in the next section, discriminatory attitudes toward sexual diversity are widespread in non-religious settings; focusing on religion as 'the problem' ignores the multiple spaces where anti-LGBTQI attitudes exist.

Researching the gaps: policy and everyday experiences

North America/UK/Europe

Even in similarly situated nation states, one can see how diverse the study of religion and sexuality is, how varied policy changes and challenges are and subsequently the broad spectrum that constitutes the relationship of religion and sexuality in its myriad forms. Even where subjects, such as marriage equality for the lesbian and gay community, are seen to be 'done' the debate and controversy surrounding the relationship of religion to sexual diversity and the picture that emerges in media and public discourse is far from settled or necessarily accurate.

Discrimination toward the LGBTQI community transcends the religious/secular divide, although the public representation of religion places it as the source of discriminatory attitudes and the space in which LGBTQI identities are most under threat.⁸ What has been demonstrated in recent

⁸ Correspondingly, the discourse posits that religious freedom is largely under threat by LGBTQI rights and 'judicial activism' (BENSON, 2004).

research regarding LGBTQI experiences of discrimination is that in high schools in Canada, homophobic, biphobic and transphobic language is heard on a regular basis (in public schools as well as in the Catholic school system); in some instances, students report it on a daily basis, by both teachers and students (TAYLOR; PETER, 2011; DELLENTY, 2013). Research on anti-gay sentiment in Western Democracies shows that levels of hostility toward LGBTQI individuals are higher among men than women; among individuals who also display tendencies of prejudice on a number of other characteristics; and among individuals belonging to fundamental religious groups (HOOGHE et al., 2010). Openly gay athletes have recently made their way into the public imagination, although the subject of homophobia in sport is underdeveloped (ANDERSON, 2011). Initiatives, such as the “You Can Play” NHL promotion, involving a number of hockey players in a campaign aimed at inclusiveness in hockey, have only recently been instituted. The experience of discrimination, at the professional level but also in schools and at the amateur level, has only begun to be of interest in the public domain.

Some professional sporting associations have created policies of non-discrimination or inclusion, notably the Australian Sports Commission has recently produced a policy of non-discrimination in sport; other sporting agencies also have formal policies though the incidence of homophobia in sports is high, but the experience among the sports teams continues to be one of discomfort or open hostility towards homosexual individuals. Discrimination against LGBTI individuals in Australia is recorded most recently in a 2010 study, which found that 61% of respondents suffered verbal abuse because of their sexuality; 18% had been physically assaulted and 69% suffered other forms of homophobia (*Better Health*). Although seen as very ‘gay-friendly’, the experience of harassment based on sexuality and sexual diversity is an ongoing struggle, with experiences recorded across health care, in the workplace and general harassment.

At this time, New Zealand does not gather census data specific to the GLBTI population. Without comprehensive data the daily realities for the sexually diverse are not well known. New Zealand’s National Equal Opportunities Network (NEON) tracks numerous media stories regarding discrimination based on sexuality and sexual orientation, documenting known issues experienced by the GLBTI population in the country. A Gay Taskforce has recently been set up to assess and respond to experiences of discrimination and bullying, noting that a core concern in New Zealand is the experience of bullying in high schools (which mirrors research in other countries). As one member of the Gay Taskforce put it:

High schools are horrible places for gay and lesbian [youth]; intersex and transgender particularly. The agents of most of the moral conservatism are the high school students, but they reflect something of the wider society. It's not just that they're young. (NEON, 2011).

Although it is difficult to represent the entirety of Europe and the experiences of the LGBTQI community across countries, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights conducted two related surveys between 2010-2012, one specifically asking about discrimination and victimization of LGBT people across the EU and Croatia and another gathering information on services provided and public bodies' practices and policies to assess whether they contribute towards (or hinder) equality for LGBT persons. With over 93,000 responses on the first survey, the project has generated a tremendous amount of data regarding the experiences of discrimination in the EU and Croatia for LGBT persons. Overwhelmingly, the respondents stated they regularly suffered from discrimination and bullying; many hide their identity, feeling they cannot be themselves at school, at work or in public (EUROPEAN UNION, 2013, p. 1). In addition to experiences of violence, or the threat of violence, based on their sexuality, four-fifths of respondents "said that casual jokes about LGBT persons in everyday life were widespread" (EUROPEAN UNION, 2013, p. 2).

Although some religious organizations have designated themselves affirming congregations, there is a paucity of research data available in regions such as Central and South America, Africa and Asia to determine to what extent religious groups and individuals are supportive of LGBT rights and same-sex marriage; this does not mean they are not out there, but the details are not easily accessible. Some religious organizations in Brazil and Colombia have designated themselves affirming (via the Affirming Pentecostal Church International predominantly). It is reported that 44% of the violence against LGBT communities in the world occurs in Brazil, but many countries are without an official reporting mechanism for crimes against the sexually 'other.'

Brazil and Argentina are seen to be the leaders in South America for LGBTQI rights yet clearly anti-gay violence is still very high. As demonstrated above, being a 'secular' country does not necessarily mean being an accepting country. In Brazil, the emergence of gay communities has been informed by socio-economic, geopolitical, culture and historical factors, connecting the development of a Brazilian gay identity with middle and upper class society in Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo (PARKER, 1999). The increasingly vocal LGBT movement in Brazil has laid bare the crises in the way branches of

government relate to one another, as it has also challenged the “very democratic and secular nature of the Brazilian state” (CARRARA, 2012, p. 188).

The Organization of American States passed a resolution on human rights in 2013 which for the first time included the LGBT community. In the wake of this momentous resolution, however, it is clear that there is much work to be done in many of the member states regarding policies that are in place discriminating against the LGBT communities. And further, although a resolution has passed, the institutionalization of discrimination still exists in many member countries and without repercussion for LGBTQI discrimination, the passing of the resolution is not likely to change anything on the ground for LGBTQI individuals (COHA, 2013).

An Anti-Discrimination bill was introduced to Congress in the Philippines over a decade ago and yet still the Philippines do not have any anti-discrimination legislation. State-sanctioned violence against the LGBT community continues to be reported, including police raids, illegal detainment, and verbal abuse (IGLHRC). During the National AIDS Council plenary meeting in January 2012, Philippine Secretary of Health Enrique Ona stated that rapid rise in HIV in the country could be addressed if parents of homosexual children ‘reined them in’ and got them tested (IGLHRC). Although LGBT individuals are entitled to full rights under the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) the actuality of these rights are not yet realized in the Philippines (and elsewhere).

In China, although homosexuality was decriminalized in 1997 and removed from the official list of mental disorders in 2001, the legal status of LGBT persons is unclear and official treatment varies widely. The idiom most often used by the government to LGBT persons is “not encouraging, not discouraging and not promoting” (GLASSER, 2014). No survey data exists to quantify the total population of LGBT people, though the conservative estimate is 3-4% or roughly 41-69 million Chinese people are LGBT (PINK SPACE). A survey conducted in 2012 about homophobic and transphobic bullying in schools showed that 77% of respondents ($n=421$) encountered some form of homophobic or transphobic bullying in school.

While Japan’s Constitution officially prohibits discrimination based on “race, creed, sex, social status, or family origin” (Article 14), there has been little support for the inclusion of sexual orientation as a protected category and further, there is no law allowing individuals or groups legal redress for discrimination. Although Japan does not criminalize same-sex sexual acts, there is no equality guarantee for LGBT individuals and many protective policies apply only to opposite-sex couples (married or unmarried). They do not extend to same-sex couples (such as laws regarding spousal violence and

public housing). Numerous examples of what would be termed hate crimes based on sexual orientation elsewhere can be referenced, but there is no special protection from these sorts of crimes for the LGBT community (IGLHRC).

The treatment of the LGBTQI communities across Africa has recently been well documented as Uganda and Nigeria, in particular, have drawn global attention for the sanctioned violence perpetrated against the LGBTQI communities. However, research conducted by Human Rights Watch demonstrated that although a country profess protections and acceptance, there is a diversity of experiences among members of the LGBTQI communities, diversities that include race, class and ‘type’ of sexual diversity (LONG; BROWN; COOPER, 2003).

These spaces and experiences of discrimination are not relegated to ‘the religious’; the experience of discrimination toward the LGBTQI communities exists across religious/secular differences and are still regularly occurring problems. Spaces of inclusion and protected spaces for the LGBTQI communities have increased in the last few decades, mostly in ‘Western’ nations. However, across countries and continents it is clear that discrimination toward LGBTQI communities is a prevalent problem that requires action. While religious opponents to sexual diversity are clearly very vocal in their expressions of intolerance, considering those opinions as the only religious ones (thus ignoring the role religion has played on both sides of the debate), it problematically assumes that we ‘know’ the location of harm toward LGBTQI communities – and that it is religious. This assumption ignores the multiple sites of discrimination that exist for LGBTQI communities that are not religious motivated or religiously ‘located’ and does not actively address the prevalence of discrimination based on sexual diversity and sexual orientation.

Concluding thoughts. Religion and sexuality: Is there a global pattern?

I began this article knowing already that there would not be ‘a’ pattern to the ways that religion and sexuality interact, exchange or respond to one another across the globe. Rather I began this article wanting to consider the relationship of religion and sexuality (positive and negative interactions) and to argue that while positive changes regarding sexuality can be seen in many countries, negative changes are still regularly occurring across the globe and it is important not to lose sight of the ongoing discrimination that exists in 2014. While my goal has been to challenge the commonly held assumption that religion and sexuality only exist in opposition to one another, it is evident that religion has supported equality rights for the LGBTQI communities over the years (in many cases before civil or legal recognition was available)

and that secularism can be shown to be a space of discrimination and even violence towards the LGBTQI communities. Assessing gaps between inclusive policy, public opinion and daily experiences shows us that within 'liberal' nations, the challenges for LGBTQI individuals are far from resolved.

The PEW Global Attitudes Project provides an international picture of the high levels of discriminatory attitudes regarding homosexuality; it further shows the links that are made regarding morality and homosexuality (whether there should be legal recognition is one issue, but for many whether homosexuality is a moral issue is entirely another). These attitudes are found in 'liberal' countries as they are also found in 'conservative' countries. In 'secular' countries and countries with protections and rights for the LGBTQI communities the concern about morality is still an ongoing issue for many individuals; this link between morality and immorality shows itself in the anti-gay attitudes that are expressed in the daily lives of the LGBTQI communities.

Some of the policy changes have come on the heels of international pressure to conform to policies elsewhere. For example, Argentina is seen as a gay rights trailblazer although its history is one of repression of homosexuality. The pressure to conform to international standards has been seen as the reason that some countries create inclusive policies as it is also seen as the reason countries with inclusive policies continue to have such high levels of discrimination and violence toward LGBTQI communities. "Global queering" is the idea that globalization has exported practices and attitudes regarding homosexuality from more liberal countries to more conservative countries (ENCARNACIÓN, 2013, p. 688-689). What this theory cannot tell us is why this trend has not overtaken all countries exposed to it; in fact, very few South American countries have legalized same-sex marriage or extended rights to the LGBTQI community. Further, as demonstrated in the European Union, policy pressure was not the result of a desire to be recognized as inclusive, but a requirement for joining the EU, further enhancing the divide between public opinion and policy revision.

As has also been demonstrated, the form that research regarding religion and sexuality takes varies widely; in some instances, this means a paucity of any kind of statistical data regarding the LGBTQI communities in a given country and further a lack of research on the relationship between religion and sexuality from an empirical perspective. Frequently the kinds of studies that have been undertaken regarding religion and sexuality have been studies that examine ways religion controls sexuality; religious influence in educational spheres (such as sex education or religious instruction; see ALLEN; BROOKS, 2012) and on policies regarding sexual orientation and their op-

ponents; and finally, psychological studies regarding the influence of religion on sexual practices and behaviour (HELM et al., 2009).

In policies, religion is often represented only in opposition to sexual diversity – so that the public picture of religion when it comes to sexuality is always already negative. It does not help matters that some dominant conservative religious voices seek out media and public spaces to express their opinion on sexual diversity, or that in some countries those voices still maintain a stronghold in politics (Martin Ssempe in Uganda). If Russia teaches us something about LGBTQI discrimination, it is that discrimination stems from all manner of ideological contexts, it is not relegated to the religious sphere nor is it solely a ‘religious’ problem.

Religious education, instruction about religion and the role of religion in education across these contexts offers compelling reflections for the similarities and differences in attitudes about religion in countries that have similar democratic and governance structures. The variety of ways religion is integrated or rejected within education spheres is perhaps one way to measure popular notions about religion and religiosity; religious education in the UK and Ireland (while hotly debated) is currently a mandatory part of the education curricula, with variations in requirements at different levels. France has replaced religious education by non-religious moral teaching (*éducation civique, juridique et sociale*, ECJS), and although Germany has a system to oversee training of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish religious education teachers by religious bodies, recently the introduction of Islamic religious education has been a challenge (reportedly because of a lack of affiliation of Muslim individuals with a large religious body).

The role of religion and the public expectation to religious instruction (their support or their critique) offers perhaps a frame for examining the ways the public views religion and religiosity. Debates about religious education, or education about religion, often reflect larger national debates about religion in public and national values (BEAMAN; VAN ARRAGON, 2015; ALLEN; BROOKS, 2012; BERGER, DAVIE; FOKAS, 2008). Religion’s role in the public sphere, and the consternation that public religiosity elicits, is a current hot topic across the globe; religious identity in public (and the ‘performance’ of religiosity in public) displays anxieties about ‘otherness’ and difference often framed under the umbrella of security concerns and cultural values (MACDOUGALL; SHORT, 2010; RAYSIDE; WILCOX, 2011; MOON, 2008; ARWECK; JACKSON, 2013). Additionally, increasing scholarship (and public debate) considers attitudes and practices of religious individuals in the public sphere (LEFEBVRE; BEAMAN, 2014; YIP; PAGE, 2013; VAN DIE, 2001; SCHIPPERT, 2005; BEYER 2008); religious diversity (BRAMADAT;

SELJAK, 2008; BEYER; RAMJI, 2013; ARWECK; JACKSON, 2013) and identity intersections, here referring to religion and sexuality (TAYLOR; SNOWDON, 2014; SHIPLEY; YOUNG, 2014; WILCOX, 2010; HUNT; YIP, 2012; YIP; PAGE, 2013).

And although ‘Western’ research is seen as dominating the landscape, when it comes to notions about religion and sexuality this is where the majority of studies are being conducted regarding disconnects and intersections of religion and sexuality. Responding to the need for more nuanced conversations, international research collections regarding religion and sexuality have brought together diverse voices and contexts, both historical and in contemporary settings, to consider identity assumptions, religious representation and the complex relationship of identity categories (HUNT; YIP, 2012; SHIPLEY, 2014b). What both of these collections show us is that there are many conversations still to be had about religiosity, religious identities, and sexual diversity and the ways these categories conflict, instruct and support each other in multiple national and international contexts. Increasingly scholarship in this area brings voices together which are most often separated. In these cases the scholarship seeks to disrupt static notions about identity conflict regarding religion and sexuality.

Studies among youth have increasingly been of interest in considering attitudes and values among young people regarding religion (REGNERUS, 2007; *National Youth Survey*), experiences of discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity (TAYLOR et al., 2011), sexual health attitudes and behaviours and the influence of religion on these attitudes (BURDETTE; HILL, 2009; COLEMAN; TESTA, 2008; GRAVEL et al., 2011; HELM et al., 2009; MCMILLEN et al., 2011) as well as recent studies examining religion, gender and sexuality at the intersections in youthful lives (YIP et al, 2011; TAYLOR; SNOWDON, 2014; SHIPLEY; YOUNG, 2014; PEDERSEN, 2014). These youth studies have begun to create a new portrait of the relationship between religion and sexuality, as integrated aspects of identity for today’s youth and as experienced within the new religious and sexual social contexts.⁹

As sexual identity becomes more prominent within political and social debate, the role and footing of religion is increasingly debated. What role, if any, should religion play in determining policy and social norms? Changing statistics regarding religious affiliation (with decreasing numbers in the

⁹ There are a number of initiatives considering ‘older’ LGBT individuals and aging among the LGBT population; there are different challenges to consider, depending on age demographic. I am not ignoring the ‘older’ LGBT research, but highlight here research among youth, which is often seen as a vulnerable age group.

traditional religious categories and more recently subsequent increases in the non-religious or spiritual-but-not-religious categories) has been seen as harkening the ‘end’ of the religious era. To say that religion has ‘disappeared,’ however, is similar to saying that sexual diversity did not ‘exist’ prior to vocal expression; they both continue to exist in shifting ways under new linguistic and cultural regimes. The role of religion and secularism need to be critically examined, as both exclusive and inclusive ideological spaces and normative frameworks, in order to continue to better understand and consider the ways religion and sexuality challenge, constrain and support one another in global context. At this time, this brief survey shows that although dramatic changes have occurred in public policy revisions and public response to religion and sexuality, discriminatory attitudes and misunderstanding about these two identity categories are widespread, with harmful results to both in many instances. Plus ça change?

References

- ADAM, B.; MATICKA-TYNDALE, E. (Eds.) Emerging directions in sociological research on sexuality. **Canadian Review of Sociology**, v. 48, n. 3, p. 217-220, 2011.
- ADVOCATE. **Catholic bishops in Nigeria ‘Thank God’ for anti-LGBT laws**. February 5, 2014. Available at: <http://www.advocate.com/politics/religion/2014/02/05/catholic-bishops-nigeria-thank-god-anti-lgbt-laws>. Accessed on: Sept. 10, 2014.
- ALLEN, K. R.; BROOKS, J. E. At the intersection of sexuality, spirituality, and gender: young adults’ perceptions of religious beliefs in the context of sexuality education. **American Journal of Sexuality Education**, v. 7, n. 4, p. 285-308, 2012.
- ANDERSON, E. Updating the outcome: Gay athletes, straight teams, and coming out in educationally based sport teams. **Gender & Society**, v. 25, n. 2, p. 250-268, 2011.
- ARWECK, E.; JACKSON, R. **Religion, education and society: young people, religious identity, socialisation and diversity**. London: Routledge, 2013.
- AUSTRALIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION. 2007. **Stories of discrimination experienced by the gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and intersex community**. October, 2014. Available at: <https://www.humanrights.gov.au/publications/stories-discrimination>. Accessed on: July 10, 2014.
- BEAMAN, L. G. **Defining harm: religious freedom and the limits of the law**. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008.
- BEAMAN, L. G. The will to religion: obligatory religious citizenship. **Critical Research on Religion**, v. 1, n. 2, p. 141 -157, 2013.
- BEAMAN, L. G.; VAN ARRAGON, L. (Eds.). **Whose Religion? Education about religion in public schools**. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- BENSON, I. Buttiglione affair: ‘homophobia,’ ‘heterosexism,’ deep intolerance and threats to religions. **Cardus**, October 22, 2004. Available at: <http://www.cardus.ca/columns/2536/>. Accessed on: Apr. 5, 2013.

- BERGER, B. Inducing fundamentalisms: law as a cultural force in the domain of religion. **Canadian Diversity**, v. 9, n. 3, p. 25-28, 2012.
- BERGER, B. The cultural limits of legal tolerance. **Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence**, v. 21, n. 2, p. 245-277, 2008.
- BERGER, P.; DAVIE, G.; FOKAS, E. **Religious America, secular Europe?** London: Ashgate, 2008.
- BETTER HEALTH. Gay and lesbian issues – discrimination. Available at: http://www.betterhealth.vic.gov.au/bhcv2/bhcarticles.nsf/pages/Gay_and_lesbian_issues_discrimination. Accessed on: September 5, 2014.
- BEYER, P. 'From far and wide' Canadian religious and cultural diversity in global/local context. In: BEAMAN, L. G.; BEYER, P. (Eds.). **Religion and diversity in Canada**. Leiden: Brill Academic Press, 2008.
- BEYER, P.; RAMJI, R. (Eds.). **Growing up Canadian: Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists**. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013.
- BRAMADAT, P.; SELJAK, D. **Christianity and ethnicity in Canada**. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- BURDETTE, A. M.; HILL, T. D. Religious involvement and transitions into adolescent sexual activities. **Sociology of Religion**, v. 70, n. 1, p. 28-48, 2009.
- BUTLER, J. **Bodies that matter: on the discursive limits of 'sex.'** New York: Routledge, 1993.
- CARRARA, S. Discrimination, policies, and sexual rights in Brazil. *Forum*, v. 28, n. 1, p. 184-189, 2012.
- CHAN, S.; HUANG, P. Religion and homosexuality in contemporary China: debates, identity, and voices. In: SHIPLEY, H. (Ed.). *Globalized religion and sexual identity: contexts, contestations, voices*. Leiden: Brill, 2014. p. 170-192.
- CHINWUBA, N. 'They Go Burn in Hell!': Exploring How African MSM Negotiate Religion and Sexuality in Canada. In: SHIPLEY, H. (Ed.). *Globalized religion and sexual identity: contexts, contestations, voices*. Leiden: Brill, 2014. p. 256-275.
- COLEMAN, L. M.; TESTA, A. Sexual health knowledge, attitudes and behaviours: variations among a religiously diverse sample of young people in London, UK. *Ethnicity & Health*, v. 13, n. 2, p. 55-72, 2008.
- COSSMAN, B. Lesbians, gay men, and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, v. 40, n. 3/4, p. 223-249, 2002.
- COSSMAN, B. *Sexual citizens: the legal and cultural regulation of sex and belonging*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- COUNCIL ON HEMISPHERIC AFFAIRS [COHA]. Progress and challenges to LGBT rights in Latin America in light of the recent 'Sixth Resolution on Human Rights, Sexual Orientation, and Gender Identity'. July 3, 2013. Available at: <http://www.coha.org/progress-and-challenges-to-lgbt-rights-in-latin-america-in-light-of-the-recent-sixth-resolution-on-human-rights-sexual-orientation-and-gender-identity/>. Accessed on: August 1, 2014.
- DAVIE, G. **Religion in Britain since 1945: believing without belonging** (making contemporary Britain). London: Wiley Blackwell, 1994.

DAY, A., VINCETT, G.; COTTER, C. (Eds.). **Social identities between the sacred and the secular**. London: Ashgate, 2013.

DELLENTY, S. Being out and proud is easier said than done (coming out as gay teachers). Nov. 8, 2013. Tesconnect. Available at: <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6373329>, 2013. Accessed on: April 10, 2014.

DICKEY YOUNG, P. **Religion, sex and politics**: Christian churches and same-sex marriage in Canada. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2012.

DUGGAN, L. The new homonormativity: the sexual politics of neoliberalism. In: CASTRONOVO, R.; NELSON, D. D. (Eds.). **Materializing democracy**: Toward a revitalized cultural politics. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

ENCARNACIÓN, O. G. International influence, domestic activism, and gay rights in Argentina. **Political Science Quarterly**, v. 128, n. 4, p. 687-716, 2013.

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT'S intergroup on LGBT rights. **Homepage**. Available at: <http://www.lgbt-ep.eu/>. Accessed on: August 10, 2014.

EUROPEAN UNION agency for fundamental rights. **EU LGBT survey – results at a glance**. May 22, 2013. Available at: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/eu-lgbt-survey-european-union-lesbian-gay-bisexual-and-transgender-survey-results>. Accessed on: September 10, 2014.

FOUCAULT, M. **The history of sexuality: an introduction**. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Random House, 1978. v. 1.

GARDINER, B. Same-sex marriage in Britain. **YouGov**, 2012. Available at: <http://yougov.co.uk/news/2012/03/19/same-sex-marriage-britain/>. Accessed on: August 21, 2014.

GLASSER, H. **China isn't Christian – So why are its gays undergoing electroshock conversion therapy?** July 13, 2014. Available at: http://www.slate.com/blogs/outward/2014/07/31/gay_electroshock_conversion_in_china_a_lawsuit_challenges_the_practice.html. Accessed on: September 10, 2014.

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA. **A literature review of public opinion research on Canadian attitudes towards multiculturalism and immigration, 2006-2009**. Available at: <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/research/por-multi-imm/sec02-1.asp>. Accessed on: July 8, 2014.

GRAVEL, E. et al. Ethnic differences in sexual guilty between Anglo-Canadians and Franco Québécois emerging adults: The meditating roles of family and religion. **The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality**, v. 20, n. 4, p. 129-142, 2011.

HELM, H. W. Jr. et al. The influence of a conservative religion in premarital sexual behavior of university students. **North American Journal of Psychology**, v. 11, n. 2, p. 231-245, 2009.

HOOGHE, M., et al. Anti-gay sentiment among adolescents in Belgium and Canada: A comparative investigation into the role of gender and religion. **Journal of Homosexuality**, v. 57, p. 384-400, 2010.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION (New Zealand). **Marriage equality and the right to form a family**. 2012. Available at: <http://www.hrc.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Marriage-equality.pdf>. Accessed on: August 10, 2014.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION (New Zealand). Sexual orientation and gender identity. 2014. Available at: <http://www.hrc.co.nz/human-rights-environment/sexual-orientation-and-gender-identity/>. Accessed on: August 10, 2014.

HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH. South Africa: LGBT rights in name only? December 5, 2011. Available at: <http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/12/05/south-africa-lgbt-rights-name-only>. Accessed on: August 10, 2014.

HUNT, S. Negotiating sexual rights in the UK: Christian constituencies and contested moralities. In: SHIPLEY, H. (Ed.). *Globalized religion and sexual identity: contexts, contestations, voices*. Leiden: Brill Academic Press, 2014. p. 193-215.

HUNT, S.; YIP, A. K.T. (Eds.). *The Ashgate Research companion to contemporary religion and sexuality*. London: Ashgate, 2012.

IGLHRC - International Gay & Lesbian Human Rights Commission. Human rights for everyone. Everywhere. Available at: <http://iglhrc.org/>. Accessed on: July 10, 2014.

IRISH EXAMINER. Same sex marriage referendum will make Ireland 'a beacon of light.' March 3, 2014. Available at: <http://www.irishexaminer.com/ireland/same-sex-marriage-referendum-will-make-ireland-a-beacon-of-light-260607.html>. Accessed on: September 1, 2014.

JAKOBSEN, J. R.; PELLEGRINI, A. *Love the sin: sexual regulation and the limits of religious tolerance*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2003.

JONES, R. P.; COS, D.; NAVARRO-RIVERA, J. *A Shifting landscape: a decade of change in American attitudes about same-sex marriage and LGBT issues*. Washington: Public Religion Research Institute, 2014.

JORDAN, M. D. The return of religion during the reign of sexuality. In: ALCOFF, L.; CA-PUTO, J. D. (Eds.). *Feminism, sexuality, and the return of religion*. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2011. p. 39-54,

KEUNG, Uganda gay activists denied visas to World Pride Conference. **The Star**, May 22, 2014, Available at: http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2014/05/22/ugandan_gay_activists_denied_visas_to_world_pride_conference.html. Accessed on: July 5, 2014.

KINSMAN, G. W. **The regulation of desire: homo and hetero sexualities**. Montréal: Black Rose Books, 1996.

KNOTT, K., POOLE, E; TAIRA, T., **Media portrayals of religion and the secular sacred: representation and change**. London: Ashgate, 2013.

LECKEY, R.; BROOKS, K. (Eds.). **Queer theory: law, culture, empire**. London: Routledge, 2011.

LEFEBVRE, S.; BEAMAN, L. (Eds.). **Religion in the public sphere: Canadian case studies**. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

LIMA, A., SIQUEIRA, V. de; SÁ, M. de. Issues of gender and sexuality in a Brazilian Technical School: displacements and exclusion processes. In: SHIPLEY, H. (Ed.). **Globalized religion and sexual identity: contexts, contestations, voices**. Leiden: Brill Academic Press, 2014. p. 129-147.

LONG, S., BROWN, A. W.; COOPER, G.. **More than a name: state sponsored homophobia and its consequences in Southern Africa**. New York: Human Rights Watch, 2003.

MACDOUGALL, B.; SHORT, D. Religion-based claims for impinging on queer citizenship. **Dalhousie Law Journal**, v. 33, n. 2, p. 133 -160, 2010.

MCGUIRE, M. **Lived religion: faith and practice in everyday life**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

MCMILLEN, E. K.; HELM JR., H. W.; MCBRIDE, D. Religious orientation and sexual attitudes and behaviors. **Journal of Research on Christian Education**, v. 20, p. 195-206, 2011.

NATIONAL STUDY OF YOUTH AND RELIGION. <http://www.youthandreligion.org/>. Accessed on: June 8, 2013.

NEDELSKY, J.; HUTCHINSON, R. Clashes of principle and the possibility of dialogue: a case study of same-sex marriage in the United Church of Canada. In: MOON, R. (Ed.). *Law and religious pluralism in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008. p. 41-64.

NEON - National Equal Opportunities Network. **Sexual Orientation**. Available: <http://www.neon.org.nz/trackingequalityatwork/sexualorientation/>. Accessed on: September 10, 2014.

PARKER, R. *Beneath the Equator: Cultures of desire, male homosexuality, and emerging gay communities in Brazil*. New York/London: Routledge, 1999.

PEDERSEN, W. Forbidden fruit: A longitudinal study of Christianity, sex, and marriage. *Journal of Sex Research*, v. 51, n. 5, p. 542-550, 2014.

PEREZ, E. U.S. expands legal benefits, services for same-sex marriage. CNN, February 10, 2014. Available at: <http://www.cnn.com/2014/02/08/politics/holder-same-sex-marriage-rights/>. Accessed on: August 10, 2014.

PEW RESEARCH. **Global Attitudes Project**. 2014. Available at: <http://www.pewglobal.org/>. Accessed on: September 9, 2014.

PHELAN, J. Who's Here? Thoughts on narrative identity and narrative Imperialism. **Narrative**, v. 13, n. 3, p. 205-210, 2005.

PINK SPACE Sexuality Research Centre. **Homepage**. Available at: <http://www.pinkspace.com.cn/>. Accessed on: September 10, 2014.

RAYSIDE, D.; WILCOX, C. (Eds.). **Faith, politics, and sexual diversity in Canada and the United States**. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011.

RELIGION DISPATCHES. **Global LGBT recap: Nigeria jails gays, Russian Orthodox spox calls for criminalization referendum**. January 15, 2014. Available at: <http://religiondispatches.org/global-lgbt-recap-nigeria-jails-gays-russian-orthodox-spox-calls-for-criminalization-referendum/>. Accessed on: September 11, 2014.

RELIGION NEWS SERVICE. **In rare public split, Catholic bishops differ sharply on anti-gay laws**. February 13, 2014. Available at: <http://www.religionnews.com/2014/02/13/rare-public-split-catholic-bishops-differ-sharply-anti-gay-laws/>. Accessed on: September 10, 2014.

RICOEUR, P. **Oneself as another**. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

RITIVOI, A. D. Explaining people: narrative and the study of identity. **StoryWorlds: A Journal of Narrative Studies**, v. 1, n. 1, p. 25-41, 2009.

- ROSAS, N.; CASTRO, C. de. **Charismatic Protestantism, gender and sexuality in Brazil.** In: SHIPLEY, H. (Ed.). *Globalized religion and sexual identity: contexts, contestations, voices*, Leiden: Brill Academic Press, 2014. p. 217-235,
- SAAD, L. Americans' acceptance of gay relations crosses 50% threshold: Increased acceptance by men driving the change. Gallup, May 25, 2010. Available at: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/135764/americans-acceptance-gay-relations-crosses-threshold.aspx>. Accessed on: August 21, 2014.
- SCHIPPERT, C. Queer theory and the study of religion. *Estudos de Religião*, v. 5, n. 4, p. 90-99, 2005.
- SEXUAL RIGHTS INITIATIVE, THE. **Stakeholder submission on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) rights in China.** 2013. Available: <http://www.hrw.org/topic/lgbt-rights>. Accessed on: September 1, 2014.
- SHIPLEY, H. Religious and sexual orientation intersections in education and media: a Canadian perspective. *Sexualities*, Special Journal Issue "Sexuality and Religion," v. 17, n. 5/6, p. 512-528, 2014a.
- SHIPLEY, H. (Ed.). **Globalized religion and sexual identity: contexts, contestations, voices.** Leiden: Brill Academic Press, 2014b.
- SHIPLEY, H.; YOUNG, P. D. Values and practices: how are youth in Canada integrating religion and sexuality in their daily lives? In: SHIPLEY, H. (Ed.). **Globalized religion and sexual identity: contexts, contestations, voices.** Leiden: Brill Academic Press, 2014. p. 276-294.
- STRAWSON, G. Against narrativity. *Ratio*, v. 17, n. 4, p. 428 -452, 2004.
- STRHAN, A. English evangelicals, equality and the city. In: SHIPLEY, H. (Ed.). **Globalized religion and sexual identity: contexts, contestations, voices.** Leiden: Brill Academic Press, 2014. p. 236-255.
- STUFF (National). **25 years of gay rights in New Zealand.** July 9, 2011. Available at: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/5259144/25-years-of-gay-rights-in-New-Zealand>. Accessed on: August 10, 2014.
- SULLIVAN, W. F. **The impossibility of religious freedom.** Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- TAYLOR, C. G. A human rights approach to stopping homophobic bullying in schools. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, v. 19, n. 3/4, p. 157 -172, 2007.
- TAYLOR, C. G. et al. **Every class in every school: final report on the First National Climate Survey on homophobia, biphobia, and transphobia in Canadian Schools.** Toronto: Egale Canada Human Rights Trust, 2011.
- TAYLOR, Y.; SNOWDON, R. Mapping queer, mapping me: visualising queer religious identity. In: SHIPLEY, H. (Ed.). **Globalized religion and sexual identity: contexts, contestations, voices.** Leiden: Brill Academic Press, 2014. p. 295-312.
- TURCESCU, L.; STAN, L. Religion, politics and sexuality in Romania. *Europe-Asia Studies*, v. 57, n. 2, p. 291-310, 2005.
- UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE. **Human rights violations of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people in Guatemala: A shadow report.** Sept. 5, 2012.

Available: <https://iglhrc.org/content/human-rights-violations-lesbian-gay-bisexual-and-transgender-lgbt-people-guatemala-shadow>. Accessed on: September 5, 2014.

UNIVISION. Voice of the People. 2012. Available at: http://univision.data4.mx/resultados_catolicos/eng/ENG_catholic-survey.pdf. Accessed on: September 1, 2014.

URSIC, E. Bi the way: rethinking categories of religious identity. *The International Journal of Religion and Spirituality in Society*, n. 3, p. 29-34, 2014.

VALENTINE, G.; WAITE, L. Negotiating differences through everyday encounters: the case of sexual orientation and religion and belief. *Antipode*, v. 44, n. 2, p. 474-492, 2012.

VAN DIE, M. *Religion and public life in Canada: historical and comparative perspectives*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

VICKERS, H. 10 thousand sign petition in favor of civil union for gay couples. PERU This Week: Living in Peru. April 2, 2014. Available at: <http://www.peruthisweek.com/news-10-thousand-sign-petition-in-favor-of-civil-union-for-gay-couples-102660>. Accessed on: September 1, 2014.

VOX. Meet the attorney who got Uganda's anti-gay law overturned. August 21, 2014. Available at: <http://www.vox.com/2014/8/21/6005841/meet-the-attorney-who-got-ugandas-antigay-law-overturned>. Accessed on: August 21, 2014.

WILCOX, M. *Queer women and religious individualism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2010.

WOODFORD, M. R., LEVY, D.; WALLS, E. Sexual prejudice among Christian College students, denominational teachings, and personal religious beliefs. *Review of Religious Research*, n. 55, p. 105-130, 2013.

YIP, A. K-T., KEENAN, M.; PAGE, S-J. **Religion, youth and sexuality**: selected key findings from a multi-faith exploration. Nottingham: University of Nottingham, 2011.

YIP, A. K-T.; PAGE, S-J. **Religious and sexual identities**: a multi-faith exploration of young adults. London: Ashgate, 2013.

Submetido em: 12-10-2014

Accito em: 12-11-2014