

The Rainbow Tide: Queer Modernity Fuels Statism Weaponizing Sexual Politics To Quell Governance

Samya Verma¹

Abstract

This paper critiques the weaponization of ‘queer modernity’ in its myriad forms to forward the goals of neo-imperialism and State authoritarianism. Drawing from the works of Jasbir Puar amongst others, it will explore how the state corpus presents itself as queer friendly in order to guise more glaring human rights violations. The modern State is milder in its marginalization of queerness, driven to all appearances by progressiveness. But this dawn of a queer modernity has inconspicuously backfired. By juxtaposing racism, settler-colonialism, cultural genocide etc. with a specious queer advocacy in its foreign policy, the State has weaponized ethos of sexual freedom to quell governance in more vulnerable parts of the world. By inducing cognitive dissonance with respect to its policies in the mind of the average citizen, it tempers dissent. Countering this clever instrumentality has become an important challenge for cross-national queer linkages. In exploring such momentous tides as Toonen v/s Australia and the passing of the Yogyakarta principles, this paper would historicize queer advocacy in international political arena, situating the points at which states first found themselves in the throes of a rainbow deluge. It will begin by contextualizing the genesis of queer geopolitics. It will exemplify the influences of a strong, transnational queer movement on how governments frame inclusive and queer friendly foreign policies. Such pressures from new nonstate actors create a global system of checks and balances, compelling states to abide by preservation of queer rights lest they be denounced by an intricately tied world order. By showily embracing queer rights, the modern State plays by the rules of corporate humanism, hoping to win over unquestioning surrender from an average ‘woke’ consumer (citizen). It would appear that an overbearing state’s governance fails to intrude into the private lives of its citizens courtesy of queer activism and its own desire to remain the most popular option/product in the international political market. But subsequent case studies of USA and Israel would pick apart the seams of this state corporatism, homonationalism, and pinkwashing, thereby unveiling the crux of the paper: How states have purportedly internalized queer modernity to counter governance and sovereignty in geopolitically unstable zones like the Middle East. I have chosen to spotlight these particular countries because of the former’s lead in selling a faux vision of modernity to the rest of the world, while failing to reconcile internal contradictions; and the latter to frame hierarchies of identities in a settler-colonialist milieu. While studies have examined these two countries in similar contexts, the current paper enhances the literature by centering contemporary narratives. While queer movements across the globe are increasingly united in their antagonism to a heteronormative State politique, pressurizing governments into acceptance of traditionally marginalized expressions of sexuality, the State now advertises itself as progressive only to enforce sanction for its regressive measures and neo-imperialist policies. Where ‘modernity’ was once a vision of equal acceptance for the marginalized, it has come to acquire the color of justification for all other human rights violations being committed by states. To discern such issues, this research paper would factually analyze sources of secondary research like books, articles, editorials, monographs, infotainment videos, and other research papers.

Keywords: queer modernity, queer geopolitics, homonormativity, homonationalism, foreign policy, state-corporatism, queerbaiting, pinkwashing, archetypes, neo-imperialism.

¹ Samya Verma is a recent graduate of history from Hindu College, DU. She is an aspiring international journalist and IR enthusiast with an interest in applying psychoanalytical narratives, Gender Studies, and Queer Theory to understand modern day inter-state relations.

Introduction

This paper uses the all-encompassing term '*queer*' to indicate '*deviance*' from the entrenched values of a mainstream, heteronormative State order. Queerness refers to any challenge against the Society's strict emphasis on gender binary, impermeable gender roles & related stereotypes, and State's institutionalization of these cis-heteronormative ideals to keep its citizens within the line. For the purpose of this paper, I will be discussing sexual deviance in particular, and associated weaponization of sexual politics against infirm governance.

'*Queer Modernity*' is simply the normativization of deviance². While the term may have once been used to imagine a future of dignity, it has come to mean societal vetting & sanction, and domesticization of a queer body according to the ideals of a traditionally heteronormative society. As queerness is subject to surveillance, management, and State scrutiny³, it folds inwards from the margins in direction of State control, being tempered by the ideas of marriage, parenthood, and stereotyping of same-sex couples into traditional gender roles.

This process of domesticization makes *homonormativity* a crucial element of *Queer Modernity*. *Homonormativity* is premised on dissolution into the heteronormative societal order, and serves as an archetypal instrument of the State: a means of propagating the image of what an ideal, sanitized, and patriotic queer citizen should look like in order to attain subjecthood.

In '*The New Homonormativity: The Sexual Politics of Neoliberalism*'⁴, Lisa Duggan defined homonormativity as "*neo-liberal sexual politics... (that) demobilizes gay constituency... (creating) a gay culture anchored in domesticity... a politics that does not contest dominant heteronormative forms, but upholds and sustains them.*"

The burgeoning of the movement for queer rights to other socio-economic areas proved a challenge to the State, which it overcame by appropriating and instrumentalizing the very *progressiveness* that acceptance of the deviant entailed, projecting its success in attaining modernity to win the support of deviant citizens for its policies against neo-imperial subjects.

Queer modernity has become only the latest addition to the rhetoric of 'civilizing the native', a poor guise for justifying the occupation of sovereign nations, installing puppet regimes, and controlling their

² Puar, J. K. (2017). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times (Next Wave: New Directions in Women's Studies)* (Anniversary, Tenth Anniversary ed.). Duke University Press Books.

³ Puar, J. K. (2017). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times (Next Wave: New Directions in Women's Studies)* (Anniversary, Tenth Anniversary ed.). Duke University Press Books.

⁴ Little, M. H. (2003). Russ Castronovo and Dana D. Nelson, eds. — Materializing Democracy: Toward a Revitalized Cultural Politics. *Left History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Historical Inquiry and Debate*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.25071/1913-9632.5525>

land and other resources. The normativization of queerness may have given rise to *queer subjecthood* as opposed to marginalization and ‘otherhood.’

But in doing so the State aims to break the solidarity of queer citizens and neo-imperial subjects over their shared repression. A feeling of ‘otherhood’ rooted in racist and xenophobic attitudes towards the East is now propped up for electoral gains and to garner support for imperialist policies in the global South.

History of International Queer Advocacy

“When individuals are attacked... because of their sexual orientation, we must speak out. Where there is tension between cultural attitudes and universal human rights, universal human rights must come first...”

Ban Ki-moon, former UNSG on
Human Rights Day, 2010

A global perspective on the movement for queer rights is largely absent from the mainstream, with most media reports lauding the efforts of individual states in repealing colonial era laws on homosexuality towards a newfound cultural vibrancy. But the unequivocal equivalence of queer rights with human rights at the United Nations has a long and crucial history, too.

Sum is greater than the parts, and it should come as no surprise that the gradual acceptance of queer rights by states this century, is in itself is a trickledown consequence of queer advocacy in the international political arena. Cross-national queer linkages that successfully pressurise states in favour of queer modernity are a result of long-term activism stretching across the second half of the 20th century.⁵

United Nations Human Rights Committee’s landmark judgment in **Toonen v/s Australia** ⁶(1994) was perhaps the singular watershed moment in human history that brought queerness within the realm of mainstream, and gave it explicitly written and tangible acknowledgement. Summarily, the ruling called for International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights’s (ICCPR) legislations against discrimination being extended to an individual’s sexual orientation. Over the following decades, this event snowballed into queer modernity and its related characteristics elaborated upon in this paper. That very year, the United States also called for extending refuge to victims of homophobic violence.

On May 17, 2005, the first **International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia and Transphobia** was observed. It marked the date on which World Health Organization delisted homosexuality as a mental

⁵ Angelo, P. J. (2021, January 29). *The Changing Landscape of Global LGBTQ+ Rights*. Council on Foreign Relations. <https://www.cfr.org/article/changing-landscape-global-lgbtq-rights>

⁶ *Toonen v. Australia, Communication No. 488/1992, U.N. Doc CCPR/C/50/D/488/1992 (1994)*. (1991, December 25). University of Minnesota - Human Rights Library. <http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/undocs/html/vws488.htm>

illness in 1990, and brought global visibility for the socio-cultural persecution faced by queer individuals worldwide.

In 2007, the efforts of human rights activists across the world brought the **Yogyakarta Principles**⁷ to pass. This defined human rights in terms of sexual orientation with such wide ranging guarantees of dignity that pervaded even the private sphere of an individual's life. It can be aptly termed the *magna carta* of global queer rights. It was drafted in explicit cognisance of the myriad forms of violence that threaten queer lives without any recourse from international institutions of social service.

In 2016, the UN passed a resolution asking participatory states to act 'against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity', and also put in place autonomous experts to ensure the effective implementation of such a legislation across the globe. But there is as yet no consensus on a universal declaration for decriminalization of homosexuality.

Nevertheless, these and more legislations calling for member states to impose a blanket ban upon such malpractices as conversion therapy have undoubtedly forwarded the cause of queer right in international political arena, and stipulated a condition of queer modernity upon states if they wish to avail the benefits of a closely linked world order. And it is this progressiveness and liberal sexual politics that the states attempt to manipulate against each other.

Queering Foreign Policy: A Case Study Of Homonationalism in The US

In a myopic era of misplaced 'Twitter-liberalism' and call-out culture, where a 280-word limit would suffice as image denting of catastrophic proportions, states appear to be harnessing queer modernity into a massive PR campaign. The modern State pretends to be 'progressive' in order to evade being 'canceled' for its more insidious Human Rights' violations. In this manner, it functions like a corporation trying to use positive-reinforcement advertisements to manipulate consumer support for itself.

Wholly corporatist in origin, **queerbaiting** as a feature now permeates State politics, too. States now equate patriotic fervour and nationalist sentiments with acceptance of queerness, using rainbow confetti to evoke celebratory jingoism. This emergent '**homonationalism**' marks the demise of radical queer politics that once challenged the regressive actions of the State. *Homonationalism is the anomalous weaving of queer rights into the tapestry of hyper-nationalism, a queer modernity fuelled statism that permeates all arenas of a country's politics, specifically its foreign policy* for the discussion at hand.

USA, as the global torchbearer of a Western paradigm of modernity, becomes an entry point for enquiry into how queer politics is manipulated as an instrument of inter-state relations. Its foreign policy is a manifestation most-becoming of queer diplomacy and homonationalist geopolitics. Beginning from 2011, queer rights acquired a new lease of life in USA's agenda on the world stage, with Hillary Clinton, then the Secretary of State, giving a powerful speech in defence of gay rights as human rights at the UNHRC⁸.

⁷ *The Application of International Human Rights Law in Relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity*. (n.d.). Yogyakartaprinciples.Org. <https://yogyakartaprinciples.org>

⁸ Angelo, P. J. (2021, January 29). *The Changing Landscape of Global LGBTQ+ Rights*. Council on Foreign Relations. <https://www.cfr.org/article/changing-landscape-global-lgbtq-rights>

Queer modernity was truly weaponised as image building by US from this point on. Further, in 2015, President Barack Obama deployed an Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBTI Persons to formulate practices of queer-friendly diplomacy for the country.⁹

A nexus of resolutions at UN, presidential memorandums openly calling for queer friendly tactics in foreign policy, and extension of such reserves as the Global Equality Fund and USAID's newly minted LGBT Global Development Partnership to queer collectives world-over, continued to mark the tenure of the Obama administration¹⁰.

Tracing the turn of events backwards, in mid-2000's, LGBTQ+ groups aided by USA vigorously campaigned the international community around the question of invading Iran when the Saddam Hussein government executed two young men allegedly on grounds of homosexuality; so much so that July 19, 2006, was even launched as the International Day Of Action Against Homophobic Persecution in Iran. Under duress, even Sweden and Netherlands halted deportations of queer Iranian refugees for the time being, while EU got a new boost in its ongoing trade wars with Iran. Queerness was openly weaponised as Islamophobia in the ever lingering feud between the West and the Near East.

That social justice wasn't quite the core of these measures becomes conspicuous when they are viewed from the vantage point of other events that conspired over the same period. The aforementioned scale of protests was scarce seen when two queer youth were murdered in Nigeria the same year. Nor was the hue and cry over the US military's overt homophobia in the Abu Ghraib case (2004) built to last. The latter has almost been exhumed from public memory¹¹.

The Obama administration's policies may therefore be investigated as a perpetuation of the early 2000's politics of advocating against Middle East on grounds of its violently homophobic legislations, but all the same, its fallacies remained ill-hidden.

In a blatant hypocrisy of modernity, USA spearheads the process of bringing 'light' to an 'uncouth' Africa and a Middle East mired in religiously sanctioned homophobia, while LGBTQIA+ rights remain largely precarious back home. While the US continues to dominate the global discourse over LGBTQ+ rights, using its wholesale normativization of queerness to win liberal support for neo-imperialist actions

⁹ Angelo, P. J. (2021, January 29). *The Changing Landscape of Global LGBTQ+ Rights*. Council on Foreign Relations. <https://www.cfr.org/article/changing-landscape-global-lgbtq-rights>

¹⁰ *FACT SHEET: Obama Administration's Record and the LGBT Community*. (2016, June 9). Whitehouse.Gov. <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/06/09/fact-sheet-obama-administrations-record-and-lgbt-community>

¹¹ Puar, J. K. (2017). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times (Next Wave: New Directions in Women's Studies)* (Anniversary, Tenth Anniversary ed.). Duke University Press Books.

in unstable and underdeveloped regions, little heed is paid to domestic activists clamouring around the issue of Roe v/s Wade and what its recent repeal portends for queer rights in the country¹².

One need not look further than the Trump administration's rollback¹³ of such wide variety of rights to the queer community to understand how queer rights are serving the American government's purpose overseas for the time being, but might not remain prominent and protected should the tide turn. Another article¹⁴ by Caravan highlights the irony of USA burrowing into Ugandan soil on grounds of promoting queer rights, while the country's brimming anti-gay violence is in fact funded by conservative Christian groups in USA's own backyard, escapes no one.

Quelling Governance: A Case Study Of Israeli Pinkwashing

Mythologizing Politics

That nation building is not a sudden epiphany, but cocooned in banality, a roundup of archetypal artillery, is best exemplified by Israel. The everyday tactics that play into shaping the image of Israel as a civilized savior of an unruly West Asia, form the core of all scholarly enquiries into 'pinkwashing'. In its acceptance of "*certain sanitised homosexual bodies in (its) nationalist project*"¹⁵, Israel has purled all queer activism into a myth of nationalism, thereby tempering its spread to anti-imperialist advocacy.

Israel has accumulated a storehouse of political mythology and manufactured archetypes to further alienate the Palestinian identity from the accepted and mainstream version of who all constitute the body of 'valid citizenry': a pro-State, white, and Jewish individual. The conquered and vanquished Palestinian, on the other hand, is furthest from this idealization and therefore a threat to Israeli nationhood.

Appropriating 'Modernity'

The burgeoning of the movement for queer rights to other socio-economic areas, and especially its anti-occupation stance, proved a challenge to the Israeli State. It overcame by appropriating and instrumentalizing the very progressiveness that acceptance of non-heterosexuality entailed, to temper deviant citizens in favour of its policies. In order to attain 'modernity', the Israeli nation state opened up the social realm of acceptance to queer individuals, rather than mold the heteronormative State conscious in favor of the 'deviance' that queer bodies exemplified.

¹² Moreau, J. (2022, June 8). *What Roe v. Wade's end could mean for LGBTQ rights*. NBC News. <https://www.nbcnews.com/nbc-out/out-politics-and-policy/roe-v-wades-end-mean-lgbtq-rights-rcna32411>

¹³ Baume, M. (2020, August 27). *Donald Trump's 8 Worst Attacks on the LGBTQ+ Community*. Them. <https://www.them.us/story/donald-trump-worst-lgbtq-attacks>

¹⁴ Shah, S. (2014, May 1). *Queering Diplomacy*. The Caravan. <https://caravanmagazine.in/gender-sexuality/queering-diplomacy>

¹⁵ Cattle, R. (2018, March 29). *Israeli Pinkwashing: Grounding Understanding Of Homonationalism*. Centre For Feminist Foreign Policy. <https://centreforfeministforeignpolicy.org/journal/2018/3/29/israeli-pinkwashing-grounding-understandings-of-homonationalism>

By normativizing queerness, by bringing it within the fold of heteronormative social ideals, and by projecting the image of what a good, abiding queer citizen should look like, Israel has fabricated a fine lie of modernity, whose hypocrisy helps no one, least of all LGBTQIA+ advocacy in the Middle East. As a Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy **article**¹⁶ by Ryan Cattle highlights, the ideal queer is “(A) white, middle-class Israeli”, a patriot at heart, who believes in the cause of Israeli nation-state, and holds no sympathies for the “Palestinian Other”, the native in dire need of being civilized into this modern way of life, out of the regression of religious dictums and orthodoxy.

The aforementioned conceptions of ‘valid citizenry’ were never expanded; rather, the scope of queer social activism was shrewdly shaved down to fit within its boundaries.

By offering acceptance and refuge, the Israeli State is producing cognitive dissonance in the mind of an average citizen; a question is posed, ‘*When your State offers you the pinnacle of human rights, and state-of-art luxury, then why would you step outside the line for Palestinian people whose religiously sanctioned homophobia would not be a second in executing you for your identity?*’ As if by way of answer, the global queer movement stands largely mute. In Sheila Collins’ words: “Theology is ultimately political. The way human communities deify the transcendent, and determine the categories of good and evil have more to do with the power dynamics of the social systems which create the theologies than with the spontaneous revelation of truth...”

These new mythologies have more to do with forwarding Israel’s political agenda in the Middle East, than with acceptance of people’s lived realities. As evinced by the condition of a Palestinian queer individual against the statehood and security of life possessed by an Israeli queer, who has been groomed in accordance with the State-sanctioned archetypes of idealized homonormativity, the State is weaving a yarn of compliance, not of human rights advocacy. Modernity is simply a shield for the more regressive, anti-native policies of Israel.

As Edward Said noted: “Every empire, however, tells itself and the world that it is unlike all other empires, that its mission is not to plunder and control, but to educate and liberate.” As always, Western propped regimes in the East seek to bring ‘modernity’ to the uncouth native, guising their exploitative and colonialist policies with a rhetoric of ‘gifting’ social and civil rights to the ‘imbecile’ and ‘inferior’ subjects of their rule. This is precisely the case with a largely White, US-backed Israel maneuvering the politics of the Middle-East. The ‘White Saviour’ narrative has never looked more appealing or sumptuous than in its nouveau garb of sexual autonomy.

Pinkwashing

This shrewd projection of a queer friendly and ‘modern’ Israeli State in direct antagonism to Palestinian rootedness in Islamic orthodoxy, births the idea of ‘Pinkwashing.’ Queer friendly jingoism is simply an old wine in a new bottle, hoping to subsume the average disillusioned citizen into acquiescing with State

¹⁶ Cattle, R. (2018, March 29). *Israeli Pinkwashing: Grounding Understanding Of Homonationalism*. Centre For Feminist Foreign Policy. <https://centreforfeministforeignpolicy.org/journal/2018/3/29/israeli-pinkwashing-grounding-understandings-of-homonationalism>

tyranny, pitting identity against identity, freedom against freedom, and drawing trench lines onto the universality of Human Rights . Case-in-point, the Tel Aviv pride parade¹⁷ involves a billion-dollar investment to boost LGBTQIA+ tourism, while more tangible policies to aid the queer community, such as the AIDS Task Force, suffer budget cuts. Colloquially termed ‘pink washing’, these actions of the Israeli State have variously been described as a manifestation of what Jasbir Puar termed ‘homonationalism’ in her 2007 book ‘Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times’.

The term ‘pinkwashing’ first entered common parlance in reference to Israel through S. Schulman’s 2011 editorial¹⁸ for the New York Times. An article¹⁹ by Femmagazine defines pink washing as “deliberate appropriation of sexual liberation movements towards regressive political ends... appropriation of the LGBTQIA+ movement to promote a particular corporate or political agenda... (and) entities marketing themselves as “gay-friendly” to gain favour with progressives, while masking aspects that are violent and undemocratic...”, all of which sums up the Israeli State’s attitudes discussed so far.

All said-and-done, pinkwashing continues to be an internally contested concept: It can only be generalized so much, given that it is fraught with fault lines of varying definitions. As Linda Dayan writes²⁰ for Haaretz, the simple act of the annual pride parade at Tel Aviv sets in motion sweeping political currents , with one side arguing against the covertly homophobic policies of the State, and specious queer advocacy to bury the rhetoric of settler colonialism; while the other argues that empowerment of Queer Rights’ groups in Israel has allowed a degree of amelioration and medical assistance for those shunned by the Palestinian society for their identity.

As there is truth to be found in the latter narratives, one is forced to reckon with how LGBTQIA+ groups can advocate queer rights before Palestinians without appearing to be marionettes in the hands of a US-backed regime; or, to quote Puar, “How do we conceptualize queer sexualities in...the “Middle East”... without reproducing neocolonialist assumptions (of) US saviour discourses?”²¹ . The paradox of a hungry,

¹⁷ ‘We won’t let anyone feel afraid’: Over 170K march in Tel Aviv Pride Parade. (2022, June 10). Times Of Israel. <https://www.timesofisrael.com/police-shutter-roads-as-tens-of-thousands-expected-at-tel-aviv-pride-parade/>

¹⁸ Schulman, S. (2011, November 23). *Opinion | ‘Pinkwashing’ and Israel’s Use of Gays as a Messaging Tool*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/23/opinion/pinkwashing-and-israels-use-of-gays-as-a-messaging-tool.html>

¹⁹ Fem Newsmagazine. (2019, June 1). *Feminism 101: What is Pinkwashing?* Femmagazine. <https://femmagazine.com/feminism-101-what-is-pinkwashing/>

²⁰ Dayan, L. (2019, June 18). *U.S. anti-pinkwashing “progressives” don’t see LGBTQ Israelis as real people, only pawns - Middle East News*. Haaretz.Com. <https://www.haaretz.com/middle-east-news/2019-06-18/ty-article-opinion/u-s-anti-pinkwashing-activists-dont-see-lgbtq-israelis-as-real-people/0000017f-f765-d318-aff-f76771b00000>

²¹ Puar, J. K. (2017). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times (Next Wave: New Directions in Women’s Studies)* (Anniversary, Tenth Anniversary ed.). Duke University Press Books.

all-consuming neo-imperialist State collapsing weaker states by weaponizing and manipulating queerness and progressiveness, haunts the international political arena.

Conclusion

The appropriation and capitalization of cultural values may not be a brand-new anomaly of imperialist institutions across the world, but its extension to lived experiences of marginalization and identitarian violence certainly is. The weaponization of progress, and the shaping of a liberal social order on the mound of a conquered state's presumed backwardness, have together informed the premise of this paper.

We began with a discussion of what queerness entails in modern politics as opposed to the hopes that were placed on its triumph against suppression a century ago. The modern State has deployed a rich range of tactics to temper queerness from clashing against its own exploitative goals in the Global South.

The paper then endeavored to historicize queer advocacy at the level of international institutions. It is these bodies whose inclination towards more liberal culturalism of the post WWII era besieged the states with a rainbow tide in the first place. While this global activism presents an optimistic vision of the successes to come for queer rights, the paper then moves onto harsher tidings: a scattering of queer-friendly policies by states that may in fact be anti-refugee, Islamophobic, and quite covertly hypocritical in light of other, more regressive, policies adopted by these very states.

Finally, the paper presents a very specific case study of Israel's image building of a 'modern' and 'queer-friendly' state as opposed to the 'uncouth' and 'homophobic' Palestine that needs the former's intervention to 'evade its persistent backwardness and medievality'.

Conclusively, the queer tide of yesteryear appears to have turned its course, becoming a weapon in the hands of the oppressor. The dilemma of our times is saving modernity from itself, lest it be torn asunder by more authoritarian forces.

Additional Bibliography

- a. Butler, J. (2008). Sexual politics, torture, and secular time. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 59(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2007.00176.x>
- b. O'Shaughnessy, H. D. (2015, March 1). *Homonationalism and the Death of the Radical Queer*. Inquiries Journal. <http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/1003/homonationalism-and-the-death-of-the-radical-queer>
- c. Puar, J. (2013). Rethinking Homonationalism. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 45(2), 336–339. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s002074381300007x>
- d. Quinn, S. (2022). *An Activist's Guide to The Yogyakarta Principles*. ARC International.
- e. Picq, L. M., & Thiel, M. (2015). *Sexualities in World Politics: How LGBTQ claims shape International Relations (Interventions)* (1st ed.). Routledge.

- f. Hartal, G., & Sasson-Levy, O. (2017). Re-Reading Homonationalism: An Israeli Spatial Perspective. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 65(10), 1391–1414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2017.1375364>
- g. Weber, C. (2016). *Queer International Relations: Sovereignty, Sexuality and the Will to Knowledge (Oxford Studies in Gender and International Relations)* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.
- h. Rao, R. (2020). *Out of Time: The Queer Politics of Postcoloniality (Oxford Studies in Gender and International Relations)*. Oxford University Press.
- i. Ritchie, J. (2014). Pinkwashing, Homonationalism, and Israel-Palestine: The Conceits of Queer Theory and the Politics of the Ordinary. *Antipode*, 47(3), 616–634. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12100>
- j. “History of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Social Movements.” *American Psychological Association*, <https://www.apa.org/pi/lgbt/resources/history>. Accessed 9 June 2022.