Introduction

In October 2011, a dozen members of the South African Black lesbian organization Free Gender picketed in front of a police station in the township of Nyanga, located about twelve miles outside Cape Town. The group was protesting police inaction in the case of Nontsikelelo Tyatyeka, a young lesbian murdered by her neighbor. Members sang songs and toyi-toyied, a form of dance historically directed at apartheid officials and designed to motivate resistance to state repression. Funeka Soldaat, the founder and then chairperson of the organization, took to a megaphone to address the crowd that had gathered and to present a memorandum to the station commander demanding that police take steps to close the case. Police neglect of the investigation into Tyatyeka's disappearance a year before underscored the low value placed on lesbian life and the frequent dehumanization of lesbians through violence.

With their actions, the organization drew attention to the institutional indifference to violence against lesbians that contradicted the promises of nondiscrimination against gays and lesbians enshrined in South Africa's postapartheid constitution. In addition to calling for a full investigation of her death, the memorandum that Soldaat presented to the police that day called on them to "work in partnership with organisations and members of the Nyanga community" (author's notes) in the apprehension of the perpetrator. Despite the confrontational tactic, the group's deployment of their identity highlighted the relationship of lesbians to multiple communities, including the local community of fellow Black Africans and the broader human community entitled to freedom from violence. Specifically, the group emphasized the commensurability

of Black lesbian identity with other important social identities such as African and community member.

On the other side of globe, in Argentina, a group called La Fulana was similarly dedicated to countering discrimination and violence against lesbians. In March 2011, the group held a major public event at Buenos Aires' Parque Centenario in honor of Natalia Gaitán, a young lesbian killed by her girlfriend's stepfather. The event was to raise awareness that *la lesbophobia mata* (lesbophobia kills). The group contracted the well-known singer Hilda Lizarazu to help draw in a large crowd that included casual passersby. Group members took turns reading statements repudiating violence before a dozen took to the stage wearing matching T-shirts and turned their backs to the audience. The activists' T-shirts, made for the event, proclaimed *Yo tambien soy Natalia Gaitán* (I too am Natalia Gaitán) above the logos of La Fulana, the Federación Argentina LGBT (FALGBT), and the Instituto Nacional contra la Discriminación, la Xenofobia y el Racismo (INADI), the state entity that sponsored the event. La Fulana deployed identity visibility, including activists' own lesbian visibility at the event, as a vital way to oppose deadly violence against lesbians.

I share these scenes to demonstrate some important features of contemporary lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) organizing that motivate this book. First, these scenes reflect one of the biggest changes to citizenship in recent decades – the formal inclusion of LGBT people into democratic regimes. In 1996, South Africa became the first country in the world to incorporate nondiscrimination protections for lesbians and gays into its constitution (Croucher 2002). In July 2010, when Argentina became the first Latin American country to adopt same-sex marriage, then President Cristina Fernández de Kirchner declared, "We are a more equitable society this week than last week," adding that thousands of Argentines could now exercise a right she already had (Encarnación 2016: 148). Fourteen countries, including Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, and Malta, have banned the discredited practice of "conversion therapy." In 2019, Taiwanese lawmakers adopted a same-sex marriage law, the first of its kind in Asia. Two years later, Spain approved a draft law that would allow anyone fourteen years of age or older to alter their gender marker without medical approval. LGBT people have gained inclusion into formal state structures, whether as candidates for major political parties, bureaucrats in state machinery, or civil society advisors for state initiatives. More than ever before, countries are incorporating queer people as citizens, granting rights previously denied based on sexual orientation or gender identity (Gross 2018).

As these scenes also make clear, rights are not enough to ensure the realization of full equality for LGBT people. The reality is that many continue to confront forms of marginalization and violence, even as they now also experience substantial improvements in legal rights and inclusion (Richter-Montpetit 2018). For every story of success in the policy arena, there are dozens more documenting the violence that LGBT people face. In both South Africa and Argentina, the high-profile murders of lesbians occurred just months before the passage of marriage equality laws. The lived experiences of sexual and gender minorities have highlighted this contradiction in the acquisition of citizenship rights for some time. In the 1990s, Urvashi Vaid (1995) described the situation of lesbians and gays in the United States as "virtual equality," saying that sexual minorities have attained only the appearance of equality rather than its full realization because of the persistence of discrimination, negative public opinion, and internalized stigma. LGBT people have been described as "strangers" to citizenship (Phelan 2001) or "fragmented citizens" (Engel 2016), unable to access all the benefits of citizenship. Not all LGBT people are equally vulnerable to violence; the benefits of rights and protections are contingent upon "access to normative power" (Stanley 2021: 2). In other words, the degree to which someone can exercise their rights depends on their position in social hierarchies determined by sexuality, race, gender, and ability, among other characteristics, a fact that is often forgotten in discussions of universal citizenship (Van Zyl 2009). In this sense, the extension of formal citizenship rights can obfuscate rather than illuminate the realities of LGBT people and their relationship to each other and the rest of society (Fischel 2019; Rao 2014).

Finally, the scenes I have described provide a glimpse into the different ways organizations may use the same sexual identity – lesbian – in pursuit of increased wellbeing for lesbians and other queer people. The near ubiquity of the identity categories lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender belie the specific characters of these identities when social movement organizations strategically take them up in pursuit of their goals. Though the construction of LGBT identities is influenced by Western trajectories, collective identities and the claims associated with them are "situationally specific" (Hunt, Benford, and Snow 1994: 186), intimately tied to the political histories of each national and local context and reflective of varying responses to transnational discourses (Ayoub 2014; Hoad 2007; Howe 2002; Moussawi 2015). Few studies have considered how identities are strategized differently by different LGBT movements or in relation to race, class, and gender identities – identities that also take on

different meanings across contexts.[1] An exception is Apoorva Ghosh's work (2015), which argues that organizations' negotiation of "post-colonial ethnicity" complicates the binary distinction between "respectable" and "queer" organizations, with the former being associated with corporate and mainstream cooptation and the latter associated with a critical perspective more likely to produce change. The negotiation of LGBT identities and culturally specific ones such as *hijra*, in the case of one Mumbai-based organization, has produced an agenda that cannot be easily classified in simple dichotomous terms. In identity strategizing, it is important to take an approach that recognizes the simultaneous negotiation of multiple identities because such an approach illuminates the scope of identity negotiation and provides insight into how organizations may challenge normative power along more than one dimension.

The realities facing LGBT activists in many parts of the world raise questions for scholars concerned about social movements and citizenship: How do activists manage the apparent contradiction between the promises of rights and persistent forms of marginalization? What are the various ways that activists use identity to reach beyond policy to eliminate violence and improve the lives of their constituents? What can specific strategic articulations of "lesbian" tell us about rights and democratic citizenship?

1 AN INTERSECTIONAL APPROACH TO CITIZENSHIP AND IDENTITY STRATEGIZING

The goal of this book is to explain the various ways organizations deploy identity in pursuit of improvements in the day-to-day lives of their constituents. Examining this issue addresses a significant gap in our understanding of LGBT politics and social movements. Up until now, most political science work in this area has focused on movements' ability to advocate for gay rights or, more recently, transgender rights (Currah, Juang, and Minter 2006; Díez 2015; Edelman 2020; Encarnación 2016; Hollar 2018; Pierceson, Piatti-Crocker, and Schulenberg 2010; Taylor, Haider-Markel, and Lewis 2018). These scholars argue that pro-LGBT policies result from activists' ability to access to the political system, take advantage of opportunities to form alliances with state actors, and frame their claims in terms of human or civil rights (Brown 2002; Croucher 2011; Díez 2011;

[1] See Anderson-Nathe, DeFilippis, and Mehrotra (2018) for an intersectional analysis of collective identity formation in the queer liberation movement in the US context.

Grundy and Smith 2005; Marsiaj 2011; Mertus 2007). While helpful for understanding how LGBT movements can expand the terms of citizenship, this literature does not consider the implementation of pro-LGBT policies and largely takes for granted the role of identity in mobilization.

When scholars do examine identity in LGBT social movements, they are divided on the utility of identity-based activism. One perspective argues that framing activism in terms of identity is largely ineffective. Identity claims draw upon the injury that marginalized groups have suffered, paradoxically solidifying their victim status (Brown 1995). Others maintain that identity-based approaches can narrow the scope of demands for change, limit the potential of coalitional work, and lend themselves to legalistic agendas because claims for rights are made based on belonging to a discrete identity group (Cohen 1997; One in Nine 2013; Spade 2015). The assimilationist strategies favored by many mainstream movements rely on static notions of lesbian and gay identity and overstate sameness to heterosexuals. This excludes LGBT people who cannot or do not want to be "just like" the majority (Mucciaroni 2017; Murib 2023; Phelan 2001; Stulberg 2018; Weiss 2003). In the global context, scholars argue that LGBT identity frameworks can override local ways of understanding sexuality and conceptions of justice (Altman 1996; Calvo and Trujillo 2011; Long 2009; Najmabadi 2012; Waites 2009). The globalization of LGBT identities can exacerbate tensions for activists outside Euro-America when they employ identities perceived to be foreign or Western (Babb 2003; Chabot and Duyvendak 2002; Currier 2012; De la Dehesa 2010; Hoad 2007; Thoreson 2014). This interdisciplinary literature adeptly demonstrates the problems with use of identity but often struggles to explain why activists invested in change would choose to continue to use it.

Other scholars argue that identity plays a vital role in the strategic repertoires of social movements (Bernstein 1997; Gamson 1995, 1996; Longaker 2021; Taylor and Whittier 1992). These scholars argue that identity strategies coalesce around depicting lesbians and gays as similar to or different from the heterosexual majority, depending on contextual factors (Bernstein 1997; Cortese 2006; Dugan 2008; Ghaziani 2011; Ghaziani, Taylor, and Stone 2016). While this literature has acknowledged that social movement actors negotiate multiple identities (Einwohner, Reger, and Myers 2008; Ghosh 2015; Moussawi 2015), it has not fully integrated the insights of intersectional theory on the development and effects of identity strategies. Specifically, there has not been sustained discussion of how race, class, and gender generate the factors

that influence sexual identity strategizing or the key role of the body in the public presentation of identity strategies.

Overall, research has not explained the conditions under which organizations strategize the relationships between identity categories and the potential effects of these strategic choices. In this book, I endeavor to fill this gap by taking a close look at how two lesbian organizations strategize identity in legal contexts that afford rights and recognition to sexual and gender minorities. I argue that, in addition to strategizing one identity category, organizations may strategize the relationships between identity categories to address the ways that interlocking systems of power affect their constituents. Despite commonalities transnationally and across many movements, such as the use of LGBT identity categories and liberal rights discourses, identities and the relationships between them vary according to context. Scholars must therefore consider the specificities of the process of inclusion. I conceptualize these specificities as differences in the historical construction of citizenship to understand how organizations respond to this new chapter in political context. As the opening anecdotes in this chapter demonstrate, activists' ability to embody these identity strategies in public is a crucial tactical component that allows for context-sensitive manipulation of identity for multiple, competing audiences and demands.

With these arguments, I make several contributions to existing literature. First, I join other scholars intent on examining the intersections of sexual identity with race, class, and gender in the study of LGBT social movements (Cohen 1997; Kollman and Waites 2011; Murib 2023). As I explain in Chapter 1, I apply an explicitly intersectional lens to analysis of the factors that influence strategic identity deployment to assess the conditions under which organizations choose to publicly deploy multiple identities. I challenge the idea, often implicit in social movement scholarship, that it is possible to mobilize on the basis of sexual identity in isolation from other identities. Instead, I show that organizations are always confronted with multiple identities but can choose how to publicly deploy sexual identity in relation to other identity categories. In doing so, my analysis addresses, but extends beyond, discussions of sameness and difference that characterize existing scholarship on strategic identity work (Bernstein 1997; Einwohner, Reger, and Myers 2008). By homing in on how sexuality relates to other identities, my analysis opens up space to consider additional characterizations of identity strategies.

Second, I intervene in conversations about citizenship and sexuality (Alexander 1994; Boston and Duyvendak 2015; Cossman 2002). I do

this by advancing inclusive citizenship as a conceptualization of the environmental factors that influence activists' decision making. As this chapter's opening anecdotes make clear, I explicitly theorize the way inclusive citizenship complicates identity work by creating a gap between rights in theory and rights in practice. That inclusion would complicate strategic calculations is somewhat counterintuitive, as LGBT movements worldwide have inclusion as their goal. Yet, as I explore throughout the book, legal success can raise new issues for LGBT organizations.

Third, bringing citizenship into conversation with identity strategizing reveals how differences in the historical construction of citizenship create variation in contemporary strategies. This includes the various ways the identity categories of race, gender, class, sexuality, and nationality have been constituted over time and how more recent expansions of citizenship on neoliberal terms affect organizations' strategizing. Here, I am indebted to scholarship that insists upon the historical specificity of sexuality and queer identities, and their imbrication in the logics of colonialism and state-building (Canaday 2009; Epprecht 2004; Hoad 2007; McClintock 1995; Mignolo 2016; Morgensen 2011; Stoler 1995; Wekker 2016).

Fourth, building on work that considers emotion and embodied performance, I center the embodied dimension of identity strategizing (Kaminski and Taylor 2008; Whittier 2012). I contend that embodiment is a key aspect of how strategies function and accounts for how organizations and their members can effectively deploy strategies that encompass multiple identities. A focus on embodiment reveals the role of identity strategies in contesting and upholding dominant notions of the rights-bearing citizen, allowing a conceptualization of how identity strategies influence the terms of legal inclusion without directly engaging the formal political system. Overall, this book provides an account of social movement organizations' identity strategies that takes multiple identities to be fundamental, rather than incidental, to these organizations' development, deployment, and political impact.

The insistence on bearing in mind the relationships between identity categories highlights the operation of power through which groups remain excluded from the benefits of citizenship. Examining how groups manage these power dynamics provides greater insight into how people live in "actually existing democracies" (Oxhorn and Postero 2010). Top-down approaches to democracy that focus on elite bargaining for rights and the adoption of inclusive policies that stop analysis at the moment of rights acquisition miss the side of the story that considers

not only the effective implementation of these rights by state actors but their interpretation, meaning, and everyday use. Indeed, there is a tremendous difference between "having citizenship and living it" (Gouws 2005: 87). Identity strategies allow groups to politicize dimensions or aspects of social, political, and economic life that are often thought to be outside of the realm of contestation (Waylen 1994). Yet depending on the strategy itself, it may leave relationships between identity categories – and therefore power relationships – unexamined and assumed. Understanding deployment of identity therefore clarifies how marginalized groups expand the terms of the political to question their relationship to the state, other members of the polity, and the parameters of the rights-bearing subject.

In the rest of this chapter I present the conceptual background of this project, which adopts an intersectional approach to understanding LGBT inclusion into citizenship. Toward the end of the chapter, I discuss some methodological aspects of this research and present the plan for the rest of the book.

2 LGBT INCLUSION: FROM OUTCASTS TO CITIZENS

Understanding the significance of LGBT people's inclusion into citizenship, and subsequent consequences for identity strategizing, requires an account of colonialism's influence on creation of identity categories and their relationship to each other. The "cornerstone" of the colonial process was the "racial codification of the world's population" (Bertolt 2018: 6). In both Latin America and Africa, colonists racialized Indigenous peoples and designated them as sexually deviant and perverse, which legitimized the appropriation of land and resources and the exploitation of Indigenous labor (Mignolo 2016; Picq 2018). As part of the colonial process, colonists dismantled kinship structures and delegitimized existing practices related to gender and sexuality, finding justification in notions of Christian morality and civilization (Adam 2020; Rohrer 2014). Maria Lugones (2008) calls this racialized classification scheme the "colonial/modern gender system." This system did not simply impose existing European notions of gender on to Indigenous peoples but also created racialized gender and sexual categories designed to ensure European domination. Authorities drew on this classification system in the colonial state-building process. In and through the establishment of state institutions, and often using science as their authoritative discourse, state-sanctioned experts created categories classified as either normal

or abnormal and enforced them across multiple institutions including immigration and judicial systems (Canaday 2009; Lewis 2012; Luibhéid 2005; Rohrer 2014). In this way, the establishment of modern citizenship helped to entrench identity categories and hierarchies of human value.

The colonial process set up "patterns of power" that shaped social, cultural, economic, and political systems that persisted even after formal decolonization (Maldonado-Torres 2007: 243). In places where colonial laws criminalized sodomy, such laws persisted or were reimagined in the postcolonial era. In her foundational work, M. Jacqui Alexander (1994) traces the historical process in Trinidad and Tobago through which populations were racialized and sexualized under colonial rule, and how the postcolonial state continued the project of population control to produce a normative citizenry. When postcolonial elites in the country passed the Sexual Offences Act of 1986 expanding colonial-era prohibitions of same-sex activity, the state inscribed the power of categories and criminalization on to the body. Elites cast their project as fighting internal "contamination" from the West, depicted as out-of-control bodies – immigrants, people with HIV, and those engaged in nonprocreative sex. This reproduced the terms of colonial (white) governance by projecting respectability in the international sphere, buttressing the country against a legitimacy crisis provoked by the precarity of their dependent insertion into the international economy.

Since at least the middle of the twentieth century, movements organized around gender and sexuality have targeted exclusionary legislation and cultural norms to contest the hetero and cissexist boundaries of citizenship (Campbell 2019; Croucher 2002; Díez 2015; Encarnación 2014; Marsiaj 2011). Whether working against the backdrop of formal democratic institutions or taking advantage of transition to democracy from authoritarian rule, LGBT activists have pursued what social movement scholars call "political opportunities" to advocate for and realize the adoption of pro-LGBT laws and policies (Bernstein, Marshall, and Barclay 2009; Brown 2002; Croucher 2002; Encarnación 2014; Green 1994; Paternotte and Tremblay 2015; Pecheny and Petracci 2006; Piatti-Crocker, Schulenberg, and Pierceson 2013; Tremblay, Paternotte, and Johnson, 2011). "Political opportunities" refers to aspects of the political environment that encourage mobilization, such as the openness of political institutions and the availability of allies in government (Meyer 2007). LGBT activists have taken advantage of resonant discourses of rights to frame their demands and communicate them to politicians and fellow citizens (Ho and Rolfe 2011; Kollman 2010; Mertus 2007; Thoreson

2014; Tremblay, Paternotte, and Johnson, 2011). For example, in both Argentina and South Africa, transitions from authoritarian rule provided LGBT activists with newfound political space to organize and make demands on democratizing political institutions using the language of human rights (Brown 2002; Croucher 2002). As mentioned earlier, the movements in Argentina and South Africa obtained important legal protections such as the right to be free from discrimination and to relationship recognition.

Partly because of these legal victories, the normative terrain confronting LGBT movements has shifted in many places from states' "insistence on heteronormativity to the increasing inclusion of homonormativity" (Puar 2013: 26). Reflecting upon political changes in the United States in the 1990s and early 2000s, Lisa Duggan (2003) introduced the concept of homonormativity to capture the way a normative white, middle-class gay subject had emerged that did not challenge heteronormative institutions or neoliberal consumption, but rather sought inclusion into them. Rather than presenting inclusion as successive processes of the betterment of a population, queer scholarship has demonstrated that inclusion is a violent process of "differentiation" through which deadly violence becomes legitimated against certain subjects (Haritaworn, Kuntsman, and Posocco 2014: 446). Jasbir Puar (2007) argues that the inclusion of some lesbians and gays into US citizenship in the post-9/11 era, through both law and cultural practices, is "contingent upon the segregation and disqualification of racial and sexual others from the national imaginary" (p. 2). Mainstream lesbian and gay organizations took advantage of anti-Muslim sentiment in politics and public opinion to craft demands for rights such as same-sex marriage in civilizational rhetoric that reinforced American exceptionalism and cast Middle Eastern countries as racially and sexually "backward" (Weber 2016). White, middle-class gays and lesbians became complicit in the state's projects of racialized exclusion in exchange for rights and belonging in a process referred to as "homonationalism" (Puar 2007). Overall, the inclusion of LGBT people into citizenship does not necessary challenge identity hierarchies around race, class, gender, or sexuality, and may even reify heteronormative standards in and through the incorporation of gender and sexual difference.

Though national citizenship presents a normative configuration of identity categories, the norms involved in the construction of these categories exceed national boundaries. Recent figurations of the "normal" homosexual have come to accompany figurations of the "perverse" homosexual in international relations (Weber 2016). For example, the