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ABSTRACT
The recent backlash against homosexuality in Uganda, culminating in the introduction of the 2009 Anti-Homosexuality Bill, has focused tremendous attention on the role religious activists have played in shaping Ugandan attitudes about sexuality. Drawing on long-term fieldwork among the Ugandan born-again Christians at the center of this controversy, I argue that anti-homosexual rhetoric is animated by something more than a parroting of American homophobia. Rather, it reflects a tension between two divergent frameworks for ethical personhood in Uganda, one related to the Ganda value of ekitiibwa or “respect/honor,” and the other based in a discourse of rights, autonomy, and “freedom.” The born-again rejection of a rights-based discourse is analyzed in relation to broader anxieties generated by a neoliberal emphasis on the autonomous, “empowered” individual during a period of growing inequality and economic and political dissatisfaction in Uganda. [Keywords: Homosexuality, Christianity, human rights, personhood, Uganda, Africa, ekitiibwa]

Over the past decade, the subject of homosexuality has been pushed to the fore of public consciousness in Uganda’s capital, Kampala. Street demonstrations in support of the “African family” have been staged, and taxi touts and young boda boda (motorbike) drivers have made...
the bumper sticker slogans “Say No 2 Sodomy; Say Yes 2 Family” and “Ebisiyaga Tubigobe” (“We should drive out homosexuality”) popular vehicle adornments. Uganda’s 2009 Anti-Homosexuality Bill was condemned by an array of international leaders and human rights activists for the draconian measures—including the death penalty—it would enforce in an effort to further criminalize homosexual sex. But these rebukes seem only to have strengthened the sentiment among many Ugandans that such a bill is necessary to protect a distinctly “African” way of life from the encroaching, and morally suspect, influences of Western culture and its attendant “freedoms.”

In Uganda today, arguments against homosexuality are often framed in terms of the cultural legitimacy of certain sexual “rights” and the freedoms that such rights engender. As one Ugandan woman, responding to an article about the bill, declared, “What kind of human rights when people are turning away from reasonable human beings to evil?” This profoundly troubling sentiment highlights the difficulty of forwarding “universal” human rights claims predicated on a liberalism rooted in Western constructs of social action and moral subjectivity (Asad 2003:157; cf. Merry 2006, Cowan 2006). Such rejections underscore the way human rights struggles are moral debates, predicated on questions not only about what rights mean and do, but how categories of ethical personhood—and humanity itself—are demarcated and experienced differently in different places. Sexuality has played an increasingly important, yet still under-analyzed, role in transnational development projects and rights-based struggles (Murray 2006, Miller and Vance 2004, Cornwall et al. 2008). Controversies such as Uganda’s lay bare the need to better understand how rights-bearing subjects are locally defined in relation to sexuality, and how those constructs both enable and limit the perception of who should have access to rights and how those rights should be deployed.

In this article, I consider how a Ugandan homophobic discourse has emerged in response to a neoliberal sexual subjectivity that is predicated on the embrace of personal rights and “freedoms.” The “problems” with freedom that Ugandans expressed to me when discussing homosexuality reveal a particular tension over moral behavior and social action, a tension not easily explained by a transnational alliance with American religious activists, or the bald political motives of the bill’s most prominent local advocates. To understand this tension better, I analyze the current controversy alongside the larger movement for “sexual morality” among
born-again Christians in Uganda, a community in which I have conducted fieldwork since 2004. I argue that Ugandan discourses surrounding homosexuality are shaped by deep ambivalence over an emergent construction of sex and sexual desire that emphasizes individual autonomy, choice, and agency, and which conflicts with other models for ethical sexual conduct in Uganda.

My approach makes a critical departure from some of the most popular interpretations of this controversy, especially those that have dominated Western media coverage. Much attention has focused on the personal connections between the sponsors of Uganda’s bill and American religious conservatives. American Christian missionaries are believed to have counseled their Ugandan counterparts about how and why to engage homosexuality as a political and social issue, supposedly providing the impetus for this legislative effort (Sharlet 2010, Kron 2012). Yet, to analyze this bill as simply the result of the transposition of an American homophobia misrepresents Ugandan concerns as mere reflections of an American agenda and obscures the motivations of local activists. Moreover, such an interpretation fails to recognize the distinct moral conflicts and models of sexual subjectivity underlying American and Ugandan objections to same-sex sexuality. This article builds upon the growing scholarship on homosexuality in Africa which has focused on historicizing sexualities in African societies, and contextualizing homophobia in relation to local experiences of kinship, sexuality, and reproduction (Epprecht 1998, 2004, 2008; Engelke 1999; Murray and Roscoe 1998; Hoad 2007). A key insight in anthropological studies of queer sexualities, in Africa and elsewhere, has been to emphasize how categories of sexual subjectivity are contested, partial, and often in tension with globalizing projects of sexual identity-making (Donham 1998; Boellstorff 2005, 2007). Just as the subject position “homosexual” may be experienced differently in different societies, the meaning and force of homophobic discourse has also formed its own unique trajectories in these places. American and Ugandan anti-homosexual activists may aspire to the same goal—the moral rebuke and criminalization of same-sex sexual acts—but their motivations, and the underlying moral frameworks which shape these motivations, are not interchangeable.

For most Ugandans, the animating tension behind a rejection of homosexuality is not one between a saved soul and its sinful worldly surroundings, but between two competing frameworks for moral action: one motivated by a Christian—and more broadly neoliberal—emphasis on the
autonomous person, and another grounded in proper relatedness and social embeddness. This controversy reveals the “contending moral worlds” (Posel 2004:231 as quoted in Vincent 2006:19) that shape contemporary life in Uganda and elsewhere, where local experiences of morality, which are animated by a person’s interdependence and obligation to others, diverge from a Kantian moral emphasis on the sovereign individual.

To examine this conflict, I focus in particular on Ugandan discourses of and about freedom. How and why have the perceived problems with freedom—and rights-based claims more broadly—been used to describe a wide set of social concerns in Uganda, especially those related to sexuality? The idea of freedom has undergirded several recent ethnographies that have sought to analyze the experience of emergent forms of governmentality in Africa and elsewhere (Paley 2001, Asad 2003, Mahmood 2005, Englund 2006, Li 2007). Neoliberal projects of development and economic restructuring have emphasized the individual—rather than the state or community—as the central actor in projects of social transformation. From recent AIDS treatment and prevention messages, where the self-controlled, abstaining individual is the key to disease management, to rural development projects where—as Tania Li (2007) has argued—individual “will” drives social improvement, the rights-bearing, autonomous individual has been empowered, and also made more accountable. Discourses about individual responsibility and internalized self-transformation have become dominant frames within which African subjects are made to engage with the contemporary world (Englund 2006, Piot 2010). But these authors have also shown that new rights and freedoms emerge as part of a “paradox” (Paley 2001), where the promise of self-empowerment is rarely coupled with the resources to enact meaningful social change.

These new modes of subjectification are also notable for the ways they diverge from older spacio-temporal experiences of social reproduction, reorienting people’s relation to their pasts (especially as they are constructed as “traditional”) and destabilizing ties to other social hierarchies and affinities long viewed as central to experiences of moral personhood and social action. The above authors broadly engage the concept of freedom to explicate how seemingly universal values of equality, dignity, human rights, and, more broadly, “development” itself are experienced historically and situationally, often in contexts where these values are placed in conflict with other ways of being or acting. As Saba Mahmood (2005:38) has cogently argued, the dominant frameworks of liberal social
action—autonomy, individual agency, even “freedom” itself—often obscure alternative ethical practices which engender different relationships between self and authority, action and embodiment.

In the present era—one which may be defined by the neoliberal policies which have given new shape to experiences of governance and discourses of individual sovereignty—the ambivalence generated by the co-existence of ideals of “traditional” social obligation and “modern” individualism has become more fraught. There is a new instability in the promises of capitalist exchange and modern self-making, and new recognition of the ways such promises remain out of reach for most Africans. Familiar forms of authority in families and villages, even within the state itself, are eroding and being replaced by more obscure, circuitous centers of power perhaps best represented by the proliferating form of the NGO. Achille Mbembe (2002) describes this period as one defined by the “fictiveness” of consumption during a period of scarcity. He notes, “Where the capture and consumption of desired but inaccessible goods becomes problemmatic, other regimes of subjectivity come into the making” (Mbembe 2002:271). Both Mbembe and the anthropologist Charles Piot note that African critiques of these conditions have also taken new forms, focused less on a visible, even if corrupt and villainous, state (or other tangible actor) and more often now articulated in the realm of the imaginary, where today’s “foes” are “less identifiable, more inchoate, and more diffuse” (Piot 2010:9). The political force of rumor, of the occult, and of a particular charismatic, Pentecostal worldview steeped in sacrifice and salvation has emerged from, and in many ways helped to produce, this sense of crisis, the tension and ambivalence generated by the failed neoliberal promise of “self-empowerment” and the liberating potential of “self-help.”

In the sections that follow, I aim to show how the now infamous imagery that has come into view during the crisis over homosexuality—imagery that presents homosexual sex as a sex that is extractive, excessive, and perhaps spiritually dangerous—is emergent from and seeks to mediate the particular tensions of the current era. I propose that much anti-homosexual rhetoric in Uganda is animated by a conflict between two frameworks for ethical personhood: one related to the Ganda value of ekitiibwa or “respect/honor,” and the other based in a discourse of rights, autonomy, and freedom. This tension elicits not only the rebuke of homosexuals, but a palpable sense of spiritual anxiety and fear among many Ugandans. These fears are being generated in part by growing inequalities during the neoliberal
era that have introduced new forms of instability that threaten to undermine the social hierarchies and experiences of gendered and inter-generational interdependence that have long defined Ugandan sociality and selfhood. Below, I introduce one of the communities at the center of this controversy, Kampala’s born-again Christians, and explore in more detail the particular frameworks they use to discuss what they view as the emergent power and problem of homosexuality, and sexual rights more broadly.

The Homosexual Controversy in Kampala’s Born-Again Community

Over the last several years, many in Kampala’s born-again Christian community became actively involved in protesting homosexuality, their interest intensifying in the wake of the 2009 bill which was publicly and vigorously supported by several prominent pastors. “Born-again” is the term embraced by a growing number of Ugandans, usually affiliated with Pentecostal or non-denominational churches, who wish to distinguish themselves from an older, “traditional,” mainline Christianity which had long dominated religious practice in Uganda. Their churches are often identified by a distinctly “international” focus—reflected in imagery, church structure, and financial or personal relationships with Christians abroad—which exceeds or circumvents a national-level bureaucracy. Their emphasis on spiritual gifts, a literal interpretation of the Bible, and participatory worship styles which feature contemporary music and media have especially appealed to Kampala’s youth. Christian radio blasts from taxi-buses, billboards advertise weekend revivals, and university students are often sighted toting their well-thumbed Bibles. In many ways, Kampala is viewed as a new outpost of a politically savvy brand of “global” Christianity. And like their evangelical counterparts in the US, born-again Christians in Kampala have begun to view the church as a platform for social protest, particularly around causes broadly related to moral sexual conduct.

Since the mid-2000s, my research—which initially focused on youth sexuality and Christian AIDS prevention programs—has been based in two churches at the center of the growing political mobilization of born-again Christians in Uganda. University Hill Church (UHC) is based near Makerere University with a congregation consisting almost entirely of university students and recent school-leavers. Central Kampala Church (CKC) is located near the city center and serves a young but more age-diverse
congregation. While these churches serve a population that strives to distinguish itself by embracing an ethos of prosperity and upward mobility, very few of my informants would be considered part of Uganda’s elite. Their educational opportunities had afforded most of them a level of distinction in diploma-conscious Ugandan society, but few had regular employment and nearly all relied to some degree on networks of family and acquaintances to get by. This article draws upon my long-term relationship with this community, including over 50 interviews with born-again young adults and their pastors. More recent fieldwork, conducted in 2010 and 2011, focused directly on the issue of homosexuality, but earlier data also informs my findings, especially the attitudes about sexuality which I draw upon throughout this article.

My focus on this topic has been informed in part by the fact that members of UHC have been deeply involved in and affected by the controversy surrounding the bill. Their head pastor has held demonstrations and press conferences in support of the bill and he has spoken alongside its legislative sponsor, David Bahati, to defend it before the media and foreign diplomatic representatives. This very public role has made the church a focus of international criticism. During my most recent trip to Uganda, church members seemed fatigued by the strain of their efforts and the ensuing backlash. Church leaders spoke with me about their concerns in the wake of the withdrawal of financial support by several American churches and Christian organizations. Members had also become more suspect about foreign interest in the church, and were wary of any sign of unwanted attention. During my 2011 trip, I arrived at church only to have a new member intercept me at the door and ask me to identify myself. The usher later explained that the screening of foreign visitors had become church policy.

There was a pervasive feeling that the sort of social activism that had once been so effective in garnering money and support from abroad had suddenly had quite the opposite effect. This generated a sense of confusion and resentment, which often translated more broadly into criticism of Western motivations. As one member of CKC explained to me, “When you come and talk about homosexuality, when there is a mother who can’t feed her children, how does this make sense? Why does the West care more about homosexuals than those who suffered under the LRA? This is how it seems. This is what it seems human rights is.”

In many ways, pastors are the ultimate “translators”—to use Sally Merry’s (2006) term—who have sought to interpret, and in this case counter, the
The Problem with Freedom: Homosexuality and Human Rights in Uganda

social significance of sexual rights-based discourses. My focus here is on the ways pastors draw upon emergent tensions over models for moral personhood to help shape the debate over homosexuality within the broader Ugandan public sphere. In the church, homosexuality is placed in tension with a related discourse about sexual self-control—the management of one’s body and desires—that is evident in pastors’ advocacy of sexual abstinence before marriage. As much as abstinence seemed to mimic a neoliberal focus on the individual in projects of social transformation, it also reinforced older notions of ethical sexual subjectivity and behavior, an idea often simply referred to as ekitibwa or “respectability.” Studies of Christianity in Africa have often focused on the ways being born-again is believed to provide access to a new, more individuated experience of the person, the provision of alternative social ties and relationships which enable a “break” from the obligations and interdependence which defines many African experiences of kinship and personhood (Meyer 1998, Gill 1990, Robbins 2003). Yet, I find in both my earlier research on abstinence, as well as this current controversy over homosexuality, that rather than advocating for the wholesale embrace of individualism, the church seeks to mediate between the seemingly opposed experiences of autonomy and interdependence, and the ethical and cultural meanings and implications that both ideals carry. Homosexuality may be a new front in this struggle, especially as anti-homosexual sentiments are being shaped by anxieties over a particular neoliberal construct of the sovereign, self-empowered individual. Below, I examine how the idea of sexual “freedom” presented a counterpoint to “respectability” that animated social tensions concerning sexual behavior, and shaped church leaders’ arguments—and broader popular discourses—against homosexuality.

“Respectability” and Freedom: Moral Personhood and Sexuality in Buganda

In Uganda, attitudes about sex continue to be deeply shaped by notions of kinship and lineage which tightly bind experiences of sexuality and reproduction, and, in turn, shape ideas about ideal gendered behaviors. The most radical transformations to intimate relationships in the later half of the 20th century in Uganda and other parts of Africa may be marked by a growing emphasis on personal choice and mutual compatibility during courtship. Yet even as these changes have emphasized individual
emotional and affective bonds, there endures a sense that one’s identity and sense of self are deeply shaped by relationship to one’s kin and one’s ability to reproduce. In interviews with young men and women, the interrelationship between marriage, reproduction, and the management of kin relationships was frequently emphasized. One young woman told me, by way of explaining the continuing importance of bridewealth exchange: “The traditional marriage [with bridewealth] is more strong because you are known.” Another woman explained further, “If he hasn’t introduced [paid bridewealth], they will ask ‘Who is your husband? We don’t know him. What has he brought here?’ He won’t be given any respect.”

The terms “respectability” or “honor” (ekitiibwa) and “good manners” (empisa) were often used in youth discussions about sexual relationships. In pre-colonial Buganda, as well as the surrounding kingdoms of the great lakes, ekitiibwa was the most important personal attribute, one that was widely used to measure the status and social worth of a person. John Iliffe (2005) describes honor in 18th and 19th century Buganda as defined by fierce loyalty to, and proper management of, social allegiances and hierarchies. For women, honor was (and largely still is) marked by a marriage arranged through bridewealth and the production of children (2005:170). Even as the region underwent dramatic social changes with the introduction of Christianity and colonial rule, the demonstration of ekitiibwa through submission to networks of kinship and clientage defined proper personhood (2005:179-180).

In contemporary Buganda, ekitiibwa continues to delineate a way of behaving that reinforces relationships defined by reciprocal obligation and, in the realm of intimate relationships, is largely marked by the maintenance and reproduction of kin ties. This is not to say that men and women in contemporary Kampala do not have many sexual encounters that are driven purely by spontaneity, pleasure, and excitement. The Baganda are noteworthy in sub-Saharan African societies for claiming an erotic culture which exceeds a reading of sexuality as simply an extension of the functional power of kin and lineage (Tamale 2005, Heald 1995). Many Ugandans, since at least the late-colonial era, have engaged in long-term sexual and domestic partnerships that have not been formalized by a marriage recognized by kin. Yet, the status bestowed through a marriage by bridewealth—even as other possibilities for domestic partnerships have emerged—speaks to the ways sexuality and reproduction are still embedded in a particular experience of kinship, one that my informants above
describe as the special “respect” that comes when your spouse is made “known” to your family.

What has only occasionally surfaced in discussions about sexuality during this controversy has been the fact that same-sex acts have always, of course, been practiced in Uganda. I was surprised when a pastor I knew owned up to this in an interview, especially given the way he and his peers have established themselves as guardians against this supposedly “foreign” practice. In his acknowledgement, the pastor clarified that it was not the mere presence of same-sex acts, but their acceptability for all—the universal “right” to homosexuality—which signaled a new, particular threat. The distinction he made highlights how in Uganda, same-sex acts have long been viewed in terms of a freedom from cultural norms, the selective access to which marked social status or distinction. Kabaka Mwanga, who as a king of Buganda in the 1880s took liberties with many of his young male pages, is perhaps the most famous example of the ways a transgression of sexual norms could mark one’s power and status.11 Such distinctions are also evident in the ways homosexuality has long been viewed as an “imported” practice associated with a cultural Other—not, at first, Westerners, but the earliest non-African “outsiders,” Arab traders.12 What is significant about these recognized instances of sexual “liberty” is that they were viewed in ways that reasserted relationships of hierarchy, status, and distinction. They emphasized the ultimate authority of the Kabaka, or the cultural difference and superiority of the Ganda people themselves. These were not practices universally available, but ones which, once claimed, marked and maintained social difference, dependence, or exclusion.13

This emphasis on status and interdependence contrasts with concerns about what other forms of “freedom” are thought to do in Ugandan society. In discussions about sexuality, freedom was often used to explain how problems arise when individuals become too independent—too loosed from the constraints and expectations of kin. Young people were especially vulnerable to such criticisms, from within their own ranks as well as from their elders. An HIV/AIDS researcher I interviewed explained, “They [university students] don’t know how to manage their freedom, the freedom begins to manage them.” Freedom was made to stand for a sort of loss of control, an inability to self-manage the myriad decisions and choices that marked contemporary, and especially urban, life. Freedom was also used to mark non-Ugandan values and ways of acting, especially
in the context of homosexuality, where a discourse of rights and equality defined opposition to the bill. One pastor chided his congregation from the pulpit, “Freedom has become an object of worship before God. That is how they can come here to tell us we are free to marry a cat. You shouldn’t acquiesce to the demands of the West, to the allure of their freedoms!”

In Uganda, discussions about the “problems” with freedom seem to uncover an ethical tension over expectations for moral behavior, where older frameworks diverge from a liberal ideal of the sovereign social agent. These tensions are revealed in the contested definitions of what freedom means and how “rights” may be best actualized and managed. In Luganda, “human rights” is usually translated as *eddembe ly’obwebange* (personal rights) or *eddembe ly’obuntu* (rights of the people, or civil liberties), the latter being also a translation for “democracy” (Karlström 1996:486, Wyrod 2008). The root of *eddembe* carries the dual meaning of “liberty” as well as “peace.” As Karlström (1996) has argued in his essay on Ganda interpretations of democracy, this duality is important. The key point underlying this discussion is that within Ganda frameworks for describing the practice of democracy, the assertion of individual “rights” should always reinforce (and not oppose or threaten) established social relationships and hierarchies, ideal (“civil”) relations between ruler and ruled. Here, it might also be significant to recognize that in Luganda “human rights” is expressed in the singular, as one “peace” or “liberty” of the people, a fact which may also reinforce this unifying, relational experience of “rights.”

This Ganda experience of “rights” emphasizes a distinct ethical framework based on the good of social interdependence rather than individual autonomy. Similarly, anxieties about the mismanagement of freedom reveal concerns about an erosion of ethical constraints which shaped and channelled individual moral conduct. For instance, in terms of family and gender relations, unfettered freedom has often been viewed as a threat to the normative hierarchies that order society and social goods. One young born-again woman drew on this argument in response to my question about why homosexuality had so recently become a point of concern for Ugandans:

> It is here now because of the changing society, the infiltration of Western culture. There is too much freedom. There is children’s rights, CPP [child protection policies]. “Don’t cane at school.” But we are still coming out of the African culture where a child is groomed. If you say don’t cane, don’t slap, and now that is made a rule, a law.
Now a child is free to do anything. So most of the infiltrations from the Western culture have caused too much freedom. If you don’t control them, they do anything. They watch pornography.

Here, she emphasizes a perceived tension between “rights,” which are viewed as mechanisms for independence from family discipline (thus eliciting the likelihood of misbehavior), and the moral cultivation inherent in the family’s hierarchical relationships. Concerns about women’s sexuality—often raised by male elders in an effort to control or manage it—have historically been expressed in similar terms, where migration and ensuing independence from male elders is thought to elicit and, more generally, mark morally suspect behavior (Davis 2000, Musisi 2001).

Concerns about sexuality and freedom may be especially shaped by the changing status of men and their relation to women in the present era. Unlike the colonial period, where men’s authority and models of ideal masculinity were altered but also reaffirmed through institutions of the school and colonial bureaucracy, the present period posits far more unstable claims to male dominance. Pathways to modern manhood—through formal marriage and a wage-earning job, for instance—have become more elusive, threatening young men’s sense of their status and social roles (cf. Wyrod 2008 in Uganda; in Africa, see Epprecht 1998, Smith 2001). Anti-homosexual discourses reflect these tensions, especially as they manifest along an axis of inter-generational strife. The specter of an ominous, predatory elder male sexuality—one that especially threatens young men—seems to have particularly dominated the current controversy. There is a related feeling that male desire has become unmoored, perhaps even dangerously unregulated and uncontrolled, in the contemporary era. These anxieties help to inform the sense that traditional means of managing and channeling sexuality and desire in socially productive ways are eroding. As I will discuss below, this controversy has problematized male sexuality especially, revealing young men’s growing frustrations within the neoliberal city.

**Homosexual “Recruitment”: NGOs, Intergenerational Tension, and Immoral Desire**

Stories about the vulnerability of youth to homosexual advances have dominated arguments in defense of Uganda’s bill. In one of the most notorious
public statements on the topic, Martin Ssempa, a prominent pastor, vividly described the physical trauma of anal sex, claiming a boy he counseled had died from the resulting wounds, and that such youth were the hidden victims of the predatory tendencies of homosexual men (Ssempa 2007). Schools and churches, places where children are often separated from their parents and prone to the influence of other elders, have been characterized as likely sites for “recruiting” homosexuals. In 2007, at a rally protesting homosexuality, Nsamba Buturo, the Minister of Ethics, stated that no one “should be allowed to pursue an agenda of indoctrinating our children to homosexuality” (Ssempogo 2007). The government, Buturo continued, was investigating reports that homosexuals had “infiltrated” schools, and that some victims had died (Ssempogo 2007). In 2008, government officials reiterated the fear that schools had become “breeding grounds for vice” when the Minister of Education, Namirembe Bitamazire, announced an investigation into homosexuality in schools (Kiwuuwa 2009). The 2009 Anti-Homosexuality Bill has been favorably compared by its supporters to Ugandan laws against child sexual abuse, statutory rape, and “aggravated defilement.” In a meeting with US State Department officials in December 2009, David Bahati and Pastor Ssempa attempted to defend the new bill from American criticism by forwarding the argument that the new legislation was an effort to protect minors from sexual exploitation.

Among supporters of the bill, homosexual relationships are often described and critiqued through the idea of “recruitment.” “Recruitment” refers to the need for homosexuals to seek out and “initiate” others (usually children and young adults) in order to reproduce their way of life. Such tactics are believed to be necessary because homosexuals are thought to exist outside normative kin relations and to be unable to have children. This argument was repeated by a Ugandan on an Internet forum in response to an article about the bill:

As Ugandans let us strongly come out to condemn this primitive and inhuman practice that the west wants to plant in our uprightly moral African society in the name of human rights...The question i [sic] have always held is whether there [sic] are normal human beings??? Do they have parents, siblings, etc.

The writer of the post above moves deftly between two related concerns: that homosexuals are operating in conjunction with Western norms and
values that are threatening (even “inhuman”), and that homosexuals are so dangerous (not normal humans) because they are themselves supposedly unconnected to kin, clan, and lineage relationships.

A crucial element of Ugandan discourses about homosexuality relates to this anxiety. It is a sexuality to be feared not just because it marks a group of people as different, but because the actions of homosexuals—seeming to reject reproduction outright by supposedly refusing (or being unable to have) sex with someone of the opposite sex—marks such persons as highly suspect, even anti-social. The disquiet generated by homosexuality seems to stem in part from the ways an assertion of sexual rights necessitates a decoupling of sexuality from kinship, gender, and reproduction. In response to my question about whether two men could marry, a woman I interviewed responded, “I don’t count it as marriage because who is a man and who is a woman? Who is catering [sexually] for whom?” When I continued by asking if marriage is “about sex,” she said, “yes, it is the biggest thing...and how can they [two men] ‘meet’ [sexually]?” The mechanics of homosexual sex were not beyond the point for her; they were rather central. What kind of sex is this if these two men cannot reproduce? And what sorts of persons claim to engage only in a sex that can never be reproductive?19 As one pastor explained, in less generous language, “In America homos have rights. Here you have no rights. You are not even a person. You are outside society because you are not acting like a person.” To assert equal rights to sexual behaviors that are seen as challenging other elements of moral personhood—the ability to reproduce, for instance—is disconcerting for many Ugandans, and in the context of debates over this bill, made to seem deeply threatening.

A key element of homosexual “recruitment” stories builds on these fears by associating homosexuality with foreign money and power that may challenge children’s allegiance to their families and elders.20 The homosexual “recruiter” has emerged as a corollary to the licentious figure of the “sugar daddy,” who has long animated anxieties about the vulnerability of young women to the sexual advances of older men in the age of AIDS. Similarly, the homosexual “recruiter” preys upon young people’s economic vulnerabilities to lure them away from the safe, moral confines of their family. In an interview, one man explained the sorts of tensions he believed existed between one’s obligations to kin and the desire for money that he presumed most homosexuals must be drawn to:
In our clan, there are very few people who will like that [you are gay]. Because if they hear you are gay, very few will take a girl from your family. It is increasing because people are very poor. If they [homosexuals] come and say “I’ll give you 200 shillings”—you will do it [have sex]. Then they will tell you to convince others. And you will. “Why don’t you forget about women! They are headaches.” But if you go back home they will keep you away because you are an animal; you can do anything.

Other men present during this interview interjected to explain that homosexuality, like leprosy or epilepsy, is considered by them to be an illness that affects the clan’s well-being and that must be treated by appealing to ancestral spirits. Because of this, when homosexuality is “brought home,” it may inhibit the ability of everyone to marry properly. Here, homosexuality is emphasized as a problem which exceeds the individual. More than bringing shame to one’s family, a homosexual is viewed as undermining other social relationships and obligations. (It might also be noted that homosexuality is interpreted as being appealing because it provides a way of gaining illicit monetary wealth while also circumventing the demands of female partners, who are widely accused by young men as levying heavy financial burdens on their lovers.) In such stories, homosexuality is constructed as a corrosive influence (in many ways, like other sources of excessive wealth that are not equitably shared) that is the basis for new, immoral social ties that threaten older, normative ones.

In March of 2009, several months before the new bill was presented in Parliament, a local pastor called a series of press conferences featuring the testimony of young men who spoke about their prior participation as “recruiters” of children. In their testimony, homosexuals were described as luring children—in these instances, with consumer goods and travel—and “initiating” them into an elaborate organization funded by anonymous foreign sources. In one Ugandan newspaper account of the event (Kiwuuwa 2009), George Oundo describes such techniques:

“I was taken to Nairobi for training,” he said. “I used to supply pornographic materials in form of books and compact discs showing homosexuality to young boys in many schools,” he explained. The training, he said, was facilitated by [the] Gay and Lesbian Coalition.
“I also got the pupils’ telephone contacts. We used to meet with both girls and boys in schools during ceremonial parties,” he asserted.

Travel across national borders, ominous foreign “coalitions,” and the use of technology to recruit and train youth all play on fears about dangerous external forces that may gain influence over children. Money and mobility are especially potent signifiers which oppose and may undermine local forms of authority and social reproduction. By placing children at the center of discussions about homosexuality, as victims easily drawn to a “foreign” way of life, pastors and others deftly link homosexuality to other contemporary anxieties about social forces which threaten hegemonic relationships and social hierarchies. Such stories also highlight a deep anxiety about social reproduction during a period of expanding urbanization and capitalist consumption.

The deceptive lure and power of the NGO has especially dominated Ugandan “origin” stories that seek to explain the mechanisms and success of homosexual “recruitment.” In the following story, told to me by a young man, the NGO is described as the importer, financer, and organizer of homosexuals:

I know of an institution somewhere in Ntinda, just around the [taxi] stage. They opened up a house, and turned it into an NGO. And the prominent girl of a prominent minister runs that place. And they do that exercise [sex] in there, that place. And they get paid money. Actually one of the boys I grew up with here also does the homosexual activity there…[My friend] goes to work at weird hours. During the day he sleeps at home and then he is having very many phones and he receives lots of calls. And he says “have you received the cargo?” And so I went to see them deliver the cargo, and they are getting shipments of flesh! Human beings! And then they take them to this place and they get paid a certain amount. Then they go and hang out in airports, shopping malls, supermarkets.

Here, as in the testimony above, homosexuality is linked to urban spaces associated with travel and consumption, desirable but also potentially dangerous places, places linked to a capitalist power that is viewed by many Ugandans as morally ambiguous. In this story, homosexuality is
first and foremost a job, one that is deviant (working at night), and driven by technology. It is also extractive and deeply immoral (buying/consuming “flesh”).

Like other rumors, in Uganda and elsewhere, that attempt to describe the source and terrifying effects of disordered power (in this case, the potentially extractive power of NGOs), these stories use fantastical elements to refract reality, addressing social anxieties relating to economic and social conditions (Smith 2008:155, White 2000). NGOs take up a somewhat mysterious place in the popular imagination. They have what seems to be unlimited access to foreign money and support—a job at an NGO has eclipsed government work as the sine qua non of employment status—but their allegiances to local norms and hierarchies are often vague, especially those which advocate rights-based challenges to promote the status of women and youth. This simmering dissatisfaction that links NGOs to “immoral” behavior and other social ills may also speak to changing experiences of governance in the neoliberal era, where the retreat of the state has been replaced by empty promises of individual “freedoms” and entrepreneurial wealth.

It should be noted that the predatory character that has dominated so many cautionary tales about homosexuality during this controversy has often highlighted a male same-sex sexuality rather than a female same-sex sexuality. Rebukes of lesbians in Uganda and other parts of Africa have been analyzed for the ways such backlashes seek to control women, to reassert normative gender roles and subservience to male authority (Tamale 2007, Niehaus 2002:288). The current image of the predatory male homosexual may also work to express dissatisfaction with changing gender relations in Kampala, especially young men’s anxieties about their ability to dominate their relationships with women and others. But these stories also seem to take up a much broader critique: of elder men’s responsibility to, and perhaps abuse of, younger men; of the extractive and predatory nature of economic opportunity in contemporary Kampala; and of the marginalization and frustration that many youth, and especially young men, regularly express. Anti-homosexual sentiment may then be more than simply a reassertion of the authority of gendered and generational hierarchies in the face of social change. Such sentiments seem also to express a critique of traditional social norms that have failed to protect and provide for young men.
Secrecy and Spiritual Danger

I have discussed how homosexuality is constructed as a subject position set in contrast to the Ganda ideal of “respectable” persons, which is based on the maintenance of normative kin relationships. I have also described how this description of homosexuality is animated by fears about social changes, especially those concerning the waning authority of elders over youth and the corrosive effects of certain types of wealth and power. It is also important to understand the spiritual threat that such discourses produce, especially as such threats have come to dominate local interpretations of homosexuality in Kampala.

In Uganda, homosexual sex, like all sex, is thought to have spiritual consequences, for oneself and for others to whom one is related. One acquaintance simply stated, by way of explanation, “everything that happens in the physical, it has implications for the spiritual.” Ugandan born-again Christians often participate in intense deliverance prayer sessions, seeking to “cast out” relationships (sexual, kin) that are viewed as spiritually dangerous. Sexual relationships, particularly those which are viewed as illicit (pre-marital sex, for instance), are believed to generate longstanding spiritual repercussions that must be addressed, usually through intense prayer which breaks the “soul ties” generated by the intimate exchange involved in such partnerships. The close scrutiny of relationships is a central part of spiritual work, where those ties which are socially and morally productive are separated from those which must be revealed, confessed, and abandoned.

In the rhetoric of pastors, the danger of homosexuality has been especially marked by its relationship to acts of deception and secrecy, the willful obfuscation of non-normative sexuality. Pastors often spoke about the need to reveal the illicit activities of homosexuals. The bill’s authors actually claimed that one of their goals was to “define” homosexuality, to delineate and expose practices that were believed to have been dangerously hidden from society. In the now infamous press conference staged by Pastor Martin Ssempa (and circulating on YouTube), the pastor presents the results of “a little research” he did “to know what homosexuals do in the privacy of their bedroom,” What follows is a graphic description and then partial screening of an American gay pornographic film featuring defecation. During his presentation—to an audience of Ugandan Christians, local media, and several visiting American youth missionaries—gay sex is portrayed as secretive, insatiable, and dangerously uncontrolled. By
“disclosing” these hidden acts, Ssempa seeks to mark them as especially problematic and anti-social.

To share a secret binds those who know from others who do not, a parceling and limiting of knowledge that establishes difference and authority. Secrecy, as Simmel (1906) long ago argued, is central to the production of social distinctions and hierarchies. In a similar sense, the revelation of that which is hidden carries special power to define and demarcate what is Other. In Uganda, the revelation of the unspoken, the demarcation of an act as one which is and should remain hidden, may also mark that act as part of a spiritually dangerous outside. Achille Mbembe remarks that the secret in African societies holds special weight: “the great epistemological—and therefore social—break was not between what was seen and what was read, but between what was seen (the visible) and what was not seen (the occult), between what was heard, spoken, and memorized and what was concealed (the secret)” (2001:144). In this sense, the emphasis on exposure that has been evident throughout the recent controversy—perhaps most notably in the front page tabloid exposés which sought to name and “out” Ugandan homosexuals—becomes more than a public humiliation (or, more ominously, a call for violence and persecution). Presentations like Ssempa’s seek to delineate and reveal, to mark homosexual sex as part of a spiritually dangerous outside to socially productive relations.

These acts also become a mirror for male sexuality more broadly: the abhorrent antithesis, the result of desires unchecked. Disordered images of eating, defecation, and sex in Africa are not, of course, limited to the representation of homosexuality (Beidelman 1972, Bayart 1993, Mbembe 2001). Such images tend to highlight dysfunctional social relations, the corruption of moral obligation and affinity between dependent social groups. Homosexuality, similar to fears about incest (another dominant theme in morality tales about sex in Africa), presents a particular disquiet in its disordered familiarity, its transgressive reversal of what is intimately known. Kristeva’s (1982) notion of the abject articulates how such images become effective. “It is thus not lack of cleanliness or health that causes abjection but what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in-between, the ambiguous, the composite” (1982:4). In these images projected by Pastor Ssempa and others, homosexuality is presented as something to be feared because it dissembles, feigning normativity, but revealing itself as its reverse, non-productive Other. Such images play upon the ambiguity and intensity of kinship relations, and the
inherent tension that proximity and dependence may elicit. A secretive, non-normative sexuality, one that operates outside the bounds of relationships of kin and lineage which are thought to productively manage and control personal desires, is especially dangerous.

Such orientations reflect a cultural framework which views certain sexual misbehavior through the lens of the occult. In interviews, school dormitories often surfaced as places where girls especially were vulnerable to occult forces which took the form of lesbian “spirits.” One young woman explained that student prayer sessions in her school usually included the shared interpretation of dreams of “revelation.” She continued, “being a girls’ school, we would have cases of lesbianism. Whenever people dreamt, the interpretation was either that the person was [possessed by] a lesbian or a devil’s agent.” The interchangeability between the figure of the “lesbian” and the “devil’s agent” speaks to the ways homosexuality (perhaps lesbianism especially) is seen as a threat to the webs of interdependent spiritual-social relationships which underlie normative kinship ties. The connection between homosexuality and the occult may also be informed by the fact that witchcraft is often characterized by a disregard for sexual norms, especially those acts which manipulate or transgress social hierarchies. In Buganda, for instance, basezi, or “night-dancers,” are witches who are believed to roam freely after dark engaging in a wide array of mischief, and are identified especially by their anti-social sexual practices. They eschew norms of dress and behavior—dancing naked, entering compounds to rub their over-sized buttocks against terrified neighbors’ doors. Illicit sexual acts, especially those driven by the pursuit of money, and at the expense of normative relationships, hold a special place in the popular imagination. In the Ghanaian and Nigerian video films popular with many Ugandans, modern life is often presented as a morally fraught terrain, rife with unregulated sexual desires that are usually satiated through the occult pursuit of wealth and power (Meyer 2004). When pastors and others describe homosexual sex as a hidden, excessive, unreproductive type of sex, a sex unregulated by and in opposition to normative kin relationships, unmistakable parallels are drawn to other forms of dangerous, anti-social misbehavior, especially witchcraft.

This discourse plays upon fears about the changing nature of gendered and inter-generational dependence, and draws upon a spiritual framework which viewed the seeming manipulation of such ties as socially and morally dangerous. If homosexuality is placed in tension with a “traditional” ideal
predicated on the maintenance of relationality (and, in turn, “respectable” personhood), it is also used to express concern about the emergence of a new form of ethical subjecthood, one predicated on the embrace of personal “rights” and “freedoms.”

Conclusion: Neoliberalism and Human Rights
Ugandans I spoke with expressed the idea that certain rights could be anti-social, a means by which individuals may erode or directly challenge accepted modes of authority and standards of conduct in society. At the core of this conflict over human rights lie divergent models of moral personhood, one predicated on interdependence and obligation, the other on the neoliberal ideals of autonomy and self-empowerment. As Talal Asad has written, we must “analyze human rights law as a mode of converting and regulating people, making them at once freer and more governable” (2003:157). Asad and others have pointed to the ways human rights work, particularly in the post-World War II era when it became a widespread platform for social activism and political reform, is as much about shaping and governing individual conduct—the making of particular models of “liberal” persons—as it is concerned with bestowing freedoms and protecting equality (cf. Englund 2006). In their separate analyses, Englund and Asad point to the shortcomings of rights-based discourse, and especially to the ways such projects may limit or obscure other frameworks for social action and organizing already present in diverse societies. In the case of Uganda, these shortcomings seem to have played into a critique that characterizes such projects as especially foreign, threatening, and “un-African.”

Throughout this article, my discussion of this conflict has been shaped by the idea that ethics is animated by more than a Kantian emphasis on autonomous, rational choice, or a Durkheimian reading of the moral code as a “total social fact.” As James Laidlaw (2002) has argued, an anthropology of ethics is based in a recognition that ethics is about the making of a certain type of self, the choices, constrained by variable forms of social power, that shape individual efforts to create themselves in particular models of moral persons. In Buganda, the pursuit of “respectability,” a value predicated on proper relatedness, emphasizes a model of personhood articulated through the reproduction of lineage and clan. Anti-homosexual activists have succeeded in constructing the homosexual person as an
imminent threat to such ways of being, posing a serious moral danger to other persons and society. This is not to say that human rights inherently have no value in Ugandan society. Nor do I mean to argue that “traditional” personhood and sexual behavior are vested with some static, immutable authority in the lives of Ugandans. What I have illuminated here is how and why particular homophobic discourses have been made meaningful in the historical and cultural milieu of contemporary Kampala.

The homophobia that has reared its head in Uganda, just like the subject position of “homosexual” itself, is a historically contingent one. It has emerged in the context of neoliberal social conditions which have exacerbated social inequalities even as such policies have espoused the (elusive) power of the individual to change these conditions. Criticisms of homosexual rights are deeply intertwined in growing dissatisfaction about political and economic conditions, a criticism that seems especially directed outwards, to the realm of international organizations that shape local experiences (and failures) with “development.” For at least some Ugandans, the privileging of the rights-bearing subject seems to pose a threat to other constructs of moral persons and relationships, a threat which seemed to be evidenced by the apparent disintegration of sociality in the context of an overcrowded, economically disenfranchised Kampala. The political repercussions of such a discourse have not been the focus of this article but should not be overlooked. President Museveni has weathered increasing criticism in recent years for what many see as his abuses of power deployed in an effort to maintain his control of government. For these observers, this controversy has functioned to deflect critical eyes—including those belonging to masses of disaffected youth and powerful conservative elites—away from an examination of the administration’s tenure and served to focus criticism instead on an already socially marginalized and vulnerable group of people—or, better yet, the meddling interventions of Western diplomats and activists.

And yet, a discourse of human rights has not been without success in Uganda. One need look no further than Karlström’s discussion of “democracy” that I referenced above to understand how a seemingly “foreign” liberal value was reinterpreted in ways that were significant within local ethical frameworks. The women’s rights movement has had a similar success, incrementally shifting the outlines of what “proper” womanhood entails, even if this has not as of yet engendered the wholesale embrace of gender equality in Uganda (Wyrod 2008). Homosexuality seems to pose a
particular challenge, for the reasons I have outlined here. But what these examples reveal is that efforts to advocate for sexual equality may be most successful by aligning with existing Ugandan frameworks for justice, dignity, and respect, and, in the process, shifting the outlines of what an ethical sexuality entails. What is painful to acknowledge is that current efforts have done little to counter what seems to be a rising tide of hatred and violence against homosexuals in Uganda. One need look no further than the 2011 murder of David Kato, a Ugandan man who advocated for gay rights, to realize that a successful counter discourse about homosexuality has still failed to gain traction. But to do so, developing a meaningful connection to local notions of humanity may be a starting point. Perhaps most critically, such a discourse needs to be viewed as emergent from—rather than oppositional to—indigenous frameworks for moral action. As such, the outlines of moral personhood, and the contemporary meanings attributed to Ganda “tradition,” may be reinforced in ways that encourage change and an embrace of sexual diversity.
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Endnotes:
1Homosexuality is currently illegal in Uganda under an older penal code statute (Section 145 and 146, which outlaw “acts against the order of nature”), though it is not subject to the death penalty and infractions warrant a more lenient sentence than under the terms of the new bill. The bill also demarcates a new group of related crimes, including “aggravated homosexuality,” failure to report a known homosexual, and participation in activities deemed to “promote” homosexuality (including NGO work that is believed to “support” or provide services to gay Ugandans). After being stalled in committee for most of 2010, legislators periodically attempted to revive the bill and introduce it for debate in 2011 and 2012. In December of 2012, Rebecca Kadaga, the speaker of Parliament, announced her intention to pass the bill before the end of the 2012 session, but Parliament adjourned without voting on it. The bill remains on the legislative agenda for 2013. Tensions surrounding the bill remain high.

2The “globalization” of Pentecostal and charismatic forms of Christianity in Africa and elsewhere has drawn significant scholarly attention. See, for instance, Coleman (2000), Corten and Marshall-Fratani (2001), and Robbins (2004).

3See Epstein (2008; especially 186-201) and Thornton (2008) for overviews of Ugandan AIDS policy and the involvement of Christian activists in anti-condom and abstinence promotion. It should be noted that Christianity has served as a platform for social protest in the past in Uganda. The East African Revival, which began in Rwanda and Western Uganda in the 1920s, was a critical moment during which debates about modern and moral subjects and behaviors were played out (see Ward 1989).
Following the human subjects research protocol approved for this study, and at the request of informants, their names and those of their churches are not used. Any names that appear are pseudonyms, or are taken from published media reports.

My young adult interviewees range in age from 19 to 33. Several have been interviewed repeatedly since the mid-2000s. Only one pastor interviewed was a woman, but interviews with young adults were nearly evenly divided between men and women. While all lived in Kampala at the time of my research, nearly two-thirds of my interviewees had grown up in rural or peri-urban villages and towns. Additional data was gleaned from media sources and formal interviews with Ugandans outside the born-again community. These sources were used to gauge how born-again attitudes both shaped and reflected popular opinions about homosexuality.

A US-based e-mail protest campaign against organizations affiliated with UHC had caused several in their network of small-scale American funders to withdraw.

The LRA is the Lord's Resistance Army, a guerrilla army which has been waging war in northern Uganda and the surrounding region for more than 20 years.

Uganda is a multi-ethnic country, and Kampala, the capital, is similarly diverse. The city is located in the former kingdom of Buganda. The majority of its inhabitants are Baganda, who speak Luganda. The majority of my informants were also Baganda, but as a whole they represented a range of ethnicities. I refer to Ganda terms in this section, but the issue of “respectability” came up in nearly every interview about sexuality I conducted with youth, regardless of ethnicity. Attitudes about the importance of kin relationships and marriage were similarly consistent regardless of ethnic background.

Studies of contemporary marriage and urban romantic relationships in Africa have highlighted the endurance and moral significance of these models of kinship and lineage, and the ways they shape modern experiences of love and family (see Smith 2001, Thomas and Cole 2009).

See Southall and Gutkind (1957) for a description of colonial era domestic partnerships.

Mwanga’s sexual appetite is especially famous because his relationships with young men became a sticking point between him and foreign missionaries in his court, eventually leading to his decision to hold a mass execution of the youth who refused to disavow their Christian beliefs and continue their sexual relationships with him. Their execution is marked by a public holiday in Uganda, Uganda Martyrs Day, though the connection to same-sex acts is rarely, if ever, mentioned. (For one of several scholarly accounts, see Hoad 2007.)

A 1995 online discussion amongst Ugandan scholars about the history of homosexuality in Uganda provides one window into debates about the “foreign-ness” of same-sex sexual practices (Accessed from http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?tx=xvXlist=H-Africa&month=9511&week=c&msg=Vj4kFkRJj/ OuPSQInxwuxWoa&user=8pw= on May 18, 2011). Etymological arguments about the origins of the word for homosexuality, “ebisiyaga,” and its association with “ghee” and Arabs are discussed. Several note that the association between homosexuality and Arab traders was made in Sir Apolo Kagwa’s Customs of the Baganda (1934), the Ganda leader’s early ethnography of the Baganda. The claim that Arab traders introduced “sodomy” is found in Kagwa’s book as part of a larger discussion of the “breakdown” of custom following Arab contact with Ganda society (1934:98).

Royal women in pre-colonial Buganda were similarly freed from the restrictions on sexual behavior levied on common women. Yet, sexual liberties were also coupled with a prohibition on marriage and reproduction, effectively marking such women as a sort of liminal social group. Musisi writes that such freedoms were permitted because they helped to strengthen existing social hierarchies and hegemonic gender relations: “In my view, selective freedoms were accorded to the princesses because these freedoms sustained the class interests of the Buganda royal family and male-dominated social order” (1991:774).

Youth often attend church separately from their parents, especially with the proliferation of born-again congregations which cater to their demographic.

“Aggravated defilement” is another category of sexual offense, introduced in the 2009 revision to the Defilement law (which addresses the sexual abuse of minors). It stipulates that HIV-positive persons who have sex with minors are subject to the death penalty.

This information was revealed in the US diplomatic cables made public through WikiLeaks. This cable, and one other concerning the bill, are available through the Guardian (UK). Accessed from www.guardian.co.uk/world/us-embassy-cables-documents on Feb 17, 2011.

Sylvia Tamale (2007:18) also notes the use of this term during an earlier backlash against homosexuality in Uganda in 2003.

19 Here, it is important to note that this woman, and other interviewees, may not be as concerned with same-sex sexual “play” as long as those forms of sexual activity do not challenge what she views as a fundamental link between sex, gender, and kinship. Donham (1998) notes a similar disconnect between “homosexual” identity as it is claimed in transnational gay rights movements and local understandings of sexuality and sexual identity in South Africa.

20 Periodic media coverage of child abduction and ritual murder both reflects and stokes such concerns (see also Karlström 2004).

21 At 2011 exchange rates, less than 10 US cents.

22 The large literature on the “modernity” of witchcraft analyzes similar concerns about the disavowal of relationships of obligation in the pursuit of wealth (see, for instance, Meyer and Pels 2003, West and Sanders 2003).

23 This goal was shared with me in an interview with a pastor who said he helped to draft the bill. The bill does enumerate sexual activities in detail, providing a sort of “definition” of homosexuality.

24 One version available on YouTube is https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=17C_9TXgAms. Many “re-mixed” versions of his comments were reposted and circulated widely outside Uganda in 2011.
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