

Finding the Homosexual in Women's Rights

THE CHRISTIAN RIGHT IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

DORIS E. BUSS

Carleton University, Canada

Abstract

In recent years, organizations on the American Christian Right (CR) have become established actors at the United Nations, working to limit international agreement on developments seen as 'anti-family', such as women's rights, population policy and abortion. At the same time, the Vatican has established itself as a strong voice opposing international law and policy on women's rights. For both actors, women's rights represent a direct challenge to the 'natural family' and hence a particular world vision premised on a sexual division of labour. While women's rights is a central preoccupation for both actors, 'homosexuality' and the prospect of lesbian and gay rights and 'gay marriage' is also a recurrent theme, intricately connected to women's rights. This article explores the relationship between women's rights and homosexuality as drawn by these two actors. It asks why, in an international arena that offers little concrete recognition of, or protection for, lesbian and gay identities both the CR and Vatican are concerned about a presumed homosexual agenda. It also explores what role the debate about women's rights plays in facilitating this 'homosexual agenda'. In addressing these questions, this article seeks to explore, and raise further questions about international women's rights as a language for international discussion about social relations.

Keywords

anti-gay, Christian Right, gender, lesbian and gay, United Nations, Vatican, women's rights

In recent years, a new actor has emerged on the international civil society scene. American Christian Right organizations,¹ concerned by international

recognition of women and children's rights, have launched what they define as an international 'natural family' alliance. Christian Right activists are building a global alliance of conservative religious faiths, including Protestants, Mormons, Catholics, Jews, Hindus and Muslims, focused on resisting international law and policy developments seen as 'anti-family' – with family defined as 'the voluntary union of a man and a woman in the lifelong covenant of marriage'.² While the alliance remains a largely American and Christian dominated affair, it has become an established actor at international arenas, often working with the Vatican on issues relating to women and children.

The international politics of the Christian Right (CR) is largely directed at the United Nations (UN), its agencies, committees and, more often, the major UN-hosted international conferences of the 1990s and early part of the twenty-first century, such as the 1994 Cairo Conference on Population and Development, the 1995 Beijing Conference on Women or the 2002 UN General Assembly Special Session on Children. At these venues, the CR, alongside the Vatican, has worked to restrict international agreement on women's rights, population policy, children's rights, abortion and sexual and reproductive rights. Their intervention, at these and other venues, usually takes the form of looking for, and trying to prevent the inclusion of specific words – such as 'abortion', 'health services', 'gender' – into international agreements, decisions or policy documents.

In their international politics, the CR and Vatican target what they refer to as 'radical' feminism (see Buss and Herman 2003: ch. 6) and women's human rights, particularly reproductive rights, as primary aspects of an agenda they view as antithetical to the 'natural family'. But, it would be a mistake, I argue, to dismiss this movement as simply anti-feminist. In its global politics, the CR identify a number of international enemies of the 'natural family' including globalism, socialism and homosexuality.³ My focus here is on one of those enemies: homosexuality. In the area of women's rights, homosexuality is often directly linked to 'radical feminism', with the CR and Vatican suggesting that it is not possible to read the language of women's rights without recognizing its homosexual dimension. This raises two main questions explored in this article: why homosexuality? And what is the relationship, as understood by the CR, between homosexuals and feminists?

In an international arena where feminist, environmentalist and human rights actors have gained a degree of legitimacy and global profile, lesbian and gay organizations remain marginal at best.⁴ International agreements and policies exist for women's rights, children's rights and HIV/AIDS, but there is no international agreement or plan of action for 'sexual minorities', to use the terminology of the UN (Heinze 1995: 50–61; Morgan and Walker 1995: 212). Some attempts have been made to include lesbian and gay issues in international documents and human rights initiatives, such as the 2003 resolution on human rights and sexual orientation placed before the UN Human Rights Commission, which expressed 'deep concern at the occurrence

of violations of human rights in the world against persons on the grounds of their sexual orientation'. The reference to 'sexual orientation' was strongly resisted by some Muslim countries – Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Egypt, Libya and Malaysia, in particular – who proposed amendments deleting the two words. Unable to move forward, the Commission deferred discussion on the resolution until 2004.⁵ Attempts such as this have been sporadic, often constituting minor provisions attached to larger documents (on, for example, women's rights or HIV/AIDS), and are, for the most part unsuccessful. Where women's rights may have achieved at least formal or notional acceptance, lesbian and gay rights are resolutely opposed at the international level.⁶

Despite the patchy record of lesbian and gay international political activity (Walker 2000: 351), the CR and Vatican continue none the less to evoke the spectre of homosexuality and a homosexual agenda at work internationally. If lesbian and gay activists have had only a marginal impact on international law and policy, why are the CR and Vatican so concerned? And, if lesbian and gay activists maintain a minor international presence, from where and how do the CR and Vatican see the homosexual threat emerging? And, what is this relationship between feminism and homosexuality for the CR? Are feminists and 'homosexuals' the same enemy, or do they merely work in concert? While it might be tempting to dismiss this focus on women's rights as a convenient stratagem for a movement in search of a (homosexual) demon, does this tell the whole story? Might it be that the language of women's rights and feminist activism resonates at some level with a CR vision of the interplay between social order and sexuality?

In this article, I take a closer look at the CR's depiction of a homosexual force at work internationally. My objective is two-fold. First, understanding the CR's construction of homosexuality as an enemy of the 'natural family' is essential to making sense of this global social movement and its international agenda. Frank Lechner argues that in its global orientation, religious orthodoxy – what Lechner (1993: 28) calls 'fundamentalism' – advocates a particular world view and attempts to change the 'actual balance of power in the world and the cultural terms in which global actors operate'. The construction of enemies is one of the devices by which the CR maps its world view and global political project. As with other conservative religious movements, the CR at the UN evidences a 'friend-foe way of thinking' (Meyer 2001: 8), in which a politics of change is constituted through a process of contesting 'the enemy' (Aho 1994: 14–15).

Second, the relationship between homosexuality and women's rights helps to reveal and complicate the world view that underlies some aspects of CR global politics. In turn, it also reveals, and is constitutive of, global dynamics around women's rights. The rise of an international CR politics occurs at a time when, for a variety of reasons, women's rights have secured an unprecedented degree of international recognition. While this recognition is far from unproblematic (see, for example, Mayer 1995), it suggests a global order in which the language of women's rights, for good and bad, has become a

framework within which to contest social relations. What larger questions might this raise for feminist and human rights advocates about women's human rights and the direction of future international engagement?

I start this article by providing a brief and inevitably partial overview of CR activists reviewed for this research. The groups discussed self-define as 'orthodox religious believers'⁷ who are active, to varying degrees, in the 'natural family' politics at the UN and, in most cases, the World Congress of Families (WCF), discussed in more detail later. In this study, I draw on the publications and newsletters, statements and interventions of these CR groups at UN meetings from the late 1990s to the present, as well as publications from affiliated CR 'think-tanks', and transcripts of interviews with activists conducted in 1999. As with any other social movement, the alliance of orthodox faiths active at the UN is inherently unstable, contradictory, at times conflicted, in a state of change, and inevitably pragmatic. The analysis presented in this article is based on the work and politics of an array of CR activists and institutions in this movement, but tends to focus on those who act as the public face and negotiating arm of the CR at the UN. Inevitably, there will be disagreements among CR activists, tensions between grassroots and elite members, frontline workers and policy entrepreneurs and evolving, and sometimes contradictory policy positions. The groups studied and referred to here represent the leading force in the movement towards an orthodox, 'natural family' alliance at the UN.

THE CHRISTIAN RIGHT AT THE UN

In the period following the 1995 UN conference on women in Beijing, China, a number of American Catholic, Protestant and Mormon organizations began to mobilize a conservative Christian coalition at the UN. Initially focused on resisting what it sees as a feminist take-over of the UN,⁸ this coalition has broadened its remit to spearhead a global campaign on behalf of the 'natural family', defined as the married union between a man and woman. The result is that the CR has become an established actor in international arenas, repeatedly clashing with feminist and other NGOs, and seeking to build alliances with sympathetic state governments, and, less successfully, other orthodox faiths, such as Islam, Judaism, and more recently Hinduism.⁹

CR international activism has become a distinct entity, continuous with but notably different from its domestic manifestation in US politics. In this article, for the sake of clarity, I refer to this alliance as the 'CR UN', to capture both its difference in make-up, and arena of political struggle. The CR UN parts company with its domestic allies on several fronts. First, it focuses almost exclusively on the socio-political dimensions of global change, particularly as they are seen to affect the 'natural family'. For both the domestic and international CR, there is a crisis in the 'natural family', but for the CR UN this crisis has assumed *global* proportion necessitating international action.

Second, the target of this international activism is the UN and, particularly the now ubiquitous UN-hosted international conference. The 1990s saw the unfolding of a relatively new arena for political engagement in the form of international meetings on various issues from the environment (Rio de Janeiro, 1992), population and development (Cairo, 1994), human rights (Vienna, 1993) and women (Beijing, 1995). The involvement of high-level state representatives, together with an activist NGO sector turned these conferences into dynamic events at which policy options were considered, the negotiation of fundamental policy change was made possible and future agenda items prefigured (Charlesworth 1996; Clark *et al.* 1998). These conferences, and particularly the involvement of NGOs, represent for the CR UN the worst possible aspects of an activist international order¹⁰ as well as, paradoxically, the most effective means for their own international participation (Buss 2004).

Some of the groups I include in the CR UN, such as Concerned Women for America,¹¹ Focus on the Family¹² and to a lesser extent Eagle Forum,¹³ are active in American domestic politics and have only recently developed a political presence at the UN. Other activists have organized separate, internationally oriented groups for the specific purpose of engaging in a 'natural family' politics at the UN. Organizations like the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute (C-Fam)¹⁴ and the Mormon organization World Family Policy Center (WFPC; formerly NGO Family Voice)¹⁵ have taken a leadership role in developing a coherent CR UN voice at the international realm.

Alongside these activist groups, and providing much of the policy direction for the CR UN, are several CR 'think-tanks',¹⁶ of which the Howard Center is the most notable. The Howard Center provides a base for some CR UN activists and produces specialized 'research' material on 'the family' that informs CR UN positions on various related issues.¹⁷ It is also one of two convenors (along with the World Family Policy Center) of the WCF.¹⁸ With its regular, regional meetings and conferences, the WCF is emerging as a permanent, global, inter-faith institution, instrumental in guiding the CR UN's attempt to build an alliance of orthodox faiths at the UN.

Another key actor allied with but distinct from the CR UN's 'natural family' politics is the Vatican, acting at the UN through its offices of the Holy See.¹⁹ As a permanent observer at the UN, the Vatican has rights of access that are greater than those afforded to non-governmental organizations, such as the CR UN. At UN conferences, this means that the Vatican can vote on the final document, add reservations to conference agreements, access state only meetings and rooms and negotiate alongside other states. In this capacity, the Vatican defines itself not as a Catholic actor, but more as a state-like entity with universal citizenship, working on behalf of 'the integral good of every human being'.²⁰

The CR UN regard the Vatican, with its status at the UN and its self-defined moral project, as a leader in the 'natural family' movement. This open alliance with the Vatican is likely to raise eyebrows among some American Christian

Right activists for whom there is a history of anti-Catholic sentiment (Herman 1997: 42–4). Several of the CR UN activists I interviewed, however, expressed open support for the Vatican's international politics, seeing it as providing a voice of morality at the UN (see, for example, Moloney 1999; Reid 1999; Wright 1999).

LOOKING FOR – AND FINDING? – AN INTERNATIONAL 'HOMOSEXUAL' AGENDA

Both the CR and Vatican make their opposition to homosexuality clear. In the case of the CR, this anti-gay position has translated into extensive and well-orchestrated campaigns in American domestic politics to oppose measures extending rights and protection to lesbians and gay men (Gallagher and Bull 1996; Herman 1997). Within the Catholic church, the 1986 release of the *Letter to all Catholic Bishops on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons* began John Paul II's legacy of explicit opposition to homosexuality, and identification of homosexuality as a 'political problem' (Jordan 2000: ch. 2). The letter on pastoral care, issued by Cardinal Ratzinger of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, sought to clarify the Vatican's position on homosexuality, stipulating that homosexuality, whether practised or not, is an 'objective disorder', indicating a 'strong tendency ordered toward an intrinsic moral evil'.²¹ A further clarification issued by the Vatican in a June 2003 document 'Considerations on Unions between Homosexual Persons',²² condemned homosexual acts as 'against the natural moral law', closing 'the sexual act to the gift of life'. Homosexual unions are to be opposed because 'they're not able to contribute in a proper way to the procreation and survival of the human race' and create 'obstacles in the normal development of children'.

In recent years, the Vatican has taken a politically active stance against lesbian and gay rights, issuing, for example, a condemnation of lesbian and gay 'unions', and rights to adoption.²³ In 2003, the Vatican issued a seventeen-page document calling on Catholic politicians worldwide to bring their political positions more in line with their religious beliefs in the areas of abortion, cloning and same-sex marriage (Paulson 2003; Williams 2003). Recent moves by some states, such as Canada, to recognize same-sex marriage are being hotly contested by the Vatican both through further explicit condemnations issued through its offices in Rome and, in the context of Canada, by directly intervening in the Supreme Court of Canada hearings on same-sex marriage.²⁴

Despite the clear anti-gay position of both the Vatican and CR, there is a central tension, at the very outset, in their international opposition to homosexuality: while the threat of a homosexual future is proclaimed by both actors, neither clearly nor consistently explains what the international homosexual movement – or its agenda – is. Rather, the CR UN and Vatican tend to be vague and sometimes even contradictory about this homosexual

threat. In a 1999 interview, Austin Ruse, President of Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, shrugged off the idea of an active lesbian and gay movement at the UN. 'The question of homosexuality does not come up here, it just does not come up in the United Nations. . . . I am surprised, honestly, I am surprised that they [homosexuals] are not here' (Ruse 1999).

Yet only months before this comment, Ruse and other CR UN activists opposed a series of measures, at various international negotiations, which they saw as attempts to advance homosexuality, including gay marriage. These measures include the use of the term 'gender', described by Austin Ruse in a 1998 article as a 'codeword for gay rights [used] by homosexual activists'.²⁵ In an article on the 1998 negotiations on the International Criminal Court, Richard G. Wilkins, Law Professor and Managing Director of the World Family Policy Center (WFPC) at Brigham Young University and Kathryn O. Balmforth, former Executive Director of WFPC, argue that 'United Nations human rights organizations have embarked on a concerted effort to reinterpret already accepted human rights documents to include new rights for homosexuals' and that these efforts are supported by the likes of Mary Robinson, former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights.²⁶

If 'questions of homosexuality' do not come up at the UN, where do these seemingly pro-gay initiatives come from? If 'homosexuals are not at the UN', who or what was behind the supposed efforts to advance gay marriage and introduce homosexuality through the term gender? Neither the Vatican nor the CR UN offer a detailed analysis of the homosexual threat apparently at work internationally. In contrast to its well-defined and orchestrated anti-gay campaign in domestic US politics (Herman 1997), the CR internationally appears more ad hoc in its opposition to homosexuality; impressionistic rather than specific; allusive rather than documentary.

This failure to articulate a coherent vision of the homosexual threat depicted by the CR UN and Vatican may be explained by a number of factors. First and most obvious, the absence of an orchestrated campaign for lesbian and gay international rights might make it difficult for CR UN activists to label the threat they see emerging internationally. Similarly, the very lack of a specific 'coding' of lesbian and gay issues by way of international human rights guarantees, for example, may mean that the CR UN is a movement in search of a target, at least as far as its anti-gay politics are concerned.

Second, the CR UN remains a relatively new participant in international venues, though this is less true of the Vatican, and it may be that its failure to give a clear embodiment to its enemy is partly due to the CR UN's own lack of clarity about who and what it faces internationally. We might expect that as the CR UN continues to develop its international political engagement, combined with its emerging research agenda through various affiliated 'think-tanks', more detailed investigation of, and analysis into, the homosexual threat will emerge in its campaign literature.

Whatever the reason, the CR UN and Vatican characterization of the homosexual threat is defined at the outset by this central tension between a

movement that *threatens* yet is largely unidentified and unexplained. The result is that homosexuality *pops* up in CR UN campaign literature, but is either defined as shadowy and threatening – ‘small but . . . very rich, powerful, and dangerous’²⁷ – or a movement that works in conjunction with other, often more concrete actors, like ‘radical’ feminists.

For example, in an article that originally appeared in the Family Research Council *Insight* series of essays, journalist Tom McFeely (2001) characterizes homosexuals as operating by ‘stealth’ and ‘subterfuge’. In an argument echoed throughout CR UN campaign literature and which I discuss in more detail later, that campaign of stealth takes the form of ‘definitional subterfuges’ (2001: 118) in which terms like ‘orientation’, ‘gender’ and ‘various forms of the family’ (2001: 119) are deployed in a ‘deliberately confusing and inaccurate’ manner (2001: 118).

In other contexts, CR UN activists warn of a ‘homosexual’ threat linked to various actors and ‘agendas’. They depict homosexuals as working in collaboration with the ‘population control movement’ to discourage motherhood and reduce fertility through the ‘incessant call for abortion rights . . . and sexual freedom’ (Hamm 1995: 143). They highlight international negotiations on children’s rights, the International Criminal Court and HIV/AIDS as areas where attempts are made to secure explicit recognition of lesbian and gay identities and the legitimacy of gay marriage through terminology such as ‘various forms of the family’, ‘persecution’ and ‘men who have sex with men.’²⁸ And, as I will discuss in more detail later, efforts to secure women’s rights are depicted by the CR UN as duplicitous attempts to gain recognition – through the language of rights – of homosexuality including homosexual marriage.²⁹

The Vatican opposes many of the same initiatives identified by the CR UN as part of a homosexual agenda, and at some UN conferences, the Vatican appears to work in concert with the CR UN and its allies.³⁰ In general, however, the Vatican has been more circumspect in its specific identification of a homosexual force at work in international arenas. In its 1995 statement of reservations on and interpretation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (on women), the Vatican objected to the language of ‘sexual and reproductive rights’ because it gives women ‘unqualified control over sexuality and fertility . . . [and] could be interpreted as a societal endorsement of abortion or homosexuality.’³¹ In more recent UN interventions, the Vatican has rarely invoked the ‘h’ word – homosexuality – using instead strong language depicting a sexualization of social issues, including human rights, that is part of a larger moral corruption of society and the family. The Vatican’s intervention at the 2002 General Assembly Special Session on Children is perhaps the best example of this approach:

When moral values are trampled on with impunity, when the atmosphere is artificially charged with eroticism, when the meaning of human sexuality is emptied and trivialized and children are even induced into unspeakable lifestyles

and behavior in an alarming climate of permissiveness, the risk of violence grows.³²

In this and other statements, the Vatican uses suggestive and vaguely indeterminate language to evoke the spectre of a radical sexual liberality that works in unison with what Pope John Paul II calls the western 'culture of death' (Urquhart 1995: 172). Vatican statements issued in the context of UN meetings and conferences, refer to 'minority' interests representing a 'narrow' or 'small' segment of the population, pushing a dangerous 'ideology' on the international community.³³ That ideology, sometimes called 'gender ideology',³⁴ is a reference to feminist and lesbian and gay attempts to secure greater recognition and rights. In its report on marriage and 'ad hoc' unions, for example, the Pontifical Council for the Family (2000) argues that 'gender ideology' – the view that 'being a man or a woman is not determined fundamentally by sex but by culture' – is being used as 'the very bases [for attacking] the family and interpersonal relationships' (2000: para. 8). 'Claiming a similar status for marriage and de facto unions (including homosexual unions) is usually justified today on the basis of categories and terms that come from the ideology of "gender"' (2000: para. 8).

The Vatican's preoccupation with upholding the family defined by marriage 'between man and woman, that is, husband and wife'³⁵ as a 'social truth'³⁶ has been a recurrent theme at recent UN conferences. Read together with references to 'moral pollution' and 'unspeakable "lifestyles"' in the context of violence against children,³⁷ and the 'proper use of sexuality'³⁸ in the context of arresting the spread of HIV/AIDS, and a picture emerges of an international force at work to undermine the 'natural family' and promote a campaign of sexual liberality that includes 'homosexuality'.

This picture of an indeterminate sexual liberalism at work internationally leaves many questions unanswered, such as: who or what lies behind this campaign of sexual liberality? What is this international force and what does it hope to gain by undermining the 'natural family' and promoting a new sexual order? In place of a concrete answer, a dominant theme emerging from CR UN and Vatican publications and statements is that the homosexual agenda, whatever it may be, is primarily advanced through the language of women's rights.

FEMINISTS, HOMOSEXUALS AND HOMOSEXUAL FEMINISTS

For both the Vatican and CR UN, the link between homosexuals and feminists is made in a number of ways. First, feminists are defined as homosexuals, and more particularly 'lesbians'. The feminist movement is 'peopled' by lesbians (Reid 1999) 'leading feminist ideologues are themselves lesbians' (McFeely 2001: 119) and UN conferences, such as the Beijing Conference, have offered a 'clear place' for lesbians.³⁹

In support of this characterization of a feminist homosexual agenda, the CR UN and Vatican point to attempts, supported by feminist activists, at the 1995 Beijing Conference on Women to include in the agreed document, references to 'sexual orientation' (Sanders 1996; Fried and Landsberg-Lewis 1999: 113–14). The draft agreement at Beijing referred to sexual orientation primarily in the context of women's right not to be discriminated against on the basis of sexual identity. The phrase 'sexual orientation' was kept bracketed – and subject to negotiation – until the early hours of the morning on the last day of negotiations when it was struck out (Sanders 1996; Fried and Landsberg-Lewis 1999: 113–14). Several states, including the USA, Canada and the European Union, agreed to read sexual orientation into their obligations under the Beijing agreement. Defining lesbians as feminists, and feminists as lesbians is, of course, nothing new (see, for example, Herman 1997: ch. 4), but the CR UN maintain a terminological distinction between 'feminists' and 'homosexuals', suggesting that beyond an overlap in personnel, the feminist and homosexual movements are otherwise distinct (McFeely 2001). They come together at the points where their different agendas overlap.⁴⁰ Thus, the second link drawn by the CR UN between feminists and homosexual activists is a shared investment in a particular vision of social change that might be characterized as an undermining of the 'natural family'.

The CR UN use various terms to suggest that issues such as abortion, a sexual division of labour, diversity of families and the legal and social recognition of homosexuality all serve to undermine the social order predicated upon the 'natural family'. A review of CR UN activist material reveals identification of a panoply of different agendas/forces/ideologies all working in alliance to build a 'post family' social order (Carlson 1999: 10). 'Feminist ideologues' (McFeely 2001: 119) work on behalf of a feminist agenda that includes abortion, a 'reproductive rights agenda'⁴¹ and 'homosexual rights'.⁴² The 'homosexual agenda',⁴³ also referred to as the 'gay rights agenda' (McFeely 2001: 118), promotes 'homosexual ideology'⁴⁴ and a 'radical safe-sex' agenda,⁴⁵ supported by an array of 'pro-homosexual forces',⁴⁶ mostly unidentified but including a 'coalition of left-wing governments',⁴⁷ and quite possibly, the 'condom lobby', working on behalf of the distribution of condoms and against the promotion of abstinence to curb the spread of AIDS.⁴⁸

Underpinning most of these references to various agendas at work internationally is the argument that all of these forces and agendas seek to undermine the 'natural family' and particularly the Christian family (Buss and Herman 2003). There is not space in this article to do justice to the 'new family theology' that underlies and structures much of the CR UN understanding of its international political project (but see Buss and Herman 2003: chs 1 and 5). What emerges from the above is a conviction by the CR UN and Vatican that the interests of feminists and homosexuals converge in this 'post family' dystopia. Thus, while homosexuals and feminists are depicted by the CR UN as more or less the same people (feminists are lesbians), and share a similar commitment to a social change antithetical to the 'natural

family', a third point of convergence emerges: both homosexual and feminist ends are achievable through the promotion of women's rights.

In a 1999 interview, Austin Ruse, President, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, described the 'feminist agenda' at the UN as a complete 'sea change in mankind' contingent upon women's liberation from their biological bodies.

Buss: And what is the agenda that radical feminists are advancing?

Ruse: The agenda? Do you mean at the end of the day what did they want? I don't really know, perhaps it's a complete change, a sea change in mankind. I mean at the end of the day perhaps that's what they are looking for. . . . it seems . . . the most important thing to them is complete freedom from their reproductive systems, which some feminists have referred to pregnancy as a kind of sexual slavery.

The implication in most CR UN activist publications is that the 'sea change' that lies at the heart of feminist activism and that will be achieved through the international recognition of women's rights, also serves homosexual interests, precisely by rewriting the social – and biological – order. CR UN publications as well as Vatican statements at UN events focus on the language of women's rights as triggering a radical rewriting of the social order in which sexual relations, including the 'natural family' and the 'natural' roles of men and women, are undermined. Terms such as 'reproductive rights' and 'health' are identified as signifiers of efforts to make access to abortion a fundamental human right,⁴⁹ while sexual rights and education, particularly as applied to adolescents, are identified as referring to the promotion of varied sexual conduct.⁵⁰

In the following section, I explore in more detail how the CR UN read these different terms as signalling a radical social agenda. The CR UN and Vatican see language as the key weapon of feminist and homosexual forces. The word that most clearly symbolizes the importance of language and the shared interests of feminists and homosexuals is 'gender'.

The Gender Agenda

Language is the weapon of choice at the United Nations – where politicians 'negotiate' instead of vote, where battles are fought with words instead of bullets and where victory is won with syllables not swords. That's because U.N. delegates, charged with protecting human rights worldwide, understand that words communicate ideas and ideas have powerful consequences.⁵¹

Very generally, the CR UN argument about the power of language, repeatedly found in its campaign literature, goes something like this: feminists use vague or 'innocuous'⁵² sounding language to mask another agenda: most commonly, the promotion of abortion and the destruction of the 'natural family'.⁵³ For

example, CR UN activists point to 'reproductive health', and variations on that phrase including 'sexual rights', 'reproductive rights' and 'health services', as duplicitous attempts to make abortion a universal human right.⁵⁴ For example, recent CR UN activist literature – primarily newsletters – carried the story about a Canadian government delegate to the UN who 'revealed' that the phrase 'reproductive health services' includes abortion. According to the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, the revelation occurred as follows:

Following a request by the United States to explain the seemingly innocuous word 'services' in relation to 'reproductive health care,' the Canadian responded, 'Of course it includes, and I hate to say the word, but it includes abortion.' Gasps could be heard from all across Conference Room 4 at UN headquarters in New York City.⁵⁵

This 'admission' by an unnamed Canadian is held out by CR UN activists as the smoking gun proving what they have long argued: 'that some delegations push radical social agendas by using such innocuous language – a strategy to avoid real debate on what they know would be controversial positions'.⁵⁶

The Vatican, meanwhile, has long condemned 'ambiguous terminology' such as "women's right to control their sexuality", "women's right to control ... their fertility" or "couples and individuals" that it says characterize international agreements on women's rights and related issues. These terms are objectionable to the Vatican because they 'could be understood as endorsing sexual relationships outside heterosexual marriage', and as a 'societal endorsement of abortion or homosexuality'.⁵⁷

The Vatican recently issued its own dictionary clarifying the meaning of 'ambiguous terminology' such as 'reproductive rights', 'gender' and the 'Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women'.⁵⁸ These terms need clarification, according to Cardinal Alfonso Lopez Trujillo, president of the Pontifical Council for the Family, the body responsible for compiling the dictionary, because they may take on meanings 'used to signify a radical ideological feminism'.⁵⁹

Perhaps the term most often identified by the CR UN and Vatican as operating to masquerade a nefarious social reform agenda is 'gender'. For the Vatican, the idea that 'male' and 'female' are socially constructed categories is inimical to its conception of the 'natural family' defined by the specific roles performed by men and women.⁶⁰ The Vatican views the complementarity of women and men as essential to the family with women and men performing the roles dictated by their different biologies. Women, for example, are 'wives and mothers'. While the Vatican argues that these roles are not biologically deterministic, in that women can be mothers *and* employees⁶¹ this complementarity between women and men is built on an essential sexual difference.⁶² Thus, gender, in its suggestion of the social construction of female and male, poses a threat to the Vatican's 'natural family' form and is resisted by the

Vatican in its interventions at the UN. In its statement of reservations and interpretations on the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, for example, the Vatican stated that it understood gender as 'grounded in biological sexual identity, male or female' and specifically rejected 'dubious interpretations based on world views which assert that sexual identity can be adapted indefinitely to suit new and different purposes.'⁶³ The CR UN takes a similar position, arguing that if gender roles are viewed as socially constructed, this will lead to homosexuality through the removal of the boundaries that define male and female.

Unfortunately, when you buy into the concept that there is no distinction between men and women that leads you down a path that gets you to accept homosexuality. What's the difference between a man and a man being together if there is no difference between men and women? Then, [you get] into all other kinds of bizarre lifestyles ...

(Wright 1999)

CR UN activist publications periodically make reference to what I have termed the 'five genders' argument.⁶⁴ Loosely based on the work of Anne Fausto-Sterling (1993),⁶⁵ the CR UN argue that the real agenda behind attempts to include 'gender' is a societal transformation in which gender identity is not limited to male and female.

[T]he goal (of activists at the Beijing Conference) is to give members of the human family five genders from which to choose instead of two. When freed from traditional biases, a person can decide whether to be male, female, homosexual, lesbian, or transgendered. Some may want to try all five in time.⁶⁶

Thus, 'gender', whether as part of the five genders story or a feminist campaign to universalize abortion, is a central and recurring feature of CR UN and Vatican positions at the UN. Through references to the 'gender agenda' or 'gender ideology', both the Vatican and CR UN position 'gender' as the key to the global political project of feminists, lesbians and gay men. This emphasis on – and arguably sensationalization of – the term 'gender' might be explained, in part, by the importance of the term 'gender' in feminist international political engagement, particularly around women's rights.

Feminist campaigns and legal strategies to secure international recognition of 'women's rights as human rights' (Peters and Wolper 1995) have consciously deployed the term gender to convey, among other things, a more comprehensive approach to women's rights rather than simple inclusion into existing frameworks (Bunch 1995). There is not space in this article to explore fully the centrality of gender to feminist international activism. However, feminist analysis of international law and politics incorporates an understanding of 'gender' – the recognition that sex roles are socially constructed – as 'a central dynamic through which power is articulated' (Segal 1999: 42). Feminist

scholars, for example, argue that existing international institutions, actors and the very discipline of international law, are premised on a world view, in which the duality of masculine and feminine imposes normative constraints on women's equality (see, generally, Peterson 1992; Bunch 1995; Sullivan 1995; Peterson and True 1998; Charlesworth and Chinkin 2000; Marchand and Runyan 2000). In the area of women's rights, a 'gender' analysis is advocated as a means to explore and challenge culturally constructed notions of masculinity and femininity that limit equal access to and application of human rights protections. Similarly, campaigns for 'gender justice' within the new International Criminal Court argue for a more expansive legal recognition of the ways in which gender structures particular forms of violence (Bedont and Hall-Martinez 1999; Copelon 2000).

The Christian Right and Vatican resisted these attempts to include 'gender' at various conferences from the 1995 Beijing conference on women (Buss 1998), to the Rome negotiations on the International Criminal Court (Copelon 2000). The result is that some international negotiations and agreements have become a tug-of-war over the inclusion of 'gender', with feminists pulling on one side for keeping the term, and CR UN activists and sympathetic states and actors, resisting. In these struggles, the CR UN and Vatican demonstrate a deeply focused opposition to 'gender' that cannot be explained solely by feminist preference for the term. Rather, this opposition to gender is likely motivated, to a large degree, by the CR UN and Vatican view that 'gender' fundamentally challenges the presumed correlation between biology and sexuality, a topic that has also been the subject of extensive feminist comment (see, for example, Butler 1993; Ingraham 1994; Martin 1996; Scott 1999; Segal 1999).

The term gender, for the CR UN and Vatican, poses a clear challenge to the social order based on the 'natural family'. Through references to the 'gender agenda' and 'gender ideology', these actors draw an explicit link between the politics of women's rights and its effect on a social order characterized by a sexual division of labour. Take, for example, the following comments by James Dobson, president of Focus on the Family written in advance of the 1995 Beijing Conference on Women and as part of a newsletter explaining the importance of Christian Right activism at that conference:

[T]he radicals want to dissolve the traditional roles of mothers and fathers. They also hope to eliminate such terms as 'wife, husband, son, daughter, sister, brother, manhood, womanhood, masculine' and 'feminine'. ... The ultimate goal ... is a plan to get rid of traditional sexuality in order to destroy patriarchy.⁵⁷

In this comment, Dobson makes a link between sexuality and patriarchy, in which the opening up of one leads to the destruction of the other. Gender – the move from biology to social construction – leaves 'the door wide open for governments to include homosexuality, bisexuality and transsexuality'.⁶⁸

Accepting gender as socially constructed 'would usher in acceptance of homosexual, lesbian and transgender/transsexual behavior'.⁶⁹

At its most basic, CR UN and Vatican opposition to gender as leading to homosexuality is an argument that 'sexual practices [are] capable of generating social change' (Richardson 2000: 31). Homosexual families, pre-marital sex and multiple partners are all characterized by the CR UN as leading to a form of social decay in which the 'natural family' will disappear. In this respect, the CR UN and Vatican offer a vision of the relationship between sexual and social spheres more fluid than that sometimes suggested by feminists themselves (Richardson 2000: 29–30). Indeed, the CR UN and Vatican insistence that gender – the social rather than biological construction of sex roles – *inevitably* challenges heterosexuality goes to the heart of recent feminist debates about the problematic erasure of sexuality from some understandings of gender. For some feminist theorists, social constructionism, and the reification of the sex/gender dichotomy have functioned to naturalize sex as heterosex. The insistence on gender as socially constructed and sex as biology, positions 'sex', and the existence of two sexes – male and female – as unquestionably 'natural', and desire as unquestionably heterosexual (Butler 1990: ch. 1; Ingraham 1994; Smart 1995; Davies 1997). Ironically, the CR UN and Vatican are raising the alarm about the radicalism of gender at the same time that some feminists are bemoaning its potential impotence.

The CR UN and Vatican opposition to gender highlights very clearly the nexus they draw between feminism and homosexuality. A change in the social structure precipitated by women's rights raises the alarm of a rupture in the sexual arena, just as a change in a biologically deterministic sexual sphere heralds the demise of a social system built upon the 'natural family'. This conflation of feminist politics with homosexual outcomes raises a number of issues about the actual manifestation of sexual politics at the UN, and the role of women's rights as a political framework for a larger discussion about social relations.

WHEN HOMOSEXUALITY MEETS WOMEN'S RIGHTS

There are likely a number of factors that motivate and shape CR UN and Vatican anti-gay politics. Strategically, finding an international homosexual foe may provide the CR with more continuity between its domestic and international politics. Many of the CR actors at the UN will have cut their activist teeth in American domestic politics and thus have a finely tuned sensitivity for anti-gay politics. The homosexual threat may, in this vein, also strike a chord with CR grass roots members who might otherwise be opposed to CR international activism or fail to see the significance of the UN as a political arena.⁷⁰

An anti-gay politics also provides a crucial point of alliance between CR UN actors and Muslim and Catholic countries with which the CR is attempting to forge a single, 'pro-family' movement at the UN (see Buss and Herman

2003). Events at the 2001 UN General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS demonstrate the level of antipathy to lesbian and gay rights in the international arena. References to gay men as one of the groups particularly vulnerable to HIV/AIDS were removed from the final document because of opposition by some states, many of them fundamentalist Islamic, who objected to even the mere mention of 'men who have sex with men' (Beattie and Valkin 2001). This position was supported by the CR UN, and hailed as a victory for 'pro family groups'.⁷¹

The homosexual threat thus provides the CR UN with something of a rationale or *raison d'être* not as readily found in the spectre of 'radical' feminism. In many respects, women's rights are a difficult issue for CR UN activists, some of whom self-identify as feminists (Ruse 1999) and others who find it hard to be 'against' rights (Moloney 1999; Reid 1999; Wright 1999). Sarah Diamond has similarly argued that 'women's rights' has become a problem for domestic CR politics in the USA: 'Even on the Right, it is no longer politically correct to make direct attacks on women's equality ... one does not read or hear arguments from the Right that women *should* be paid less than men for the same work ...' (Diamond 1998: 127, emphasis in original). Homosexuality thus offers a potentially more uncomplicated target for the CR. This is not to suggest that feminism is not still a central villain in CR UN activism. Indeed, I would argue that 'radical' feminists are, in many respects, the *dramatis personae* in a larger CR UN politics based on protecting 'the traditional family', but which includes other enemies, such as homosexuals.

Finally, the CR UN and Vatican are at least partly right that the language of women's rights, for good or bad, has proved to be a potential vehicle for securing international recognition of sexual rights (Lai and Ralph 1995; Fried and Landsberg-Lewis 1999; Otto 1999). The Beijing Conference, with its bracketed references to 'sexual orientation', enabled a reasonably high-level international discussion of sexuality as a human right. Similarly, the decision by some state governments to *read in* sexual orientation to the final Beijing agreement represented an important step towards international recognition of some aspects of lesbian and gay rights.

All of these factors suggest that homosexuality is and likely will remain a key enemy against which the CR UN defines itself. Other enemies, such as 'radical' feminists are also important global contenders, and there is no indication that one or the other occupies first place in a CR UN 'most wanted' list. However, it is equally clear that feminist activism and the language of women's rights will continue to frame CR UN and Vatican opposition to various global political initiatives. Not only does women's rights, particularly as advanced by 'radical' feminists, represent for the CR UN and Vatican a vision of social relations antithetical to its own, women's rights also provides an accessible conceptual platform from which to launch a 'natural family' global politics. And it is here, at the intersection of feminist activism, women's rights and international politics that I want to offer some tentative, concluding thoughts.

In a study of women's human rights activism and scholarship, anthropologist Annelise Riles (2002: 303) argues that for feminists, international human rights 'served as a marker, an empty box around which a contentious conversation could be cautiously continued'. Thus, while the language of women's rights may have become a political project in its own right, it serves another purpose: providing an arena and context within which to make other demands on, and challenges to, the social order. Similarly, one might read women's rights as 'keywords' (see Appadurai 1990) in a period of global change where social relations are negotiated and contested at forums like the UN-hosted conference.

But at what costs have women's rights become the empty boxes around which debate takes place? Certainly, women's rights, and international feminist politics, have enabled an important political discussion of social relations and global change. What are the implications for women's rights that also operate as a platform for an international 'contentious conversation'?

My question is more than just a concern about women's rights as generating a 'backlash' by orthodox Christian actors. CR UN and Vatican global activism has demonstrated that in some cases 'the empty box' of women's rights becomes the focus of different currents and political projects. This is not necessarily a negative feature. One might argue that a vision of women's rights that also entails a consideration of the relationship between sexual relations and social change is a positive development, suggesting a more broad-based, inclusive challenge to the dominant order. But it also suggests the importance of thinking about and tracking the ways in which the language of women's rights becomes the host for different debates about social relations. Future research, for example, might consider why it is that the language of women's rights has become something of an international framework for negotiating social change. And, what implications will this have? Might it be, for example, that by framing the debates on aspects of social relations, women's rights becomes inflected with different meaning, in turn shaping and constraining a politics of equality?

And what should we make of this focus on the *language* of women's rights? Just as the Christian Right and Vatican emphasize language as the insidious force of change, so too do some feminists (see, for example, Fried and Landsberg-Lewis 1999: 105). What are the implications – and limitations of – a politics focused on language? How important is this recognition at the international level? Does the 'tug-of-war' over gender, for example, help or hinder a politics of equality?

Doris E. Buss
Department of Law
Carleton University
1125 Colonel By Dr.
Ottawa, Ontario,
Canada K1S 5B6

E-mail: dbuss@connect.carleton.ca

Notes

- 1 In this article, I use the term 'Christian Right' in reference to primarily American organizations pursuing a conservative politics based on a strict and particular reading of the Bible. Somewhat unusually, I also include conservative Catholics and Mormons as part of the Christian Right movement at the United Nations because of attempts by various organizations to build a broad, interfaith 'natural family' coalition at the UN. For a further discussion of the religious and political character of the Christian Right, see Lienesch (1993), Herman (1997) and Buss and Herman (2003).
- 2 Geneva Declaration, World Congress of Families II, November 1999, available at <http://www.worldcongress.org>. The Geneva Declaration is the agreed statement, and future policy 'road map' drafted at the second World Congress of Families (WCF) held in 1999. The WCF is a regular conference of conservative religious activists drawn from across the globe and representing a variety of faiths, including Christian, Muslim, Jewish and Hindu. The WCF seeks to establish an alliance of 'the most orthodox believers in each denomination, church or faith group' to 'respond together to the global spread of a militant secularism' (WCF website, <http://www.worldcongress.org>, accessed 13 December 2003). For further discussion of the WCF and Geneva Declaration, see Buss and Herman (2003); Buss (2004).
- 3 For a further discussion of the CR's global political enemies, see Buss and Herman (2003). In this article, I use the term 'homosexuality', rather than 'lesbian and gay' because it is the term used by both the CR and Vatican. Homosexuality arguably has a pejorative resonance. To reflect fully and fairly the position and approach of these two actors, I continue to use 'homosexuality' in contexts where the CR and Vatican would do so.
- 4 The International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA), an umbrella organization representing various lesbian and gay groups, attempted to gain UN-ECOSOC accreditation as a non-governmental organization. ILGA was successful in 1993, allowing it to attend and participate in various United Nations forums as an accredited NGO. This status was revoked the following year, apparently at the behest of the United States after controversy erupted over the presence of the North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA) as one of the organizations within the ILGA umbrella. ILGA was expelled from ECOSOC (see Morgan and Walker 1995: 213–4; Otto 1996; Sanders 1996; Walker 2000: 346–7), and its attempts to regain its status as an ECOSOC accredited NGO were eventually unsuccessful (Archibald 2002b). While there are other, smaller lesbian and gay organizations with an active international interest, at the time of writing, there does not appear to be a lesbian and gay organization with a dedicated mandate at the UN.
- 5 Jonathan Fowler, 'U.N. Rights Postpones Attempt to Tackle Gay Rights amid Anger from Muslim Countries', Associated Press, 25 April 2003. See also Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'Homosexuals Threaten Aggressive Campaign to Pass UN Human Rights Law', *Friday Fax* 6 (19): 2 May 2003, on file with

- author; Austin Ruse, 'Emergency Action Alert/Fight Radical Homosexual UN Agenda', *Friday Fax* 2 May 2003.
- 6 There have been some notable successes in securing international recognition of lesbian and gay rights (for a discussion see LaViolette and Whitworth 1994: 576–7; Sanders 1996; Walker 2000), but these are sporadic and partial. The human rights concerns of lesbians and gay men have been largely ignored at the international level. Amnesty International, for example, has only recently, and after much contention, concerned itself with human rights violations of 'sexual minorities' (Baehr 1994). Similarly, lesbians and gay men have had to fight, with patchy success, to secure recognition of sexuality as a protected ground for purposes such as refugee claims (McGee 2001; Millbank 2002).
 - 7 See the World Congress of Families website, <http://www.worldcongress.org>, and discussion at footnote 1.
 - 8 See, for example, Kathryn Balmforth, 'Hijacking Human Rights', speech delivered at the World Congress of Families II, 14–17 November 1999, Geneva, Switzerland (<http://www.worldcongress.org>, accessed 16 December 2003).
 - 9 *World Congress of Families Newsletter* (2001) 2 (9). Available at <http://www.worldcongress.org> (accessed 16 December 2003).
 - 10 CR UN activists point to conferences such as the 1994 Cairo Conference on Population and Development and the 1995 Beijing Conference on Women as examples of venues at which 'radical' groups 'hijacked' the negotiations to push their own agenda (Kathryn Balmforth, n. 8; Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'Powerful NGOs Gather to Put Left-Wing Pressure on UN General Assembly', *Friday Fax* 3 (13): 18 February 2000, <http://www.c-fam.org>). NGOs, other than CR groups, are routinely vilified in CR activist publications as, for example, the source of 'all the wacky ideas in the world' (Austin Ruse, President, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, newsletter, 21 October 1999, on file with author).
 - 11 See <http://www.cwfa.org>
 - 12 See <http://www.family.org>
 - 13 See <http://www.eagleforum.org>
 - 14 Founded in 1997 by Human Life International, C-Fam is located in New York near the UN. See <http://www.c-fam.org>
 - 15 According to the World Congress of Families website (http://www.worldcongress.org/wcf3/wcf3_home.htm, accessed 23 April 2002), WFPC was founded by the David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies and the Reuben Clark School of Law, in partnership with the School of Family Life at Brigham Young University. WFPC's mission is 'to provide worldwide democratic input and effectively educate the United Nations System on pro-family and other value-based issues'. Its managing director is Richard Wilkins, a law professor at BYU. See <http://www.worldfamilypolicycenter.org>
 - 16 This rise in the number of CR think-tanks and use of social science research to bolster CR policy positions appears to be a growing trend within the CR more generally. Other notable research centres, for my purpose, include the Beverly LaHaye Institute (Concerned Women for America, [---

Doris E. Buss/Finding the homosexual in women's rights](http://www.</div><div data-bbox=)

- beverlylahayeinstitute.org/bli/), the Family Research Council (<http://www.frc.org>) and the new International Organizations Research Group (C-Fam), 'a think-tank to research and write about institutions that pose direct threats to the family, the unborn, the faith and national sovereignty' (<http://www.c-fam.org/iorg.htm> (C-Fam)).
- 17 With links to the Rockford Institute (see <http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/>), the Howard Center (see <http://www.profam.org>) contains two specialized research units: The Family in America Studies Center and the Religion and Society Studies Center, as well as the Swan Library, a 'clearinghouse of truthful and effective information' in support of 'the natural family'.
 - 18 See discussion, note 2.
 - 19 The Holy See refers to the diocese – the seat – of Rome, but practically, is the official face of the Vatican at the UN. For a discussion of the status of the Holy See at the UN, see Kunz (1952). I prefer the term Vatican because it has a broader meaning and includes both the Holy See *and* the offices through which the Pope functions and the Church is governed (Reese 1996).
 - 20 John Paul II, 'Address to the United Nations General Assembly', 1996, on file with author.
 - 21 Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 'Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons', 1 October, signed Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger and Alberto Bovone (http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19861001_homosexual-persons_en.html).
 - 22 Holy See, 'Considerations Regarding Proposals to Give Legal Recognition to Unions between Homosexual Persons', Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, signed 28 July 2003 by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger and Archbishop Angelo Amato (http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20030731_homosexual-unions_en.html).
 - 23 See, for example, Pontifical Council for the Family, 'Family, Marriage and "De Facto Unions"' report, 26 July 2000, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/family/documents/rc_pc_family_doc_20001109_de-facto-unions_en.html; 'Declaration of the Pontifical Council for the Family regarding the Resolution of the European Parliament dated March 16, 2000, making de facto unions, including same sex unions, equal to the family', 17 March 2000, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/family/documents/rc_pc_family_doc_20000317_declaration-homosexual-unions_en.html
 - 24 Campbell Clark, 'Court to Handle Same-Sex Bill Its Way.' *Globe and Mail*, 2 August 2004: A4.
 - 25 Austin Ruse, President, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'Feminists at UN Seek Redefinition of Universal Human Rights', 13 November 1998, <http://www.NewsMax.com> (accessed 12 November 2000).
 - 26 Wilkins and Balmforth 2001: 106. See also Concerned Women for America, 'United Nations Cairo +5 Preparatory Conference', 31 March 1999, <http://www.cwfa.org/> (accessed 13 August 1999).

- 27 Austin Ruse, President, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, emergency action alert, 2 May 2003, on file with author.
- 28 On the International Criminal Court, see, for example, Wilkins and Balmforth (2001) and their discussion at note 21. The 2002 Special Session on Children was seen to condone homosexual marriage through references in the agreed final document to various forms of the family: see, for example, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'Press Release: Bush Administration Stops Abortion at UN Child Summit', 13 May 2002 (on file with author); Archibald (2002a). See also, Austin Ruse, President, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, newsletter, 27 June 2001 (on file with author) who reports that 'left-wing governments and homosexual activists' have attempted to 'hijack the UN World Conference on Aids [to] turn it into a propaganda tool for the homosexual ideology'.
- 29 See, for example, Concerned Women for America, 'Redefining "Local Control": 18th Commission on Human Settlements Paves Way for Istanbul +5', 12 February 2001 (on file with author).
- 30 See, for example, Archibald (2002a); Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, n. 28; 'Statement by the International Sexual and Reproductive Rights Coalition (ISRRRC)' press release, 10 May 2002, http://www.reproductiverights.org/ww_adv_child_coalition.html (accessed 29 May 2002).
- 31 *Beijing Declaration, Chapter V, Adoption of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action*, UN Doc. DPI/1766/Wom (1996), paragraph 11.
- 32 Holy See, 'Statement by His Eminence Alfonso Cardinal Lopez Trujillo at the Twenty-Seventh Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Children, New York 9 May 2002', <http://www.un.org/ga/children/holyseeE.htm> (accessed 1 October 2002).
- 33 See, for example, 'Address to the Secretary General and the Administrative Committee on Coordination of the United Nations', 7 April 2000, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/2000/apr-jun/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20000407_secretary-general-un_en.html (accessed 26 January 2004); 'Intervention of the Holy See at the Commission on the Status of Women', 4 March 1999, available at <http://www.vatican.va> and accessing the Roman Curia, Secretariat of State; 'Intervention of Cardinal Angelo Sodano at the Millenium Summit of the United Nations', 8 September 2000, on file with author.
- 34 John Paul II, 'Address to the United Nations General Assembly', 8 July 1996, on file with author; Pontifical Council for the Family, 'Family, Marriage and "De Facto Unions"', n. 23.
- 35 'Declaration by the Holy See Delegation at the Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Adoption of the Documents "A World Fit for Children"', 10 May 2002, <http://www.holyseemission.org> (accessed 9 October 2002).
- 36 'Statement by H. Em. Cardinal Alfonso López Trujillo during the Meeting of Religious Leaders as Part of the Special Session of the General Assembly on Children, New York, May 7, 2002', <http://www.holyseemission.org> (accessed 9 October 2002).

- 37 'Statement by His Eminence Alfonso Cardinal Lopez Trujillo at the Twenty-Seventh Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Children' 9 May 2002, <http://www.un.org/ga/children/holyseeE.htm> (accessed 1 October 2002).
- 38 'Statement by H.E. Archbishop Javier Lozano, Barragán, President of the Pontifical Council for Pastoral Assistance of Health Care Workers, Head of the Holy See Delegation to the XXVI Special Session of the General Assembly on HIV/AIDS, New York, 27 June 2001', http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/secretariat_state/documents/rc_seq-st_doc_20010627_un-aids_en.html (accessed 7 October 2002).
- 39 Concerned Women for America, 'In the Aftermath: The UN Fourth World Conference on Women', 7 August 1997, on file with author.
- 40 See, for example, Catherina Hurlburt, 'The Good Ol' Girls' Club: United Nations' Anti-Family Discrimination Exposed', Concerned Women for America, 5 March 2001, <http://www.cwfa.org> (accessed 27 June 2001); Concerned Women for America, 'Redefining "Local Control"', n. 29; Real Women of Canada, 'Troubling Concerns about International Charities', *Reality*, September/October 1999, <http://www.realwomenca.com> (accessed 7 October 2000).
- 41 Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'Noted UN Expert Criticizes New UN Child Document', *Friday Fax* 4 (22): 18 May 2001.
- 42 Catherina Hurlburt, n. 40; Concerned Women for America, n. 29.
- 43 See, for example, Concerned Women for America, 'Habitat II: The United Nations' Attempt to Control Your Family', 24 September 1997, <http://www.cwfa.org> (accessed 13 August 1999).
- 44 Austin Ruse, President, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, newsletter, 27 June 2001, on file with author.
- 45 Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'Pro-Family Groups Claim Victory on UN AIDS Declaration', *Friday Fax* 4 (28): 29 June 2001; see also, David Wagner and Michele Hunter, 'Cairo-Practice: The U.N. Seeks to Globalize the Safe-Sex Ideology', *Insight*, Family Research Council, 1994, on file with author.
- 46 The phrase 'pro-homosexual forces', was used in a *Washington Times* article and attributed to, but not directly quoted by, Monsignor Reinert, a negotiator with the Vatican's delegation to the 2002 UN General Assembly Special Session on Children (Archibald 2002a).
- 47 Austin Ruse, President, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute newsletter, 27 June 2001, on file with author.
- 48 See, for example, Catholic Family and Human Rights, 'Condom Lobby Drives AIDS Debate Besides Abstinence Success in Africa', *Friday Fax* 5 (51): 13 December 2002; Austin Ruse, President, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, newsletter, 29 January 2003, on file with author.
- 49 See, for example, Kathryn Balmforth, 'Hijacking Human Rights', n. 8; Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'UN Child Summit Postponed Indefinitely, Negotiations Stymied', *Friday Fax* 4 (39): 21 September 2001; Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'UN Bureau Releases Draft Document for Next Year's Child Summit', *Friday Fax* 4 (1): 21 December 2000.
- 50 See, for example, Concerned Women for America, 'United Nations Cairo +5

- Preparatory Conference', 26 March 1999, <http://www.cwfa.org> (accessed 13 August 1999); Concerned Women for America, 'The End of Innocence: How the U.N. Stole Childhood', on file with author. For further discussion of the CR UN and international rights of the child, see Buss (2000).
- 51 Candi Cushman, 'A World of Difference', *Citizen Magazine: A Web-Site of Focus on the Family*, 2002, <http://www.family.org> (accessed 5 June 2002). See also Hamm (1995: 143), who, in a post-Beijing analysis, writes: 'The battle of words will continue. Words have meaning and those that control the definitions can use words as they want.' The phrase 'gender agenda' comes from O'Leary (2001).
- 52 See, for example, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'Pro-lifers Poised for Greatest Victory to Date at UN', *Friday Fax* 4 (26): 15 June 2001, reproduced in *World Family Policy Center News*, 19 June 2001; Concerned Women for America, 'Beijing +5: Why You Should be Concerned', 29 February 2000 (on file with author); Moloney (1999).
- 53 See, for example, Kathryn Balmforth, n. 8; Austin Ruse, 'UN Skirmishes in War on Family: The Hague Forum Marred by Questionable Procedures and Controversial Results', *Population Research Review* 9 (2): February/March 1990, <http://www.pop.org> search PRI Review archive (accessed 26 January 2004); Real Women of Canada, 'Canada's Duplicity at the UN', *Reality*, March/April 1999, <http://www.realwomenca.com> (accessed 7 September 2000); Reid (1999); Wright (1999).
- 54 Balmforth, n. 8; Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'UN Commission on Status of Women Is Suspended Amid Chaos', *Friday Fax* 6 (13): 21 March 2003; Terry Phillips, 'Diplomatic Scrap at U.N. over Women's Treaty', *Family News in Focus* (Focus on the Family): 17 March 2003, <http://www.family.org/cforum/fnif/news/A0025168.html> (accessed 18 March 2003); Bilmore (2001).
- 55 Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'Pro-lifers Poised for Greatest Victory to Date at UN', *Friday Fax* 4 (26): 15 June 2001.
- 56 Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'Pro-lifers Poised for Greatest Victory to Date at UN', *Friday Fax* 4 (26): 15 June 2001. The story was also picked up by Focus on the Family, see Cushman, n. 51. See also Austin Ruse, newsletter 'Pro-Abortion Fundamentalists Expose UN Strategy', 21 June 2001 (on file with author).
- 57 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, China, 4–15 September 1995, Chapter V, Adoption of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, UN Doc. DPI/1766/Wom (1996), paragraph 11 (referred to as 'Reservations and Interpretative Statements').
- 58 Nicole Winfield, 'Vatican to Publish Dictionary of Buzzwords like Gender, Reproductive Rights', *Associated Press Worldstream*, 22 January 2003, <http://www.lexisnexis.com> (accessed 11 February 2003).
- 59 Quoted in Nicole Winfield, 'Vatican to Publish Dictionary of Buzzwords like Gender, Reproductive Rights'.
- 60 See, for example, John Paul II, *Address to Mrs. Gertrude Mongella*, 1995, on file with author.
- 61 See, for example, Reservations and Interpretative Statements, paragraph 11, n. 57.

- 62 For a discussion of the Vatican's theory of complementarity, and its positions at Beijing more generally, see Buss (1998).
- 63 Reservations and Interpretative Statements, paragraph 11, above n. 57.
- 64 See, for example, Hamm (1995); Wilkins and Balmforth (2001); James Dobson, *Focus on the Family Newsletter*, August 1995, on file with author; Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'Radical Theorists and Policy Makers Promote Idea of "Five Genders"', *Friday Fax* 4 (18): 20 April 2001.
- 65 Some CR UN publications, such as Wilkins and Balmforth (2001), directly credit Fausto-Sterling, while others simply portray the five genders argument as a feminist truth and hence a CR UN revelation about what feminists are *really* up to.
- 66 Dobson, n. 65.
- 67 Dobson, n. 65.
- 68 Concerned Women for America, n. 52, 'Beijing +5: Why You Should Be Concerned'.
- 69 Catherine Hurlburt, n. 40. 'The Good Ol' Girls' Club'.
- 70 For a discussion of CR theological and political views of the UN, see Buss and Herman (2003: ch. 3).
- 71 Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute, 'Pro-Family groups claim victory on UN AIDS Declaration', *Friday Fax* 4 (28): 29 June 2001.

Acknowledgement

Many thanks to following friends and colleagues who read earlier drafts of this article: Davina Cooper, Brettel Dawson, Didi Herman, Sari Kouvo, Surya Munro and the anonymous reviewers for *IFJP*. This article also benefited from the comments and support received when I presented it at the Feminisms and Fundamentalisms workshop, Cornell University Law School, and the Gender, Sexuality and Law II Conference, Keele University, UK.

References

- Aho, J. A. 1994. *This Thing of Darkness: A Sociology of the Enemy*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Appadurai, A. 1990. 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Structural Economy', in Featherstone, M. (ed.) *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization, and Modernity*, pp. 295–310. London: Sage Publications.
- Archibald, G. 2002a. 'U.S. to Help U.N. Redefine "Families"' *Washington Times*, 22 April. Available at <http://www.washtimes.com/national/20020422-67480.htm>
- Archibald, G. 2002b. 'U.N. Keeps Ban on Gay Lobby That's Silent on Pedophile Ties.' *The Washington Times*, 1 May: A8.
- Baehr, P. R. 1994. 'Amnesty International and Its Self-Imposed Limited Mandate', *Netherlands Quarterly on Human Rights* 12: 5–21.
- Beattie, A. and Valkin, V. 2001. 'Squabbles Leave AIDS Delegates Frustrated, UN

- Conference Claims of Time Wasting.' *Financial Times*, 28 June. Available at <http://www.ft.com> (accessed 2 July 2001).
- Bedont, B. and Hall-Martinez, K. 1999. 'Ending Impunity for Gender Crimes under the International Criminal Court', *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 6 (1): 65–85.
- Bilmore, I. 2001. 'The Right to Health According to WHO', in Wagner, T. and Carbone, L. (eds) *Fifty Years after the Declaration: The United Nations' Record on Human Rights*, pp. 25–31. Lanham & Washington: University Press of America and Family Research Council.
- Bunch, C. 1995. 'Transforming Human Rights from a Feminist Perspective', in Peters, J. and Wolper, A. (eds) *Women's Rights Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives*, pp. 11–17. New York & London: Routledge.
- Buss, D. 1998. 'Robes, Relics and Rights: The Vatican and the Beijing Conference on Women', *Social and Legal Studies* 7 (3): 339–63.
- Buss, D. 2000. '"How the U. N. Stole Childhood": The Christian Right and the International Convention on the Rights of the Child', in Bridgeman, J. and Monk, D. (eds) *Feminist Perspectives on Child Care Law*, pp. 271–94. London: Cavendish Press.
- Buss, D. 2004 (forthcoming). 'The Christian Right, Globalization and the "Natural Family"', in Tetreault, M. A. and Denmark, R. A. (eds) *Contending Fundamentalisms: Globalization, Modernity, and Religious Social Movements*, vol. 13 of *The International Political Economy Yearbook*, pp. 87–124. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Buss, D. and Herman, D. 2003. *Globalizing Family Values: The Christian Right in International Politics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Carlson, A. 1999. *For the Stability, Autonomy, and Fecundity of the Natural Family: Essays Toward the World Congress of Families II*. Rockford, IL: The Howard Center for Family, Religion, and Society.
- Charlesworth, H. 1996. 'Women as Sherpas: Are Global Summits Useful for Women?', *Feminist Studies* 22 (3): 537–47.
- Charlesworth, H. and Chinkin, C. 2000. *The Boundaries of International Law: A Feminist Analysis*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
- Clark, A. M., Friedman, E. J. and Hochstetler, K. 1998. 'The Sovereign Limits of Global Civil Society: A Comparison of NGO Participation in UN World Conferences on the Environment, Human Rights, and Women', *World Politics* 51 (October): 1–35.
- Copelon, R. 2000. 'Gender Crimes as War Crimes: Integrating Crimes against Women into International Criminal Law', *McGill Law Journal* 46: 217–40.
- Davies, M. 1997. 'Taking the Inside Out: Sex and Gender in the Legal Subject', in Naffine, N. and Owens, R. J. (eds) *Sexing the Subject of Law*, pp. 25–46. New South Wales: LBC Information Services.
- Diamond, S. 1998. *Not by Politics Alone: The Enduring Influence of the Christian Right*. New York & London: Guildford.

- Fausto-Sterling, A. 1993. 'The Five Sexes: Why Male and Female Are Not Enough', *Sciences March/April*: 20–24.
- Fried, S. T. and Landsberg-Lewis, L. 1999. 'Sexual Rights: From Concept to Strategy', in Askin, K. D. and Koenig, D. M. (eds) *Women and International Human Rights Law*, 3, pp. 91–121. Ardsley NY: Transnational.
- Gallagher, J. and Bull, C. 1996. *Perfect Enemies: The Religious Rights, the Gay Movements, and the Politics of the 1990s*. New York: Crown Publisher.
- Hamm, M. S. 1995. 'Gender Identity: When Nature and Nurture Meet', in Roylance, S. (ed.) *The Traditional Family in Peril*, 3rd edn, pp. 134–45. South Jordan, Utah: United Families International.
- Heinze, E. 1995. *Sexual Orientation: A Human Right*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Herman, D. 1997. *The Antigay Agenda: Orthodox Vision and the Christian Right*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ingraham, C. 1994. 'The Heterosexual Imaginary: Feminist Sociology and Theories of Gender', *Sociological Theory* 12 (2): 203–19.
- Jordan, M. D. 2000. *The Silence of Sodom*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kunz, J. 1952. 'The Status of the Holy See in International Law', *American Journal of International Law* 46: 308–14.
- Lai, S. Y. and Ralph, R. E. 1995. 'Female Sexual Autonomy and Human Rights', *Harvard Human Rights Journal* 8: 201–27.
- LaViolette, N. and Whitworth, S. 1994. 'No Safe Haven: Sexuality as a Universal Human Right and Lesbian and Gay Activism in International Politics', *Millenium Journal of International Studies* Winter: 563–88.
- Lechner, F. J. 1993. 'Global Fundamentalism', in Swatos, W. H. Jr (ed.) *A Future for Religion? New Paradigms for Social Analysis*, pp. 25–46. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lienesch, M. 1993. *Redeeming America: Piety and Politics in the New Christian Right*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- McFeely, T. 2001. 'Homosexuality Is *Not* a "Universal Human Right"', in Wagner, T. and Carbone, L. (eds) *Fifty Years after the Declaration: The United Nations' Record on Human Rights*, pp. 117–24. Lanham & Washington: University Press of America and Family Research Council.
- McGee, D. 2001. 'Persecution and Social Group Status: Homosexual Refugees in the 1990s', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 14 (1): 20–42.
- Marchand, M. and Runyan, A. S. (eds). 2000. *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistances*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Martin, B. 1996. *Femininity Played Straight: The Significance of Being Lesbian*. New York: Routledge.
- Mayer, A. E. 1995. 'Rhetorical Strategies and Official Policies on Women's Rights: The Merits and Drawbacks of the New World Hypocrisy', in Afkhami, M. (ed.) *Faith and Freedom: Women's Human Rights in the Muslim World*, pp. 104–32. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Meyer, T. 2001. *Identity Mania: Fundamentalism and the Politicization of Cultural Differences*. Trans. M. Reddy and L. Hinchman. London: Zed.
- Millbank, J. 2002. 'Imagining Otherness: Refugee Claims on the Basis of Sexuality in

- Canada and Australia', *Melbourne University Law Review* 7. Available at <http://www.austlii.edu.au>
- Moloney, S. 1999. Interview with author, Eagle Forum offices, Washington, DC, 5 October.
- Morgan, W. and Walker, K. 1995. 'Tolerance and Homosex: A Policy of Control and Containment', *Melbourne University Law Review* 20: 202–17.
- O'Leary, D. 2001. 'Human Rights and the Gender Perspective', in Wagner, T. and Carbone, L. (eds) *Fifty Years after the Declaration: The United Nations' Record on Human Rights*, pp. 109–16. Lanham & Washington: University Press of America and Family Research Council.
- Otto, D. 1999. 'Sexualities and Solidarities: Some Thoughts on Coalitional Strategies in the Context of International Law', *AustralAsian Gay and Lesbian Law Journal* 8: 27–38.
- Paulson, M. 2003. 'Catholic Politicians Warned on Dissent.' *The Boston Globe*, 17 January: A1.
- Peters, J. and Wolper, A. 1995. *Women's Rights Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Peterson, V. S. (ed.). 1992. *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Peterson, V. S. and True, J. 1998. 'New Times and New Conversations', in Zalewski, M. and Parpart, J. (eds) *The 'Man' Question in International Relations*, pp. 14–27. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Reid, D. 1999. Interview with author, Concerned Women for America offices, Washington, DC, 4 October.
- Reese, T. J. 1996. *Inside the Vatican: The Politics and Organization of the Catholic Church*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Richardson, D. 2000. *Rethinking Sexuality*. London: Sage Publications.
- Riles, A. 2002. 'Rights Inside Out: The Case of the Women's Human Rights Campaign', *Leiden Journal of International Law* 15 (3): 285–305.
- Ruse, A. 1999. Interview with author, Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute offices, New York, 7 October.
- Sanders, D. 1996. 'Getting Lesbian and Gay Issues on the International and Human Rights Agenda', *Human Rights Quarterly* 18: 67–106.
- Scott, J. W. 1999. 'Some Reflections on Gender and Politics', in Ferree, M. M., Lorber, J. and Hess, B. B. (eds) *Gender*, pp. 70–96. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Segal, L. 1999. *Why Feminism? Gender, Psychology and Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Smart, C. 1995. *Law, Crime and Sexuality: Essays in Feminism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Sullivan, D. 1995. 'The Public/Private Distinction in International Human Rights Law', in Peters, J. and Wolper, A. (eds) *Women's Rights Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives*, pp. 126–34. New York & London: Routledge.
- Urquhart, G. 1995. *The Pope's Armada*. London: Bantam Press.
- Walker, K. L. 2000. 'Evolving Human Rights Norms around Sexuality', *ILSA Journal of International and Comparative Law* 6: 343–53.

- Wilkins, R. G. and Balmforth, K. O. 2001. 'The International Criminal Court, Human Rights and the Family', in Wagner, T. and Carbone, L. (eds) *Fifty Years after the Declaration: The United Nations' Record on Human Rights*, pp. 99–108. Lanham & Washington: University Press of America and Family Research Council.
- Williams, D. 2003. 'Pope Admonishes Catholic Politicians; Stances Same, but Direct Appeal Unusual.' *The Washington Post*, 17 January: A20.
- Winfield, N. 2003. 'Vatican to Publish Dictionary of Buzzwords like Gender, Reproductive Rights', *Associated Press Worldstream*, 22 January.
- Wright, W. 1999. Interview with author, Concerned Women for America offices, Washington, DC, 4 October.

Copyright of International Feminist Journal of Politics is the property of Routledge, Ltd. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.