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# Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BDS</th>
<th>Blue Diamond Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNMH</td>
<td>Centro Nacional de Memoria Histórica (National Centre of National Memory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil society organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>Disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARC</td>
<td>Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPV</td>
<td>Intimate partner violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSM</td>
<td>Men who have sex with men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPA</td>
<td>New People’s Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBV</td>
<td>Sexual and gender-based violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGM</td>
<td>Sexual and gender minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOGI</td>
<td>Sexual orientation and gender identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>Security sector reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPS</td>
<td>Women, peace and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSW</td>
<td>Women who have sex with women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key terminology

**Cisgender:** Denoting or relating to a person whose gender identity corresponds to the biological sex that they were assigned at birth.

**Gender:** The socially constructed roles, characteristics and behaviours considered appropriate for men and women respectively, which differ across cultures and time periods.

**Gender identity:** A person’s internal sense and experience of their own gender, which may or may not correspond with the sex they were assigned at birth or with the traditional categories of man/male and woman/female.

**Heteronormativity:** Beliefs, practices, attitudes and behaviours by which certain forms of heterosexuality are positioned as the only conceivable sexualities and the only way of being ‘normal’. By extension, heteronormativity also refers to cultural and social practices that cast perceived deviation from gender norms (for example, men being too ‘effeminate’), homosexuality, same-sex couples, trans and other non-binary identities, practices and ways of living as abnormal or deviant.

**Homophobia:** Beliefs, practices, attitudes and behaviours that express intolerance or hatred of homosexuality or someone who identifies as homosexual.

**Intersectionality:** The interconnected nature of social categorisations such as race, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, ability and social class, which overlap to create interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage. Originally coined by critical race theorist Kimberlé Crenshaw.

**LGBTI:** An acronym for lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex people that is widely used in the Western world and has been adopted by a variety of international institutions. Other formulations include LGBT+, LGBT* and LGBTQ (the ‘Q’ stands for ‘queer’).

**Gender policing:** The imposition or enforcement of traditional gender roles and expressions, particularly on individuals who through their appearance or behaviour are perceived to be deviating from their assigned roles according to their (presumed) biological sex or gender identity.

**Sex:** A biological categorisation assigned to an individual at birth, usually on the basis of secondary sex characteristics (genitalia) but also by reproductive and chromosomal markers. Generally either ‘male’ or ‘female’, but individuals may also be categorised as ‘intersex’, where a clear perception of male/female is not possible.

**SGMs:** Sexual and gender minorities, or SGMs, refers, for the purposes of this report, to people whose sexual orientation, gender identity or sexual practices fall outside traditional norms. It may also refer to people who are perceived as such by others, resulting in similar social exclusion and vulnerability.

**Sexual orientation:** An individual’s emotional, romantic and/or sexual attraction to a given sex or gender.

**SOGI:** Sexual orientation and gender identity, or SOGI, is an acronym used by a variety of organisations and researchers to refer to issues of gender and sexuality. It does not indicate a particular group, as all humans have a sexual orientation and multiple gender identities.

**Transgender:** An inclusive term that denotes any individual whose gender identity or expression differs from the sex they were assigned at birth.

**Transphobia:** Beliefs, practices, attitudes and behaviours that express intolerance or hatred of transgender people, or of variations of gender identity and gender expression.

---

1 K. Crenshaw, Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics, The University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1, 1989, pp.139–167
Executive summary

Peacebuilding, in its essence, is about building more inclusive and less violent societies, with gender often being one of the most salient factors impacting on social exclusion. Questions of sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) that do not fall into the binary categories of women and men or do not adhere to heterosexual norms have been largely absent from gender and peacebuilding research, policy and programming.

Based on our research conducted in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Lebanon and Nepal, as well as a review of secondary literature, we demonstrate how identifying – or being identified by others – as belonging to a sexual and gender minority (SGM) often adds additional layers of vulnerability, precariousness and danger to lives already under threat. While SGM persons often live in precarious conditions in peacetime, these are exacerbated in situations of violent conflict and displacement. As with other gendered vulnerabilities and power imbalances, pre-existing conditions of discrimination and exclusion are heightened and made more acute in these situations. Peacebuilding must therefore do a better job at understanding these dynamics and addressing them.

In this report, we:
- explore why broadening the debate on gender in peacebuilding to examine SGMs is necessary;
- highlight the multiplicity and particularity of vulnerabilities and needs faced by these individuals and communities due to dominant dynamics and norms of exclusion; and
- elaborate on some of the possible ways in which peacebuilding can better address these.

Our findings highlight that due to dominant social norms of exclusion, which can be mobilised in times of conflict and used strategically by conflict actors, SGM persons are often placed in particular positions of vulnerability. Furthermore, SGM individuals, couples and communities are likely to face exclusion, discrimination and violence not only from armed conflict actors but also from civilians, including close family members. Neither the end of a violent conflict nor an escape from a conflict zone automatically guarantees an end to these dynamics or the multiple dangers that SGM persons face.

If as peacebuilders we seek to support more inclusive societies, then we can take advantage of the opportunities that arise in the dynamics of post-conflict change that can open up spaces for reducing discrimination and violence against SGM communities and individuals. This can be done both by promoting more societal equality across the board and by integrating SGM perspectives into particular peacebuilding activities such as the reintegration of displaced populations and former combatants, access to justice or security sector reform (SSR). Engaging with SGM issues also allows for an examination of the dominant gender norms and exclusionary ideologies of many conflict actors.

Given the sensitivity of working on SGM issues, however, adopting a ‘do no harm’ approach is essential. This requires understanding the context in which one is working, listening to the needs and wishes of the intended beneficiaries, and working closely together with pre-existing local networks, initiatives and organisations active on the issue. It also means taking a more comprehensive approach to integrating gender into project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, with the aim of changing discriminatory and violent gender dynamics and norms that harm not only SGM people but also others in society, and perpetuate violent conflict.
Our examination of the needs and vulnerabilities of SGM persons in conflict-affected situations as well as the responses to them lead us to make the following recommendations for the peacebuilding sector:

1. There is a need for peacebuilding policy and practice to engage more with the fact that gender is not a binary categorisation of women and men only, and that non-heterosexual practices and identities should be taken into account when using a gender lens to understand and intervene in peacebuilding contexts. The concerns of SGM persons and communities need to be seen through a relational and intersectional lens, that is, understanding the interplay between gender and other social identity markers in defining behaviour, vulnerabilities and peacebuilding opportunities. In doing so, care should be taken to understand local SGM identities and practices in their diversity so as to avoid restricting analyses to those identities also present in Western conceptualisations.

2. Given the sensitivity of the issue and the sometimes extremely vulnerable position of SGM individuals and communities, ‘doing no harm’ is central. Working on these issues requires taking approaches that are conflict-sensitive, do not endanger the intended beneficiaries or the staff of the implementing agency and do not jeopardise other work. Work in this field needs to be carried out in a way that is sensitive to the wishes and needs of the intended beneficiaries and sensitive to the risk of a backlash if this is seen as an outside imposition. Likewise, those not directly working on SGM issues should ensure that they are not inadvertently causing harm to the intended beneficiaries.

3. As SGM issues have mostly been at the margins of conflict and peacebuilding research, policy and programming, there is an immense need to conduct more research to better understand what these issues are in particular geographical and thematic contexts, and for peacebuilding actors to have open discussions about what these findings mean for our work.

4. At the policy level, approaches to gender in peacebuilding such as the global women, peace and security (WPS) framework need to be broadened and deepened to not only refer to women and girls, or to women, men, girls and boys, but to expand this to cover all gender identities.

5. Peacebuilding work must do more to integrate SGM perspectives and broader understandings of gender identity into all peace-related activities, thereby addressing particular vulnerabilities and contributing to more inclusive, peaceful societies.

6. As actors in the peacebuilding field, we must all ensure that our internal mechanisms, policies and ways of working are non-discriminatory and inclusive, and take the safety, security and dignity of all beneficiaries, partners and staff into account, regardless of their SOGI.
1. Introduction

People whose gender identity lies beyond or between the categories of women and men – or who live and love outside the norms of heterosexuality – have been agents of change and builders of community throughout history and around the world. Across cultures and social strata, sexual and gender minorities (SGMs) are family members, workers, policy-makers, peacebuilders, soldiers, refugees and ordinary people. Their struggles for recognition and rights have strengthened wider movements for social justice, and the safe spaces they have forged amidst adversity have served as sites of tolerance and solidarity in often difficult times. Nonetheless, SGM individuals and communities continue to face violence and discrimination, in both conflict and peace, owing to the social norms and attitudes that denigrate their humanity and render them vulnerable.

At its core, peacebuilding is about building more inclusive and less violent societies, with gender often being one of the most salient factors impacting on exclusion. Questions of sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) that do not fall into the binary categories of women and men or do not adhere to heterosexual norms have been largely absent from gender and peacebuilding research, policy and programming. Identifying – or being identified by others – as lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans or intersex (LGBTI) or other non-mainstream SOGI, however, often adds additional layers of vulnerability, precariousness and danger to lives already under threat in situations of violent conflict and displacement. As with other gendered vulnerabilities and power imbalances, pre-existing conditions of discrimination and exclusion are heightened and exacerbated in these situations.

This lack of attention to SGM issues sits uneasily with inclusive approaches championed by peacebuilders. If one takes the premise that “building inclusive, sustainable, positive peace in societies affected by violent conflict requires analysing and addressing gendered power dynamics as well as gender roles and expectations”, then this implies including, as far as possible, everyone regardless of their SOGI and all gendered power dynamics. The ‘inclusive peace’ approach of peacebuilders is close to rights-based approaches, according to which human rights apply to all members of society, without discrimination. In addition, taking a needs-based approach should also lead to an examination of concerns relating to SGM people. If intervening actors and agencies really do seek to give priority to the needs of the most vulnerable, then it follows that many members of SGM communities would fall under this remit, including same-sex couples who may lose out on aid or other forms of support for lack of official recognition, or transgender or transsexual persons from poor socio-economic backgrounds who are often reliant on sex work for survival.

In this report, we:
- explore why broadening the debate on gender in peacebuilding to examine non-mainstream forms of SOGI is necessary;
- highlight the multiplicity and particularity of vulnerabilities and needs faced by these individuals and communities due to dominant dynamics and norms of exclusion; and
- elaborate on some of the possible ways in which peacebuilding can better address these.

Alert has been working in conflict-affected areas and on gender for the past 30 years, exploring dynamics and developing programmes that promote gender inclusivity. As an organisation, we consider gender – understood to encompass the ways in which we are, and are expected to be, women, men, girls, boys, trans or intersex persons – to be a central element in both conflict and peacebuilding:

“Gender is one of the factors that influence[s], positively and negatively, the ability of societies to manage conflict without resorting to violence. Since gender analysis can help us understand complex relationships, power relations and roles in society, it is a powerful tool for analysing conflict and building peace.”

Although the importance of gender has been recognised in the field of peacebuilding for several decades, people who do not conform to dominant heterosexual norms and binary gender identities have been largely absent from these discussions.

In conflict settings, SGM individuals and communities often have to confront violence, repression and discrimination. Violence against them emanates not only from armed security actors such as militaries, police and rebel factions, but also from other civilians, including in some cases from their own family members. The vulnerabilities that SGM people face are not innate to their SOGIs, but are determined by the currents of social exclusion and discrimination that condition their lives, which are often amplified in times of conflict. Furthermore, the onset of conflict, such as disasters, frequently leads to the loss and collapse of informal and often clandestine communities or peer support systems they have built up for themselves, increasing their vulnerability.

This report is based on research conducted by Alert in 2015–2016 in Bosnia and Herzegovina (by Henri Myrttinen), Lebanon (by Lana Khattab) and Nepal (by Jana Naujoks), as well as additional research commissioned by Alert in Colombia (by Diana López Castañeda) and Lebanon (by Charbel Maydaa of Mosaic and Georges Azzi of the Arab Foundation for Freedoms and Equality – Middle East and North Africa). The research consisted of interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs), as well as numerous interviews and discussions with human rights activists and researchers globally. In addition, extensive use was made of secondary literature, both academic research and grey literature published by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and rights groups, as well as national and international agencies. It also builds on previous research conducted by Alert in 2013 and 2014 in Burundi, Colombia, Lebanon, Nepal and Uganda. The research findings from the Lebanon and Nepal research have also been partially published elsewhere.

1.1 Regarding terminology

Before continuing, it is necessary to address the tricky and contested issue of terminology. While variations of LGBTI (e.g. LGBT, LGBT&Q, LGBTQ or LGBTIQ) are common in primarily, but not exclusively, Western discourses, these are not universally accepted. In fact, some of our local partners and research respondents objected to the categorisation, as well as to the term ‘queer’, for being too tied to Western understandings of SOGI and for not including the numerous local identities. In addition, the LGBTI acronym is based around a series of identity categories, and thus may not ring true for people who see sexual orientation as a particular set of sexual, affective and social practices rather than identities.

Finding an alternative terminology is not a straightforward process. The term ‘SOGI’ does not in itself delineate a particular group, as all humans have a sexual orientation and multiple gender identities. ‘Cisgender’, a term...
that has increasingly gained currency in academia and in some activist circles, is problematic in as much as it, depending on the definition, either draws the line between transgender persons and others, or between those who are comfortable with their socially assigned gender identity and those who are not, potentially pathologising fluid gender identities. Other terms that have been put forward include ‘sexual and gender dissidents’ or ‘non-conforming identities’, but these insinuate a level of active or passive resistance that may well not be there. Furthermore, such an insinuation of intentional resistance may put the intended beneficiaries at risk in societies where such identities are viewed with suspicion or hostility. We have therefore settled for SGMs, which is not a perfect fit by any means, and we in no way mean to imply through the use of the word ‘minority’ that the individuals and communities or their concerns are marginal – quite the opposite.

The question of appropriate terminology is not merely semantic but also politically important and of conceptual and practical concern. Politically, if the aim is to increase the visibility of particular groups and their concerns as well as to foster inclusivity, then this needs to be reflected in the language used. Conceptually and practically, language shapes our view of the world and our reactions to it. Groups and individuals who are not named will often not have their concerns taken into account – and the history of how gender has been understood in peacebuilding has plenty of these examples, be they male survivors of sexual violence or female ex-combatants. A complicating factor, which will be explored more below, is that, for SGM individuals and communities, societal invisibility may in many cases be a survival strategy.

Furthermore, the concepts we use may distort the way in which we understand and approach issues. In terms of SGMs and SOGI, for example, Western legal and advocacy approaches tend to focus on SGM identity, while in some contexts sexual and social practices may be seen as separate from one’s social identity. This also raises the question of whether and how to include men who have sex with men (MSM) or women who have sex with women (WSW) but do not identify as gay, lesbian or bisexual; or men and women who become targets of homo-, bi- or transphobic violence for being seen by others as not conforming to expectations of ‘real’ manhood or womanhood without self-identifying as a SGM person. For the purposes of this report, we will include these and specifically point them out when and where they face similar types of discrimination and vulnerability as SGM individuals and communities.

1.2 Heterogeneous categories

The use of aggregate categories such as SGMs or LGBTI also risks homogenising a very heterogeneous group of people. Lesbian women, gay men, bisexual women and men, trans and intersex persons, and other queer, non-binary or gender-fluid people face different challenges and these need to be understood in an intersectional manner. That is to say that age, class, ethnicity, caste, appearance, social capital (e.g. having or not having social and political connections), location, education, marital status, urban or rural settings, having official papers or not, religious and ethnic background as well as nationality all intersect with SOGI to determine the degree of vulnerability and extent of agency. While some forms of discrimination and vulnerability will be the same, a gay, upper-middle-class lawyer in his 50s is likely to have a different degree of agency and resources to draw upon than a 16-year-old, lower-class transgender sex worker in the same city – let alone someone in a rural area.

The more immediate goals of SGM rights movements of a single country may also vary widely. In Colombia, for example, while trans organisations broadly fight for the recognition of their rights and demands, transgender women have been lobbying for exemption from conscription into the armed forces, while transgender men have been pushing for the opposite – the right to serve in the armed forces. We are indebted to Nour Abu Assab from the Centre for Transnational Development and Collaboration (CTDC) for highlighting this. For a particular case study on the complexities of sexual orientation as separate from gender identities among MSM, see M.C. Alcano, Masculine identities and male sex work between East Java and Bali: An ethnography of youth, bodies, and violence, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

9 We are indebted to Nour Abu Assab from the Centre for Transnational Development and Collaboration (CTDC) for highlighting this.

10 For a particular case study on the complexities of sexual orientation as separate from gender identities among MSM, see M.C. Alcano, Masculine identities and male sex work between East Java and Bali: An ethnography of youth, bodies, and violence, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
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been globally much more visible in research (and campaigning) on SGM issues, followed by trans women, with lesbians, trans men, bisexuals and intersex persons often receiving – or demanding – less attention.12

At the risk of stating the obvious, although many religious groups, and nationalist and xenophobic movements seek to cast SGMs as a ‘Western’ import or invention, this is not the case. In addition to the identities covered by the LGBTI acronym, a plethora of local identities and practices exist across the planet, be it the hijra in South Asia, waria in Indonesia and Malaysia; fa'afafine in Samoa; burnesha in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and Macedonia; two-spirited people among North American First Nations; yan daudu among the Hausa in Nigeria; or practices of bacha posh in Afghanistan.13 One of the paradoxes of the rhetoric of SGM rights being a ‘Western’ import is that it was in fact often Western colonial powers that originally criminalised non-heterosexual practices and identities in various African, Asian and Middle Eastern countries – and in part it is anti-SGM discourses, be they secular or religious, that are coming from and/or being supported by globally active actors that are currently supporting an anti-SGM drive in these societies.14 That these long-standing forms of non-heterosexual identities and practices exist, however, does not automatically mean that they are not exposed to harassment, exploitation and discrimination. On the contrary, often they are associated with a precarious life at the margins of society. Furthermore, even in societies with comparatively low levels of discrimination, the needs/concerns of SGM people have often long been ignored and belittled as marginal concerns, and homo-, bi- and transphobic violence persists globally.15

SGM persons are not born vulnerable. Rather, it is social norms that discriminate against them and place them in positions of vulnerability. What is considered in a given society to be ‘non-mainstream’ gender behaviour or identity is also not an absolute. Rather, it is always defined in relation to what is seen as ‘normal’ (that is, heterosexual) and changes over time and cultural space: men holding hands publicly, for example, is seen as completely acceptable heterosexual behaviour in most cultures, but seen in parts of the West as ‘gay’.

---


13 In South Asian countries, and particularly India and Pakistan, the term hijra refers to individuals who were identified as male at birth but who live as women. Hijras have played a spiritual role in South Asian societies for centuries and are legally recognised in India as a third gender. Similarly, waria is a portmanteau of the Indonesian words for woman (wanita) and man (pria) that denotes gay men, drag queens and transgender women who are biologically male but embody a feminine spirit. Fa'afafine are individuals in Samoa who embrace both masculine and feminine traits, sometimes having been raised as such by their parents; and yan daudu is a Nigerian term for men who pursue feminine roles and behaviours. On the other hand, Burnesha, or ‘sworn virgin’, refers to biological females who have taken an oath of chastity and, in return, are allowed to live as men in terms of employment, property ownership and social status, particularly in Albania. Bacha posh is a cultural practice in Afghanistan whereby families without sons designate a daughter to be raised as a man and embody a masculine role in the family. ‘Two-spirit’ is an umbrella term that encompasses but also goes beyond the Western categories of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and non-binary identities among the North American First Nations, including a spiritual and ceremonial element that dates to pre-Columbian times in the Americas.


15 In a survey of 93,000 LGBTI respondents in the European Union, 26% reported having faced threats of violence due to their SOGI over the past five years, and among trans respondents this rose to 35%. Data from E. McAslan Fraser, Violence against LGBT people, VAWG helpdesk research report No. 75, London: UK Department for International Development, 2015.
1.3 Structure

This report first discusses the integration of SGM perspectives from an ‘inclusive peacebuilding’ perspective. Following on from this, it examines issues confronted by SGM individuals and communities in times of violent conflict and peace. Given the nature of the violence faced by SGM persons, both the violence experienced directly in conflict zones and also during displacement and post-conflict is considered. Next, how SGM perspectives might be better integrated into peacebuilding processes is outlined. This is looked at not only in ‘standard’ peacebuilding activities such as transitional justice, in particular with respect to sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV), and the disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) of ex-combatants and SSR, but also in peacebuilding more broadly. Lastly, how the integration of SGM perspectives could lead to both a better understanding of conflict and peacebuilding as well as better peacebuilding practice is summarised – while highlighting the necessary safeguards that need to be kept in mind. While our primary research was conducted in societies directly affected by violent conflict, we also on occasion draw on examples from societies that are not directly affected by conflict to underscore how violence and discrimination of SGM people do not disappear with the end of violent conflict.
2. SGMs and inclusive peacebuilding

Since the early 2000s, the issue of violence against SGM individuals and communities has slowly moved up on the international agenda. After the issue had been discussed by the United Nations (UN) Human Rights Council in 2011 and 2014, the United Nations Security Council held its first-ever debate on LGBTI rights in August 2015, prompted by violence by Islamic State against SGM persons in Iraq and Syria. Partly as a response to the Syrian and Iraqi conflicts, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) published a global report on SGM refugees and displaced persons, also in 2015. Later that year, the Colombian Centro Nacional de Memoria Histórica (National Centre of Historical Memory, CNMH) published a landmark report on the impacts of the decades-long civil war on LGBTI citizens. Nevertheless, in spite of these positive developments and certain other exceptions, the particular needs of SGM individuals and communities have largely been overlooked in academic, policy and NGO deliberations on and implementation of programming on gender, conflict and peacebuilding.

Examining the gendered dynamics of excluding SGM people can give us valuable insights into how violent ideologies function and how they are underpinned. Apart from the practical, conceptual and ethical reasons to integrate SGM issues into peacebuilding, examining the gendered dynamics of excluding SGM people can also give us valuable insights into how violent ideologies function and how they are underpinned. Militant xenophobic and ultra-nationalist groups, as well as hardline factions of all major world religions, have used SOGI rights as a rallying point for broader campaigns against increased gender equality, democratisation.

18 CNMH, Aniquilar la diferencia: Lesbianas, gays, bisexuales y transgeneristas en el marco del conflicto armado colombiano [Annihilating the difference: Lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgender people in the context of the Colombian armed conflict], Bogotá: CNMH, 2015
19 J.J. Hagen, Queering women, peace and security, International Affairs, 92(2), 2016, pp.313–332
or other processes seen as a threat to ‘traditional’ patriarchal cultural mores. On the other side of the debate, the espousal of SOGI rights has been used by some far-right groups in Western Europe as a cudgel against migrants, especially from Muslim societies, not primarily out of concern for the rights of SGM persons but rather out of Islamophobia. Given this global rallying power of SOGI issues for groups that are of concern for peacebuilders, a better understanding of these dynamics and their gendered underpinnings makes it possible to better counter them.

Examining the violence against and shunning of SGM persons and communities can also be revealing about the gendered ideologies and fears of the perpetrators at the personal and group levels, leading to a better understanding of the interplay between gender norms, gender identities, gendered power relations and violence. Thus, investigating SGM issues, including anti-SGM sentiment and violence, can be a way of getting to the heart of dominant heteronormative (and often violently masculinist) gender ideologies; to understanding how these perpetuate violence and unequal power relations; how they interact with ideologies of exclusion; and how they are driven by personal and communal insecurities and fears of the other.
3. Violence and vulnerability – in and out of conflict

3.1 Continuums of violence and discrimination

In many societies, discrimination means that states fail to provide for the security needs of SGM persons, leaving them in a position of vulnerability. In terms of survival mechanisms, many SGM individuals are forced to hide their gender identity vis-à-vis other members of society and, where possible, rely on clandestine networks of trust and mutual support. While conflict exacerbates SGM vulnerabilities and increases violence from certain groups (e.g. non-state armed actors, militias or security forces) that are not present or not endowed with similar degrees of power and impunity in peacetime, violence against SGM people exists within a continuum that crosses time and space, transcending the violent conflict itself. In other words, homo-, bi- and transphobic violence and discrimination does not start with the outbreak of conflict nor disappear with a ceasefire; likewise, escaping a conflict zone does not necessarily mean an end to an exposure to violence. SGM individuals and communities can face repression before conflict, such as in pre-war Syria; during conflict, not only from combatant groups but also from the broader population and extremist groups, as seen in Ukraine; in societies recovering from violent conflict such as Bosnia and Herzegovina; in countries affected by ‘frozen’ conflicts such as Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia; in contexts of gang violence, be it Honduras, Russia or South Africa; or even in societies generally considered to be at peace, such as across the European Union (EU).

For displaced SGM persons, fleeing a conflict zone does not necessarily mean escaping from violence and discrimination. But as our FGDs and interviews in Lebanon with Syrian, Iraqi and Palestinian SGM refugees have shown, they are exposed to violence across different settings and at different stages of their flight. The respondents have faced violence in smaller rural towns, in the bigger urban centres to which they had fled, at multiple stages of their flight to Lebanon, only to face continued violence in their new host countries specifically related to their SOGI. The threat of violence came from other family members and community members, from armed groups and state security actors, from other refugees and the host community, and exploitation and discrimination was omnipresent – even in presumed ‘safe spaces’ such as within the SGM community in Beirut, where their SOGI may be accepted but where they may still face discrimination for being Syrian and refugees.

23 J. Lytvynenko, Intolerance and violence against LGBT people is on the rise in war-torn Ukraine, Vice News, 8 September 2015, http://www.vice.com/read/in-war-torn-ukraine-there-is-no-time-for-lgbtq-rights
27 E. McAslan Fraser, Op. cit., 2015
28 Experiencing flight as a continuum of violence is of course not limited to SGM refugees, although their vulnerabilities are gendered differently. On SGBV experienced by refugees at different stages, see, for example, U. Krause, A continuum of violence? Linking sexual and gender-based violence during conflict, flight, and encampment, Refugee Survey Quarterly, 34(4), 2015, pp.1–19
Research by the Centre for Transnational Development and Collaboration showed that Syrian SGM refugees who had been placed in conservative satellite cities in Turkey to await processing were afraid to leave their homes. The study noted that Syrian SGM refugees faced additional stress of keeping their SOGI and relationships secret in refugee camps and interim housing that deny them privacy. Similarly, some refugees in European camps reported feeling the need to hide their SOGI to avoid discrimination, harassment or violence from other refugees, but also from members of the host community, service providers or security forces. Similar dynamics also emerged in our research in Colombia and Nepal, as well as in other countries, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo and Uganda.

Our research and that of others highlights that conflict-related violence against SGM people can be difficult to distinguish from the other forms of violence perpetrated against them. While conflict can exacerbate vulnerability and violence, many SGM individuals already experience high levels of physical and sexual violence in day-to-day life, be it from security forces, ideologically motivated groups, other citizens or even from their own families and communities. In addition, underreporting of attacks against them is commonplace, as reporting itself can lead to more violence either in retribution or from the security services to which the violence is reported. Violence has been integral to the experience of people marginalised for their SGM status in many different conflict-affected and displacement settings.

3.2 Intersectionality and differences in vulnerability

Conflict and displacement bring added layers of risk to the experience of SGM persons who are already facing pre-existing social discrimination and vulnerability, although the intensity of these often depends on the access of SGM people to financial and social capital (e.g. access to support networks, educational level), class, caste, ethno-religious background, age, dis-/ability, or urban and rural location. Another particular factor for SGM persons is their ‘visibility’ to others as such, as opposed to being able to ‘pass’ as ‘straight’, with many of our respondents remarking on how increased visibility led to increased targeting. In addition, social and political
activism can come at a lethal cost, as for example the brutal murder, mutilation and burning (and possible rape) of the trans activist and sex worker Hande Kader in Istanbul in August 2016 underscored, while the Azerbaijani gay activist Isa Shahmarli committed suicide in 2014 out of desperation over the situation of SGM individuals and communities in the country.\textsuperscript{38}

The degree of vulnerability and forms of discrimination and violence can differ from context to context, shifting the degree of danger in which trans persons, gay men, lesbian women, intersex people, bisexual women and men or other gender identities find themselves. For example, for lesbian, bi and trans women, as well as in some cases trans men, many of their vulnerabilities are comparable to those of heterosexual women – but exacerbated if their SOGI is revealed. An example of this is so-called ‘corrective rapes’ of suspected lesbians, which sometimes end in murder, in South Africa and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{39} Likewise, SGM people who are in precarious life situations – for example, engaging in sex work, living with addiction, accused of adultery or displaced as refugees – face similar vulnerabilities as others in these categories but theirs are heightened due to the way others in society judge their gender identity.

### 3.3 Forms of violence and discrimination

Some of the forms of violence and discrimination that SGM individuals and communities face in conflict and peacetime can be categorised as follows:

- targeted violence, including killing and sexual violence;
- policing of gender norms;
- blackmail and extortion; and
- rejection by family and other community members.

We use this division for the sake of classification, but the differentiation between these forms of violence is somewhat forced, as in practice many of these forms occur simultaneously and/or one form might lead to another.

José Fernando Serrano-Amaya classifies the motivations of armed groups for various forms of homo-, bi- and transphobic violence in conflict to include shaming, humiliation and dehumanisation of the victims/survivors, reinforcing territorial control, obtaining community support, re-educating and maximising resources and impeding social mobilisation in areas under their control.\textsuperscript{40} Thus, when armed actors carry out acts of violence against SGM people openly and publicly, they are working to maintain and promote particular visions of political and social life, violently asserting certain norms of masculinity and femininity.\textsuperscript{41} Some of the more hidden violence and exploitation of vulnerabilities of SGM persons may be linked to individualised displays of power and satisfaction of sexual desires, as well as greed.\textsuperscript{42}

### 3.4 Targeted violence against SGM persons

Armed groups of very different ideological persuasions have used targeted violence, including murder, against SGM persons. The most systematic targeting was arguably that by Nazi Germany, which led to the deaths of tens


\textsuperscript{40} J.F. Serrano-Amaya, Chiaroscuro: The uses of ‘homophobia’ and homophobic violence in armed conflicts and political transitions, PhD thesis, University of Sydney, 2014, pp.41–42


\textsuperscript{42} It should be noted that there is, across the board, very little in-depth research on perpetrators of sexual violence, abuse and exploitation in times of conflict and their motivations, even more so in the case of violence against SGM persons.
of thousands of gays, lesbians, bisexuals and trans persons. Syria and Iraq are currently the conflicts in which targeted violence against SGM people is most pronounced and visible. The violence committed by Islamic State, which includes the sentencing and the alleged execution of gay men by throwing them off buildings as well as targeted violence against lesbian women, has gained the most international prominence. However, other militias as well as state security forces have also targeted SGM individuals, including specifically lesbian women in Iraq and Syria for persecution, violence and murder.

Nonetheless, and as noted above, it is not only those self-identifying as a SGM person who are targeted. Iraqi men accused of being ‘effeminate’ and women accused of being too masculine (and therefore suspected of being gay or lesbian), based on their mannerisms, sartorial style, haircut or the like, faced violence, including death, from family and community members, state security forces and militias such as the League of the Righteous (Asa‘ib Ahl al-Haq) and the Mahdi Army (Jaish al-Mahdi). Similarly, Syrian respondents in our research reported fleeing after receiving death threats, facing detention and physical abuse, or having friends killed or ‘disappear’ at the hands of various armed groups and state security forces. Respondents also reported having to ‘buy’ the protection of members of the security services or armed groups, including through sexual services, as well as being blackmailed.

Violence against SGM people in other conflicts is usually not as systematic as in the cases of Syria and Iraq, let alone Nazi Germany. Rather, different armed groups and state security forces mostly target open and suspected SGM people on an individual basis, but with no less lethal consequences in some cases. Targeted homo, bi- and transphobic violence by state and non-state armed actors, groups and individuals associated with violence-prone movements is not uncommon in conflicts, but given the invisibility of SGM issues in research and discussions on gender, conflict and peacebuilding, there is often little to no information available on this. Exceptions include Colombia and Nepal, and also Peru, where state security forces, the Partido Comunista del Perú – Sendero Luminoso (Communist Party of Peru – Shining Path) and Movimiento Revolucionario Túpac Amaru (Túpac Amaru Revolutionary Movement) guerrillas all committed targeted acts of violence against SGM persons, including multiple murders of gay men, lesbian women and transgender travestis, accompanied by public messages against SGM persons, as in the case of the leftwing guerrillas.

This violence is not restricted to times of conflict but also occurs in societies considered as being at peace, as well as in post-conflict situations and situations marked by a ‘frozen conflict’ (e.g. places like Kosovska Mitrovica in Kosovo, parts of the South Caucasus, and among those in Bosnia and Herzegovina who define themselves through conflict-related identities). In these contexts, SGM communities and individuals may be targeted not only

---

43 B. Jellonnek, Homosexuelle unter dem Hakenkreuz: Die verfolgung von homosexuellen im Dritten Reich [Homosexuals under the Hakenkreuz: The persecution of homosexuals during the Third Reich], Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1990
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...for homo-, bi- or transphobic reasons but also as they are seen as ‘traitors to the nation’ for not procreating or, in the case of gay men in Armenia, Lithuania and Turkey, being either exempted or barred from conscription to the armed forces or face hazing, harassment and violence if their sexual orientation is revealed.\textsuperscript{50} As explored in more detail below, violence and discrimination may be perpetrated by extremist groups and individuals, but also by other community members and even family and relatives.

In addition to physical violence, and/or the threat thereof, SGM people are often sexually assaulted, exploited and humiliated by conflict actors, and also by others who may coerce them under threat of outing them and/or use the prevailing impunity to commit their acts. These forms of violence were reported from all of our research focus countries as well as from other conflicts covered in literature, and affected lesbian women, gay men, bisexual men and women, and trans and intersex persons. As with other forms of violence, discrimination and exploitation, these occurred both in the conflict zone and outside of it. Physical and sexual violence and other forms of abuse are also common against SGM individuals in spaces of detention, including refugee camps and prisons.\textsuperscript{51} Similar patterns of recurring exposure to sexual violence, exploitation, harassment and abuse in both conflict and non-conflict zones also came up in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Nepal, and in Uganda.\textsuperscript{52}

The reinforcing of homophobic norms and attendant humiliation of the survivor can be a particular feature of SGBV. In the case of male survivors of SGBV, in particular male rape, having been sexually violated is at times construed by the perpetrator, and in part also other members of society, as a ‘homosexualisation’ or ‘feminisation’ of the victim.\textsuperscript{53} Targeted sexual violence against lesbian or bisexual women, but also against trans persons and gay men, is sometimes construed as “punitive” or “corrective”, seeking to violently enforce heterosexual behaviour and gender conformity, and punishing alternate expressions.\textsuperscript{54}

### 3.5 Policing of gender norms

While homophobic discrimination and violence may in some cases be rooted in religious conservatism, they are not limited to religious discourse or movements. A wide range of nationalist and political movements and armed groups have drawn on homophobic sentiment to consolidate their power and reinforce a particular understanding of the nation and normative gender roles, often using the language of ‘social cleansing’ to police heteronormative gender ideals both within their own ranks and among the civilian population. In 2015, the UN Security Council noted, for the first time, this targeting of SGM people for physical and sexual violence by armed groups as a form of “moral cleansing”.\textsuperscript{55} This phenomenon may be due to dominant homo-, bi- and transphobic ideologies among armed actors and/or an attempt to gain the support of the civilian population under their personal and political meanings of ‘LGBT’ for non-heterosexual and transgender youth in Kyrgyzstan, Central Asian Survey, 29(4), 2010, pp.68–87; 5. Sivakumaran, Lost in translation: UN responses to sexual violence against men and boys in situations of armed conflict, International Review of the Red Cross, 92(877), 2010, pp.1–277


\textsuperscript{51} FGDs with LGBT refugees, Beirut, September 2015; Interviews with SGM rights activists, Bogotá and Cali, February 2013; Kathmandu, April 2013; Sarajevo, December 2015, London, February 2016


\textsuperscript{55} UN Security Council, Conflict-related sexual violence: Report of the Secretary-General, S/2015/203, 23 March 2015, para. 30; see also J.J. Hagen, 2016, Op. cit., p.322
control, who might see SGM persons as being ‘deserving’ of the violence committed against them for going against dominant societal norms.56

The violence against SGM communities and individuals in both Syria and Iraq is perhaps the most visible example of such policing currently, but similar patterns are visible elsewhere. In its groundbreaking report, Colombia’s CNMH detailed how “armed actions […] formed part of a calculated strategy to ‘clean’ the territories of a presence that they found uncomfortable or to ‘correct’ those life choices that they considered counter to how they should be”, a conclusion supported by a 2011 Amnesty International report on Colombia’s armed groups.57 Colombia’s largest guerrilla group, the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, FARC), has engaged in the policing of gender norms and punishment of those perceived to fall outside heterosexual expressions of gender and sexuality, as have rightwing paramilitaries and some of their successor groups.58 The CNMH argues that there have been two main forms of violence against SGM people in the Colombian conflict: first, violence aimed at punishment and reinforcement of heteronormative gender relations, and, second, sexual violence that could take the form of sexual slavery, kidnapping and forced disappearance.59 Thus, the FARC and Colombia’s paramilitaries acted as arbiters of sexuality and gender relations. In practice, this has meant harassment and threats against gay, lesbian and transgender people that caused many to flee their homes, particularly in rural areas.60 In a case against ex-paramilitary leader Arnubio Triana Mahecha, alias El Botalón, the court found that armed groups led by him were responsible for the murders of three transgender youths.61 Reports have also surfaced of paramilitary groups forcing ‘effeminate’ men to box as a form of entertainment.62 In Colombia, healthcare providers in paramilitary-controlled areas would refer both SGM and HIV-positive patients self-identifying as ‘straight’ to Bogotá in order to protect them from violence by paramilitary groups.63 Similarly, in Lebanon, service providers regularly transfer trans refugees from the informal tented settlements to Beirut to enable them to safely access services without the risk of being targeted by other refugees.64

In Northern Ireland, both nationalist and especially loyalist paramilitary groups have carried out policing of local communities, including the “regulation and punishment of deviant sexualities”, as according to the Northern Ireland Community Relations Commission.65 SGM people were lumped together with sex workers, paedophiles and drug dealers by the paramilitaries’ moral codes,66 which condemned non-normative sexualities and lifestyles as a “covert but real problem”.67 As a result, members of Northern Ireland’s SGM communities faced attacks, in which survivors lost teeth and even eyes, and had their homes and events they attended petrol bombed; from 2000 to 2004, the Police Service of Northern Ireland received reports of 50 such incidents per year.68

---

59  A. Serrano Murcia, Enfoque de género en los procesos de DDR [Gender focus in the DDR process], in CNMH (ed.), Desafíos para la reintegración, enfoque de género, raza y étnica [Challenges for reintegration, a focus on gender, race and ethnicity], Bogotá: CNMH, 2013, pp.107–108
62  Grupo de Memoria Histórica [Historical Memory Group], Mujeres y guerra: Victimas y resistentes en el caribe colombiano [Women and war: Victims and resistance in the Colombian Caribbean], Bogotá: Taurus/Semana, 2011
65  The Northern Ireland Community Relations Commission is quoted in J. Curtis, Pride and prejudice: Gay rights and religious moderation in Belfast, Sociological Review, 61(52), 2013, p.146.
66  G. Ellison, Criminalizing the payment for sex in Northern Ireland: Sketching the contours of a moral panic, British Journal of Criminology, 57(1), 2015, pp.204–205
conducted in and around the city of Belfast revealed that the fear of leaks to paramilitary groups and subsequent revenge prevented many respondents from reporting attacks to the police.69

During Nepal’s civil war, both the governing regime and the Maoist rebels came under criticism for harassment of SGM communities and individuals, including police violence, harassment, sexual exploitation, various forms of sexual violence and kidnapping, both during the conflict and after its end.70 The violent policing of non-heterosexual behaviour, often in conjunction with violent attacks against other socially marginalised groups and individuals such as sex workers, drug addicts or street children as well as suspected ‘traitors’, has found either tacit or open support of communities in locations as diverse as Colombia, Northern Ireland, Peru, the South Caucasus and the western Balkans.71

3.6 Blackmail, extortion and harassment

A number of our FGD respondents in Syria and Lebanon had been sexually and financially exploited by armed actors or civilians at the risk of having their identity revealed. The blackmailing and extortion of SGM individuals has a history that is presumably as long as that of the stigmatisation of non-heterosexual identities and practices, as the extortion would otherwise not be effective. While the cases that we encountered in our research were widespread, they were not necessarily systematic, but rather opportunistic and individual. In some cases, however, the blackmail can be more organised, as in the case of Palestinian SGM persons being coerced by Israeli security forces to become informers or risk outing – thus also stoking homophobia by casting the suspicion of being Israeli agents on the Palestinian SGM community as a whole.72

SGM persons, and in particular those who are more visible (e.g. trans persons or sex workers) and/or more vulnerable (e.g. refugees or those of lower socio-economic classes), are prone to violence, harassment, humiliation and exploitation by security forces. Several of the gay Syrian men in our FGDs had been forced to regularly provide sexual services to male members of the police and armed forces in return for protection lest they risk outing and/or violence. Upon fleeing to Lebanon, several had been exposed to sexual humiliation by Lebanese border guards. In Lebanon, refugees from Syria have been harassed, incarcerated, tortured and threatened with deportation by Lebanese police for non-heteronormative appearance or same-sex expressions of affection.73 Santamaria Fundación, a support organisation for transgender people, has accused Colombian police of extortion, sexual abuse and unlawful detention of people who fall outside normative gender roles.74 Northern Ireland’s police force targeted the country’s gay community throughout the so-called ‘Troubles’ with violent assaults, forced medical examinations and outing individuals to their families and even to paramilitary groups. Such was the repression of members of the SGM community that some who had been subjected to this treatment suggested police officers might be exercising feelings of helplessness against the Irish Republican Army on marginal and relatively powerless people.75 Extortion, blackmail and harassment are not restricted to security forces and armed actors: in Lebanon, some of the trans refugees we interviewed had been exploited sexually by their landlords, and many of the lesbian, bisexual and trans women had been sexually harassed or had sexual favours demanded from them in exchange for services – issues also faced by non-SGM women refugees.76

---
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A raid of the Al-Agha Hammam in Beirut in August 2014, in which 27 people were arrested, was a high-profile example of the kind of treatment faced by SGM persons in many parts of the world. The case also demonstrates the differential vulnerabilities between different gay, bisexual and trans women and men as well as those suspected of being gay due to their having been in the hamam (bathhouse), be it as staff or customers, regardless of whether or not they self-identified as such. The raid was triggered after a gay Syrian refugee had been questioned, subjected to physical and verbal abuse, and had his telephone messages screened by General Security (Sûreté générale). This led to a raid of the hamam by the Internal Security Forces, with many of the arrested reporting severe verbal and physical abuse, much of it homophobic in nature. Syrians who had been working in the hamam were also racially abused. The degree of abuse suffered by those arrested also varied according to nationality, income level and wasa (that is, having or not having influential connections), as well as ‘flamboyance’: Lebanese and those with enough connections and money were able to extricate themselves out of the situation relatively easily, while those with less social and financial capital, Syrians (whether they self-identified as gay or not) and a transgender person were imprisoned. In prison, they were subjected to further verbal abuse and physical violence by both prison staff and other inmates, and those not able to pay US$100–500 were forced to spend the night in the prison toilet.

4. Legal, social and ideological frameworks of exclusion

The vulnerability of SGM communities and individuals to violence and discrimination is underpinned by legal, social and ideological narratives and forms of exclusion, which may reduce or deny them access to the services or rights provided to other citizens. In fragile and conflict-affected states where services are often limited from the start, SGM persons are left in one of the most vulnerable positions in society. In countries where same-sex activities are illegal, reporting SGBV to the police can put the victim/survivor in the position of the criminal. As of 2016, between 75 and 77 countries have laws that criminalise same-sex sexual practices, some going as far as to criminalise identities, in particular trans identities, as well as acts.81 These laws expose people who are already socially marginalised within heteronormative societies to arrest and prosecution for consensual sexual activities and their gender expressions. Criminal laws against homosexuality or other forms of non-normative sexuality also protect the perpetrators of homophobic, biphobic and transphobic violence by restricting the ability of their victims to file complaints or press charges.82 Even where such laws are not enforced, as in Nigeria where a moratorium currently stands on the use of the death penalty for those convicted of homosexual acts, the existence of those laws nonetheless constitutes a form of “cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment” and legitimises persecution.83 Wherever they exist, such laws can be and at times are held over the heads of SGM people, used not only to prosecute them but also to marginalise, blackmail and extort them.84

Beyond direct criminalisation, many legal provisions aimed at the general population are used excessively or in targeted ways to persecute SGM individuals. Laws intended to control sex work, public decency or debauchery are used disproportionately against people who are seen to disrupt gendered norms of behaviour and appearance; one UNHCR field office called notions such as decency “elastic concepts” that could be deployed as security forces saw fit.85 A 2004 report by Human Rights Watch demonstrated that Egypt’s law on fujur, or debauchery, was principally intended to control sex work; however, it was being interpreted and used to criminalise both commercial and non-commercial sex between men.86

In the city of New Orleans, police regularly target SGM individuals, in particular African-American trans women, and question them for appearing dressed ‘like sex workers’, carrying condoms or false identification, or soliciting sex, using these charges as excuses to subject them to verbal abuse and sexual harassment. In a submission to the UN in 2013, researchers found that all of the trans women surveyed had been propositioned by police.87 Hurricanes Katrina and Rita placed particular strain on Louisiana’s state shelters, mental health facilities and prisons, funnelling greater numbers of people into inadequate facilities and particularly affecting SGM persons, who were already less likely to have other options such as supportive parental custody.88 In the US prison system,
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State security forces and non-state armed groups are, in their absolute majority, male dominated and the kinds of masculinities nurtured in these institutions have often been explicitly defined as non-homosexual, something that is instilled in recruits in basic training or through formal and informal rites of passage. Non-heterosexual members have often been purged, at times with lethal consequences, although it can be reasonably assumed that non-heterosexual members have been present in security institutions and serving loyally for as long as those institutions have existed. In the cases of Armenia and Turkey, ‘proven’ homosexuality is seen as a sufficient reason for not being conscripted into the armed forces, but may lead to discrimination in later life for not having served. However, in line with increasing openness for SGM persons in some societies, armed forces and police are increasingly allowing openly non-heterosexual members to serve.

4.1 Extralegal harassment and violence

In addition to legal criminalisation and excessive use of punishment and detention, SGM communities frequently face extralegal harassment and violence from state security actors including police and militaries. The Blue Diamond Society (BDS), which provides advocacy and assistance to SGM people in Nepal, has noted that increases in violence against people who fall outside normative gender and sexual identities are “directly linked to the increased mobilisation of military and police given the critical security situation in the country.” BDS has documented abuse against Nepal’s varied SGM communities, detailing sexual and physical violence, robbery, arbitrary detention, deception, verbal abuse and outing to their families and the media. Around the time the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) assumed office in Nepal, it adopted a policy to neither encourage nor punish homosexuality, but incidents persist. According to a Nepali Ministry of Health official, “police feel they can do anything to [SGM] people because there will be no consequences.”

Individual police officers and soldiers operate with relative impunity, without enough meaningful opposition.
from higher up the command structure. In spite of anti-harassment regulations in the Nepali armed forces, there have been individual cases of discrimination reported against allegedly lesbian soldiers. Similarly, in South Africa, some lesbian cadres in the armed wing of the African National Congress, the uMkhonto weSizwe, were subjected to sexual harassment, abuse and violence by their male comrades, even where officially there was a commitment to diversity.

Globally, the UN Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (UN OHCHR) has noted widespread assault and torture perpetrated by security forces against people identified as gay or transgender, including violence that particularly targets the features marking them as different. In a 2012 report, the UN OHCHR documented cases where trans women had been beaten on their breasts and cheekbones, where they had surgical implants, to release toxins. In Uganda and Lebanon, police and army officers have routinely extorted SGM refugees who engage in sex work for sexual services, with threats of harm, deportation or public outing.

However, in spite of widespread and common anti-SGM violence and violent policing of heteronormativity, armed groups and state militaries have at times shown a perhaps surprising openness to sexual and gender diversity. In our research in Colombia, we came across reports of otherwise heteronormative rightwing paramilitaries accepting gay combatants and even their transgender partners in their ranks. In spite of high levels of everyday harassment, sexual exploitation and discrimination against SGM members in its ranks and a generally heteronormative outlook, the first gay marriage in the Philippines was organised by the Maoist New People’s Army (NPA). Performing same-sex marriages for its cadres also allowed the NPA to bridge an internal contradiction of its gender ideology, namely on the one hand its recent openness to sexual and gender diversity and on the other its insistence on promoting ‘revolutionary families’, which would raise new, Maoist children.

### 4.2 Ideologies of exclusion

Nationalist and extremist propaganda often instrumentalises SGM persons and communities as “convenient” scapegoats and easy targets, and as agents of outside forces ‘seeking to destroy our culture.’ Furthermore, gay men and lesbian women, as well as trans and intersex persons may be labelled as ‘traitors’, especially in conflicts framed in ethno-religious terms, as for example in Armenia or Northern Ireland, for not fulfilling their ‘patriotic duty’ of producing more offspring for their side of the conflict. There is also a long history of questioning, especially, gay men’s loyalty to the nation state, fears about the degree to which they can be blackmailed by outside powers or outright moral panics about SGM persons as potential ‘enemy agents’ undermining both the society and the state, as for example in Indonesia.

Women identified as lesbians have been cast as a threat to the purportedly ‘natural’ patriarchal order, SGMs have been wrongly conflated with paedophiles and those with non-heterosexual SOGI have been viewed as ‘diseased’
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or ‘contagious’, as for example in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Serbia, but also Russia and Ukraine. On the other hand, some Western European countries, along with Israel, the US, Canada and Australia, have also seen the rise of a phenomenon called ‘homonationalism’. Originally developed by Jasbir Puar, the concept refers to the way that acceptance of SGM rights are increasingly seen as prerequisites to being (or becoming) a liberal, progressive society. At the same time, however, they are also used to differentiate between those deserving of state protection and national belonging and those who are not – the ‘right kind’ of citizens and values. This tends to affect non-Western immigrants in particular, but also affects populations such as Palestinians in the Israeli case.

Before, during and after violent conflict, many nationalist groups have depicted themselves as hyper-masculine and inherently heterosexual through the media and other outlets, while painting other nations, groups and actors as “subordinate (homosexual) masculinities” – language that explicitly excludes and denigrates gay, lesbian and transgender people. Insinuations of homosexuality are also often used to delegitimise political opponents, as for example in Northern Ireland’s decades-long conflict, where such allegations were regularly deployed by both the Republican Catholic and Protestant Unionist sides to “cast aspersions on one’s integrity.”

All-too-common backlashes against gender equality and SOGI rights in the wake of conflict are shaped by rejections of difference, societal change and externally imposed norms (actual or perceived). The uncertainty of post-conflict recovery has been known to give rise to what has been called ‘golden age-ism’, a (usually heteronormative) longing for a purportedly better time in the past when families, gender relations and social life was seen to be better. War-torn societies often seek to reinstate or invent conservative gender roles in the name of improving social order and the existence of SGM groups within society disrupts and challenges those goals. This harking back to an imagined heteronormative past does not come only from those who lived in pre-conflict times: in post-conflict Bosnia and Herzegovina, homo-, bi- and transphobic violence is perpetrated by members of all communities (Bosnian Muslim, Bosnian Croat and Bosnian Serb), in particular young men who have grown up or were born after the end of the war. Some are organised through nationalist football fan clubs, but violence has also been perpetrated by religiously motivated groups such as Wahhabis. Homophobia thus acts as an extremely unfortunate unifying factor and also becomes a cornerstone of nationalist and/or religiously tinged identities. As in other countries, increased SGM activism has been met with increased violence, pointing to the limits of purported tolerance, which is contingent upon SGM persons being invisible.

Faith-based forms of nationalism have tended to reject same-sex relationships and non-normative gender identities, using their power within nationalist movements and conflict-related confusion and reconstruction as
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opportunities to press their cases. In Serbia, for example, the Orthodox Church has participated in marches against the Belgrade Pride Parade, carrying incense to cleanse the city. Religious nationalists, claiming to represent the ‘organic’ Serbian nation, have publicly blamed the parade for flooding in the country in 2014. \(^{112}\) Similarly, in Northern Ireland, negative attitudes towards sexual and gender differences stem from the dominant conservative interpretation of Christianity. In the 1970s, for example, a campaign against homosexuality led by the Democratic Unionist Party leader Ian Paisley, a staunch anti-Republican, used conservative Christian rhetoric to argue that same-sex relations would destroy the moral fabric of the nation, eventually achieving 70,000 signatures (or 5% of Northern Ireland’s population) on a petition of support. \(^{113}\) Since the signing of the Good Friday Agreement in 1998, which brought an end to the protracted ethno-nationalist conflict, the gains made by Northern Ireland’s gay community have only prolonged the “sense of ontological insecurity among a section of the Protestant/Unionist community that has seen its traditional value system as under attack in recent years”. \(^{114}\) Prominent politicians have drawn on their conservative Protestant faith to call homosexuality “vile”, “repulsive” and “nauseating”. \(^{115}\)

Latent social unease with regards to SOGI rights has been stoked and mobilised as a political issue and cast as a struggle against the imposition of neo-imperialism and alleged ‘Western decadence’ in many parts of Eastern Europe (where anti-Western parlance often refers to the EU as ‘Gayropa’ and those espousing liberal views are called ‘tolerasti’, a portmanteau of ‘tolerance’ and ‘pederast’). Sub-Saharan Africa, and South and Southeast Asia – often both deliberately silencing and invisibilising local non-heteronormative SOGI and the role played, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, by Western private donors in supporting these agendas. \(^{116}\)

4.3 Social exclusion and isolation

The most immediate expression of social exclusion for SGM people is often from their own family members, which leaves them isolated and without the social safety nets of family and community. Those whose SGM status is revealed as children experience particular isolation, as they are often thrown out of family homes and unable to finish school, experiencing higher rates of unemployment, homelessness and instability as a result, and often resorting to petty crime, violence and sex work to survive. The UNHCR has stated that “families and communities may threaten serious harm on LGBTI individuals, and this can constitute persecution where (as is often the case) there is no meaningful State protection.” \(^{117}\)

This is not limited to directly conflict-affected societies. In the US state of Louisiana, a survey of youth who identified as gay or transgender found that 25% had left home due to conflict with families. In the state’s family courts, SOGI has also been used as a justification for parents to declare their children “ungovernable”, relinquishing them to the state’s juvenile detention and mental health facilities – systems already overloaded in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. \(^{118}\) In Northern Ireland, research has shown that the threat of rejection by their families leads many to take risks, meeting partners in public places instead of in their homes and risking discovery and violence by police, paramilitary groups and members of the public. \(^{119}\)
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\(^{116}\) S. Dai, Examining the legislative difference on homosexuality among African countries: Domestic and international factors, Paper presented at the ISA Annual Convention, Atlanta, 16–19 March 2016

\(^{117}\) UNHCR, Women on the run: First-hand accounts of refugees fleeing El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Mexico, Geneva: UNHCR, 2015b, p.37


In our FGDs conducted with Syrian SGM refugees living in Lebanon, participants reported pressure from their families to enter into heterosexual marriages against their will and frequent rejection from their family homes. Some respondents had fled Syria to escape persecution by families, neighbours and armed groups; others were displaced with their families and lived closeted double lives. Family rejection can also directly precipitate violence against SGM persons. A survey of lesbian women following the end of the civil war in Nepal found that 20% had been excluded from social gatherings as a result of their sexualities, while 25% had had to move house due to prejudice in their communities. Of the same group, 70% of the women had experienced intimate partner violence (IPV). This high prevalence of IPV is in line with initial, indicative studies from elsewhere, according to which SGM individuals may be generally exposed to higher levels than heterosexual partners, in particular in forced marriages. Reports from the UN Special Rapporteur on violence against women have found that lesbian women are subject to violence and even murder at the hands of their families, or ‘honour killings’, as a direct result of “prejudices and myths” about their sexualities. Many Syrian SGM refugees, both men and women, also reported receiving death threats from their fathers and brothers, and other male family members.

4.4 Poverty and lack of access to social services

SGM issues may be seen by mainstream political actors as ‘trivial concerns’ rather than pressing and immediate needs, but research from the Institute of Development Studies shows that sexual rights have strong links to factors such as mental and physical health, education, employment and political participation – that is, these rights are indivisible and repression of sexual rights has an immediate impact on access to other areas of social life. The civil disruption of violent conflict and displacement has a negative impact on employment and social services such as healthcare, education and housing for the population at large, but this impact is even greater for poor and marginalised groups, among whom SGM people are overrepresented. In Louisiana, for example, gay and transgender youth fearing violence were found to be three times more likely than the general population to bring a weapon to school, potentially leading to expulsion from education, while their rates of substance abuse and suicide were also high. SGM individuals also suffer from discrimination and abuse in healthcare provision. In Uganda, the criminalisation of homosexuality caused health workers to refuse to treat gay and transgender patients, whether because they fear repercussions or because criminalisation has legitimated their own prejudice. Hospitals themselves have also been reported as sites of violence, with HIV-positive status used as evidence of homosexuality in Egypt and men in locations from Colombia through Northern Ireland to Lebanon subjected to forced examinations to ‘demonstrate’ their sexual orientations.
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Homophobic prejudice can also limit SGM individuals or even whole communities to precarious, poorly paid and dangerous work. In Colombia, transgender women, many of whom had fled their homes and communities, are overwhelmingly employed in low-paid and precarious work, including as sex workers, due to their lack of education and skills, as well as stereotypes about transgender women. Facing racism and homophobia in the workplace, many Syrian SGM refugees living in Lebanon have been forced to accept extremely expensive and poor-quality housing that offers little sunlight or fresh air, inadequate security, and threats, extortion, sexual exploitation and control at the hands of landlords. In Serbia, despite legislation prohibiting discrimination based on SOGI, SGM individuals engage in self-censorship to hide their gender identities and sexualities, fearing that their employers will find spurious reasons to fire them. Lacking education, employment or family support, many SGM persons are driven into petty crime or become sex workers, facing criminalisation and violence from police, clients and intermediaries. In Lebanon, some SGM refugees, in particular gay men and trans women, reported resorting to sex work for lack of other options, and noted that they felt powerless to demand safe sex practices and were thus at risk of sexually transmitted infections.

4.5 Impacts of SGM exclusion

The effects of conflict-related upheaval and violence on SGM people are greatest in those places where acceptance of sexual and gender difference was already low, leaving them socially marginalised and vulnerable. Stigma against SGM persons and communities is as widespread as it is varied, as various SGM groups and identities are viewed and treated differently across cultures and regions. Culturally specific factors such as social caste in Nepal and ethno-religious divisions in the former Yugoslavia can also play an important role.

The added stress of conflict and displacement can increase interpersonal violence of different kinds, including familial and IPV, self-harm and suicide.

As a result of these various forms of discrimination and violence, SGM groups confront extreme rates of emotional and psychological stress. This is what criminologist Gail Mason calls the “double move” of homophobia, which marks out non-normative people for violence while simultaneously ensuring their silence and invisibility through fear of that same violence. SGM individuals frequently suffer from stress and psychological effects including paranoia and disturbed sleep, compounded exclusion from social services and communities, substance abuse and increased risk of suicide. Focus groups in Lebanon showed that conflict exacerbates both the need for secrecy on the one hand and the stress of achieving it on the other, forcing individuals to moderate their appearance and behaviour, and leading to feelings of hopelessness and despair. Likewise, in Northern Ireland, shame and fear throughout decades of conflict have limited the visibility of gay and lesbian people in public spaces, with many going as far as to live secretly from family, friends and colleagues; moderate their appearances and mannerisms in public; and avoid public expressions of affection with their partners.
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5. Using peace processes to push for change

While most of the focus has so far been on the negative impacts of conflict and post-conflict backlash on SGM persons, the post-conflict period can also give rise to opportunities to press for new laws that recognise and protect SGM people and other measures, such as civic education, which aim to change the norms and attitudes that lead to exclusion, discrimination and violence in the first place. These norms can include recognition for minoritised groups, anti-discrimination laws and protection from hate crimes in treaty negotiations and constitutional processes – post-apartheid South Africa’s constitution, which was the first in the world to outlaw discrimination based on sexual orientation, is a prime example. As with all activities in this field, working towards these advances needs to be done in a careful and circumspect way, to avoid increasing the vulnerability of the intended beneficiaries or causing societal backlash, be it violent or political. As a case in point, it has been argued that the inclusion of SGM rights in Colombia’s 2016 peace agreement may have prompted socially conservative voters to reject it in the referendum.141

In Nepal, campaigning by civil society organisations (CSOs) such as the BDS has put the language of equality, women’s empowerment and SGM rights on to government agendas. Following a 2007 lawsuit by SGM activists, the Nepali Supreme Court overturned discriminatory provisions in the constitution and added recognition of a third gender, based on indigenous forms of non-heteronormative identity. As a result of this kind of activism, Nepal now not only has three gender options on its national census, but also has a focal point in its National Human Rights Commission that specifically examines the rights of SGM individuals and communities, as well as inclusion in the national HIV/AIDS strategy.142 In Bosnia and Herzegovina, passing of more egalitarian SOGI legislation has been seen as a relatively ‘easy win’ for otherwise disparate political parties on the way to European integration.143

There are a number of ‘standard’ peacebuilding activities that could be made more inclusive by better considering and integrating the needs of SGM communities and individuals. Access to justice and recognition, if not compensation for past violations, are important elements of post-conflict reconciliation, in which SGM concerns have long been invisibilised. Both Peru and Colombia have taken important first steps in their respective transitional justice processes in this respect, with the Peruvian Comisión de la Verdad y Reconciliación (Truth and Reconciliation Commission) including a section on violence against SGM individuals and communities in its final report and the Colombian CNMH publishing a separate report on the impact of the conflict on SGM people. Efforts to prevent SGBV in conflict and post-conflict situations have rarely taken SOGI questions into consideration, even where these directly contribute to increased vulnerability. Post-conflict SSR processes such as those in Northern Ireland and Serbia have started integrating SOGI issues in order to build up trust between SGM communities and individuals and police forces, and transforming forces and institutions previously viewed by many SGM persons as repressive or uninterested in, if not actively hostile to, their issues.144 The reintegration of former combatants presents another area where SGM perspectives could and should be integrated. The Colombian reintegration agency Agencia Colombiana para la Reintegración (Colombian Agency for Reintegration, ACR) has internally deliberated on what particular needs SGM ex-combatants may have, such as ensuring that same-sex couples have access to the same benefits and support packages, and that trans ex-combatants have hormonal treatment in their healthcare plans.145
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Increasingly, agencies such as the UNHCR are mainstreaming considerations of SGM needs into the humanitarian support they give, although this process still has a long way to go.\textsuperscript{146} According to the UNHCR itself, only 20% of field offices said most or all of their staff members were adequately trained to process claims from SGM individuals.\textsuperscript{147} Even in fields that are comparatively advanced in terms of taking SGM perspectives into account, such as HIV/AIDS prevention and care, this is not always the case for conflict-affected situations. As Stella Nyanzi notes, “a shortcoming of current available prevention, care and treatment services for HIV/AIDS in displacement and post-conflict contexts is the over concentration on normative heterosexualities.”\textsuperscript{148} Furthermore, relief agencies for the most part still continue using the heterosexual nuclear family unit as the focus of relief efforts, which can lead to situations such as in the Sunsari flooding in Nepal in 2008, where SGM families got half of the usual aid, forcing some into sex work to survive.\textsuperscript{149} To avoid such discriminatory practices and to live up to both the aim of inclusivity and that of supporting the most vulnerable, a broadening and deepening of the understanding of gender identities in a given context is necessary.

Peacebuilding is, however, not only a matter of a technical implementation of processes such as SSR or DDR, of judicial and legal change or of service delivery, but is a broader, long-term endeavour that aims towards less violence and more social cohesion and inclusivity. Working on changing societal norms of exclusion against SGM persons, including the often violent expressions of masculinity and femininity that are linked to homo-, bi- and transphobia, helps reduce not only these forms of violence and exclusion, but also others, as these tend to also drive violence against other social groups. This kind of a comprehensive approach to long-term peacebuilding is thus of importance not just for SGM communities and individuals, but more generally for creating more peaceful, inclusive societies.

5.1 Claiming spaces

Even outside the formal peace processes and courts, conflict can provide openings for SGM groups to forge communities and spaces for themselves and others. Again, these processes are not straightforward and can be met with repression and violence, but the moments of agency that these new spaces demonstrate are nonetheless indicative of human resilience in the midst of upheaval and social breakdown.

The instability of conflict can present a challenge to traditional gender roles and open up new roles for men, women and non-binary people alike. In both Syria and Nepal, for example, emerging research shows that crisis has caused a re-evaluation of social norms in some circles – although this is not guaranteed to be in favour of more progressive views on SOGI.\textsuperscript{150} These changes may regress in the wake of conflict but they may also develop into a lasting evolution of social structures. In Lebanon, “war weariness” and a continuous flow of outward migration during the civil war later resulted in greater tolerance for sexual and gender diversity, as returning expatriate Lebanese brought a globalised worldview and experiences of other cultures with them, strengthening local “underground” scenes and contributing to the creation of a “queer space” in Lebanon.\textsuperscript{151}

The process of advocating for rights has also shown benefits in terms of greater organisation and development of networks. The breakdown of social and political governance during war necessitates the establishment of strong CSOs, which can then continue their work in the post-conflict era. Thus, Lebanon’s civil war saw the foundation of Helem, the first organisation serving SGMs in the Middle East.\textsuperscript{152} In addition, the experience of working with Syrian SGM refugees in the current crisis has encouraged previously more conservative NGOs to start taking these issues more seriously, in addition to opening up new spaces in Lebanese society for SGM persons,
in spite of the difficulties.153 Serbian activists for SGM rights, while they have faced intense opposition from the SSR process, have become more likely to report violence than other SGM people because they feel protected by their organisations, networks and media access, and are politically committed to challenging homophobia.154 Transgender sex workers in Nepal today are less likely to be arrested or harassed by the police than cisgender sex workers because they benefit from strong organisations that advocate for their rights.155 Globally, Western-style LGBTI identities have become a kind of ‘calling card’ for integration into international networks of solidarity and advocacy. This evolution is not without its problems, as it can contribute to the perception that non-normative identities and practices are inherently Western or foreign, but it has provided lifelines and support to SGM groups in a wide variety of contexts.156

Perhaps most unexpectedly, SGM people have been able to forge new communities as a neutral ground in the midst of violent conflict. During ‘the Troubles’ in Belfast, “many lesbians and gay men took advantage of the deserted city spaces which had opened up to them as a result of curfews imposed after dark in the wake of the heightened security situation. In these spaces, people who were ordinarily divided on the basis of religious or political identity came together under shared experiences of sexual oppression.”157 Places such as gay clubs and organisations became neutral ground, where not only gay and lesbian people but others as well – marginal or not – could come together to escape violence and leave aside the entrenched identities that divided them.

5.2 ‘Looking in’: What integrating SGM perspectives means for peacebuilders

Integrating SGM perspectives into peacebuilding work gets to the heart of one of the paradoxes of the field: changing exclusionary societal norms and power dynamics that perpetuate violent conflict will lead to conflict with those who have vested interests in these norms and dynamics, and may indeed lead to violence. Gender identities and norms in particular are highly sensitive, as they are central to who we are as individuals and how our societies are structured. Working on SGM issues therefore needs to, as all peacebuilding should, start from a ‘do no harm’ perspective, which is based on the needs and wishes of those who are the intended beneficiaries of this work. Forcibly or accidentally outing people whose social or physical survival may depend on a degree of invisibility in terms of their SOGI can have grave consequences. Proceeding with caution is, however, necessary not only in terms of not harming intended beneficiaries; operationally, peacebuilding organisations working on these issues may also experience a backlash from institutions and organisations opposed to SGM, which in turn may threaten the wellbeing of staff or other operations in that country. ‘Doing no harm’ should, however, not be taken to mean doing nothing, unless the risks are too great. Thus, peacebuilders aiming to work on these issues need to inform themselves and coordinate closely with pre-existing SGM rights organisations and networks in-country, listen to and address their needs and concerns, but also avoid ‘squeezing out’ these local initiatives.

Integrating SGM perspectives across the work of peacebuilding organisations needs to start with an in-depth context and conflict analyses as well as a risk assessment, ideally drawing on the local expertise of SGM individuals and
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rights organisations. Given the differences in societal attitudes as well as in legal environments, and the needs for conflict-sensitivity and ‘doing no harm’, the resultant parameters for peacebuilding work will inevitably differ between locations. Staff and partners at all levels need to be made aware of SGM needs, but also of social sensitivities, potentials for conflict and unintended harm through dedicated trainings.

In terms of programme design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, SGM perspectives should be comprehensively brought in as part of integrating gender. This includes, for example, selecting partners and project staff who are working on, or are aware of, SGM needs, and/or building their capacity in this respect; ensuring that context, conflict-sensitivity and gender analyses as well as needs assessments, formative research and baselines take SGM issues, including societal attitudes, into account and that these insights are reflected in project design, monitoring and evaluation. Ongoing project monitoring should include assessing the possible causation of unintended consequences, in particular negative ones, and addressing these as soon as they arise. The impacts of the project on SGM individuals, as well as lessons learned, should also be reflected in end-line evaluations.

5.3 Internal practices and policies

In terms of internal policies and ways of working, peacebuilding organisations should ensure that human resources and other internal policies are non-discriminatory and also proactively consider SGM perspectives in staff, partner and beneficiary security planning. Sensitisation and training on SGM issues and non-discrimination is recommended for all staff members, but of particular importance to frontline staff (including receptionists, drivers and security guards) who directly interact with beneficiaries, in order to avoid discriminatory or stigmatising behaviour, or putting staff and/or beneficiaries accidentally at risk. Similarly, advocacy and outreach material need to be designed from a ‘do no harm’ perspective. Several international NGOs have set up internal staff support networks on SOGI issues or have diversity focal points, which in order to function properly require sufficient resourcing and institutional buy-in.

One way in which NGOs and donors can encourage the consideration of SGM perspectives is to make the inclusion of this a prerequisite for funding, such as, for example, as the USAID has done. This is, however, also a rather blunt instrument that can be either counterproductive or lead to a superficial, ‘tick-the-box’ approach to integration – or be seen as a Western imposition.

In recent years, staff members of several organisations working in the development and peacebuilding fields have set up internal discussion and support networks around gender and sexuality, including on SGM issues. Increasingly, there are also networks active across the sector, which allow SGM staff members to exchange experiences but also provide support to organisations seeking to increase their own sensitivity to these issues and their inclusivity. Organisations working on SGM rights and HIV/AIDS have developed guidance notes that can be of use to the peacebuilding sector as well, and which are already being implemented by some public and private sector actors.
6. Conclusion

As shown in the discussion above, gendered societal dynamics of exclusion and violent conflict affect SGM individuals and communities in specific ways – ways that have to date not been raised to any great degree in peacebuilding programming or policy. In part, this invisibility has been due to a lack of knowledge and information about the issue, and in part it may be out of a reluctance to engage with an issue that is seen as either marginal or too sensitive. Nonetheless, there is a clear case for bringing SGM issues into peacebuilding that encompasses making societies more comprehensively inclusive and taking the concerns of the most vulnerable sections of society into consideration. As outlined above, SGM persons are often among the most exposed to different forms of violence and exclusion, be it by armed actors or civilians, and escaping a conflict zone may not result in finding safety and security, and even expose them to further vulnerability. Examining violence and discrimination against SGM persons also helps us to better understand the gendered dynamics behind exclusionary politics and violence.
7. Recommendations

Our examination of SGM needs and vulnerabilities in conflict-affected situations as well as the responses to them lead us to make the following recommendations for the peacebuilding sector:

1. There is a need for peacebuilding policy and practice to engage more with the fact that gender is not a binary categorisation of women and men only, and that non-heterosexual practices and identities should be taken into account when using a gender lens to understand and intervene in peacebuilding contexts. As with gender more broadly, SGM concerns need to be seen through a relational and intersectional lens, that is, understanding the interplay between SOGI and other social identity markers in defining behaviour, vulnerabilities and peacebuilding opportunities. In doing so, care should be taken to understand local SGM identities in their diversity in order to avoid restricting analyses to those identities also present in Western conceptualisations.

2. Given the sensitivity of the issue and the sometimes extremely vulnerable position of SGM individuals and communities, adopting a ‘doing no harm’ approach is essential. Working on these issues requires taking approaches that are conflict-sensitive, do not endanger the intended beneficiaries or the staff of the implementing agency, and do not jeopardise other work. Work in this field needs to be carried out in a way that is sensitive to the wishes and needs of the intended beneficiaries and sensitive to the risk of a backlash if this is seen as an outside imposition. Likewise, those not directly working on SGM issues should ensure that they are not inadvertently causing harm to SGM persons and communities.

3. As SGM issues have mostly been at the margins of conflict and peacebuilding research, policy and programming, there is an immense need to conduct more research to better understand what these issues are in particular geographical and thematic contexts, and for peacebuilding actors to have open discussions about what these findings mean for our work.

4. At the policy level, approaches to gender in peacebuilding such as the global WPS framework need to be broadened and deepened to not only refer to women and girls, or to women, men, girls and boys, but to expand this to cover all gender identities.

5. Peacebuilding work must do more to integrate SGM perspectives and broader understandings of gender identity into all peace-related activities, be they direct relief and recovery support and aid; access to justice; access to resources; participation, prevention and protection; judicial reform and SSR; DDR; SGBV service provision; or psycho-social rehabilitation, thereby addressing particular vulnerabilities and contributing to more inclusive, peaceful societies.

6. As actors in the peacebuilding field, we all must ensure that our internal mechanisms, policies and ways of working are non-discriminatory and inclusive, and take the safety, security and dignity of all beneficiaries, partners and staff into account, regardless of their SOGI.