

Abstract

Ten years since its emergence on the UN agenda, sexual orientation remains a battleground within the UN human rights system. The progress made by the UN's expert bodies in addressing a range of human rights abuses based on sexual orientation is in stark contrast to the denial and defiance shown by certain governments at the political bodies of the UN, where any reference to sexual orientation has consistently been "bracketed" and written out of draft human rights texts. This article identifies key challenges for future advocacy, including the need to counter cultural justifications for human rights violations, to confront shortcomings in the legal interpretation of rights relating to sexual orientation and to lift the particular barriers facing those who defend these rights.

Depuis son apparition sur l'ordre du jour des Nations Unies il y a dix ans, l'orientation sexuelle est toujours un véritable champ de bataille dans le système des droits humains des Nations unies. Le contraste est frappant entre les progrès réalisés par les organisations spécialisées des Nations unies en réponse à une grande variété d'abus des droits humains basés sur l'orientation sexuelle et les attitudes de refus systématique et de défi de certains États dans le cadre des organes politiques des Nations unies, où toute référence à l'orientation sexuelle a toujours été «encadrée» et extirpée de tous les projets de textes sur les droits de l'homme. Cet article identifie les principaux défis à relever à l'avenir pour les activistes, y compris le besoin de dénoncer les justifications culturelles pour les violations des droits de l'homme, de remédier aux problèmes d'interprétation juridique des droits en rapport avec l'orientation sexuelle et d'éliminer les barrières particulières auxquelles se heurtent les personnes qui défendent de tels droits.

A diez años de su aparición en la agenda de las Naciones Unidas, la orientación sexual sigue siendo un campo de batalla dentro del sistema de derechos humanos de la ONU. El progreso que hicieron los organismos expertos de la ONU para abordar la gama de abusos a los derechos humanos en base a la orientación sexual contrasta marcadamente con la negativa y desafío mostrados por ciertos gobiernos dentro de los organismos políticos de la ONU, en los cuales cualquier referencia a la orientación sexual ha sido consistentemente marcada y dejada por fuera del texto de los borradores de acuerdos sobre los derechos humanos. En este artículo, se identifican retos claves para la defensa de derechos en el futuro, incluyendo la necesidad de oponerse a las justificaciones culturales para las violaciones de los derechos humanos, de confrontar las deficiencias en la interpretación legal de los derechos en relación a la orientación sexual, y de eliminar las barreras particulares con las que se enfrentan aquellos que defienden tales derechos.

BRACKETING SEXUALITY: Human Rights and Sexual Orientation— A Decade of Development and Denial at the UN

Ignacio Saiz

This year marks the 10th anniversary of an important milestone in the history of the recognition of rights relating to sexual orientation within the United Nations human rights system. In March 1994, a ground-breaking decision by the Human Rights Committee (HRC) in the case of *Toonen v. Australia* found that Tasmanian laws criminalizing all sexual relations between men were in breach of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), whose non-discrimination provisions were interpreted as including “sexual orientation.”¹

Hailed at the time as “the first juridical recognition of gay rights on a universal level,” the decision became an authoritative reference for a series of successful legal challenges to discriminatory criminal laws around the world.^{2,3} It also gave an important boost to public health arguments that criminalization of homosexual activity hampers HIV/AIDS prevention.⁴ *Toonen* offered hope that the international human rights system might at last provide a recourse against the array of abusive laws and practices that have criminalized, pathologized, or demonized those whose sexual orientation or gender identity does not fit the perceived norm.⁵

Toonen was one of several developments in 1994 that seemed to signal a shift in the approach to human rights and

Ignacio Saiz, LL.M., is Director of the Policy and Evaluation Program of the International Secretariat of Amnesty International and Member of the International Working Group on Sexuality and Social Policy. The views expressed here are the author's and do not represent those of Amnesty International or those of the International Working Group on Sexuality and Social Policy. Please address correspondence to ignaciosaz@aol.com

Copyright © 2004 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College and Ignacio Saiz.

sexuality at the United Nations. A burgeoning articulation of sexuality-related rights emerged from the 1994 UN-sponsored International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo, particularly in relation to women's sexual and reproductive rights.⁶ The year also saw the appointment of a UN Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, whose analysis of the link between control of female sexuality and violence against women eventually led to a pioneering affirmation of women's right to sexual autonomy.⁷ Sexuality, previously on the UN agenda only as something to be circumscribed and regulated in the interest of public health, order, or morality, was for the first time implicitly recognized as a fundamental and positive aspect of human development.⁸

Ten years on, however, sexuality remains a battleground within the UN human rights system. At the 60th session of the UN Commission on Human Rights (CHR) in Geneva in March 2004, 10 years to the day from the *Toonen* decision, the government of Brazil moved to postpone discussion of a resolution it had tabled the previous year which expressed concern about human rights violations occurring on grounds of sexual orientation around the world.⁹ Brazil claimed it was forced to do so because it had not been possible "to arrive at a necessary consensus."¹⁰ The draft resolution had met with fierce opposition from governments arguing that sexual orientation was not a proper subject for consideration by a human rights body.¹¹

This article evaluates the progress made at the UN in addressing issues of sexual orientation in the decade since *Toonen*. It surveys the considerable body of work done by the UN's expert human rights mechanisms to develop international standards and hold states accountable for a range of human rights violations based on sexual orientation. This progress, however, is in stark contrast to the consistent denial and defiance shown by governments at the more "political" UN forums such as the Commission on Human Rights or UN World Conferences, where the merest reference to sexual orientation has consistently been bracketed and systematically written out of any instruments adopted.

Furthermore, this article analyzes some of the challenges for future advocacy, including the need to defend the universality of these rights and to confront limitations in the way international human rights bodies have recognized them. Sexual orientation is only one of many aspects of human sexuality that have begun to be addressed from a rights perspective over the past decade.¹² This article argues that framing sexual-orientation-related rights within a broader concept of sexual rights, including the right to sexual health, may offer important opportunities for overcoming some of the conceptual, political, and practical obstacles encountered within the UN system. The current climate of backlash and retrenchment poses significant challenges—but also engenders considerable opportunities—for advocacy on sexuality, gender, and health to converge around a renewed articulation of sexual rights.

Toonen + 10: Sexual Orientation and the Treaty Bodies

The *Toonen* decision was a significant departure from earlier international jurisprudence that had found the prohibition of same-sex sexual relations to be in breach of the right to privacy.¹³ In *Toonen*, the Human Rights Committee found a violation of the ICCPR's privacy provisions (Article 17) in conjunction with the prohibition of discrimination (Article 2), innovatively interpreting the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of "sex" as including "sexual orientation."¹⁴

Since *Toonen*, other treaty-monitoring bodies of the UN have helped consolidate the principle that sexual-orientation discrimination is proscribed in international human rights law.¹⁵ The Human Rights Committee, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), and the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) have repeatedly and consistently called for the repeal of laws criminalizing homosexuality in countries around the world.¹⁶ The HRC has emphasized the harmful consequences of these laws for the enjoyment of other civil and political rights, particularly

where they result in the death penalty and other cruel, inhuman, and degrading punishments.¹⁷

The concerns of the treaty bodies have, furthermore, extended far beyond the criminalization of homosexual sex. "Social cleansing" killings of sexual minorities, and the impunity surrounding them, have been addressed by the Human Rights Committee.¹⁸ The Committee against Torture has condemned the ill-treatment of people detained on grounds of sexual orientation in Egypt and the discriminatory treatment of gay prisoners in Brazil.¹⁹ Both Committees have also addressed abuses against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) rights defenders, including threats and attacks against activists, restrictions on their freedom of association, and denial of police protection.²⁰ In line with developments in refugee law, the treaty bodies have welcomed measures to protect refugees fleeing persecution on grounds of sexual orientation and have voiced concern at the threat of arbitrary deportation of non-nationals on these grounds.²¹

Abuses based on sexual orientation have also been addressed from the perspective of the rights of the child. This is particularly significant given that earlier UN approaches, based on prejudiced notions about "predatory" homosexuality, had pitted children's rights against the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people.²² The Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) has highlighted the harmful effects of sexual-orientation discrimination on adolescent health, calling on states to ensure that young gay and transsexual people "have access to the appropriate information, support and necessary protection to enable them to live their sexual orientation."²³

Laws prohibiting the "promotion of homosexuality" or setting a higher age of sexual consent for same-sex relations have been held by the CRC to breach the non-discrimination provisions of the Children's Convention.²⁴ Two recent General Comments by the CRC have reaffirmed the need to address sexual-orientation discrimination in the context of promoting adolescent health and preventing HIV/AIDS.²⁵ The Committee has also recommended that attention be given to sexual-orientation discrimination as one of many factors that can expose children to a higher risk of violence and victimization at school.²⁶

The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has also explored the nexus between the right to health and discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation. Its General Comment on the Right to Health was the first by any treaty body to include explicit reference to sexual-orientation discrimination.²⁷ The CESCR has addressed the impact of sexual-orientation discrimination in a range of other spheres such as employment, housing, and the right to water.²⁸

Moreover, the relevance of the work of the treaty bodies to issues of sexuality goes well beyond these specific references to sexual orientation. For example, CEDAW has addressed a range of barriers impeding women's access to sexual health and has clarified the obligation of states to prevent and punish gender-based violence in the home and the community, issues of particular relevance to the experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people.²⁹

As this brief overview indicates, all the major human rights treaties can and have been invoked to challenge a range of violations based on sexual orientation or gender identity.³⁰ The extensive and increasingly comprehensive body of case law and authoritative comment by the treaty bodies has served to illuminate patterns of human rights violations long excluded from the ambit of human rights protection. It has also consolidated the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation as one that is firmly grounded in international standards, requiring not only the repeal of discriminatory criminal laws but also the adoption of proactive anti-discrimination measures.³¹

Still in question at the time of the *Toonen* decision, however, was the extent to which the treaty bodies would be willing to affirm the applicability of the non-discrimination principle across the full spectrum of rights contained in the treaties they supervise, particularly in regards to the right to marry and to found a family, where there may not be consensus among committee members, let alone states.³²

A key test case was brought in 1999 by two lesbian couples from New Zealand who argued that the failure of the New Zealand Marriage Act to provide for same-sex marriage was discrimination on grounds of "sex" and "sexual orientation" and violated their right to marry, their right to privacy and family life, and their right to equal protection of

the law, among others.³³ Despite powerful arguments, the Human Rights Committee found no violation of the ICCPR, holding that the right to marry under Article 23 applied only to “the union between a man and a woman.”³⁴ This categorical assertion is at odds with the views expressed elsewhere by the Committee and other international human rights bodies that “marriage” and “the family” are continuously evolving concepts that apply to a diversity of arrangements across cultures and so must be interpreted broadly. Neither is defined in any international standard.³⁵

A more recent decision by the Human Rights Committee in the case of *Young v. Australia*, however, applies the principle of equal protection of the law (Article 26 of the ICCPR) to the sphere of partnership rights.³⁶ The HRC found that the denial of pension benefits to the same-sex partner of a deceased war veteran breached Article 26, as Australia had failed to provide any justification for making distinctions on the basis of “sex or sexual orientation.” The decision transcends *Toonen* by moving the principles of non-discrimination and equal protection beyond the narrow confines of privacy and applying them to other areas of civil, economic, and social entitlements.

A separate concurring opinion by two individual committee members, however, draws attention to the limits of the decision’s scope. It indicates that, had Australia explained its grounds for denying equal partnership rights to same-sex couples, the Committee might have found these to be “reasonable and objective” justifications for discrimination.³⁷ It remains to be seen how sympathetic the Committee will be in the future to arguments that discrimination can be justified with regard to certain rights in the interest of the “protection of the family.”

New Frontiers for Human Rights: The Special Procedures of the Commission on Human Rights

Over the past decade, many of the individual human rights experts appointed by the Commission on Human Rights to study particular themes or country situations have foregrounded sexuality as an important human rights issue.³⁸ Their analysis has served not only to identify the

specific forms, causes, and consequences of abuses based on sexual orientation and gender identity, but also to promote new approaches to human rights as they apply to human sexuality.

Since the mandate was created in 1994, the relationship between sexuality and human rights has been integral to the work of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women. The first post-holder, Radhika Coomaraswamy, identified violence against women who “live out their sexuality in ways other than heterosexuality” as part of a broader spectrum of violence inflicted on women for exercising their sexual autonomy in ways disapproved of by the community.³⁹ She has analyzed how gender-based violence is rooted in social constructions of feminine and masculine identity and perpetuated or justified by narrow interpretations of concepts such as “tradition,” “culture,” “privacy,” and “family.”⁴⁰ Towards the end of her mandate, she began to explore the contours of a “right to sexuality and sexual autonomy” and affirmed that sexual rights were the “final frontier” for women’s human rights.⁴¹ Her successor, Yakin Ertürk, has probed further into the link between violence against women and the control of women’s sexuality, and the ways in which different forms of discrimination intersect.⁴²

Other rapporteurs have also been dealing with issues of sexual orientation and gender identity for a number of years. The Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial, Arbitrary and Summary Executions has condemned the application of the death penalty for consensual sexual relations, state-sponsored and state-tolerated killings of sexual minorities, media-fuelled societal indifference, and threats against LGBT rights defenders.⁴³ The Special Rapporteur on Torture has focused on patterns of torture against sexual minorities, including the prevalence of sexual violence, the infliction of cruel, inhuman, and degrading punishments for consensual same-sex relationships or transgender behavior, and ill-treatment in prisons, state medical institutions, and the armed forces.⁴⁴ A recent report by examines how stigma and discrimination on grounds of gender identity and sexual orientation can compound the risk of torture or ill-treatment

for people who are (or are perceived to be) living with HIV/AIDS.⁴⁵

The Special Representative of the Secretary General on Human Rights Defenders has highlighted the risks facing human rights defenders whose work challenges oppressive social structures and traditions, signaling: "Of special importance will be women's human rights groups and those who are active on issues of sexuality, especially sexual orientation and reproductive rights. These groups are often very vulnerable to prejudice, to marginalization and public repudiation, not only by State forces but by other social actors."⁴⁶

The Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health has significantly advanced debates and understandings of sexuality-related rights at the UN, highlighting how discrimination and violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people impedes their enjoyment of sexual and reproductive health and rights.⁴⁷ Other Special Rapporteurs have included reference to sexual orientation issues in connection with the right to education, freedom of expression, due process, the right to housing, and the right to a remedy.⁴⁸ The Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, which is another important mechanism of the CHR, has condemned the arbitrary detention and torture of 55 men in Egypt in connection with their perceived homosexuality.⁴⁹

The Sub-Commission on Human Rights, despite its mandate to undertake thorough studies on a range of emerging human rights issues, has not taken up calls from NGOs and from its own individual members to study the connections between sexual-orientation discrimination, health, and human rights.⁵⁰ Although Sub-Commission studies have occasionally referred to the non-discrimination principle, the Sub-Commission is well placed to carry out a more rigorous and comprehensive analysis of the obstacles that have prevented recognition in practice of the rights affirmed in principle by other parts of the UN system.⁵¹

A "Non-Subject": Reactions at the Political Bodies of the UN

The work of experts appointed by the Commission on Human Rights has been enormously significant in applying international human rights protections to those facing dis-

crimination and violence because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Attempts to place these findings on the agenda of the CHR itself, however, have met with intense resistance. In contrast to the bodies surveyed above, the Commission is made up of government representatives. Politics rather than principle usually determine the outcome of its human rights deliberations, and CHR members have constantly sought to undermine the effectiveness of CHR-appointed human rights experts.⁵²

The fate of the draft resolution presented by Brazil to the CHR regarding human rights and sexual orientation exemplifies this pattern.⁵³ Despite its relatively modest content, the draft resolution tabled in 2003 was described by Pakistan as an insult to the world's 1.2 billion Muslims.⁵⁴ Five member states of the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) proposed deleting all reference to sexual orientation in the draft, which would have rendered it meaningless.⁵⁵ After other blocking and delaying tactics, discussion of the draft resolution was postponed to the 2004 session.⁵⁶ At the 2004 Commission, however, concerted opposition from the OIC and the Holy See and lukewarm support from supposedly sympathetic governments led Brazil to postpone formal discussion of the resolution for yet another year.^{57,58}

The arguments invoked by the Holy See and the Organization of Islamic Conference against the Brazil resolution are typical of the objections raised over the past 10 years whenever sexual-orientation rights have been asserted at the political bodies of the UN. Letters circulated by their representatives in Geneva argued that the principle of non-discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation cannot be considered as universally recognized as it does not appear in any UN treaty.⁵⁹ They argued, furthermore, that sexual orientation, an "undefined term," may be a legitimate basis for discrimination to protect children and the family. It is not a human rights issue but a social and cultural one, best left to each state to address within its own sovereign legal and social systems. Asserting sexual orientation as a source of universal rights is culturally divisive and therefore threatening to the UN consensus.

Although strikingly out of touch with the human rights developments canvassed earlier, these arguments have a

long and successful history, both at the CHR and at other UN forums made up of government representatives.⁶⁰ At the series of UN World Conferences since the ICPD in Cairo in 1994, attempts to include even a reference to sexual orientation in draft declarations have systematically met the same fate, the words remaining bracketed before being dropped in the interest of "consensus."

At the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, four references to the persecution of women for their sexual orientation in the draft Platform for Action were dropped after the Vatican and some Islamic states, supported by organizations of the Christian right, decried the "hijacking of human rights" by feminist and lesbian rights activists as a major threat to fundamental religious and cultural values.⁶¹ Sexual orientation, they said, was a "non-subject" that would open the floodgates to many unacceptable behaviors.⁶²

The five-year review conferences held in 1999 and 2000 to evaluate implementation of the Cairo and Beijing commitments saw concerted attempts to reverse the hard-fought progress made on sexual and reproductive rights at those conferences.⁶³ In 1999, the Holy See forged alliances with other theocratic governments in fiercely resisting any language in the ICPD+5 Key Actions Document that could be interpreted as addressing either abortion or homosexuality. At the UN General Assembly Special Session in June 2000 to review implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action, a proposal to add reference in the resolution to measures taken "by a growing number of countries ... to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation," was opposed by delegates from Senegal, Syria, Nicaragua, and Kuwait on grounds that they could not accept "sexual orientation," an undefined term, as a human right.⁶⁴

Although the UN's work on HIV/AIDS has helped break taboos about discussing sexual diversity in human rights forums, at the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on HIV/AIDS in June 2001, the bracketed references to "men who have sex with men" as a group vulnerable to infection were removed from the text of the Declaration of Commitment following heated debate and objections from

a number of governments.⁶⁵ The same battles over bracketed text were fought in August 2001 at the UN World Conference Against Racism in Durban, South Africa. A proposal by Brazil to recognize sexual orientation as a related form of discrimination remained bracketed in the Conference's draft Program of Action until the last day and was eventually deleted.⁶⁶

Nevertheless, progress at the political forums of the UN cannot be measured solely in terms of textual references to sexual orientation. While sexual orientation may be absent from the instruments adopted at UN World Conferences, sexuality more broadly has had an increasingly tangible presence. The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action in particular was a milestone in the recognition of sexual and reproductive autonomy as a central plank of women's human rights. One of its paragraphs in the section on health, adopted after heated controversy, builds on Cairo's codification of reproductive rights by affirming women's "right to have control over and decide freely and responsibly on matters related to their sexuality, including sexual and reproductive health, free of coercion, discrimination and violence."⁶⁷

If the "bracketing" has consistently muted any explicit recognition of sexual orientation rights at the political forums of the UN, those defending these rights have increasingly made their voices heard. Their participation and visibility at UN forums have made these empowering processes, providing a unique opportunity for activists around the world to strategize and exercise rights of political participation denied in their home countries.⁶⁸ The 2004 Commission on Human Rights saw an unprecedented number of formal interventions by LGBT rights defenders, as well as their participation in NGO-organized panel discussions.⁶⁹

Over the past decade, an ever-increasing number of governments and mainstream human rights organizations have also sponsored initiatives and spoken powerfully in favor of sexual-orientation rights.⁷⁰ This has left a minority of governments opposed to these efforts increasingly on the defensive. The vehemence of their resistance is itself a measure of the impact that movements for gender equality

and sexual diversity have had across the globe.⁷¹ Nevertheless, this backlash has ensured that, for the moment, sexual orientation stays off the agenda in the name of “consensus.”

Confronting Obstacles, Rethinking Strategies

Events at the 2004 Commission on Human Rights exemplify the dynamic at the UN a decade after *Toonen*. Rights relating to sexual orientation (and sexuality more generally) may be legally well established, but they remain politically contested. Certain governments have intensified their efforts to deny or roll back any recognition of them, using “cultural sovereignty” as a rallying cry and the lack of explicit reference to sexual orientation in international standards as their justification.

This current revisionism may have more to do with geopolitics than the finer points of international human rights law. Yet these arguments point to some of the challenges that future advocacy strategies need to confront: defending universality against cultural relativist attacks; overcoming barriers to the participation of human rights defenders working on sexuality in UN processes; and confronting limitations and biases in the way human rights law is interpreted and applied.

Challenging “Cultural” Justifications

Sexuality remains one of the arenas where the universality of human rights has come under the most sustained attack and around which governments most often seek to erect protective barriers of cultural and national sovereignty to evade their internationally recognized rights obligations.⁷² Sexuality figures prominently in the construction of narratives around state sovereignty, national identity and non-interference.⁷³ The appeal to “cultural sovereignty” and “traditional values” as a justification for denying sexual orientation (alongside other sexual-rights) claims, has become all the more prevalent in response to the processes of economic globalization and global cultural homogenization.⁷⁴

As in the context of women’s rights, this is often based on highly dubious misrepresentations of history and on

fixed and selective notions of culture.⁷⁵ Some governments in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, for example, have sought to bolster their domestic authority through nationalist rhetorics, portraying homosexuality as a foreign imposition and a manifestation of western decadence.⁷⁶ Nor is this appeal to mythical traditional cultural values limited to governments of the South. The US has been at the forefront of recent “fundamentalist” attempts at the UN to rollback sexual and reproductive rights in the name of defending traditional forms of family.⁷⁷ While UN consensus documents have stressed that national and regional cultural and religious values cannot trump fundamental human rights, in practice states are still afforded a wide margin of discretion within the UN human rights system when it comes to matters of sexuality.⁷⁸ A vigorous defense of the universality of rights related to sexual orientation has generally been lacking at the UN.⁷⁹

A dilemma for rights advocates is how to formulate claims to universal rights in language that recognizes the significance of cross-cultural constructions of sexuality. Labels and perceptions attached to same-sex sexual identity and behavior vary enormously from culture to culture.⁸⁰ Advocacy strategies that appear to globalize essentialist and culturally specific notions of “lesbian/gay identity” may be seriously counter-productive.⁸¹ The increasingly central role being played by rights activists from the South in UN processes around sexuality is the most eloquent response to those governments that seek to claim that sexual rights are an exclusively Northern concern. The obstacles that many of them face both domestically and internationally, however, have constrained their potential role as protagonists in UN lobbying. In many countries, they are denied legal status, resources, and recognition of their status as human rights defenders, all of which hampers their capacity to engage with international organizations.⁸² Moreover, activists from all parts of the globe have consistently faced attempts by governments to exclude them from UN forums, particularly through denial of accreditation.⁸³

As the UN Special Representative on Human Rights Defenders has suggested, the obstacles and risks facing those

defending rights of sexuality across the globe merit greater attention and sensitivity from both UN human rights bodies and others within the human rights movement.⁸⁴

Confronting Limitations and Biases in International Human Rights Law

For all the progress made at the UN over the past decade, sexual orientation is still not mentioned in any binding UN human rights treaty, nor is it in any final political commitment document resulting from a UN world conference. The decisions and interpretations of the treaty bodies are authoritative, but most states hold that they are not legally binding. Instruments such as the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action contain extensive reservations by states on the provisions relating to sexuality and contain no text on sexual orientation. Although the prohibition of sexual-orientation discrimination has been unequivocally recognized by the UN treaty bodies and other international human rights bodies, reactions by governments at the UN indicate that in political venues it is not wholly accepted by the full community of states.⁸⁵

The lack of explicit reference to a right to be free from discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, or a broader right to sexual autonomy, has meant a reliance on progressive “reading into” existing human rights provisions, typically the right to privacy, rights to physical integrity (freedom from torture and the right to life), and freedom from discrimination on grounds of sex.⁸⁶ While rights claims based on these approaches have achieved important victories, each has its limitations and has proven insufficient on its own.⁸⁷

The boundaries of the right to privacy have proven highly mutable, and respect for privacy can co-exist with moral disapproval or mere tolerance of homosexuality, as long as it is confined to the private sphere of the closet.⁸⁸ Similarly, focusing on rights of physical integrity limits the scope of concern to the most egregious violations, such as the torture of lesbians through forced psychiatric treatment or “social cleansing” killings of transgender sex workers.⁸⁹

While claims based on the principles of non-discrimination and equal protection of the law have been increas-

ingly successful at the UN, as well as in many national jurisdictions, the UN expert bodies have been virtually silent regarding the basis for locating “sexual orientation” in the non-discrimination provisions of international standards.⁹⁰ This is significant because legal strategies in a number of jurisdictions have foundered on the question of whether sexual-orientation claims can be argued as sex discrimination.⁹¹

The jurisprudence to date betrays other limitations of the non-discrimination approach. Human rights doctrine on non-discrimination allows considerable leeway for subjective interpretation regarding what circumstances may justify unequal treatment.⁹² Differential treatment is not considered discrimination if the criteria for differentiation are “reasonable and objective,” and if the aim is to achieve a purpose deemed “legitimate” under international standards.⁹³

As seen in the cases of *Joslin* and *Young* before the Human Rights Committee, the treaty bodies have shown themselves willing to tolerate discrimination in partnership rights in the name of “protection of the family,” a legitimate interest invoked in an unduly restrictive way which denies the diversity of contemporary forms of family. Non-discrimination arguments will have only limited success if the basic concepts underpinning human rights law, such as “marriage,” the “family,” and “state sovereignty” continue to be interpreted in heterosexist ways. As feminist legal scholars have pointed out, a non-discrimination approach is inadequate without addressing the structural biases of international human rights law.⁹⁴

While some have argued for a new UN declaration or convention prohibiting sexual-orientation discrimination, such a project is not only hopelessly unattainable in the current climate, it also lays bare the problem of naming the categories to be protected.⁹⁵ The binary categories inherent to non-discrimination norms (“men/women,” “homo/heterosexual”) can also serve to subtly reinforce the subordination of one by the other.⁹⁶ Volatile and culturally specific concepts such as “lesbian and gay” and “sexual minorities” defy the

kind of fixed universally applicable categorization that is necessary for codification in anti-discrimination instruments.⁹⁷

The Promise of “Gender Integration” at the UN

The obstacles canvassed above—including deference to cultural justifications, exclusion from UN processes, and biased interpretation of international standards—are the very same obstacles that have historically hampered progress in advancing women’s rights internationally.⁹⁸ This is not surprising, given the inextricable link between sexuality and gender.⁹⁹ The process of “gender-mainstreaming” underway at the UN since the 1990s aimed to overcome these gender-biases in its work. However, its progress has, at best, been mixed. Moreover, there is little evidence that those at the forefront are willing to make the conceptual links to sexual orientation—perhaps out of fear that this would compromise the broader process of gender integration by alienating governments.¹⁰⁰

In regard to sexual-orientation claims, norms and mechanisms created to combat gender discrimination have been disappointingly underused within the UN system.¹⁰¹ The Beijing Platform for Action represented an important acknowledgement of women’s right to decide on matters of sexuality free of violence or coercion, but women’s rights advocates have sought a more comprehensive and affirmative vision of women’s right to sexual autonomy, de-linked from reproductive rights.

Of all the mechanisms created within the UN system to enhance gender perspectives on human rights, only in the work of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women does one see a comprehensive linkage of gender and sexuality, including sexual orientation. The previous Rapporteur was the first UN human rights expert to explicitly articulate a concept of sexual rights. While speaking of these as part of a “fourth generation” of women’s rights, she has described sexual rights as a constellation of existing rights, including “the right to information, based upon which one can make informed decisions about sexuality; the rights to dignity, to privacy and to physical, mental and moral integrity in realizing a sexual choice; and the right to the highest standard of sexual health.”^{102,103}

Sexual Rights: A Broader Palette

The discourse of sexual rights offers new conceptual and strategic tools for future work within the UN system. This discourse is the product of increasing dialogue and collaboration between activists and social movements working on sexuality from a number of different perspectives, including women's rights, population and development, reproductive health, HIV/AIDS, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender rights.¹⁰⁴ This dialogue across disciplines has led to attempts to situate sexuality within a more comprehensive human rights framework and to explore commonalities between disparate struggles.

The sexual rights discourse builds on the limited articulation of sexual rights at Cairo and Beijing, as well as on existing case law on sexual orientation and standards regarding. It embraces a more affirmative and emancipatory vision of sexuality, seen not just as something to be protected from violence or other interference, but also as a social good to be respected, protected, and fulfilled. The principles underpinning these rights have variously been identified as "autonomy," "empowerment," "bodily integrity," and "respect for sexual and family diversity."¹⁰⁵

The concept of sexual rights enables us to address the intersections between sexual-orientation discrimination and other sexuality issues—such as restrictions on all sexual expression outside marriage or abuses against sex workers—and to identify root causes of different forms of oppression. It also offers strategic possibilities for building bridges and coalitions between diverse movements so as to confront common obstacles more effectively (such as religious fundamentalism) and explore how different discourses of subordination work together.

Sexual rights make a strong claim to universality, since they relate to an element of the self common to all humans: their sexuality. The concept therefore avoids the complex task of identifying a fixed sub-category of humanity to whom these rights apply. It proposes an affirmative vision of sexuality as a fundamental aspect of being human, as central to the full development of human health and personality as one's freedom of conscience and physical integrity. Sexual rights offer enormous transformational potential,

not just for society's "sexual minorities" but for its "sexual majorities" as well.¹⁰⁶

Exploring the Right to Sexual Health As a Sexual Right

The many dimensions of human sexuality—physical, mental, spiritual, social, associational—intersect with a multiplicity of rights. Developments in early 2004 indicate that a particularly fruitful avenue for sexual-rights advocacy—and a major area of contestation—in the coming years will be around the right to sexual health.

Within the UN system, the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health, Paul Hunt, has significantly advanced the thinking on the links between sexuality, health, and rights. His report to the Commission on Human Rights in 2004 includes a particular focus on sexual and reproductive health, as a contribution to the 10th anniversary of the ICPD in Cairo.¹⁰⁷ It is groundbreaking in its attention to issues of sexual orientation and health, its analysis of what a human rights perspective can bring to sexual-health policy, and its call for greater attention to sexual rights.¹⁰⁸

The Rapporteur posits a rights-based approach to sexual health that transcends the medicalizing and moralizing approaches of much social policy in areas of sexuality. His report suggests a more comprehensive rights-based definition of sexual health than that included in the Cairo and Beijing instruments: sexual health is "a state of physical, emotional, mental and social well-being related to sexuality, not merely the absence of disease, dysfunction or infirmity."¹⁰⁹

A rights-based approach to sexual health "requires a positive and respectful approach to sexuality and sexual relationships, as well as the possibility of having pleasurable and safe sexual experiences, free of coercion, discrimination, and violence."¹¹⁰ Human rights also impose clear and measurable obligations on relevant authorities and can empower individuals and communities to see their health needs as legitimate entitlements to be claimed from service providers.

Affirming that "sexuality is a characteristic of all human beings [and] a fundamental aspect of an individual's identity," he concludes that "the correct understanding of

fundamental human rights principles, as well as existing human rights norms, leads ineluctably to the recognition of sexual rights as human rights. Sexual rights include the right of all persons to express their sexual orientation, with due regard for the well-being and rights of others, without fear of persecution, denial of liberty or social interference."¹¹¹

Although the Rapporteur's focus on sexual and reproductive health and rights drew criticism from several governments at the Commission on Human Rights, including the U.S., Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt, these rights received another important re-affirmation by the Commission in a resolution on violence against women—a resolution that echoed the sexual rights language of the Beijing Platform for Action.¹¹² The 2004 Commission can therefore be recognized as a turning point in the struggle to link rights, health, and sexuality.

Nevertheless, a measure of the battles ahead lies in the fact that the March 2004 meeting of the Conference on Population and Development to mark the 10th anniversary of the Cairo Platform for Action was unable to agree on a resolution reaffirming the Cairo commitments following concerns raised by the United States and others that these might endorse same-sex marriage and abortion.¹¹³ The next stages of the Cairo and Beijing review processes will be important fronts on which to defend and promote the right to sexual health as part of the broader struggle for sexual rights.

Conclusion

It is clear that, 10 years on from *Toonen*, the momentum at the UN for addressing issues of sexual orientation within a broader framework of sexual rights is unstoppable. Both the emergence of a global movement of human rights defenders working on these issues and the increasing support of governments from the North and South suggest that we are at a crucial turning point in the recognition of sexual rights at the UN. But sexual rights can be expected to remain a contested area of human rights as sexuality increasingly becomes a site of struggle between traditionalist and modernizing forces, both within and across cultures.¹¹⁴ The promotion and defense of these rights will therefore de-

mand priority attention on the human rights and health agendas over the next 10 years.

There are a number of immediate steps that the UN's expert human rights bodies could take to ensure that their findings are no longer ignored or dismissed by recalcitrant states. These include: undertaking specific studies on human rights and sexuality; considering the desirability of a dedicated thematic mandate; using all available mechanisms to hold governments to their obligations under the range of human rights treaties; factoring sexuality into the on-going process of gender integration and sharing best practices among different bodies; and strengthening contacts with human rights defenders working on sexuality issues while eliminating barriers to their effective participation in the UN system.

Despite persistent attempts to roll back the gains, *Toonen's* anniversary should be marked as the year in which sexuality broke free of the brackets that have contained and silenced it for more than a decade.

References

1. Human Rights Committee, *Toonen v. Australia*, Communication No. 488/1992, 31 March 1994, para 8.7.
2. S. Joseph, "Toonen v. Australia," *University of Tasmania Law Review* 13 (1994).
3. Examples include the successful challenges to "sodomy" laws in South Africa (*National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality v. Minister of Justice*, Constitutional Court of South Africa, CCT 11/98, October 1998) and in the U.S. state of Texas (*Lawrence v. Texas*, 123 S. Ct. 2472, 2003).
4. *Toonen v. Australia* (see note 1), para 8.5.
5. Gender identity refers to a person's deeply felt sense of belonging to a gender and the sense of conformity or non-conformity between their gender and their biological sex. Although distinct from sexual orientation, it is intimately linked both as an aspect of identity/behavior and as a reason for abuse or discrimination.
6. The ICPD Program of Action affirmed that women's reproductive rights include "the right to a safe and satisfying sex life" and recognized that "the purpose of sexual health is the enhancement of life and personal relations, and not merely counseling and care related to reproduction and sexually transmitted diseases." International Conference on Population and Development, Program of Action, A/CONF.171/13/Rev.1, 13 September 1994, para 7.2.
7. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Preliminary Report submitted by the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women,

E/CN.4/1995/42 (1994), paras 58-69.

8. Twelve years before its decision on *Toonen*, the Human Rights Committee had found that the criminal prosecution of a Finnish television broadcaster for airing a debate on homosexuality was not in breach of the ICCPR as such a program “could be judged as encouraging homosexual behavior... In particular, harmful effects on minors cannot be excluded.” *Hertzberg v. Finland*, Communication No. 61/1979, 2 April 1982, para 10.4.

9. Commission on Human Rights, Summary record of the 49th meeting, E/CN.4/2004/SR.49, 22 April 2004, para 100.

10. Statement by the Permanent Mission of Brazil, cited in “UN Sexual Orientation Bid in Trouble After Sponsor Bails Out,” CNSNews.com, 3/30/04.

11. Action Canada for Population and Development, *An NGO Guide to Human Rights and Sexual Orientation at the UN Commission on Human Rights* (Ottawa: Action Canada for Population and Development, 2003).

12. Other aspects include protections from sexual violence, coercion around partner choice, and the criminal regulation for consensual sex. For an overview of work on sexuality and human rights, see S. Fried, “Annotated Bibliography: Sexuality and Human Rights” in this issue of *Health and Human Rights* and International Working Group on Sexuality and Social Policy, *Annotated Bibliography on Sexual Rights* (New York: Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, 2004).

13. Three previous decisions by the European Court of Human Rights had found such laws to be in breach of the right to privacy under the European Convention on Human Rights. See *Dudgeon v. UK* 45 Eur. Ct. H.R. (ser. A), 1981; *Norris v. Ireland* 142 Eur. Ct. H.R. (ser. A), 1988; and *Modinos v. Cyprus* 259 Eur. Ct. H.R. (ser. A), 1993.

14. *Toonen v. Australia* (see note 1), para 8.7.

15. The treaty bodies are committees set up under seven international human rights treaties—the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the Convention against Torture, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families—to monitor compliance by States party. The Committees, made up of experts from around the world, examine periodic reports submitted by the States parties, often in light of information from non-governmental organizations, and issue Concluding Observations and Recommendations to governments. The Committees also publish General Comments elucidating the treaties’ provisions. Five of the Committees can adjudicate individual complaints. The Committees’ decisions, Concluding Observations and General Comments, although not in themselves legally binding, are considered authoritative interpretations of binding treaties and are therefore valuable advocacy tools. The

Migrant Workers' Convention only entered into force in July 2003 and its Committee met for the first time in 2004. For more on the UN treaty bodies, see Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, *Treaty Bodies*. Available at: www.unhcr.ch/pdf/leafletontreatybodies.pdf.

16. See for example, Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee: Tanzania, CCPR/C/79/Add.97 (1998), para 23; Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee: Romania, CCPR/C/79/Add.111 (1999), para 16; Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Concluding Observations of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: Cyprus, E/C.12/1/Add.28 (1998), para 7; Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, Concluding Observations of Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Kyrgyzstan, CEDAW/C/1999/1/L.1/Add.3 (1999), paras 34 and 35.

17. See for example Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee: United States of America, CCPR/C/79/Add.50 (1995), para 287; Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee: Chile, CCPR/C/79/Add.104 (1999), para 20. For the death penalty and other cruel, inhuman, and degrading punishments see Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee: Sudan, CCPR/C/79/Add.85 (1997), para 8.

18. Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee: Colombia, CCPR/C/79/Add.76 (1997), para 16; Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee: El Salvador, CCPR/CO/78/SLV (2003), para 16.

19. Committee against Torture, Concluding Observations of the Committee against Torture: Egypt, CAT/C/CR/29/4 (2002), para 5(e); Committee against Torture, Concluding Observations of the Committee against Torture: Brazil, CAT/A/56/44 (2001), para 119.

20. Committee against Torture, Concluding Observations of the Committee against Torture: Venezuela, CAT/C/CR/29/2 (2002), para 10; Human Rights Committee, Summary Record of the 1645th Meeting of the Human Rights Committee, CCPR/C/SR.1645 (1998), para 48 (regarding Zimbabwe).

21. In regards to protecting refugees fleeing persecution on grounds of sexual orientation, see Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Sweden, CEDAW/A/56/38 (2001), para 334. In a case heard under its individual complaint procedure, the Committee against Torture considered unfounded the complainant's claim that he would be at risk of torture if returned from the Netherlands to Iran because his homosexuality was known to the authorities. Committee against Torture, *K. S. Y. v. The Netherlands*, Communication No. 190/2001, 26 May 2003. In regard to the arbitrary deportation of non-nationals, see Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee: Zimbabwe, CCPR/C/79/Add.89 (1998), para 24.

22. See for example the concerns of the Human Rights Committee in its 1982 decision *Hertzberg v. Finland* (see note 8).

23. Committee on the Rights of the Child, Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child: United Kingdom, CRC/C/15/Add.188 (2002), para 43.
24. Committee on the Rights of the Child (see note 23), para 44; Committee on the Rights of the Child, Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child: United Kingdom, CRC/C/15/Add. 134 (2000), paras 22 and 23; Committee on the Rights of the Child, Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child: United Kingdom, CRC/C/15/Add.135 (2000), paras 25 and 26; Committee on the Rights of the Child, Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child: Austria, CRC/C/15/Add.98 (1999), para 16. The Human Rights Committee has also criticized Austria's discriminatory age of consent laws. See Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee: Austria, CCPR/C/79/Add.103 (1998), para 13.
25. Committee on the Rights of the Child, General Comment No. 3: HIV/AIDS and the Rights of Children, CRC/GC/2003/3 (2003), para 8; Committee on the Rights of the Child, General Comment No. 4: Adolescent Health and Development, CRC/GC/2003/4 (2003), para 6.
26. Committee on the Rights of the Child, Report on the 28th Session, CRC/C/111 (2001), para 727.
27. Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, General Comment 14: The Right to the Highest Attainable Standard of Health, E/C.12/2000/4 (2000), para 18.
28. For employment, see Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Concluding Observations of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: Ireland, E/C.12/1/Add.35 (1999), para 5. For housing, see Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Summary Record of the 14th Meeting: Netherlands, E/C.12/1998/SR.14 (1998), para 42. For the right to water, see Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, General Comment 15 on the Right to Water, E/C.12/2002/11 (2003), para.13.
29. See Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, General Recommendation 19: Violence against Women, A/47/38 (1992); Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, General Recommendation 24: Women and Health, A/54/38/Rev.1 (1999).
30. While not having addressed sexuality or gender identity explicitly in its country-monitoring or individual-complaints procedure, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination has highlighted the link between racism and other forms of discrimination, including sexual-orientation discrimination. See Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Background Paper for the World Conference against Racism, E/CN.4/1999/WG.1/BP.7 (1999).
31. For example, the HRC, the CESCR, and the CRC have all called on states to include sexual orientation in anti-discrimination legislation and to ensure its effective implementation in practice. Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee (Hong Kong): China, CCPR/C/79/Add.117 (1999), para 15; Human Rights Committee, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee: Trinidad and Tobago, CCPR/CO/70/TTO (2000), para 11; Human Rights Committee, Summary Record of the 1764th Meeting: Poland,

CCPR/C/SR.1764 (1999), para 5; Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, Concluding Observations of the Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights: Finland, E/C.12/2000/SR.63 (2000), para 71.

32. For an example of differing opinions among Committee members, see the CESCR's discussions on same-sex partnership and adoption rights in the context of Article 10 of the ICESCR (protection of the family), where some individual members have argued that legalizing same-sex partnerships "eroded the concept of the family as articulated in the Covenant" (Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, Summary Record of the 12th Meeting: Denmark, E/C.12/1999/SR.12 (1999), para 137) and that granting adoption rights to lesbian or gay individuals or couples might leave children at risk of sexual abuse (Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, Summary Record of the 124th Meeting: Netherlands E/C.12/1998/SR.14 (1998), para 22).

33. Human Rights Committee, *Juliet Joslin et al. v. New Zealand* Communication No 902/1999: New Zealand, CCPR/C/75/D/902/1999.

34. The authors canvassed and rebutted a whole series of justifications that might be advanced to bar same-sex marriage, concluding that "society and the State have programmed their selective memories to construct marriage as inherently and naturally heterosexual, thereby clearly excluding access by 'deviant others' to marriage." Human Rights Committee (see note 33), para 5.2. The quote in the body of the article is from para 8.2.

35. See Human Rights Committee, General Comment 19: Protection of the Family (1990), para 2; Human Rights Committee, General Comment 28: Equality of Rights between Men and Women (2000), paras 23 and 27; Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, General Recommendation 21: Equality in Marriage and family relations (1994), paras 13-18. The European Court of Human Rights has also interpreted the right to marry in a dynamic way; see *Christine Goodwin v. the UK*, ECHR (2002). For an international survey of evolving legal interpretations, see R. Wintemute and M. Andenaes (eds.), *Legal Recognition of Same-Sex Partnerships* (Oxford: Hart, 2001).

36. Human Rights Committee, *Young v. Australia*, Communication No. 941/2000: Australia, CCPR/C/78/D/941/2000 (2003).

37. Human Rights Committee (see note 36), Appendix: Individual opinion by Committee members Ruth Wedgwood and Franco DePasquale.

38. In contrast to the treaty bodies, the CHR's special procedures can scrutinize the human rights performance of countries regardless of the treaties they have ratified. There is far greater scope for analysis of patterns, causes and consequences of violations in their work, which often draws on academic scholarship or input from NGOs, and more leeway to determine areas of research or inquiry. Some have proactively sought contact with LGBT rights organizations.

39. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, *Violence against Women in the Community*, E/CN.4/1997/47 (1997), para 8.

40. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special

Rapporteur on Violence against Women, *Violence against Women in the Family*, E/CN.4/1999/68 (1999), paras 6-18; United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, *Cultural Practices that are Violent Towards Women*, E/CN.4/2002/83 (2002), paras 99-104.

41. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, *Women's Reproductive Rights and Violence against Women*, E/CN.4/1999/68/Add.4 (1999), para 5; United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, E/CN.4/2003/75 (2003), para 65.

42. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, E/CN.4/2004/66 (2004), paras 35-39.

43. See, for example, United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur, E/CN.4/2001/9 (2001), para 50. Her reports have also included specific recommendations regarding the investigation of homophobic crimes and the implementation of policies to combat prejudice among public officials and the general public.

44. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on Torture, E/CN.4/2002/76 (2001). "Torture and discrimination against sexual minorities" are included as special concerns.

45. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on Torture, E/CN.4/2004/56 (2004), para 64.

46. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary General on Human Rights Defenders, E/CN.4/2001/94 (2001), para 89(g). The Special Representative has signaled her intention to undertake or encourage further study of these risks so as to draw up a "compendium of possible measures" for protection.

47. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Health, E/CN.4/2004/49 (2004), paras 33, 38, and 39. This report is analyzed in the final section of this article.

48. For the right to education, see United Nations Economic and Social Council, Annual Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education, E/CN.4/2001/52 (2001), para 75. For freedom of expression, see United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression, *Mission to Argentina* E/CN.4/2004/75/Add.1 (2004), para 124. For due process, see United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers, E/CN.4/2003/65 (2003), Annex: Bangalore Principles for Judicial Conduct (sexual orientation is included in their equal treatment provisions). For the right to housing, see United Nations Economic and Social Council, Second Progress Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Housing, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1994/20 (1994), which includes reference to "sexual orientation" discrimination in the draft International Convention on the Right to Housing. For the right to a remedy, see United Nations Economic and Social Council, Final Report of the Special Rapporteur on Right to Restitution, E/CN.4/2000/62 (2000), para 27.

49. United Nations Economic and Social Council, WGAD Opinion No. 7 (Egypt), E/CN.4/2003/8 (2001). See also Human Rights Watch, *In a Time*

of Torture: The Assault on Justice in Egypt's Crackdown on Homosexual Conduct (New York: HRW, 2004) and S. Long, "When Doctors Torture: The Anus and the State in Egypt and Beyond" in the present issue of *Health and Human Rights*.

50. The Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights consists of 26 independent experts elected by the Commission on Human Rights. Although nominated by governments, they act in their personal capacities. The Sub-Commission's functions include "to make recommendations to the Commission concerning the prevention of discrimination of any kind" (www.unhchr.ch/html/menu2/2/sc.htm). For an example of calls by NGOs to study the links between sexual-orientation discrimination, health, and human rights, see the Statement made by Amnesty International to the Sub Commission, 8/14/01 (available at action.web.ca/home/lgbt). One Sub-Commission member, Louis Joinet, proposed a dedicated study in preparation for the World Conference on Racism, noting "it would be unfortunate if the World Conference ignored discrimination against homosexuals, which was a major aspect of discrimination." United Nations Economic and Social Council, Summary Record of the 17th Meeting of the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, E/CN.4/Sub.2/2000/SR.17 (2000).

51. Sub-Commission references to the non-discrimination principle can be found in, for example, United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Special Rapporteur on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, E/CN.4/Sub.2/1992 (1992), para 185; United Nations, Working Paper on Further Proposals for the Work of the World Conference on Racism, A/CONF.189/PC.2/19/Add.1 (2001), para 5; United Nations Economic and Social Council, Proposed Draft Human Rights Code of Conduct for Companies, E/CN.4/Sub.2/2000/WG.2/WP.1/Add.1 (2000).

52. See Amnesty International, "Commission on Human Rights: Weakening Commitment to its own Procedures," Amnesty International Press Release, 4/20/04; Amnesty International, "Commission on Human Rights: Where Is the Reform Agenda?," Amnesty International Press Release, 4/22/04.

53. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Draft Resolution: Human Rights and Sexual Orientation, E/CN.4/2003/L.92 (2003).

54. Action Canada for Population and Development (see note 11), p. 31. The draft resolution merely expressed "deep concern" at the occurrence of human rights violations all over the world on grounds of sexual orientation and called on states and relevant UN human rights bodies to give due attention to these violations. It did not propose creating any new international standards or mechanisms to protect against sexuality-related abuses.

55. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Proposed Amendments by Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Egypt, Libya and Malaysia, E/CN.4/2003/L.106-110 (2003).

56. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Organization of the Work of the 59th Session of the Commission on Human Rights, E/CN.4/2003/118 (2003).

57. Although not a UN member state, the Holy See (representing the lead-

ership of the Catholic Church and the inhabitants of the Vatican) has permanent UN observer status. For an analysis of the Holy See's resistance to sexual and reproductive rights at the UN, see Center for Reproductive Rights, *The Holy See at the United Nations, An Obstacle to Women's Reproductive Health And Rights* (New York: Center for Reproductive Law and Policy, 2000). Available at: www.crlp.org

58. While Brazil professed its continued commitment to the resolution, NGO advocates in Geneva alleged that Brazil had ceded to OIC threats to boycott a forthcoming trade meeting in Brazil unless the resolution was withdrawn. "Homosexual Rights Resolution Withdrawn at United Nations," *The Washington Times*, 3/30/04.

59. Letter from the Permanent Mission of Pakistan on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Conference, 2/26/04, and Letter from the Permanent Mission of the Holy See, 3/1/04.

60. For example, draft CHR resolutions tabled in recent years endorsing the findings of the Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial, Arbitrary and Summary Executions have prompted controversy over the inclusion of references to "killings based on sexual orientation," and have often been subjected to a vote following objections by several Islamic countries. In 2001 this resulted in the replacement of the reference with the phrase "all killings committed for any discriminatory reason," deliberately obscuring the issue. See United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report on Extrajudicial, Summary or Arbitrary Executions, E/CN.4/RES/2000/31 (2000), para 6; United Nations Economic and Social Council, Summary Record of the 72nd Meeting of the Commission on Human Rights, E/CN.4/2001/SR.72 (2001).

61. See for example the critique by Kathryn Balmforth, Director of the World Family Policy Center, Brigham Young University, that "The UN is being taken over by the radical feminists, population control ideologues, and homosexual rights activists who make up the anti-family movement. ... The ongoing takeover of some of the human rights mechanisms of the United Nations ... is a potential threat to the rights of people everywhere to enjoy their own cultures and religions." K. Balmforth, "Hijacking Human Rights." Available at: pw1.netcom.com/~efny/congress%20speech.htm

62. For a full account of the sexual orientation debate at Beijing, see G. Careaga Pérez, *Sexual Orientation in Women's Struggle* (El Closet de Sor Juana/ILGA, 2003).

63. While fraught with conflict, the review processes succeeded in reaffirming the Beijing and Cairo commitments and articulating strategies for implementation and evaluation. Center for Reproductive Rights, *ICPD+5: Gains for Women Despite Opposition* (New York: Center for Reproductive Law and Policy, 1999). Available at: www.crlp.org

64. The reference was deleted after the Pakistani delegate accused Western delegations of "holding the women of the world hostage to one term, 'sexual orientation,'" when their real needs were clean water and help in overcoming illiteracy. D. Sanders, "Getting Lesbian and Gay

Issues on the International Human Rights Agenda," *Human Rights Quarterly*, 18/1 (1996): pp. 67-106.

65. Regarding the breaking of taboos see R. Parker, "Sexual Rights: Concepts and Action," *Health and Human Rights* 2/3 (1997): pp. 31-37. See also United Nations Economic and Social Council, The Protection of Human Rights in the Context of HIV/AIDS, E/CN.4/2003/81 (2003), paras 10 and 28. Regarding the change in the text of the Declaration of Commitment see International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, "Human Rights Activist Banned from Speaking at UN-GASS," IGLHRC, 06/22/01.

66. World Conference against Racism, Draft Program of Action, A/CONF.189/5/Corr.1, 2 September 2001, para 68.

67. Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, A/CONF.177/20, 15 September 1995, para 96.

68. The Beijing Conference, in particular, marked a turning point in the engagement and visibility of lesbian rights activists with UN processes. See for example the statement made by Palesa Beverlie Ditsie on behalf of the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission to the Plenary on September 13th, 1995: "If these words [sexual orientation] are omitted from the relevant paragraphs, the Platform for Action will stand as one more symbol of the discrimination that lesbians face and of the lack of recognition of our very existence." See also C. Bunch and C. Hinojosa, "Lesbians Travel the Roads of Feminism Globally" in J. D'Emilio, W. Turner, and U. Vaid (eds.) *Creating Change: Sexuality, Public Policy and Civil Rights* (St. Martin's Press, New York, 2000).

69. For example, Statement by Dorothy Aken'Ova, International Centre for Reproductive Health and Sexual Rights (INCREASE), Nigeria, "Protecting Sexual Health and Rights of Vulnerable Groups", 4/14/04; Statement by Raquel Caballero, Centre for Global Women's Leadership, "The LGBT Situation in Paraguay with Respect to Torture and Arbitrary Detention." Statement by Wendy Isaack, Lesbian and Gay Equality Project, South Africa, "Violence against Women." Three NGO panels were organized between March 30th and April 1st, 2004 on human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity, with a focus on the experiences of people from the global South.

70. For example, among the many governments at Beijing who spoke in favor of including sexual orientation, Switzerland said deleting the reference "would not delete the people it is intended to protect." At the Durban conference, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Ecuador, and Guatemala stated that sexual orientation was a human rights issue which could no longer be ignored at the UN and called for "more in-depth analysis, discussion and debate to contribute to the development of worldwide consensus on this matter" (Joint statement by Brazil, Canada, Chile, Ecuador and Guatemala, 9/7/01).

71. M. Castells, *The Power of Identity* (Oxford: Blackwells, 1998), p. 242.

72. See for example the amendments proposed by Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Egypt, Libya, and Malaysia to the Brazilian resolution to the CHR in 2003 on human rights and sexual orientation, which delete all references to sexual orientation and insert language affirming respect for "cultural di-

versity," "cultural pluralism," and the preservation of "cultural heritage and traditions." United Nations Economic and Social Council (see note 55).

73. The discourses structuring these narratives often identify the state as heterosexual and homosexuality as the foreign "other." Within societies, homophobia is stoked and inflamed for political reasons in order to demarcate boundaries of citizenship and national belonging. Such discourses are an integral part of the justifications currently invoked by governments in international human rights forums that there are "compelling state interests" for denying equal rights to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people. See C. Stychin, *A Nation by Rights: National Cultures, Sexual Identity Politics and the Discourse of Rights* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998).

74. For an extensive analysis of how states have used claims of sovereignty to marginalize and attack organizing around sexuality-related rights, including at the Beijing World Conference on Women, see C. Rothschild and S. Long, *Written Out: How Sexuality is Used to Attack Women's Organizing* (New York: IGLHRC and Center for Women's Global Leadership, 2000).

75. A. Rao, "The Politics of Gender and Culture in International Human Rights Discourse" in J. Peters and A. Wolper (eds.) *Women's Rights as Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

76. For example, some Southern African leaders have defended their country's "sodomy" laws on grounds that homosexuality is a foreign disease alien to local norms and traditions. Ironically, it is not same-sex behavior, but the laws prohibiting it that are the colonial imposition, as well as the social and scientific construct of "homo/hetero-sexuality" that such laws enshrine. The ways in which homophobia has been manipulated for political purposes by some Southern African governments is analyzed in Human Rights Watch, *More Than a Name: State-sponsored Homophobia and its Consequences in Southern Africa* (New York: Human Rights Watch, 2003).

77. F. Girard, *Global Implications of U.S. Domestic and International Policies on Sexuality*. (International Working Group on Sexuality and Social Policy, Working Papers No. 1, June 2004, available at www.healthsciences.columbia.edu/dept/sph/cgsh.html); R. Petchesky, *Reproductive and Sexual Rights: Charting the Course of Transnational Women's NGOs* (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, 2000), p. 15; International Women's Health Coalition, *Bush's Other War*, IWHC Fact Sheet, 2002. Available at: www.iwhc.org

78. "While the significance of national and regional particularities and various historical, cultural and religious backgrounds must be borne in mind, it is the duty of States, regardless of their political, economic and cultural systems, to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms." United Nations, Vienna Declaration and Program of Action, A/CONF.157/23 (1993), para 5.

79. E. Heinze, "Sexual Orientation and International Law: A Study in the Manufacture of Cross-Cultural 'Sensitivity,'" *Michigan Journal of International Law* 22 (2001): p. 284. Heinze criticizes the "cross-cultural

sensitivity game" played by sympathetic governments who refrain from advancing issues of sexual orientation on the UN agenda for fear jeopardizing the UN consensus.

80. G. Herdt, *Same Sex, Different Cultures* (Oxford: Westview Press, 1997).

81. S. Katyal, "Exporting Identity," *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism*, 14/1 (2002): pp. 97-176; O. Phillips, "Constituting the Global Gay" in D. Herman and C. Stychin (eds.) *Sexuality in the Legal Arena* (London: Athlone, 2000); B. Adam, J. Duyvendak, and A. Krouwel (eds.) *The Global Emergence of Gay and Lesbian Politics* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998).

82. Amnesty International, *Crimes of Hate, Conspiracy of Silence* (New York: Amnesty International, 2001), pp. 53-58.

83. For example, at the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on HIV/AIDS in June 2001, the General Assembly spent almost three hours and cast three separate votes to decide whether to accredit a representative of the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (IGLHRC) to deliver a three-minute speech at a human rights round-table discussion. International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (see note 65). At the Durban Conference, a decision on whether to grant accreditation to the International Lesbian and Gay Association was, exceptionally, put to a vote and narrowly defeated.

84. United Nations Economic and Social Council (see note 46).

85. The fate of the Brazil resolution is only one recent indication of some governments' reluctance to recognize the principle. See, for example, the failure of the Consultative Meeting on the Draft Basic Principles on the Right to a Remedy to agree on the inclusion of the term "sexual orientation" as a recognized category for protection against discrimination. United Nations Economic and Social Council, Report of the Consultative Meeting, E/CN.4/2003/63 (2002), paras 65 and 66.

86. For an overview of relevant international case-law beyond the UN, see Human Rights Watch, *Resource Library for International Jurisprudence on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity*. Available at: www.hrw.org

87. For a more detailed analysis of the shortcomings of "privacy" and "non-discrimination" based approaches, see N. Bamforth, *Sexuality Morals and Justice* (London: Cassell, 1997), chapter 6.

88. For example, in finding that laws criminalizing homosexual sex breached the right to privacy in the case of *Dudgeon v. UK*, the European Court of Human Rights argued that "decriminalization did not imply approval." *Dudgeon v. UK* (see note 13), para 61.

89. For example, Amnesty International (see note 82).

90. While it is perhaps fortunate that the treaty bodies have not followed the example of the concurring opinion in *Toonen*, which wades dubiously into explanations that sexual orientation is an "immutable status," the lack of clarification about the reasoning for reading "sexual orientation" into "sex" (or "other status" as the CESCR General Comments appear to do) fuels the perception that the non-discrimination norm is not well established.

91. See, for example *Grant v. South West Trains*, European Court of Justice, ECR C-249/96 (February 1996), cited by New Zealand in the case of *Juliet Joslin et al. v. New Zealand* (see note 33) as authority for the argument that denying benefits to same-sex partners was not sex discrimination. The drafters of the South African Constitution argued that a specific provision on sexual-orientation discrimination was necessary so as to acknowledge the historic injustices suffered by sexual minorities under apartheid and to promote understanding that sexual orientation is a characteristic analogous to race or gender. Constitutional Court of South Africa, *NCGLE v. Minister of Justice*, May 1998.
92. See A. Bayefsky, "The Principle of Equality or Non-Discrimination in International Law," *Human Rights Law Journal* 11 (1990): pp. 1-34.
93. Human Rights Committee, General Comment 18: Non-Discrimination (1989), para 13.
94. See C. Chinkin and H. Charlesworth, *The Boundaries of International Law: A Feminist Analysis* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), p. 49.
95. For the argument that there should be a new UN declaration or convention, see E. Heinze, (see note 79), p. 300.
96. E. Heinze, (see note 79), p. 300. The homo/hetero binary has its roots in 19th century science which pathologized homosexuality in contrast to healthy heterosexuality.
97. The particular difficulty of naming sexual dissidents as subjects of international standards has reinforced their invisibility and lack of protection. The seemingly impossible task is to deconstruct identity labels while at the same time defining them. However, the problem of defining and naming unstable categories is by no means unique to the area of sexuality: "race" and "gender" are also volatile social constructs rather than fixed or "natural." See A. Miller, "Sexual But Not Reproductive: Exploring the Junction and Disjunction of Sexual and Reproductive Rights," *Health and Human Rights* 4/2 (2000): pp. 71-75; E. Heinze, "The Construction and Contingency of Minority Groups" in D. Fottrell and B. Bowring (eds.) *Minority and Group Rights in the New Millenium* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1999).
98. C. Chinkin and H. Charlesworth (see note 94); A. Gallagher, "Ending the Marginalization: Strategies for Incorporating Women into the United Nations Human Rights System," *Human Rights Quarterly* 19/2 (1997): pp. 283-333.
99. Violence and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people are "gender-based" in that they are inflicted to enforce a rigid separation between the socially constructed roles of women and men. See J. Willets, "Conceptualizing Private Violence against Sexual Minorities as Gendered Violence: An International and Comparative Law Perspective," *Albany Law Review* 60/3 (1997).
100. On the aims of "gender mainstreaming," see United Nations Economic and Social Council, *The Question of Integrating the Human Rights of Women throughout the UN System*, E/CN.4/1998/49 (1998). For a critique of its effectiveness, see A. Miller, "Women's Human Rights NGOs and the Treaty Bodies: Some Case Studies in Using the Treaty

Bodies to Protect the Human Rights of Women" in A. Bayefsky (ed.) *The UN HR Treaty System in the 21st Century* (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2000).

101. As described above, the work of CEDAW and the Beijing process have focused on women's sexuality almost exclusively in the context of reproductive health. See A. Miller (see note 97).

102. R. Coomaraswamy, "Reinventing International Law: Women's Rights as Human Rights in the International Community," Edward A. Smith Visiting Lecture, Harvard Law School, 1997.

103. United Nations Economic and Social Council (see note 40), 1999, para 5.

104. R. Parker (see note 65); A. Miller, "Human Rights and Sexuality: First Steps towards Articulating a Rights Framework for Claims to Sexual Rights and Freedoms," American Society of International Law Proceedings, 1999.

105. R. Petchesky, "Sexual Rights: Inventing a Concept, Mapping an International Practice" in M. Blasius (ed.) *Sexual Identities, Queer Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001).

106. R. Petchesky (see note 105).

107. United Nations Economic and Social Council, (see note 47).

108. The Special Rapporteur cites the harmful health consequences for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people of legal prohibitions on same-sex relations and the widespread lack of protection against violence and discrimination, as an example of how discrimination and stigma can be "underlying determinants" bearing upon health status. Citing *Toonen*, he reminds states that they must ensure that sexual and other health information and services are available to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people. United Nations Economic and Social Council (see note 47), para 39.

109. United Nations Economic and Social Council (see note 47), para 53.

110. United Nations Economic and Social Council (see note 47), para 53.

111. United Nations Economic and Social Council (see note 47), para 54.

112. Commission on Human Rights, Resolution on Violence against Women, E/CN.4/2004/L.63 (2004), para 8.

113. CPD Briefing Note, 37th Session, 22-26 March 2004, Population Action International.

114. For a global overview of the political impact of social transformations in the area of sexuality and the family, see A. Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping our Lives* (London: Profile Books, 2002), Chapters 3-4.