# City Research Online

## City St George's, University of London

**Citation:** Slootmaeckers, K. & Bosia, M. J. (2023). The Dislocation of LGBT Politics: Pride, Globalization, and Geo-Temporality in Uganda and Serbia. International Political Sociology, 17(1), olad004. doi: 10.1093/ips/olad004

This is the published version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

**Permanent repository link:** https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/29096/

**Link to published version:** https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/olad004

**Copyright and Reuse:** Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to City Research Online policy.

City Research Online: http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/ publications@citystgeorges.ac.uk

*International Political Sociology* (2023) **17**, 1–19

# The Dislocation of LGBT Politics: Pride, Globalization, and Geo-Temporality in Uganda and Serbia

Koen Slootmaeckers[†]
*University of London, United Kingdom*
and
Michael J. Bosia[†]
*Saint Michael's College, United States of America*

Scholars consider the translatability and efficacy of "western" LGBT politics as they diffuse, but pay little attention to the role of its histories and cultures as geo-temporal phenomena. Focusing on Pride events, this article demonstrates how such oversights inhibit a full account of the widely diverse impacts of similar actions in different places. We explore the ways in which Pride events, as a mode of activism, go global and integrate in vastly different contexts: Serbia and Uganda. Paying particular attention to acts of violence and the instrumentalization of Pride as geopolitical, we argue that divergent outcomes connect to the diffusion of Pride as creative of geo-temporal dislocations of politics and history. Incorporating the concept of extraversion, we demonstrate that the intertwining of the domestic and international facilitates the transformation of politics in terms of foreseen outcomes and unintended consequences. Overall, we propose a framework that advances an understanding of homophobic and homophilic politics as instrumentalizations of geo-temporal dislocations that underpin the global fight for LGBT rights. As a challenge to the progress narrative nearly intrinsic to western international relations, this approach is useful to explore processes that shape other types of transnational politics, such as democracy, climate change, and peace movements.

Les chercheurs considèrent la traduisibilité et l'efficacité des politiques LGBT « occidentales » quand elles se diffusent, mais accordent peu d'attention au rôle des histoires et cultures comme phénomènes géotemporels. En se concentrant sur les marches des fiertés, cet article démontre que ces omissions ne permettent pas de produire un récit complet des conséquences extrêmement diverses des actions similaires dans d'autres endroits. Nous analysons les façons dont les marches des fiertés, en tant qu'événements militants, se mondialisent et s'insèrent dans des contextes très différents : en Serbie et en Ouganda. En nous intéressant plus particulièrement aux actes de violence et à l'instrumentalisation géopolitique de la marche des fiertés, nous avançons que des résultats divergents sont à mettre en lien avec la diffusion de la marche des fiertés, car elle crée des dislocations géotemporelles de la politique et de l'histoire. En intégrant le concept d'extraversion, nous démontrons que l'enchevêtrement des niveaux national et international facilite la transformation de la politique en termes de résultats anticipés et de conséquences indésirées. De

Slootmaeckers[†], Koen, and Michael J. Bosia[†]. (2023) The Dislocation of LGBT Politics: Pride, Globalization, and Geo-Temporality in Uganda and Serbia. *International Political Sociology*, https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/olad004
**Corresponding author e-mail:** koen.slootmaeckers@city.ac.uk
[†]*Author's Note:* Both authors share equal contribution to the manuscript.
© The Author(s) (2023). Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the International Studies Association. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

façon générale, nous proposons un cadre qui permet d'avancer notre compréhension des politiques homophobes et homophiles comme instrumentalisations des dislocations géotemporelles, sous-jacentes dans la lutte mondiale en faveur des droits LGBT. Puisqu'elle remet en question le récit progressiste presque intrinsèque aux relations internationales occidentales, cette approche est utile pour l'exploration des processus qui forment d'autres types de politiques transnationales, comme la démocratie, le changement climatique et les mouvements pacifistes.

Los investigadores consideran la traducibilidad y eficacia de las políticas LGBT «occidentales» a medida que se difunden, pero prestan poca atención al papel de las historias y las culturas como fenómenos geotemporales. Centrándose en los eventos del Orgullo, este artículo demuestra cómo tales omisiones impiden una explicación completa de los muy diversos impactos de acciones similares en diferentes lugares. Exploramos las formas en que los eventos del Orgullo, como modo de activismo, se globalizan e integran en contextos muy diferentes: Serbia y Uganda. Prestando especial atención a los actos de violencia y a la instrumentalización del Orgullo como geopolítica, argumentamos que los resultados divergentes conectan con la difusión del Orgullo como elemento creador de dislocaciones geotemporales de la política y la historia. Incorporando el concepto de extraversión, demostramos que el entrelazamiento de lo nacional y lo internacional facilita la transformación de la política en términos de resultados previstos y consecuencias imprevistas. En conjunto, proponemos un marco que permite comprender la política homófoba y homófila como una instrumentalización de las dislocaciones geotemporales que sustentan la lucha mundial por los derechos de las personas LGBT. Como desafío a la narrativa del progreso casi intrínseca a las relaciones internacionales occidentales, este enfoque es útil para explorar los procesos que dan forma a otros tipos de política transnacional, como la democracia, el cambio climático y los movimientos pacifistas.

---

"Because time is what keeps everything from happening simultaneously!"
—Raymond E. Feist (*Magician's End* 2013, 449).

LGBT Pride marches are ubiquitous in the politics and advocacy of gender and sexual minority groups around the world. Among many shared historical narratives that inform LGBTQI+ activism and strategies, Pride is a feature in many movements and is often discussed and shared through large-scale global umbrella organizations, including ILGA World and Outright International. It represents an important part of a broad transnational movement that has received significant scholarly attention. Yet, the politics of Pride are not the same in all places and at all times: In some places, Pride is held as mass celebrations with corporate sponsors, whereas in others, governments have banned Pride (e.g., in Moscow and Warsaw), participants have been met with extreme violence (such as in Serbia), or they face mass arrest (e.g., Uganda). In this article, we explore what sits behind these vastly different experiences and the divergent politics that emerge from the ways in which Pride, as a mode of activism, goes global and integrates in vastly different contexts. We focus in particular on the ways that Pride "moves" from core contexts in the "west" to peripheries. We argue that such a move represents a geo-temporal dislocation of Pride politics, and is not without consequences as it generates new avenues for local actors of all kinds to engage with and transform gender and sexuality. To develop an analytical approach sensitive to geo-temporal underpinnings of modes of activism as they go global, we incorporate in our theorizing insights from the literature on strategies of extraversion to capture how domestic actors instrumentalize

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

time and space to further their own goals, shifting the possibilities for and potential of organizing around gender and sexuality politics.

Despite more recent scholarship attentive to the translation of norms and categories in sexuality and gender identity (Cottet and Picq 2019), it is quite stark how little purchase has been attached to modern notions of geographies and temporalities in the study of sexualities as globalized (for exceptions, see Kulpa and Mizielińska 2011; Szulc 2018; Rao 2020). To date, scholars have applied theories that address how norms "cascade" across the international into the domestic (Lutz and Sikkink 2001) and shape sexuality and gender politics (Kollman 2007; Ayoub 2016; Slootmaeckers et al 2016). Others have been critical in analyzing how the internationalization of LGBT rights has led to pre-emptive (Currier and Cruz 2020) or anticipatory (Weiss 2013) countermovements, and the rise of "state homophobia" (Bosia 2020) and "homocolonialism" (Rahman 2014).

Our perspective, in line with many critical queer international relations (IR) approaches, challenges activism and scholarship that are bound up uncritically with modern conceptions of time and space. We call into question the often unspoken unspoken "arc of history" approaches or a "sexual modernization theory" (see Bosia and Weiss 2013; Weber 2016) through which notions of progress underpin large parts of LGBT activism and scholarship. Within a progress-based narrative, sexual and gender minority experiences are meant to improve across space and time in a linear and similar fashion. It is this praxis to which we turn and seek to challenge. Building on the work of Rao's (2020) that "provincializes" the time of western modernity and highlights how people have been temporally (re)positioned to be "out of time," we turn to the notions of time embedded within activism itself, and how these have become political resources for both opponents and proponents of LGBT rights.

In this article, we propose an analysis of the globalization of sexuality politics that draws, first, on a growing consensus among critical queer scholars that sexuality politics have become deeply embroiled in notions of modernity tied to a particular geo-temporality (Rahman 2014; Bosia 2020; Rao 2020), and, second, on questions of time and space ever-present, though under studied, within LGBT activism and other exchanges between queer people and the state (Rao 2020). Indeed, both temporality and spatiality are constantly manipulated and/or differently experienced, whether it relates to activists' desires to alter their experiences of the present through reimagining the past or how conceptions of the present shape the narratives and interpretations of LGBT people's pasts (Rao 2020).

In this way, we push toward a more critical account of globalized activism between the core and peripheries more generally. Our analysis improves the understanding of the sharing of activist narratives and practices by focusing on the movement of practices as geo-temporal phenomena that transform politics, in terms of foreseen outcomes and unintended consequences. Interrogating the spatial and temporal undercurrent of such globalizations and the politics they produce, we argue, is key to understanding the complexities of global sexual diversity politics—and so global politics more generally—and remains largely unaddressed in the literature.

With such geo-temporal complexities and tensions in mind, we ask what happens when modes of activism and strategies globalize? Particularly, how does the dislocation of modes of activism and strategies from one time and place to another open up a new set of politics previously not encountered? These questions are important as activist strategies and actions are always already embedded and marked by the historical and geographical context in which they developed; as and when diffused, they become substantially/characteristically/necessarily relocated into a distinct geopolitical and geo-temporal context. Without regard to the contextual histories that gave rise to Pride, the action of geo-temporal dislocation—i.e., the process by which politics/actions/ideas are moved outside their geo-temporal context of origin into a new one and thus disturbing their original state—contorts extant historical processes where Pride came from as well as where it is received. The

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

result is that histories from elsewhere produce a whole new set of challenges and opportunities in the present, as well as distinctive futures, both in the contexts to which they move and in their locations of origin, and thus generate new forms of politics in the advocacy for and hostility to LGBT identities and rights.

To answer these questions, we examine the globalization of "Pride" events, which have become a quintessential part of the panoply of rituals available to a global LGBT movement, as a geo-temporally challenging example of globalized semiotics and politics. We aim to theorize and understand a displacement of LGBT politics that occurs when modes of activism globalize, by paying particular attention to the temporalities embedded within globalizations. We argue that the present politics of Pride cannot be understood without considering its dislocation from specific geo-temporal pasts and implantation where transnational pasts, local presents, and possible futures are intertwined.

Our contribution is two-fold. First, we theorize how the internationalization of "LGBT politics" and modes of activism are always out of time and out of place by virtue of the fact that they all emerge out of, and start in, specific geographical locations at specific points of time. Thus, they always already contain contextualized politics that cannot be translated nor transported, yet maintain a ghostly presence. Through our theory, we challenge progress-thinking and highlight that local politics embedded and generated by modes of activism are already changed by virtue of the diffusion process. Second, we apply the concept of extraversion, which focuses on the shifting and intertwining of international and domestic politics, to the geo-temporal politics of Pride, thereby developing a more complex analytical framework to understand shifting power dynamics and policy debates within Pride politics in particular, and sexual and gender minority politics more generally, as they go "international."

Through a relational and transnational approach to international relations, we take the relationality of processes and the world as an essential starting point of our analysis (Jackson and Nexon 1999; Qin 2018). Though it is possible to observe actors/entities shaping the process, when solely focusing on these actors/entities, one risks losing sight of the emerging effects of the process itself (Jackson and Nexon 1999). The relational approach switches from "thinking about the world as a noun to understanding it as a verb—to focus on the effects of the blowing rather than the blowers" (Eyben 2010, 388). Doing so, we "imagine that a process is mutable in relation to space and time, as are the mechanisms established to promote it" (Eyben 2010, 388), and emphasize how the process shapes and produces LGBT politics. Additionally, we draw from transnational approaches that promote supplementing the domestic/local and international/global, to highlight the "linkages across cultural contexts rather than reproduce analyses of scale" (Kim-Puri 2005, 143). In other words, it is the combination and imbrication of the domestic/local and international/global that creates "unique conditions, with unique opportunities and challenges, for lives and activisms" (Szulc 2018, 10).

In this article, we briefly discuss the origins and development of Pride first as local actions and then as a global(ized) ritual. Then, we develop our theoretical understanding of temporal simultaneity, geo-temporal dislocation, and the extraversion of domestic politics as intertwined processes. Finally, we show how our theoretical approach enables us to capture and understand the politics emerging from the geo-temporal undercurrents of Prides in non-western contexts by considering Pride in Uganda and Serbia as cases from the periphery and the semi-periphery (respectively), each with a different positioning toward the core (understood as the "west").

## The Globalization of Pride Parades

Pride events are presented as central to LGBT activism, expected to be universally effective and modular, easily transferable, and exportable across geographical and

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

cultural divides (Stella 2012). Consider, e.g., the description of Pride as "essential" by ILGA-Europe (the European transnational umbrella organization) in their booklet aimed at helping LGBT activists organize Pride parades in Central and Eastern Europe: "Pride events not only bring LGBT people together to form a public identity and to build a visible community in a difficult social context, but they also allow individuals to express this identity and provide hope for people who are still living in fear" (ILGA-Europe 2006, 10).

Through such a portrayal of Pride, transnational LGBT organizations define and confirm the centrality of Pride within the struggle for LGBT rights, and few rhetorics are more emblematic of contemporary LGBT politics than Pride celebrations, organized to mark the 1969 riots at the Stonewall Inn (in New York City).[1] In the 1970s, the marches commemorating the riots became a primary tool to protest continued criminalization, discrimination, and violence, while authorities—forced to provide protection—saw such parades as a provocation (Armstrong and Crage 2006). As a response to homophobia, the marches showed the potential of collective solidarity to construct a powerful identity that enables agency, through a "strong affirmation of the ideal of community—a sense of belonging that [. . .] made a positive sense of self achievable" (Weeks 2015, 50). These early marches in the aftermath of Stonewall were not styled as the "Pride" events seen today. Instead, the early Christopher Street Liberation Parade in New York, San Francisco's Gay Freedom Day Parade, or the participation of FHAR (Homosexual Front for Revolutionary Action) in the annual May Day march in Paris were marked by a radical politics in the aftermath of the 1960s.

Over time and with the spread of march organizing—as a key strategic yet modular ritual—its nature and political character changed. As the struggle for LGBT equality moved from radical gay liberation to a more accommodating rights movement, organizing shifted from demonstration to parade. The transition provoked tensions locally and globally between radical system critique and celebration of identities. Examples of the more radical origins can be found in the National Union of Miners leading the 1985 Lesbian and Gay and Pride Parade in London in solidarity against the Thatcher government, and ACT UP chapters intervening in LGBT parades across the west to focus on local political failures in fighting the AIDS pandemic, and as recently as the Black Lives Matter disruption of Toronto Pride in 2016 over the presence of police officers in the march (Davis 2021). Even so, the neoliberalization of LGBT rights and identities (Duggan 2001) brought a more celebratory focus on (self-)recognition that triumphed across the west, as exemplified by the first EuroPride (1992) and WorldPride (2000). As "western" Prides became institutionalized and often commercialized, they entered into a more ambiguous relationship with politics (Ammaturo 2015) without becoming devoid of politics. In short, Prides transformed into "a party with politics" (Browne 2007), resembling mass events and festival-like tourist attractions featuring stylized commercial erotics in place of the radical gender and sexual expression characteristic of the liberatory impulse.

The changing nature of Pride through historical processes cannot be escaped when Pride rituals move from its origins in the core to a variety of peripheries, provoking a number of questions: What is it about Pride that is being moved, and how is its history being dislocated? What does it mean for activists facing official persecution and risk of arrest, disclosure, and violence to adopt "Pride" as a dislocated rhetorical strategy or event/action? Why, in particular, do so when an (often western) Pride framework largely abandoned its origin as protest and confrontation in favor of a festival signaling a politics of increasing assimilation? And how does the co-existence of both party and protest in Pride in global space impact the politics of these events?

[1] For a detailed account of the Stonewall (Inn) Riots, see, e.g., Duberman (1993) and Carter (2004).

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

## Theorizing the Temporal Simultaneities of Pride at the Peripheries

Our critique is not that the transnational LGBT movement forces local movements to organize Pride, because local actors decide if Pride is an appropriate tool. Instead, we draw attention to Pride politics and rhetorics as they (re)produce the hegemonic idea that Pride is the key strategy to empower the "community," used when the time is right, which is based on an assumption that the recreation of the Stonewall moment for LGBT communities will help in collective struggle.

The Stonewall assumption is based on a very particular conception of progress situated within a western linear temporality, where the periphery is expected to follow the path laid out by the experience of the core (Mizielińska and Kulpa 2011). Such linear temporalities can be imagined through the following metaphor of a stream of water:

> "Consider this jet of water as an analogy for time." […] "Imagine a single drop to be a moment, which flows from here down to here." […] "Now, we are in a drop, our "now", and we travel along with it, so when we were up here," he pointed to the top of the stream, "that was yesterday, and when we get here," he pointed to the bottom, "it will be tomorrow." "So as the drop travels we pass from yesterday through now to tomorrow" (Feist 2013, 449–50).

Applying this analogy to notions of progress within LGBT rights, we see that much research spotlights one such droplet as it flows through the stream. Sexual modernization theory and other notions of progress, in effect, consider each drop on a singular journey, yet with shared milestones, to a joint destination. Stonewall is represented as such a milestone, a breaking free of a repressive past and the entry into the liberatory future.

We argue that theories of linear time are problematic for two reasons: First, they ignore how temporal conceptions are bound up in power structures, creating and maintaining hierarchies in international politics (Puar 2005; Butler 2009), and, second, they atomize temporalities (and associated politics) as unconnected but on a similar and shared trajectory within global history. Theories of linear time and progress, then, disconnect temporalities from each other and atomize each iteration as a water drop anchored within a specific locality (see also Rao 2020). While the issue of temporal hierarchies has been discussed at length (e.g., Mizielińska and Kulpa 2011), the atomization of temporalities—as isolated and detached like the imagined singular droplet within a wider stream—has received little attention within sexuality politics (for an exception, see Rao 2020), though it is consequential for how we understand the diffusion of LGBT politics. The singular conceptualization of temporality obscures the fact that time is "far more tangled, far more common and bound" (Sharma 2013, 314).

"Pride" is an example of temporal entanglements, evidencing how things are happening locally/globally; anachronistically/(a)historically; yet simultaneously as well as unsequentially/disjunctively. To make this argument, we draw on the work of Mizielińska and Kulpa 2011, 16) that points to how peripheries are located within a different temporality from the core's idealization of historical progress, one that could be described as "knotted," where "mismatched models and realities, strategies and possibilities, understandings and uses" of LGBT politics are happening somehow simultaneously (see also Rao 2020). This temporality does not only mean that activists have access to all of the core's different historic periods of struggle for LGBT rights, including Stonewall, but also implies a simultaneity in which these struggles are taking place despite their original historical specificity.

Temporal simultaneity occurs in two ways. First, we cannot atomize events and "progress" as if they happen in isolation, but rather whatever happens in one geopolitical location is bound up in the events of another. Such combinations create tensions that are particularly accelerated through the globalization processes. Second,

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

simultaneity occurs through the complex relationship between the pasts and the presents of both the core and peripheries. While linear conceptions of time argue that past and present are distinct from each other as if they are different points in the stream—one of the limits forced upon us through the modern progress paradigm (Assmann 2013)—we follow Koselleck's theory that there is no otherness of the past, but instead that "the past flows in and through the present" (as cited in Zammito 2004, 133). In fact, we consider that the past and present are interwoven in at least two key ways: the past is part of the present because (1) it "continue[s] to be politically used and abused" (Assmann 2013, 47), and (2) the past journey and associated transformations have lasting residual implications for the present.

Looping in our water metaphor, we argue that geo-temporalities as drops of water never truly travel independently, but continuously combine, separate, and recombine with other droplets as they travel. In this way, we see that the flow of one droplet can never be fully understood without considering that of the others sharing the journey. Moreover, throughout its journey, each drop not only interconnects with other droplets but also changes as it goes along. For example, by traveling through the stream, it picks up sediment and thus parts of its past travel with the drop, and as it intertwines with other droplets, the sediment of the past journey of each droplet intertwines with the present of both.

Returning our discussion of temporalities to the diffusion of Pride as an activist model, it becomes clear that Pride events are situated in their local context and are inherently connected to contemporaneous Pride events through intersecting geographies, as well as the history of Pride as a whole. For example, while local activists might seek to recreate local "Stonewall moments" based on radical politics of the early gay liberation movement, their efforts are inherently intertwined with the transformation of Pride into a celebratory event, which itself is in part linked to and through the ready availability of images of Prides around the world. Moreover, whereas Stonewall and the first marches happened in an era where LGBT rights were constituted as domestic issues, any such event now is emerging in a geopolitical context that is marked by globalization and the instantaneous internationalization of homophobia and homophilia (Bosia 2020). In other words, whether or not Pride is intended to kickstart some notion of progress for LGBT rights modeled on the western experience, it represents a tool which is geo-temporally dislocated. Without making a normative claim on geo-dislocations, we rather draw attention to the complexity of geo-temporal fields in which Pride finds itself and the consequences this has in terms of politics. Building on the theories of Laroui (1976, see also Riecken 2015), we observe that while the recognition of multiple temporalities allows us to overcome (western) centrist perspectives, these multiple temporalities are not just local and/or particular but embedded within an overarching structure that is universally available. We consider these geo-temporal flows to consist of histories and narratives contained in ideas, discourses, symbols, as well as material support. These flows, moreover, are intersecting between core and periphery countries, for both movements associated with Pride (homophile) and those associated with homophobia. The fact that Pride parades are located within such multi-dimensional flows, both in terms of geographies and temporalities, opens up new politics, and a variety of avenues to use, abuse and instrumentalize such events for different politics locally and globally.

### Extraversion: The Political Avenues of Multi-Dimensional Geo-Temporalities

The concept of *Extraversion* (Bayart 1993, 2000) provides a tool for conceptualizing the new analysis of geo-temporality central to our understanding of LGBT rights and Pride. As a challenge to dependency theory, extraversion conceives of the local and international realms of politics as inherently intertwined (Peiffer and Englebert 2012), and captures systems of structured post-colonial dependency

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

playing out in the dislocating of domestic politics to the international (and vice versa). Indeed, Bayart (1993, 2000) identified *strategies of extraversion* to capture the ways in which post-colonial state actors in Africa might, as Richards (2014) explains, look to the international for tools for maintaining or achieving power. Bayart's concept has been applied to the political relationships of state actors and civil society organizing to reintroduce agency within the analysis of the post-colonial state (Pommerolle 2010), and to demonstrate how the local and international are inherently intertwined (Peiffer and Englebert 2012). Further, extraversion should not be considered a singular strategy, but rather a shifting and adaptable means through which local actors instrumentalize and localize the international realm for domestic goals, as even access for local non-state actors to the international as a location of political and social power (public discourse, symbols, rhetorics, and notions of difference) is contested.

In other words, the conceptual power of extraversion lies in the fact that it considers the international and local as mutually constitutive and not separate, indicating that it is nearly impossible in such contexts to think about political action and governance on sexual minority issues as anything other than simultaneously global and local. Strategies of extraversion, therefore, represent the adaptable means through which local actors in peripheries instrumentalize and localize the "international" for domestic goals. And if we continue our water metaphor, the strategies of extraversion represent the dams, canals, locks, pipes, and bridges—the water management tools—through which states as well as global and local actors navigate the internationally and domestically unequal distribution of infrastructure and manipulate the flow for their own benefit.

Much scholarship on extraversion as a political strategy focuses on three underlying geo-political principles (Pommerolle 2010). First, the international is an object of tension between civil society actors and state actors, in particular, as state actors and allies assert their monopoly over contact with international actors or even over passage across borders. Second, the concept of extraversion enables us to see the global not as a distant site for advocacy, resource or skill development, or financial support, but instead as mutually constituted within local politics. Third, extraversion emphasizes forms of inequality that prefigure the relationships between state and international actors as well as those between global advocates and local advocates.

We expand the conceptualization of extraversion to include, as a fourth principle, the politics around geo-temporally dislocated rhetorics and practices, like Pride, that constitute time and space as resource-rich. As transnational gender and sexuality politics are embedded in a complex landscape comprised of both geography and temporality, local actors can use the international for their local benefit, but they can also rely on the different temporalities that are embedded within the rhetorics available from actors whose engagement is accessible globally. The geo-temporal strategies of extraversion, then, relate to political struggle over the reshaping of the system of rivers, lakes, and reservoirs, and aqueducts, pipelines, and plumbing that represent the temporalities of gender and sexuality politics. In order to destroy unwanted, reinforce old, and/or create new associations between pasts and/or presents, extraversion enables the instrumentalization of international gender and sexuality politics and reinforces or challenges local power positions.

Geo-temporal resources are not ideologically one sided, as state and social actors have dragged both homophobic and homophilic histories across the international to the local, from the core to peripheries (Broqua 2015). Rather, the LGBT strategies and Pride rituals available with the extraversion of domestic politics are malleable, made to fit the specific configuration of struggles in which actors find themselves. In our study, we see such tensions between the application of state homophobia/-philia and the intersection of global and local modes of resistance to it. With this in mind, we consider that sexual and gender politics on the

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

periphery occur across five fields of political struggle involving sets of differently empowered actors: between homophiles and homophobes in the west; transnational homophobes working in alliance; transnational homophiles working in alliance; between transnational homophobes and homophiles; and between homophiles and homophobes in peripheral countries. Each of these fields has its own history and institutional framework—its unique geo-temporality—though contestation in the west and internationally sustains more resources and idea development and is, as a result, more powerful and attractive on the periphery. Ideas, rhetorics, and strategies, whether innovative or long imbedded, become modular across these dimensions (Bosia and Weiss 2013), dislocating from specific histories and relocated to new and different contexts, reflecting impositions and adaptations in one place, and simultaneous temporal disjunction and discontinuity in another.

In the case studies ahead, we find spatial dimensions of relational power developed through the extraversion frame highly relevant to (1) the shifts that dislocate sexual and gender minority politics from Uganda to global networks; (2) sites in eastern Europe and the European Union (EU), and the introduction of the EU as local actor when international politics are relocated to domestic space; and (3) the elaboration of complex spatial relationships imbedded as well within the historic temporalities of oppression and resistance in those locations. In both contexts, state actors and allies as well as gender and sexual minorities initiate appeals to and respond to pressures from transnational state and civil society actors, with a growing cognition of debates about sexuality and gender identity (including Pride) in the west. This array of actors and relations is complicated, but it is through these networks that ideas about sexuality and gender identity—both homophobic and homophilic—are extrapolated, adapted, dislocated, and relocated by actors in our case studies, without regard to the historical and institutional dynamics within which the specific methods and strategies were developed. The result is a simultaneity or compression of time and space, which subjects sexual and gender minorities to greater risk of violence and trauma at the hands of state and social actors, clearly contrasting with the celebratory and affirming intent of "Pride" events in the core, but also with the early more radical marches.

## Prejudice and Pride in Uganda

Unlike the west's decades of post-Stonewall contestation over sexual and gender norms after a century of socio-scientific elaboration, the geo-temporal dislocation of Pride from the west to Uganda is situated within the sudden amplifications of both homophobia and homophilia after 2000. Shaped through the extraversion of domestic politics around gender and sexual diversity as state actors and allies joined an emergent global anti-human rights coalition to craft a "gay peril" as one response to neoliberal and democratizing pressures, sexual and gender minorities faced in the same moment repression like that which instigated calls for privacy in the 1950s west, and neglect from powerful bureaucracies similar to that which western AIDS activists faced in the 1980s. Against homophobia, Ugandan gender and sexual minority activists sought to gain global traction by adopting visibility tactics that are legible to international interlocutors, while global and regional NGOs simultaneously employed international pressures to push autocracies like Uganda to protect sexual and gender minorities whose existence such states called an existential threat. Where the origins of homosexuality as an "abnormal identity" exists in the west through a consistent articulation of its threats, President Museveni of Uganda had claimed at a Commonwealth event in 2002 that "we don't have homosexuals in Uganda."[2] But by the time of the first Pride events in 2012, Ugandan

[2] This statement was widely covered. Seee.g., https://www.wired.com/2002/03/blind-eye-award/ (accessed February 12, 2022).

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

sexual and gender minorities faced a very different context from their own past and from the first marches after Stonewall, so that emerging confrontations with the state over domestic LGBT politics and over access to international support subjected activists at Pride to greater risk of arrest and violence than faced at contemporaneous western Pride events.

With local actors reaching out globally for allies, and international networks reaching in to claim footholds, homophobia, and homophilia represent the extraversion of domestic politics in two ways: the internationalization of domestic politics, and the localization of the international. The former is achieved through western religious missions and government aid programs providing vital resources for the preservation of the Ugandan regime locally (Kaoma 2013), as well as sexual and gender minorities shifting their resistance against state and social oppression to the global in the form of claims addressed to western/transnational LGBT rights organizations (Jjuuko 2013) and through regional networks like Pan Africa ILGA (Lennox and Waites 2013). The latter is represented in local politics with the dislocation and instrumentalization of western LGBT politics and modes of homophobic and homophilic activism. We see state actors, allies, and proxies promote a "gay peril," on one hand, and gender and sexual minority activists provide discursive support and advocacy for LGBT identifications, on the other, as each is in contest over notions of identity and rights.

Homosexualization, as both the creation of LGBT subjects and the "gay peril," starts as a post 2002 state project and precursor to Pride in Uganda involving a series of internationalized actors, flows of capital, and explicit trainings for local elites and the public about the dangers foisted on decent Christians by a decadent west—explicit in terms of precision and in terms of sexual display, though unironic in its conception of a decadent west that in fact is the origin of homophobia itself. While research demonstrates that Ugandans were unable to define homosexuality (Jjuuko 2013), government allies like Martin Ssempa, a Uganda and US based reverend often considered an "expert" on HIV/AIDS programs by the wife of Uganda's president and US conservatives, have taught about specific sexual acts they associates exclusively with gay men. Such acts include fisting and anilingus. To illustrate his point, Ssempa displays pornography culled from the web, and explains the latter sexual act by mimicking the licking of an ice cream cone.[3]

Homophilic efforts respond to state homophobia with global audiences in mind, not aimed solely at local community building. For example, the first Pride events were in 2012 just after US Secretary of State Clinton pledged that "gay rights are human rights."[4] They were disrupted by police as the regime debated proposed legislation to apply the death penalty to "aggravated homosexuality." In 2016, 400 people attended the Mr and Miss Pride Pageant at a rooftop bar in Kampala.[5] The pageant, part of a series of Pride celebrations, was raided by police. Some attendees fled by jumping off the rooftop as others were detained by authorities. Police beat those they entrapped, bringing local media to photograph the detainees, with authorities using force to expose them to the cameras.

In this way, the availability of various pasts and external debates disrupts temporality, as homophobes and homophiles each draw rhetorical models—including Pride—from external allies and deploy them without regard to the histories that characterize their content or the consequences of dislocation. Kampala Pride, then, does not share affinities with the first commemorations after Stonewall as much as it amplifies the ambient tensions in 1970 in the west into violent consequences in

[3] See https://youtu.be/cNACKnLmfD0 (accessed July 15, 2022).

[4] For example, see https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-16062937 (accessed February 12, 2022).

[5] https://www.kuchutimes.com/2017/08/day-three-pride-2016-the-pageant-that-never-was/ (accessed February 12, 2022).

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

Kampala, where Pride contends with panic as a largely untethered police force utilizes the same violent disregard for rights it shows onto any of the regime's targets.

As a result, Pride, amplified by official and scandal-oriented media, offers a malleable image of a "gay peril" for state actors, allies, and contenders promoting legitimacy in the midst of challenge and crisis (Bosia 2013). For example, western funders press liberalization on the regime, and the government veils destabilizing reforms by denouncing homosexuality as the real danger. As opposition to reform rises and electoral challenges emerge, the President and his allies use homophobia to focus domestic frustration on western culture instead of economic actors, but also to push back on the international stage against foreign donors and human rights NGOs as the government breaks budgetary guidelines and suppresses electoral opposition. As global actors press for democratization, and a robust and highly competitive press threatens to expose corruption, both legal and extrajudicial means are used to squelch criticism, so the media turned from corruption scandals to homosexuality to titillate readers.

For the regime, "gay peril" became a far too convenient slur in a rhetoric of national unity and a context of religious and ethnic schism, providing a scapegoat for a once anti-colonial regime now reliant on western actors, shielding against global human rights claims while garnering succor from an international network. The nexus of international religious movements, global donor and NGO pressures, and a scandal-seeking press transformed homophobia from rhetoric to policy. Even programs supported by the US Presidential Emergency Plan For AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) purposefully intertwined with local and global faith-based organizations to exclude sexual and gender minorities. A clientelist structure, run through the presidency and an AIDS organization led by the president's wife, provided resources to allies even as the state followed global mandates to reduce funding in other areas. Western evangelicals instigated new laws, including a constitutional redefinition of marriage in 2004 and the Anti-Homosexuality Act. The act would have enhanced criminal penalties for homosexuality, mandated reporting of suspected homosexuals, and criminalized certain forms of advocacy—importing and expanding the original "no homo promo" prohibitions on LGBT discussions crafted by the US Congress and UK parliament in the 1980s. Drafted just a few years after US Evangelicals lost the final battle over criminalization of sodomy at the US Supreme Court, and coupled with a law adopted in Uganda in 2015, including moral standard in mandatory state licensure for NGOs, these laws then boomeranged back to Europe and the United States—after adoption in Russia—as Florida and Hungary crafted prohibitions on LGBT themes in education in 2022.

Responding to state homophobia, Ugandan sexual and gender minorities moved rapidly to incorporate a variety of western tools from the LGBT rights advocacy kit, including Pride. The earliest organizing in the late 1990s focused on services and support for men with AIDS, but Sexual Minorities Uganda (SMUG) was founded in 2004 in response to AIDS programs that deprived sexual minorities of access to PEPFAR and related funding, and SMUG participated in a 2009 human rights conference outlining the risk experienced by sexual and gender minorities. Later, Queer Youth Uganda searched the Internet for a name that would inspire global connections, choosing "Queer" though it was not used as a sexual or gender pejorative in Uganda.[6] Transgender Equality Uganda called on western support though leaders sometimes strategically identified in Kampala as women, and not LGBT, in order to appeal to a discourse of women's empowerment locally and distance themselves from a "gay peril,"[7] even as they engage in global LGBT networks. If global *homophobic* connections came together with legislation to apply the death penalty to "aggravated homosexuality" in 2009, then the assassination of activist David Kato in

[6] Author's Interview, Kampala March 2013.

[7] Author's Interview, Kampala March 2013.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

2011 secured the position of Ugandan sexual and gender minorities as a focus of *homophilic* international attention, and placed LGBT rights firmly on the diplomatic agenda in theUnited States.

What we see in Uganda, then, are complex global and local geo-temporalities in the tools used in struggle by homophobes and homophiles alike, developed as they were in different institutional environments, with different histories, in different sequences. In the United States and United Kingdom, state homophobia might have ebbed and flowed in the twentieth century, enabling a variety of social and political accommodations and resistances that ranged from discrete lives to tea rooms, then from claims to a right to privacy during the era of increased criminalization and visible condemnation within the national security state (Johnson 2004). Later a right to be out and visible was claimed against "no promo homo" laws at the time of AIDS in the United States and United Kingdom, while French AIDS activists used the pandemic to link neoliberalism with racism and homophobia.

Facing a decade of repression, to which western history were Ugandan sexual and gender minority activists to appeal? Come out? Global solidarity? Discretion or public recognition? Police sensitivity or resources to pay bribes? Can one even appeal to LGBT rights as human rights in a context where human rights are routinely subverted by state actors and proxies? Instead of providing clear answers, the dislocation of these specific geo-temporal politics rewrites histories and creates dangers in the same moment as opportunities, new rights as well as atypical vulnerabilities, and confusions, complications, and inequalities between even the allied local and the international (Thoreson 2017). In this context, Pride events represent an appeal from Ugandan sexual and gender minorities to western advocates and allies in general and US allies in particular, representing the extraversion of their local struggle against a repressive state. But the absence of the gradual give and take that the west experienced in the historical period surrounding Stonewall, and the western embrace of LGBT rights as singular, actually increased vulnerability to police power at Pride and to new government restrictions on organizing against "Ugandan values."

## State Instrumentalization of Pride in Serbia[8]

As demonstrated in much more details in Slootmaeckers (2017, 2023), Pride in Serbia is a complex collapse of pasts and presents and the local and global. When activists first sought to organize Pride to draw attention to the plight of non-heteronormative sexualities, and to stand against political and social homophobia fostered by the nationalist regime of the 1990s (Rhodes-Kubiak 2015), they were inspired both by the successes of mobilizations in the "west" intertwined with the mythology of the Stonewall riot (Kajinić 2018) and with their own traditions of street actions as part of anti-war activism. The undeniable presence of Stonewall is signaled by the date chosen for the event, June 30, 2001 (which coincides with Stonewall's anniversary, June 28), as well as surrounding discourses. Yet, what actually unfolded in 2001 is emblematic of the geo-temporal dislocation of Pride as an activist tool, in at least two ways: the extraversion of domestic human rights struggles in order to situate the state outside or within European values; and the instrumentalization of contemporaneous sexualized imagery of Pride by opponents to transport LGBT equality and recognition outside local politics as an international "gay peril." This extraverted struggle, then, is centered locally and internationally through notions of European values and EU integration processes.

First, we observe that the dislocation of Pride from its western geo-temporal context, as in Uganda, leads to significantly different outcomes. The 2001 Belgrade

[8] This section draws from a decade-long research project on Belgrade Pride. For a more comprehensive and in-depth analysis of the history and politics of the Serbian case study, see Slootmaeckers (2017, 2023).

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

Pride—now remembered as the Massacre Pride—was marred by extreme violence in an attack mobilized against marchers. Despite feeling that this moment represented "their Stonewall,"[9] it remained impossible to bring Stonewall and its politics from the western past to Serbia's. Unlike the marches for "liberation" or "freedom" following the 1969 riots, which lead to the collective transformation away from privatization and shame (Armstrong and Crage 2006), the 2001 Pride created a collective trauma that caused the movement to retreat within itself and avoid visibility within Serbian society for the better part of a decade (Rhodes-Kubiak 2015).

While the trauma experienced paused organizing, Pride was not abandoned as a tactic. Instead, State actors—eagerly engaged within the international system and seeking the approval of the west—suggested it was simply *too early* to organize such a visible event (Rhodes-Kubiak 2015), adding that Serbia had not yet become modern enough to support these liberties (Slootmaeckers 2023). "It was too early," PM Zoran Djidjić proclaimed, "to stand this test of tolerance in a country that has been in isolation for so long, and which has had a repressive patriarchal culture."[10] Whereas the state pushed the possibility of LGBT rights into the future, traumatized activists debated the need to bring a progressive future into the present by bringing the international to the domestic. They criticized the government and the state apparatus for having failed their human rights test, and further argued that this failure would prevent Serbia's aspirations of joining European institutions.[11] While such tactics, embedded within a modernization teleological worldview, fuse Pride parades with contemporaneous human rights discourses—a returning feature for future Belgrade Prides—they also inherently internationalize Pride within tensions between the "civilized" west and various peripheries.

Such internationalization of the responses to the first Pride brings us to the second way in which the politics of Belgrade Pride has been affected by its geo-temporal dislocation. As Belgrade Pride was inspired by the successes of Pride in other regions of the world, and its implicit interwovenness with contemporaneous Pride events, nationalist political forces have drawn on Pride to resist the visibility of LGBT lives, similar to how autocrats manipulate Pride and LGBT rights in Uganda. Whilst organizers were cautious to avoid a link with international Prides, it was opponent who instrumentalized readily available sexualized imagery of "western" Prides as examples of the "immorality" and "perverse orgies" to present Pride as a threat to Serbian values.[12] During the extreme violence surrounding the 2001 Belgrade Pride, one attacker declared on live television: "This is not Berlin or Paris. This is Serbia. This kind of things does not happen here [. . .] these faggots, homosexuals and all that is doing on against the Serbian people" (quoted in Bilić 2016, 121). From that moment onward, LGBT rights have been marked as a foreign, "gay peril," de-localized from Serbian experience.

The extraversion of domestic struggles over LGBT equality and recognition were central to the next Pride organized, and then banned, in 2009. Again, Pride was caught in a dynamic of internationalization, delocalization, and decoupling. The Serbian desire to join the EU and the EU's demand for anti-discrimination policies and LGBT rights re-affirmed the always/already international-ness of LGBT rights and Pride in Serbia, as both proponents and opponents of LGBT rights used a European argument to gain political support for their positions (Slootmaeckers 2023). While LGBT rights advocates relied on EU (visa liberalization) conditionality, opponents framed the law as a (western) attack on Serbian values.

The extraversion of LGBT politics and the geo-temporal dislocations of Pride have not been without consequences. In fact, the internationalization of Pride

[9] http://www.thegully.com/essays/gaymundo/010723yu_gay_djuric.html (accessed June 22, 2022).
[10] See http://www.thegully.com/essays/gaymundo/010705gay_yugoslavia.html (accessed June 22, 2022).
[11] http://www.b92.net/specijal/gay-parada/gay-saop.phtml (accessed June 22, 2022).
[12] See http://www.thegully.com/essays/gaymundo/010723yu_gay_djuric.html (accessed June 22, 2022).

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

provided new opportunities and tools for the Serbian state to transform how they engage LGBT rights within the EU accession process. Following the 2009 Pride ban and the international response questioning the government's commitment to the European integration process, the officials pivoted to a 2010 Pride to counteract such criticisms. Indeed, in January 2010 and unbeknownst to LGBT activist, the Minister for Human and Minority Rights, Svetozar Čiplić, declared that there would be a Pride event in Belgrade that year;[13] the 2010 Belgrade Pride became an important avenue for the Serbian government to showcase Serbia's Europeanness. While the state may have "co-organized" the event to promote its European credentials (Mikuš 2011), it would be wrong to take the state's need for Pride as a sign of any investment in LGBT lives, as seemingly pre-planned and well-orchestrated anti-LGBT riots also occurred on the streets of Belgrade (Slootmaeckers 2023). In response to such violence, the government tried to externalize the responsibility for Pride and the associated violence (Mikuš 2011), arguing that the EU had forced both Pride and homophobic violence upon Serbia.[14] This internationalization of Pride politics by prominent politicians as well as the "litmus test-ization" (Slootmaeckers 2017) of Pride by the EU further reinforced the extraversion of Pride politics (Mikuš 2011; Bilić 2016). Whereas LGBT rights and Pride gained visibility through its internationalization, local LGBT lives remained invisible (Igrutinović 2015).

Both the relocation of Pride politics to the international arena and the extreme violence associated with both Pride events had significant consequences. For the following 3 years, the government used security threats as excuses to ban Pride events, forcing Pride to be reduced to a human rights "freedom of assembly" devoid of its sexual and gender politics, as even organizers stated that their focus shifted to "having a Pride" at the expense of its politics.[15] This depoliticizing and desexualizing shift enabled Pride to become a tool for the state's international agenda, rather than a tactic of LGBT activism.

Indeed, when Pride re-emerged in 2014, it was the government, and Prime Minister Vučić in particular, who stood most to gain. Playing on the organizers' desperate need to exercise their freedom, Vučić used Pride as a homonationalist move, a tool to bolster his (inter)national image as a reforming Pro-EU force, and to highlight his capacity to enforce Serbia's constitution. But by militarizing Pride, Vučić transformed "State Pride" into "Ghost Pride," i.e., a state tolerated manifestation of Pride which remains invisible to the wider public (Slootmaeckers 2017). Indeed, one of the organizers explained how they felt the heavy police presence was isolating them and protecting them at the same time, saying, "You are surrounded by police, no one can pass you, and you do not have any kind of contact with the population, there is you, the circle of police and the rest of the world."[16] In effect, the securitization of Pride enabled the state to keep LGBT visibility to a minimum. Where western politicians and police began to march in Pride parades to demonstrate support for a less radical LGBT agenda, which some have described as homonationalist (Puar 2007), the Serbian state-controlled Pride positions sexuality and gender politics as an appeal to European interlocutors.

The transformation of the politics of Pride in Serbia and the plight for the recognition of LGBT lives is thus measured in relation to the geo-temporal dislocation of Pride as an activist tool: from the moment where it emerged as a "reaction of a structurally disadvantaged population to a homophobic legal system that even banned homosexual acts in private settings" (Bilić 2016, 121) to a context where homosexuality was decriminalized by a nationalist/authoritarian regime without any activist

[13] http://www.b92.net/eng/news/society.php?yyyy=2010&mm=01&dd=18&nav_id=64557 (accessed June 22, 2022).

[14] http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/the-cyclical-farce-of-serbian-gay-pride (accessed March 22, 2022).

[15] Author's interview, Belgrade, May 2015.

[16] Author's interview, Belgrade, May 2015.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

involvement, mirrored in the spatial relocation of its politics between the domestic and the international.

## Closures and Openings

In this article, we have examined the interplay of the state and LGBT activists in Uganda and Serbia through Pride as a transnational ritual, theorizing global "LGBT politics" as always out of time and out of place. Because Pride events emerge from specific geo-temporalities in the west, they are recontextualized in ways that do not translate through similar experiences or outcomes when Pride events are adopted on the periphery. By further developing the concept of extraversion in relation to global LGBT politics, we offer new tools to understand the geo-temporal politics of Pride, and thereby complicate how we understand "LGBT politics" and Pride as they go international. Overall, we propose a framework that advances an understanding of how homophobic and homophilic politics emerge through the geo-temporal dislocations that underpin much of the global fight for LGBT rights. Such a theoretical model challenges the progress narrative nearly intrinsic to western international relations, and can be used to fully grasp the processes that shape other types of transnational politics, such as democracy, climate change, and peace movements.

By way of conclusion, we offer observations about geo-temporal dislocations for LGBT communities in ways that challenge queer theory as an academic construct and instead focus on questions for engaged scholars who seek to shift politics. The American artist Debbie Grossman has produced works in which she photoshops images of rural life originally created at the end of the Depression Era, replacing the men with loving women. She sought to make a history she would "wish was real," but also to see herself as legible in another time and place: "Manipulating the touch of one woman's hand on another's shoulder is a way for me to access and merge my desire with figures which would have otherwise remained frozen in time," she told *the New York Times*.[17] This re-imaging, rethinking, and repurposing history inspired our inquiry into the entanglements of time and space in transnational sexuality activism, as we can situate Grossman's work within LGBT rights as geo-temporal dislocation. Viewed as an imposition of contemporary identities on an unknowable past to render same-sex loving legible, the artist might erase the voices of the women who they now position as similar to themselves—which results from closing and transpositioning histories and rituals from an LGBT engaged now to past peripheries of gender and sexual minority danger. Similarly, the process of engagement between west and peripheries we outline, which requires a contortion of space and time across multiple geo-temporalities, suggests the imposition of available identities as constraint on emerging sexual minority activists, and one that brings peril as well as aid.

Our model engages a more complex understanding of global LGBT rights struggles, and serves as a stepping stone to more radical and queer questions (Cooper-Cunningham 2022). Particularly, the geo-temporal impositions observed throughout this text compel us to ask how it serves LGBT activists in the west to extend to peripheries as modular and fixed the historically weighted rituals and sociopolitical interventions developed in western contexts. What we point to here is the freighted notion of LGBT identity itself, tied to shame (Warner 1999) and interlocking with systems of oppression (Bosia 2020). Leaving sexual and gender shame unaddressed, as Warner (1999) notes, shifts identity from sex to pride, attempting to call into being a collective self in order to suppress the sexual shame that is at the heart of the LGBT experience. Rituals of collective Pride, then, focus on the normalization and assimilation of self within a set of what Duggan (2001) calls "homonormative" practices. The result of normalization, we contend, is the alienation of shame, so that its relation to self is now in tension with and unaddressed by rituals of Pride.

[17] https://www.nytimes.com/2019/12/04/t-magazine/gay-artwork-history.html (accessed June 22, 2022).

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

Instead, the geo-temporal dislocation of LGBT identities and rituals might enable a cycle of pride and shame to be replayed as LGBT communities search for self in both geographic and temporal others, calling forth the other through an image of self, without regard to histories and geographies. This interpellation of the other masks an insatiable desire for the salvation of a self burdened with shame.

At the same time, we can consider Grossman's work through queer understandings of body and image politics (Cooper-Cunningham 2022). Perhaps their shift in space and time is not rendered to settle the perpetual motion machine through which pride and shame are juxtaposed, but to unsettle it. Queer politics and readings point us to the centrality of shame along with the atopian or futureless nature of sexualities that are not considered reproductive (Edelman 2004), the relationality of sexual and gender prohibition to racism, misogyny, classism, and ablism (Cohen 1997; Stryker, Currah and Moore 2008), and the complex interplay of domestic and international, time and space in counter-homophobic imagery and visibility (Cooper-Cunningham 2021). In this way, Grossman's compression of time and space reinforces our critique of historical temporalities tied to a chronological stream of water as separate drops, and by opening the present in the past, their work might force queer scholars to see the multiplicity of dimensions and possibilities, in ways that cannot be done through an analysis of Pride as a "queer-less" global LGBT politics, with its always closing histories, identities, and styles.

**Acknowledgments**

Both authors would like to acknowledge the significant contributions of each other, without which this article would not be possible. Each would like to express their appreciation of and gratitude for years of conversations and friendship, and for the insights gained from the different theoretical perspectives and experiences they were able to share in the process of theorizing and writing the article. The authors also thank the anonymous reviewers who provided a thorough assessment, and Prof. Nicole Grove and Prof. Kyle Grayson, the editors who ushered them through the review process. As the paper developed during a global pandemic, the authors benefited from the close readings of Manuela Picq and Michael Stambolis-Ruhstorfer at ISA and CES conferences, and Jeppe Mulich, Sasikumar Sundaram, and other colleagues at a City, University of London workshop. Finally, Bosia would like to acknowledge grant support from Saint Michael's College and the American Political Science Association for field research in Uganda.

**Funder information**

M.J. Bosia received funding for research in Uganda through a Faculty Development Grant from Saint Michael's College and a Small Research Award from the American Political Science Association.

**References**

Ammaturo, F.R. 2015. "Spaces of Pride: A Visual Ethnography of Gay Pride Parades in Italy and the United Kingdom." *Social Movement Studies* 15 (1): 19–40.

Armstrong, E.A., and S.M. Crage. 2006. "Movements and Memory: The Making of the Stonewall Myth." *American Sociological Review* 71 (5): 724–51.

Assmann, A. 2013. "Transformations of the Modern Time Regime." In *Breaking Up Time: Negotiating the Borders between Present, Past, and Future*, edited by C. Lorenz and Berber Bevernage, 39–56. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

AYOUB, P.M. 2016. *When States Come Out: Europe's Sexual Minorities and the Politics of Visibility*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

BAYART, J.-F. 1993. *The State in Africa: The Politics of the Belly*. translated by M. Harper, C. Harrison, and E. Harrison. London: Longman.

———. 2000. "Africa in the World: A History of Extraversion." *African Affairs* 99 (395): 217–67.

BILIĆ, B. 2016. "Europe ♥ Gays? Europeanisation and Pride Parades in Serbia." In *LGBT Activism and Europeanisation in the Post-Yugoslav Space: On the Rainbow Way to Europe*, edited by B. Bilić, 117–53. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

BOSIA, M.J. 2013. "Why States Act: Homophobia and Crisis." In *Global Homophobia: States, Movements, and the Politics of Oppression*, edited by M.L. Weiss and M.J. Bosia, 30–54. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press..

———. 2020. "Global Sexual Diversity Politics and the Trouble with LGBT Rights." In *The Oxford Handbook of Global LGBT and Sexual Diversity Politics*, edited by M.J. Bosia, S.M. McEvoy, and M. Rahman, 432–49. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

BOSIA, M.J., AND M.L. WEISS. 2013. "Political Homophobia in Comparative Perspective." In *Global Homophobia: States, Movements, and the Politics of Oppression*, edited by M.L. Weiss and M.J. Bosia, 1–29. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

BROQUA, C. 2015. "Les Pro, Les Anti Et l'international: Mobilisations autour de l'homosexualité en Afrique de l'Ouest." In *Collective Mobilisations in Africa/Mobilisations Collectives en Afrique: Enough is Enough!/Ça Suffit!*, edited by K. Tall, M.E. Pommerolle, and M. Cahen, 183–204. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

BROWNE, K. 2007. "A Party with Politics? (Re)Making LGBTQ Pride Spaces in Dublin and Brighton." *Social & Cultural Geography* 8 (1): 63–87.

BUTLER, J. 2009. *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?* New York, NY: Verso.

CARTER, D. 2004. *Stonewall: The Riots that Sparked the Gay Revolution*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Griffin.

COHEN, C. 1997. "Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politlics." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 3 (4): 437–65.

COOPER-CUNNINGHAM, D. 2021. *The International Politic of Sex: Visual Activism in Response to Russian State Homophobia*. PhD Dissertation. University of Copenhagen.

———. (2022). "Security, Sexuality, and the Gay Clown Putin Meme: Queer Theory and International Responses to Russian Political Homophobia." *Security Dialogue* 53 (4): 302–23.

COTTET, C., AND M. L. PICQ, eds. 2019. *Sexuality and Translation in World Politics*. Bristol: E-International Relations Publishing.

CURRIER, A., AND J.M. CRUZ. 2020. "The Politics of Pre-emption: Mobilisation against LGBT Rights in Liberia." *Social Movement Studies* 19 (1): 82–96.

DAVIS, K. D. 2021. "Transnational Blackness at Toronto Pride: Queer Disruption as Theory and Method." *Gender, Place & Culture* 28 (11): 1541–60.

DUBERMAN, M. 1993. *Stonewall*. New York, NY: Plume.

DUGGAN, L. 2001. "*The Twilight of Equality? Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy.* " Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

EDELMAN, L. 2004. *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

EYBEN, R. 2010. "Hiding Relations: The Irony of 'Effective Aid.'" *The European Journal of Development Research* 22 (3): 382–97.

FEIST, R.E. 2013. *Magician's End*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

IGRUTINOVIĆ, D. 2015. "Tanks, Truncheons, Testosterone: A Panicky Reconstruction of Masculinity in the Serbian Media after the Pride Parade." In *Representation of Gender Minority Groups in Media: Serbia, Montenegro, and Macedonia,* edited by T. Rosic Ilic, J. Koteska, and J. Ljumovic, 63–80.Belgrade: Faculty of Media and Communications.

ILGA-EUROPE. 2006. *Pride Against Prejudice: A Toolkit for Pride Organising in a Hostile Environment*. [online] Brussels: ILGA-Europe. Available at: ⟨http://www.ilga-europe.org/sites/default/files/Attachments/pride_against_prejudice_toolkit_sept_2006.pdf⟩ [Accessed 9 Feb. 2023].

JACKSON, P.T., AND D.H. NEXON. 1999. "Relations before States: Substance, Process and the Study of World Politics." *European Journal of International Relations* 5 (3): 291–332.

JJUUKO, A. 2013. "The Incremental Approach: Uganda's Struggle for the Decriminalisation of Homosexuality." In *Human Rights, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in The Commonwealth: Struggles for Decriminalisation and Change*, edited by C. Lennox and M. Waites, 381–408. London: Institute of Commonwealth Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London.

JOHNSON, D.K. 2004. *The lavender scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

Kajinić, S. 2018. "Cartographies of Fear and Freedom: Lesbian Activists in the First Belgrade and Zagreb Pride Parades." In *Lesbian Activism in the (Post-)Yugoslav Space: Sisterhood and Unity,* edited by B. Bilić and M. Radoman, 61–85. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kaoma, K. 2013. "The Marriage of Convenience: the US Christian Right, African Christianity, and Postcolonial Politics of Sexual Identity." In *Global Homophobia: States, Movements, and the Politics of Oppression,* edited by M.L. Weiss and M.J. Bosia, 75–102 Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kim-Puri, H.J. 2005. "Conceptualizing Gender–Sexuality–State–Nation." *Gender & Society* 19 (2): 137–59.

Kollman, K. 2007. "Same-Sex Unions: The Globalization of an Idea." *International Studies Quarterly* 51 (2): 329–57.

Kulpa, R., and J. Mizielińska eds. 2011. *De-centring western sexualities: Central and Eastern European perspectives.* Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Laroui, A. 1976. *The Crisis of the Arab Intellectual: Traditionalism or Historicism?* Translated by D. Cammell. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Lennox, C, and M. Waites. 2013. "Human Rights, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in the Commonwealth: From History and Law to Developing Activism and Transnational Dialogues." In *Human Rights, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in The Commonwealth: Struggles for Decriminalisation and Change,* edited by C. Lennox and M. Waites, 1–59. London: Institute of Commonwealth Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London.

Lutz, E., and K. Sikkink. 2001. "The Justice Cascade: The Evolution and Impact of Foreign Human Rights Trials in Latin America." *Chicago Journal of International Law* 2 (1): 1–33.

Mikuš, M. 2011. "'State Pride': Politics of LGBT Rights and Democratisation in 'European Serbia.'" *East European Politics & Societies* 25 (4): 834–51.

Mizielińska, J., and R. Kulpa. 2011. "Contemporary Peripheries": Queer Studies, Circulation of Knowledge and East/West Divide." In *De-centring Western Sexualities: Central and Eastern European Perspectives,* edited by R. Kulpa and J. Mizielińska, 11–26. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Peiffer, C., and P. Englebert. 2012. "Extraversion, Vulnerability to Donors, and Political Liberalization in Africa." *African Affairs* 111 (444): 355–78.

Pommerolle, M.E. 2010. "The Extraversion of Protest: Conditions, History and Use of the 'International' in Africa." *Review of African Political Economy* 37 (125): 263–79.

Puar, J.K. 2005. "Queer Times, Queer Assemblages." *Social Text* 23 (3–4): 121–39.

———. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times.* London: Duke University Press.

Qin, Y. 2018. *A Relational Theory of World Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rahman, M. 2014. "Queer Rights and the Triangulation of Western Exceptionalism." *Journal of Human Rights* 13 (3): 274–89.

Rao, R. 2020. *Out of Time: The Queer Politics of Postcoloniality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rhodes-Kubiak, R. 2015. *Activist Citizenship and the LGBT Movement in Serbia: Belonging, Critical Engagement, and Transformation.* New York, NY: Palgrave.

Richards, R. 2014. *Understanding Statebuilding: Traditional Governance and the Modern State in Somaliland.* London: Routledge.

Riecken, N. 2015. "History, Time, and Temporality in a Global Frame: Abdallah Laroui's Historical Epistemology of History." *History and Theory* 54 (4): 5–26.

Sharma, S. 2013. "Critical Time." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 10 (2–3): 312–8.

Slootmaeckers, K. 2017. "The Litmus Test of Pride: Analysing the Emergence of the Belgrade 'Ghost' Pride in the Context of EU Accession." *East European Politics* 33 (4): 517–35.

———. 2023. *Coming In: Sexual Politics and EU Accession in Serbia.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Slootmaeckers, K., H. Touquet, and P. Vermeersch, eds. 2016. *The EU Enlargement and Gay Politics: The Impact of Eastern Enlargement on Rights, Activism and Prejudice.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stella, F. 2012. "The Politics of in/Visibility: Carving out Queer Space in Ul'yanovsk." *Europe–Asia Studies* 64 (10): 1822–46.

Stryker, S., P. Currah, and L.J. Moore. 2008. "Introduction: Trans-, Trans, or Transgender? " *Women's Studies Quarterly* 36 (3–4): 11–22.

Szulc, L. 2018. *Transnational Homosexuals in Communist Poland.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Thoreson, R.R. 2017. "LGBT human Rights in the Age of Human Rights." *The Scholar and the Feminist Online* 14 (2):. Available at: ⟨https://sfonline.barnard.edu/thinking-queer-activism-transnationally/lgbt-human-rights-in-the-age-of-human-rights/⟩ [Accessed 15 Feb. 2022].

Warner, M. 1999. *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weber, C. (2016). *Queer International Relations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023

WEEKS, J. 2015. "Gay Liberation and Its Legacies." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Lesbian and Gay Activism*, edited by D. Paternotte and M. Tremblay, 45–57. Farnham: Routledge. 45–57.

WEISS, M.L. 2013. "Prejudice before Pride: Rise of an Anticipatory Countermovement." In *Global Homophobia: States, Movements, and the Politics of Oppression*, edited by M.L. Weiss and M.J. Bosia, 149–73. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

ZAMMITO, J. 2004. "Koselleck's Philosophy of Historical Time(s) and the Practice of History Reviewed." *History and Theory* 43 (1): 124–34.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ips/article/17/1/olad004/7058039 by guest on 08 March 2023