UiT The Arctic University of Norway

Institute of Philosophy and First Semester Studies,
Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education

Justice for the LGBTQ+ community through Celebrating Pride

[An examination of justice for sexual minorities in the light of recognition and redistribution, as presented by Axel Honneth and Nancy Fraser.]

Cornelia Kjærnes

Master's Thesis in Philosophy …. FIL- 3900 …. november 2019

Foreword

First of all I would like to thank Kjersti Fjørtoft for being my mentor and for guiding me through this process. I truly appreciate the honest feedback, the good talks and our open form of communication that entails not only academic discussions, but also personal anecdotes, lots of humor and heart to hearts. I have felt safe handing over my drafts in all their flawed forms to you, as well as my ambitious visions, and embryonic ideas. Thank you for keeping me on my toes and for not sugarcoating.

A special thanks goes to my parents for all financial and emotional support. I could not have fulfilled this task without you, and I truly appreciate the visits, phone calls, the good advice and the incredible amount of uplifting words. I am truly blessed to have such loving, generous and enlightened parents.

A very special thank you to my dear friend and colleague, Torhild Skillingstad, who is an invaluable source of support and joy . Thank you for welcoming me into your life, for letting me intrude weekly on couple's night (also, thank you to Kjell-Willy for the hospitality), for being a true and honest friend, and for making me feel at home in Tromsø. Thank you for always reading my papers, giving me feedback and letting me learn from you.
I am beyond grateful for our friendship.

Thank you to my fellow student and friend, Tilian, for emotional support, academic discussions, tons of laughter and numerous neck massages. Thank you for letting me bounce my ideas off of you, and thank you for your open mindedness and for having my back over the past two years.

A thank you in also in order to my psychologist Vigdis for being a wonderful source of support and guidance over the past year and a half. I am beyond grateful for the genuineness of our relationship.

Thanks to Trine Antonsen for guiding me through my own web of thoughts and helping me categorize my ideas so I was able to land on a project that is close to my heart. Thank you for your sincerity in wanting to help me and for expressing your belief in my capabilities.

Abstract

The LGBTQ+ community has over the past fifty years gone from being a severely oppressed group of people, where most people lived closeted lives, to become a well known minority group that many people associate with celebration, bravery and pride. This is not to say that the circumstances have completely changed for the LGBTQ+ community. They are still subjected to a high level of threat when it comes to both freedom to love, and freedom to participate in society as themselves. In addition to that, the discrimination they face in the labor marked makes it difficult to find substantial financial income.

In the political debate of remedy for oppressed minorities, we often face a confrontation between the scope of recognition and the scope of redistribution. In light of what I choose to see as a success, the pride parade has given rise to the recognition of the LGBTQ+ community and made a space for them in most western democratic societies. Examining pride, then, through the theories of Axel Honneth and Nancy Fraser, I strive to trace the benefits and failures of recognition theory.

Table of Contents

Del 1

1. Introduction

"I am an adult lesbian woman. But I am ashamed of being different. I have experienced that people have cut ties with me because of my sexual orientation. This has lead to me being scared of ridicule and that people won't like me. I shouldn't be ashamed, but it is difficult not to be.[1]*"*

- Woman, 30 years old (gaformeg.no)

This is not my story, but the story of a thirty year old woman from Oslo. She wrote this in 2017 before the Oslo Pride Festival. The Organization *FRI- Foreningen for kjønns- og seksualitetsmangfold* (FRI- organization for gender and sexuality diversity), organized a

[1] Original text: «*Jeg er en voksen lesbisk kvinne. Men skammer meg ofte over at jeg er annerledes. Jeg har opplevd at folk har kuttet kontakten med meg pga min seksuelle orientering. Dette har gjort at jeg er redd for å bli latterliggjort og at andre ikke skal like meg. Jeg burde ikke skamme meg, men det er vanskelig*.» Historien til en kvinne på 30 fra Oslo.

campaign where celebrities and LGBTQ+ allies could walk in the pride parade for LGBTQ+ people who, for several reasons, did not dare to attend pride themselves. The text above was written by the woman I walked for. A woman close to my age, and who lived in my city. It is safe to say that the experience hit close to home on many levels.

Although I walked with pride and joy, there was definitely an uncomfortable feeling of bitterness clouding the festive experience. I was walking with hundreds of other people for FRI. Other people who also proudly walked for closeted individuals of all ages and from all over the country. Amongst forty thousand cheerful people in colorful creations, and with rainbow flags galore in the streets of Oslo, it was just too obvious that “woman, 30” was missing. And so was “man, 56”, and “boy, 17”, and “non-binary person, 72”, and all the other people who were kept from attending *their* event due to a society plagued by injustice and lack of recognition. It was an unpleasant reminder that although sexual minorities are allowed to live freely in my country, many of them ‘choose’ not to. There are still plenty of people who consider a life in ‘the closet’ to be a better choice because the chances of losing loved ones, facing ridicule and discrimination, if ‘coming out’ is too real.

1.1 Why Recognition for LGBTQ+ Matters in Society

In this thesis, I will discuss the obstacles LGBTQ+ people are met with in their fight for recognition. I will do so by discussing such obstacles as categorized by justice and self-realization, or rather, a lack thereof. As I explore these two main categories of obstacles for recognition, I will also confer gay pride parade as a method for LGBTQ+ people to overcome such obstacles.

As portrayed in the anecdote from the 2017 Oslo pride parade, the subject of sexual minorities is one that concerns politics, sociology, anthropology, law making, as well as philosophy. However, this is not a subject that has been given much attention within the discipline of philosophy. This might be due to the timeline of the subject compared to the timeline other philosophical topics. It is, after all, often considered to be a fairly new problem. However, I would like to point out that the topics of sexuality, love, and freedom are all issues dealt with in the area of philosophy over centuries. There is also the field of recognition theory and justice theory, which have grown considerably over the past hundred years. What all these topics seem to have in common is their presence within the philosophical issue of sexual minorities. This is not to say that no philosopher has discussed this topic, because there are several philosophers who have, but the apparent lack of interest for this issue in mainstream philosophy is quite obvious. I find this to be nothing short of baffling considering that it is a topic that touches on so many of the most prevalent questions within philosophy and politics to this day.

This thesis is a deep dive into 'recognition as remedy' for injustice and distorted self-image. For this paper I have chosen to investigate and discuss the theories of two prominent philosophers within the field of multiculturalism: Axel Honneth and Nancy Fraser. The reason I landed on these two theorists is that their basis of focus is within the same topic, but their theories are extensively different. Both Honneth and Fraser examine the question of recognition for minority groups, though from different perspectives.

1.2 Problem Statement

When the question of recognition as justice is on the table, there seems to be a call for an amalgamation of paradigms. The 'struggle for recognition' and 'equal redistribution' each offer solutions to the problem of recognition absence, however, as we see the current issues facing sexual minorities in today's western democratic society, can we, with certainty, lean on any of them as a sufficient resolutions to the problem?

It appears as if the LGTBQ+ community has taken it upon themselves to answer this question by creating, expanding and maintaining the gay pride parade. Have they found the ultimate solution to counteracting a discriminatory society by publicly achieving recognition on their own?

- How can recognition be understood as a means of justice in philosophical theory?
- Can misrecognition be a cause of injustice, and how so?
- How can the intersubjectivity of internal and external recognition in the pride celebration contribute to a more just society?

1.3 Background Information Concerning the Plight of LGBTQ+ Across the Globe.

Pride takes many forms – from carnvalesque marches, to film screenings and debates – and is a moment of celebration of people who are marginalized by strict definitions of what it means to be a man or a woman. Most common is Pride through the form of parades with a variation of groups of private individuals and political groups who promotes equality for sexual minorities by walking, shouting, singing, dancing- either by foot or on floats- with banners, slogans, and mottos. The parade itself is often accompanied by other LGBT+ events such as debates, theme nights in nightclubs and fundraising initiatives. The pride events are organized throughout the year, depending on where you are in the world. In the Americas and Europe, the season usually kicks off in June, while February to March is Pride season in South Africa. Whatever the form or take on the event, it's a moment for LGBTQ+ people to show that they are 'out' and proud to be who they are. This is commonly demonstrated by dressing up in colorful outfits and costumes as a way to demonstrate visibility and to make space for themselves. Pride is supposed to celebrate the LGBTQ+ movement in all its diversity, and amplifies the call to respect and protect LGBTQ+ rights, as well as to fight for the absence of due rights in places such as Russia, Saudi- Arabia, Uganda, and most recently Turkey, where pride festivals are banned and sexual minorities still suffer greatly under discriminatory laws.

Being LGBTQ+ is considered illegal in 72 countries, 8 of which have death penalty. This statistics shows that the discrimination is not only a matter of personal comfort and self-realization, but that it is a matter of justice and the right to be living without persecution.

1.4 Relevance of Misrecognition of LGBTQ+ Peope

The LGBTQ+ community is currently facing a large number of issues, keeping them from attaining the recognition they need to be an equal part of society. As the focus is on western modern society, mainly the U.S., in this paper, it should be mentioned that there is still no federal law protecting employees from discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity in the United States[12] and there is no state-level protection for sexual orientation or gender identity in 29 of the 50 US states.[13] This means employees can be fired simply on the grounds of being LGBTQ+. In other words, discrimination is a very real and relevant issue that many face across the United States.

An article published on June17 2019, by *Catalyst*, tells us that “one-fifth (20%) of LGBTQ+ Americans have experienced discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity when applying for jobs”. While it is easy to think that this kind of discrimination is of the kind to have a damaging effect on a person’s self- realization, we must also recognize the matter of injustice that it brings about. On the one hand, there is the issue of being an unprotected employee, which is a serious issue in and of itself, as it brings about uncertainty for the employee. For a person who cannot be open about their sexuality at their workplace, the place they spend most of their day every day, and to the people with whom one talks every day, there must be a sort of veil of dishonesty that clouds their presence as a worker. In fact, almost half (46%) of LGBTQ workers in the United States are closeted in the workplace (Catalyst.org, 2019).

In most workplaces it is common that colleagues to some extent share from their personal lives, whether it be about their partner, children, pets, residence, hobbies etc. If a person is in danger of losing their job due to their non-heterosexualism, these are not conversations they can take part in and therefore are kept from participating on an honest level in the workplace bonding. Such fears prevent LGBTQ+ employees from bringing their full selves to work. “Employees report feeling exhausted from spending time and energy concealing their sexual orientation (17%) and gender identity (13%) (Catalyst.org, 2019). Being excluded from the social climate, due to being unable to share and participate in personal conversation with colleagues, can be detrimental to mental health and general well-being.

On the other hand, there is the issue of financial consequences of not being protected against discrimination in the work sphere. When one is being kept from employment due to one’s sexual orientation, one is also, consequently, kept from having an income, and therefore also prone to financial hardship. In fact, *Catalyst* reports that as much as 22% of LGBTQ+ Americans have not been paid equally or promoted at the same rate as their heterosexual peers, which tells us that this is clearly a matter of injustice and not a mere threat to people’s self- realization (Catalyst.org, 2019). Then again, it is neither a matter of injustice alone. Everyone who has applied for jobs without winning results knows what it can do to one’s self-image and confidence. Now, picture such rejection, but not on the basis of work-related skills, but rather, on the basis of an innate part of one’s self. When there is a fixed part of a person that is the basis for rejection, it goes without saying that the outcome of that action will negatively affect the individual’s well being.

Transgender people are a part of the LGTBQ+ community who are especially vulnerable to discrimination in the workplace. In 2015, over a quarter of the transgender population said they were not hired, were fired, or were not promoted due to their gender identity or expression. Within the marginalized community of transgender people who managed to get employment, a whopping 80% of the population experienced harassment or mistreatment on the job or took steps to avoid it.

The fact that in 2018 over half (53%) of LGBTQ+ employees heard offensive lesbian and gay jokes at work, while 37% heard offensive bisexual jokes and 41% heard offensive transgender jokes in 2018, shows that there is no such thing as equality, justice, or recognition for the LGTBQ+ people in the U.S. While things seem to be a bit more sophisticated in Norway, due to a more inclusive and protective anti-discrimination law, LGBTQ+ people are still not safe from harmful discrimination and a flawed legal system. As a matter of fact, there is no Norwegian law prohibiting the practice of sexual conversion therapy in religious environments. Furthermore, the Norwegian government actually subsidies several religious institutions that promote such practices (Regjeringen.no, 2018) The defense of gay conversion therapy in Norway is more often than not based on the argument of religious freedom. As the case of gay conversion therapy is one of the biggest threats to the recognition of sexual minorities, I will discuss this case in more detail in part 3.

According to History, the U.S. military service only lifted their ban on transgender people serving in the military while being open about their sexuality in 2016. However, in 2018, a policy discriminating against transgender people serving in the military was announced by President Donald Trump. This shows that, as History puts it, “though LGBT Americans now have same-sex marriage rights and numerous other rights that seemed farfetched 100 years ago, the work of advocates is not over” (Catalyst.org, 2019).

1.5 The Terminology Used When Addressing LGBTQ+ Matters

It is worth mentioning that this thesis is written on the basis of heteronormativity as the societal standard. This means the social platforms discussed in this paper operate under the impression that heterosexualism is the default sexual orientation. It assumes that sexual and marital relations are to be exercised on the premise of a cisgender man and a cisgender woman.

As the non-heterosexual group can be referred to by different names and abbreviations, I have also chosen to refer to them as such.

There are numerous variations of initialisms describing the non- heterosexual community, and even a bigger number of reasons and motivations explaining which letters should be used, what they stand for, and why they are suitable representations. Examples of some of the more common abbreviations are LGBT which includes both transgender/transsexual, while the LGB abbreviation, which stands for lesbian, gay and bisexual, has left the T for trans out usually due to the belief that transgender and transsexual causes are not the same as those of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) people. (Advocate.com, u.å) This argument centers on the idea that transgenderism and transsexuality have to do with gender identity, and not sexual orientation. *LGBTQIA* is sometimes used and adds "queer, intersex, and asexual" to the basic term. There are also variants that add U for unsure, T for transvestite, C for curious, A or SA for allies/ straight allies, P for polyamorous or pansexual, A for asexual, H for HIV-affected, and O for other. Some initialisms can become quite long and difficult, such as LGBTTQQIAP (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, queer, questioning, intersex, asexual, ally, pansexual), or *QUILTBAG* (queer and questioning, intersex, lesbian, transgender and two-spirit, bisexual, asexual and ally, and gay and genderqueer). While initialisms and abbreviations such as these seem to be an attempt to be inclusive, they often meet criticism for letter placement and for leaving some people out. It seems like it is the case that the more letters (groups of people) that are being included; the more people become upset about those who are not. On that note, it is quite common to add a + at the end of any initialism as a way to include all related communities. However, even the plus sign sparks debates about whether everyone should be included. Hot topics within these debates are amongst others whether gender should be a part of the non-heterosexual community, and of course, whether straight allies belong or not. Either way, it seems to be the case that if the term is anything but ‘non-heterosexual’, someone will feel left out. But then again, many people are opposed to the term non-heterosexual as it portrays deviance from the heteronormative to be abnormal or unnatural (Glaad.org, u.å).

LGBT is, as established, the most commonly used acronym to address the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community. Acronym aside, ‘queer’ is one of the more common words to describe non-hetersexual orientation or gender dysmorphia. For this thesis, I will be addressing this community with the following acronym, LGBTQ+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning), in an attempt to be as inclusive of sexual minorities as possible while still remaining efficient and precise. I will also use the words sexual minorities, and non-heterosexual as a description of the 'sexual orientation'- part of the LGBTQ+ community, and not as an indicator of deviance from the norm.

Recognition, in this case, is not a positive connotation. Rather it is a word of neutral value. Instead of giving the impression of positive reinforcement or validation, it simply means mirroring. Receiving recognition, then, means experiencing a mirrored look from the world outside one's own mind. Therefore, in this paper, in order to separate and clarify, I will use the term recognition as one of neutrality, and I will apply value and lack thereof by describing positive reinforcements as 'positive recognition' and insults as 'negative recognitions'. To clarify, 'positive recognition' is an encouraging mirroring of oneself from the outside world, and 'negative recognition' is the kind of mirroring that is destructive and not aligned with one's own self image.

In terms of addressing injustice I would like to clarify that while the misrecognition and injustice in focus are experienced on personal levels for various individuals, I am indeed speaking of structural injustice in this paper. By structural injustice I am referring to the definition given by American political philosopher, Iris Marion Young:

> Structural injustice... exists when social processes put large groups of persons under systematic threat of domination or deprivation of the means to develop and exercise their capacities, at the same time that these processes enable others to dominate or to have a wider range of opportunities for developing and exercising capacities available to them. Structural injustice is a kind of moral wrong distinct from the wrongful action on an individual agent or the repressive policies of a state. Structural injustice occurs as a consequence of many individuals and institutions acting to pursue their particular goals and interests, for the most part within the limits of accepted rules and norms. (Young, 2013, p. 52)

1.5 Structure of the Thesis

The thesis is divided into three main sections, and these sections are separated into chapters. In section one, the topic of the thesis is presented, and the theoretical basis is laid. Section one consists of chapters 1 and 2. I will mostly discuss recognition theory as presented by Axel Honneth and Nancy Fraser. In chapter 2, I will provide some background information of these philosophers as well as about their theories on recognition, for Honneth, and on redistribution, for Fraser.

Section two concerns the challenges facing LGBTQ+ peoples in terms of recognition. In chapter 3, I will go on to examine the case of conversion therapy and how it plays a part in the struggle for recognition for sexual minorities today.

In section three of the thesis I will be discussing pride, through chapters 4, 5, 6 and a concluding chapter. In chapter 4, I will provide some background on the origins of pride, and the issue of "coming out". This is important in order to understand the significance of pride today. Chapter 5 moves on to discuss the development of Pride and the Pride celebration as we know it today. The issue of minority stress will be covered in chapter 6, as well as a discussion of the linkage between stress and injustice.

Finally, in chapter 7 I will summarize and conclude on the basis of the discussions throughout the thesis, as well as touch upon significant aspects of this topic that I would have explored further, given the opportunity.

2. Theoretical Perspectives of Recognition and Redistribution for Sexual Minorities

Is justice a matter of recognition or redistribution? The theories I have applied in this paper seem to disagree on this question. One the one hand I will look to Axel Honneth and, briefly, to Charles Taylor for perspective on the value of recognition, in terms of personal benefits, as well as consequences in cases of misrecognition. On the other hand, I will examine Nancy Fraser's theory, which attributes the scope of redistribution to the conversation. My goal for this chapter is to provide enough theory from both sides of the issue at hand to create a platform for a fruitful discussion in the chapters to come. However, I will also focus on making the discussion just narrow enough to bring the topic of the paper into focus. Lastly, I will contribute with my own understanding of the structure of recognition.

I start with Charles Taylor as he is closely related in theory to Honneth and a central political thinker within recognition theory. From there I will move on to Axel Honneth and his theory of the three spheres of recognition. Then I will be moving on to Nancy Fraser and her two-dimensional theory of parity of participation. Let it be mentioned, that there is in fact an additional third part to Fraser's theory, the sphere of representation, which is not included in this paper, as I find the other two parts of her theory, redistribution and recognition, to be sufficient to make her case on this topic.

As social struggles over time have exhibited, and as illustrated in the introduction of this paper, justice demands more than an apparently fair distribution of goods. Recognition politics, on the other hand, is coming up short by relying on recognition alone. As the focus on self-realization is growing and the search for identity is becoming an increasingly popular endeavor, so is the demand for recognition. In *Redistribution or Recognition* Axel Honneth and Nany Fraser write that "whether the issue is indigenous land claims, or women's care work, homosexual marriage or Muslim headscarves, moral philosophers increasingly use the term "recognition" to unpack the normative basis of political claims. They find that a category that conditions subject's autonomy on intersubjective regard well captures the moral stakes of many contemporary conflicts" (Honneth & Fraser, 2003, pg.1).

Never before has there been so much talk of people feeling attacked and offended as there is today, and we find ourselves in a battle between individuals and cultural structures where the offence-defense roles are constantly shifting. This leaves us with the question of how to navigate through the whirlwind of recognition demands, to figure out how we can ensure justice where it is due and when to leave self-realization solely to individuals.

Deciding the best possible way to view injustice and how to go about tackling such problems is a discussion that goes as far back as time itself. However, if we narrow the question down to injustice today and in the modern western society, there are certain key people who have established such discussion, whose theories ought to be addressed before I throw my own ideas into the mix. As disclosed in the introduction I will be focusing most of my attention on Axel Honneth and Nancy Fraser. This is not to say that there are no other philosophers who are central to this discussion. One key theorist who has played an influential part in this matter is Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor.

In the *Politics of Recognition,* Charles Taylor uncovers the importance of recognition by mainly shedding light on the consequences following the lack of recognition:

> Our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the *mis*recognition of others, and so a person or a group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, of the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves (Taylor, 1994, p. 25).

For a number of groups, especially minority groups or others in vulnerable positions, their self-image often rests of the feedback they receive from society. The lack of recognition is often a common denominator in the kind of behavior and conditions we have already established as damaging or impeding everyday life, like for example bullying, loneliness, depression, exclusion, existential crisis, social anxiety etc.

The issue of identifying as LGBTQ+ is deeply embedded into the identity and feeling of self worth for many. Recognition from others can both help and hurt in this situation, depending on whether the recognition is positive, misplaced or whether it is a form of misrecognition. Taylor states,

> Thus my discovering my own identity doesn't mean that I work it out in isolation, but that I negotiate it through dialogue, partly overt, partly internal, with others. That is why the development of an ideal of inwardly generated identity gives a new importance to

> recognition. My own identity crucially depends on my dialogical relations with others." (Taylor, 1994, s.34).

The identity of being LGBTQ+ therefore is not only something that happens within and individual, but it is also an identity that is formed in society through interaction with others.

This assertion is a key segway into the philosophy of Honneth, as it points to the personal damages in which Honneth is trying, though his philosophy of recognition, to escape.

Similar to Taylor, the German philosopher Axel Honneth has also focused on the importance of recognition in order to live a full life, and Honneth perhaps even to a greater extent focuses on the fatal consequences of the absence of recognition. The Hegelian motive of 'becoming oneself through others' is central, and Honneth has reworked and developed this into a three dimensional theory, in the book *Kampf un Anerkennung* (1992). Here, Honneth mainly focuses on recognition as an individual, before he moves to uncover what he considers essential to recognition from a social perspective. The way in which he tackles this task is through dividing recognition theory into three main sections: a) The private sphere, often referred to as the sphere of love, b) the legal sphere, often referred to as the sphere of state c) the solidarity sphere, also referred to as the sphere of love, in which he employs in the context of both individual and social recognition. It is only through receiving recognition in all three spheres Honneth believes that we can live a worthy life. In the same way, any absence of the three forms of recognition results in a violation, which comparatively would be a catalyst for unworthy lives. With violation comes motivation to fight for recognition, a struggle Honneth believes to be moral, as he bases his theory not only on conflict and integration, but also on reason and emotion (Lysaker, 2015).

2.1 Axel Honneth's Three Spheres of Recognition

Honneth argues for the importance of recognition through the spheres. He believes that a worthy life could only be achieved through a complete recognition, through all three of the spheres, love, state and social relations.

2.1.1 Love

With regard to the concept of love, Honneth seems keen to avoid allowing the classic romantic perspective to dominate the discourse. While romantic and sexual relationships are primary and most commonly referred to as typical love- relationships, Honneths' theory is not restricted to these kinds of relationships in the discussion concerning love. On the contrary, love relationships are to be understood, according to Honneth, simply as primary relationships which are constituted by strong emotional attachments among a small number of people. Therefore, love relationships commonly present themselves in form of parent-child relationships, erotic relationships between lovers, as well as through friendship. Such love relationships facilitate the development and maintenance of the basic relation-to-self that Honneth terms 'basic self-confidence' or in german, selbstvertrauen which translates to 'trust in oneself' (Anderson in Honneth, 1995, pg. xii-xiii). In this context, Honneth is not referring to the colloquial use of the word, but rather pointing out that a "...basic self-confidence has less to do with a high estimation of one's abilities than with the underlying capacity to express needs and desires without fear of being abandoned as a result" (Anderson in Honneth, 1995, pg. xiii). The sphere of love therefore helps build self-confidence, and in turn recognition.

While love relationships can represent a spectrum of relationships that are first and foremost based on strong emotional bonds, it is the parent- child relationships that seems to be brought up most primarily in the love- relationship discussion, due to the first hand experience of recognition between parent and child. The unconditional care by a parent provides the baby with reassurance and security, and thus feelings of being worthy of love. Correspondingly, the baby's genuine need for care and security from a parent assures the parent of their role as being of utter importance to another person. To further illustrate this idea, Honneth draws on the object-relations theory of early childhood experience, particularly as developed in the work of English psychoanalyst Donald Winnicott who claims that "the care with which the 'mother' keeps the newborn baby alive is not added to the child's behavior as something secondary but is rather merged with the child in such a way that one can plausibly assume that every human life begins with a phase of undifferentiated intersubjectivity, that is, as symbiosis" (Honneth, 1995, pg. 98).

This comes to show that it is only together that the child and caregiver can depend on each other for the satisfaction of their needs and negotiate the delicate and shifting balance between ego-dissolution and ego-demarcation (Anderson in Honneth, 1995, pg. xiv). It is this balance, arguably, that provides the intersubjectively reproduced basis of love and trust, whether it be baby and 'mother', amongst friends, or between lovers (Anderson in Honneth, 1995, pg. xiv).

Further, Honneth argues that "this notion of bodily integrity, together with the need for love and concern it entails, captures something important that cuts across differences of cultural and historical contexts." This is not to say that practices of love have gone unchanged, but "that the capacity to trust one's own sense of what one needs or wants is a precondition for self-realization in any human community" (Anderson in Honneth, 1995, pg. xiv).

2.1.2 State – rights and self-respect

While love appears to represents a symbiosis defined by mutual recognition of each other's individual independence and a mutual trust in the safety of expressing one's needs and desires, it might also bring about the idea that the love relationship hinges solely on the type of recognition which relies on the cognitive acceptance of the other's independence. And so, the search for a more holistic understanding of recognition must transcend the circumference of love and delve into the next sphere of recognition theory. According to Honneth, that is the sphere of rights. Building on the general premises of civil and political rights from the eighteen hundreds to the twentieth century, Honneth draws a connection from rights to self-respect, which he deems essential to his tripart recognition theory. There is a strong Kantian element to the view that self-respect has less to do with feeling good about oneself and more to do with possessing a universal dignity as a person, in which we owe it to people to recognize their status as autonomous agents.

Drawing on a variety of rights-theories, Honneth highlights a quote from American political and legal philosopher Joel Feinberg:

> Having rights enables us to 'stand up like men', to look others in the eye, and to feel in some fundamental way the equal of anyone. To think of oneself as the holder of rights is not to be unduly but properly proud, to have that minimal self-respect that is necessary to be worthy of the love and esteem of others. Indeed, respect for persons… may simply be respect for their rights, so that there cannot be the one without the other. And what is called 'human dignity' may simply be the recognizable capacity to assert claims. (Feinberg in Honneth, 1995 pg. 120)

In other words, in order for people to truly achieve self-respect, people need to live in a world where there is a substructure in which legal rights are the stepping stones to self-respect, and in turn expression of needs and ideas. What Feinberg refers to as 'human dignity' can very well be understood as the ability to assert claims, which accordingly, and quite judiciously, can only become a basis for self-respect in the case where there actually is capacity to exercise such claims. Whether or not there is any logical validity to the argument that one might be capacious but not be in a position to exercise that capacity, would in this case be a secondary discussion. Nevertheless, what seems to be the takeaway here is that it is the rights in themselves that ensure the real opportunity to exercise the universal capacities, which are, according to Honneth, constitutive of personhood. Furthermore, as explained by Joel Anderson : "...the appeal to right has, built into it, the idea that every subject of the law must also be its author" (Anderson in Honneth, 1995, pg. xvi). This is to say that a person with the capacity to exercise one's right also needs to be a person who recognizes one's own role in society and value as a free agent, and who has a sense of what they are entitled to, as well as the grounding and confidence to stand up for it.

2.1.3 Social – Solidarity and self-esteem

Whereas Honneth refers to self-respect as considering oneself, as well as being considered by others, as an autonomous agent who is entitled to rights and status on an equal level to other people, he shift this focus, from similarity to uniqueness, when addressing the final part of the recognition puzzle: the social sphere. The social sphere, also known as the sphere of solidarity or of self-esteem, circles the role of particularity. This particularity, also known as self-esteem, is thus built on a sense of what makes one special. However, such uniqueness cannot simply be derived from trivial characteristics. Such distinguished particularity must be of a certain value, meaning that one needs have a sense of that what one can offer to the world is something of a positive contribution. Thus, in return, to hold a perception of not having anything valuable to bring to the table would resemble an absence of any substructure for identity development. (Honneth, 1995, pg. 122-123)

Honneth presents the need to bring about something valuable not as a testimony to oneself, but for the purpose of a communal verification: "As long as society's conception of its ethical goals are still conceived of substantively and the corresponding value-ideas are hierarchically organized in such a way that a scale of more and less valuable forms of conduct can arise, a person's status is measured in terms of social honor" (Honneth, 1995, pg. 123). Accordingly, Honneth says, honor "designates the relative level of social standing that people can attain when they manage to conduct themselves habitually in line with the collective expectations that are 'ethically' linked to their social status…" (Honneth, 1995, pg. 123). This is to say, it seems, that honor, or esteem if you like, is systematically accumulated through society's, or one's social circle, affinity towards oneself.

The social conditions for esteem are therefore determined by the general idea of what a valuable contribution to one's society is considered to be, by the specific society one happens to live in.

Dissimilar to the sphere of rights, this sphere holds a communitarian momentum of particularity, namely that the particular values endorsed by one community hinges on that community's specific culture and history, whereas the sphere of rights hold a structure based on universality. To illustrate, a woman who decides to work as a stay at home mom in a society where such work does in fact not hold the status of a legitimate job, she will not be able to obtain a social status equal to those who do work in fields that are considered legitimate places of work. In other words, since, in this example, working as a stay at home mother is not considered to be valuable work compared to other types of jobs of a higher status, this woman will then be considered to not have anything valuable to offer to the society in which she lives.

In terms of the struggle for recognition for (cultural) minority groups', such as feminists and LGBTQ+ , identity, Honneth seems to regard struggles where the dimension of esteem is central as attempts to end social patterns of subjugation. However, Honneth stresses that

> esteem is accorded on the basis of an individual's contribution to a shared project; thus, the elimination of demeaning cultural images of racial minorities does not provide esteem directly but rather establishes the conditions under which members of those groups can then build self-esteem by contributing to the community. (Anderson in Honneth 1995, pg. xvii-xviii).

The cultural images of the LGBTQ+ community is therefore of much importance in the process of recognition for the group.

2.1.3 Expectation of Recognition

For most individuals, it is often in meeting other people that we become aware of the importance of recognition as it is a central aspect of our self-image and personal development: "People do not acquire the languages needed for self-definition on their own. Rather, we are introduced to them through interaction with others who matter to us…" (Meade in Taylor, 1994, p. 32). This is a case in which pretty much all kinds of interpersonal interaction can be used as an example. A classroom full of students who greet you every day and who invite you to play in recess is positive recognition of your presence and your capacity and role as a playmate. A job as a barista where the feedback you get is that you are pretty or sexy, is also a form of recognition, but not relating to the work you are doing. To a person who takes pride in doing a good job as a barista, the repeated feedback on their appearance, even though it was intended as a positive, can contribute to hurting the barista's self-image and enthusiasm for the job. A person who is gender neutral, but who is consequently asked to identity as either male or female, can feel like they are not being taken seriously, not being accepted, feel lonely in their identity etc. A Muslim who gets offensive comments about terrorism and war will likely develop a twisted self-image, and may associate their faith, culture and family, with negative feelings.

Some might say, and many do, that you should not care what other people say as long as you yourself know who you are and what you stand for. That is probably right in many cases and to a certain extent. The problem is that self-esteem and confidence is dependent on people's feedback in order to grow and develop: "The genesis of the human mind is in this sense not monological, not something each person accomplishes on his or her own, but dialogical" (Taylor, 1994, p. 32). What Taylor emphasizes is that our identity depends on the communication with other individuals in order to develop and become completed:

> Thus my discovering my own identity doesn't mean that I work it out in isolation, but that I negotiate it through dialogue, partly overt, partly internal, with others. That is why the development of an ideal of inwardly generated identity gives a new importance to recognition. My own identity cruelly depends on my dialogical relations with others. (Taylor, 1994, p. 34).

It is through social relations, Taylor posits, that our identity emerges, and not in isolation. In that case, an additional layer of urgency and gravity for the consequences of repeated negative feedback or lack of recognition is added to the discussion. It is not merely enough for each individual to recognize oneself and be happy with one's identities. There is also a responsibility in society to contribute to the recognition of other people.

It seems safe to say that all people pursue recognition. However, the degree of pursuit depends on a number of things such as background, goals, awareness of already received recognition, attraction, etc. Can we be fully aware of what kind of recognition we crave without there being a painful absence of it? Surely, people who suffer from an extreme lack of essential recognition, such as recognition as valuable human beings, as equal citizens, as people worthy of love and care, etc., will not be in doubt of what recognition is missing because they know the pain of its drought. The question which then arises from knowing this, challenges the state of consciousness of expectations of recognition, when not in a state of painful recognition deficiency. Certainly, we have the need to be recognized beyond the scope of an equal and valuable citizen, but how we go about this need is something of a knot, which I will humbly attempt to detangle.

Imagine that every person has a list of identity factors, or personality traits, if you will. Let's call them IDP's- Identity Properties. For the sake of the thought experiment, let's say that every person has about 200 IDP's. These IDP's can be all sorts of characteristics, depending on the beholder's personality. Naturally, the IDP's are weighted differently in terms of importance. To some the identity property of being a female is of the utmost importance, while being an athlete is of a secondary significance. For the next person the identity property of being an Alaskan carries far more weight than being a brother. To clarify, within the list of IDP's there are some properties that are of higher importance than others. The importance of the IDP's will vary from person to person, and quite naturally, the importance of each of them will, most likely, shift with time and experience.

Now that we have established that there are some IDP's that hold the role as primary IDP's, let us focus on those IDP's that are less significant. Make no mistake, this is not to say that certain properties are not important, it is simply to illustrate that in order to create an image of a person's identity it is naturally that certain IDP's stand out more than others. The less significant IDP's are still valuable in the way that they are part of completing a person's identity.
I like to visualize this idea by thinking of a t-shirt with tickable boxes printed on it, and each IDP listed next to their respectable box. Figure 1 shows this kind of shirt, but imagined with several more IDP's.

Figure 1: Shirt with tickable boxes

I imagine that most people are generally aware of all 200 IDP's on their list, even though they might only actively think about a small number of them on a regular basis. Some of the IDP's are rarely given much thought at all, if ever. However, we become quite aware of them when we are addressed in a manner that doesn't align with any of IDP's on our shirts. For example, I might not have given my role as a Norwegian much though nor value until someone incorrectly refers to me as a Dane. While there is no objective difference in value in being Norwegian or Danish, being addressed as a Dane would to me feel wrong since I am in fact Norwegian. There is a Norwegian box in my shirt, and not a Dane box, and therefore it causes a disarray in my perception of self when the ticker acknowledges me, the tickee, as something I do not personally recognize.

Furthermore, there is also the case in which the ticker ticks boxes that the tickee did not expect. Imagine this, you- a teacher- are supposed to teach a subject to some friends. However, since the students are your friends, they refuse to acknowledge you as anything but their friend, and your status a teacher is not recognized. Or, in another case, you go to a job interview for a job as a teacher, a job for which you have the education, but instead of being asked questions about your resume and skills, the interviewer flirts with you and only appeals to you romantically or sexually. The 'prospective teacher's box is not ticked, but the 'sexual being' and 'single' boxes are. In this example we have a case of unwanted boxes ticked, which in turn can be experienced as unexpected negative feedback or misrecognition. Other people ticking boxes which are far down on your list can also remind you of IDP's that you had not thought about for a long time, and if other's tick this same IDP of seemingly low importance often enough, it might grow in size, as others clearly identify this trait as central.

While this, in practice brings about great frustration and grief, it also brings about, in theory, the question of how our expectations came about, and furthermore, where the absence of expectation were derived from. As already established, some expectations are unmistakably part of our conscious mind. We all have IDPs that we actively think about and that we fervently pursue recognition for. And then there are IDPs that we do not necessarily think about but somehow still know that is there, as boxes on our shirts. Would it be correct to say that these are the products of our subconscious mind, or some sort of subdoxastic interpretation of one's own identity?
If we free ourselves from the thought that there is a consciousness and subconsciousness and nothing in between or parallel to those, we might be able to think of a third sphere in our mind; a 'quasi-consciousness' if you will.

There are thoughts somehow formed in your mind that are accessible to you, but not part of your active thinking patterns. These are not subconscious thoughts because you can access them, but you can only access them through the external intervention. If your mind is a room with a lamp that can only light up certain parts of the room, the external intervention is a flashlight pointed in the direction of the shadows in the room. Nothing in the room changes, once it is lit up because whatever is in the shadows were already there, although the light couldn't reach it by itself.

2.2 Nancy Fraser's Theory of Recognition Through Redistribution and Participation

In *Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation,* Nancy Fraser highlights that the political movements of our time seem to be calling for two separate demands of justice. On the one hand, there is redistribution, which encompasses the discussion of the distribution of financial resources and goods. On the other hand, there is recognition, which, as already established, requires the acknowledgement of people's needs, traditions, cultures, religion, sexuality and way of life.

Nancy Fraser denies that distribution can be subsumed under recognition. Instead, she proposes a two-dimensional interpretation of justice that includes claims of both redistribution and recognition, without reducing the one to the other, but rather accommodate defensible claims for social equality and the recognition of difference. (Fraser, 2003, pg.9)

2.2.1 Fraser on justice: an amalgamation of paradigms.

According to Fraser: "...justice today requires *both* redistribution *and* recognition. Neither alone is sufficient" (Fraser, Redistribution or Recognition, 2003, pg. 9).

Fraser thinks the association with the two kinds of politics, politics of redistribution and the politics of recognition, are misleading because they tend to paint a one-sided picture of the movements and topics involved: the politics of redistribution is commonly equated with class politics, while the politics of recognition is assimilated to "identity politics" which is equated in turn with struggles over gender, sexuality, nationality, ethnicity, and "race" (Fraser, 2003, pg. 11) Fraser attempts to treat each folk paradigm, redistribution and recognition, that is, as if it expresses a "distinctive perspective on social justice", which, fundamentally, can be applied to any case of social movement, and not just the ‘classic’ ones that are typically associated with such paradigms; politics of redistribution and politics of recognition.

By opening up the conversation to encompass a wider take on the paradigm of redistribution and recognition, which welcomes those forms of feminism and anti-racism that look to, for example, socioeconomic transformation, or in fact, the movements that aim to revalue unjustly devalued identities such as cultural feminism and gay identity politics, which have rejected the ‘essentialism of traditional identity politics, Fraser creates a much broader approach to these issues that we tend to see in conventional identity politics (Fraser, 2003, pg. 12).

Although the two folk paradigms depend on each other to create a complete picture of injustice, there are, according to Fraser, four main differences that separate the paradigms. The first one is that the two paradigms assume different conceptions of injustice, and the second one is that the two folk paradigms propose different sorts of remedies for injustice. The third one is that both redistribution and recognition assume different conceptions of the collectivities that suffer injustice, and the fourth one is that the two folk paradigms assume different understandings of group differences (Fraser, 2003, pg. 13-15).

In order to explain why the “either/or” approach to the politics of recognition and redistribution is a false antithesis, Fraser offers a thought experiment in which the two folk paradigms are extremes on each side of a spectrum, and in between are the cases which synchronously fit both paradigms of justice. On the one end, the redistribution side, there is the typical social division which is grounded in the economic structure of society. This means that any form of systematic injustice will be due to or blamed on the political economy, which in turn means that the problem, at its core, is rooted in socio-economic maldistribution. Therefore, the countermeasure would naturally be a shift in distribution. A classic example of a division based on economical maldistribution is racialized groups of immigrants that are largely excluded from regular waged work. (Fraser, 2003, p. 14)

On the other end of the spectrum, the recognition side, there is the division based on the status order kind of society, where the structural injustices will be rooted in the institutionalized patterns in society, which speaks of cultural value. An example of this are groups of people, such as ethnic minorities who suffer under a notion of less respect and lower status that other groups in society. Often such groups are indigenous people, whose status has suffered from a history of suppression from the main group on people in their area. In these cases, the core of the injustice will obviously be misrecognition, and therefore, naturally, the remedy for such will have to be recognition, as opposed to redistribution (Fraser. 2003, pg. 16-17).

However, it is when we approach the middle part of the spectrum that matters become equivocal. Here we face injustices that can be traceable to both the redistribution paradigm as well as the recognition paradigm. Fraser calls such divisions “two- dimensional” and explains that these groups “suffer both misdistribution and misrecognition in forms where neither of these is an indirect effect of the other, but where both are primary and co-original” (Fraser, 2003, pg. 19), and therefore two-dimensionally subordinated groups need both politics of redistribution and also politics of recognition (Fraser, 2003, pg. 19).

2.2.2. A distinctive perspective on social justice in the case of gender

To illustrate this thought experiment, Fraser applies her theory to the division of gender, as it seems to be an intermixture group, or a ‘two- dimensional’ group. In order to investigate and comprehend gender injustice, one will have to examine both distribution and recognition. Because there is a significant gap between higher paid male dominated jobs and lower paid female dominated jobs, as well as lesser economic gain for domestic work, which is predominantly female occupied work, gender appears to be a class- based differentiation, and therefore an injustice rooted in the economic structure of our society. If this is the case then clearly redistributive atonement is the way to go about the healing process. However, gender is also very much rooted in cultural patterns which are central to the status order. In view of status, it happens to be so that our culture values traits associated with masculinity, and devalues traits associated with femininity; an institutionalized pattern Fraser portrays as androcentrism, which therefore brings about a status disparity developed from the paradigm of misrecognition. In such a case, proper recognition is a requirement for justice. As a result, we see that gender is in fact a two-dimensional division that requires to be treated from both ends of the scale. What follows, then, is the question of the commonality of two- dimensional divisions.

Fraser argues that there are a number of quite obvious cases, such as race, class, sexuality, which eventually turns into a convincing theory where apparent one-dimensional cases should be seen through two-dimensional lenses:

> For practical purposes, then, virtually all real- world axes of subordination can be treated as two-dimensional. Virtually all implicate both maldistribution and misrecognition in forms where each of those injustices has some independent weight, whatever its ultimate roots. (Fraser, 2003, pg. 25).

This is not to say that all axes of subordination are equally placed on the spectrum. Fraser does point out that some cases tilt more towards the redistribution end of the spectrum, whereas other cases fall, naturally, closer to the recognition end of the spectrum. To further the practical aspects of her theory, Fraser moves on to indicate that we ought to refrain from seeing axes of subordination independently, and rather begin to acknowledge them as intersecting axes. After all, "no one is a member of only one such collectivity. And all individuals who are subordinated along one axis of social division may well be dominant along another" (Fraser, 2003, pg. 26). If a person is both black and female, for example, that person will have to address both recognition and redistribution regardless of what those axes represent as single categories. Fraser seems to claim here, that anyone who cares about social justice simply cannot look away from the junction of the two-dimensional axes of subordinations of maldistribution and misrecognition. In fact, she states that there should be a goal "to develop an integrated approach that can encompass, and harmonize, both dimensions of social justice" (Fraser, 2003, p. 26).

In any attempt to integrate redistribution and recognition one must be careful to address what seems to be the pressing question here, especially when comparing Fraser's theory to other theorists commenting on the same issues, which is the subject of classification. Unlike prominent contemporary philosophers like Charles Taylor and Axel Honneth, Fraser proposes that recognition is indeed a matter of justice, and not self-realization. Honneth, however, as mentioned in section 2.1, situates his theory within the tradition "that emphasizes not the struggle for self-preservation, but rather the struggle for the establishment of relations of mutual recognition, as a precondition for self- realization." (Anderson in Honneth, 1995, pg. X)

This idea, that recognition is considered to be, predominantly a matter self-realization is also supported by Canadian political philosopher Charles Taylor who claims that:

> Our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the *mis*recognition of others, and so a person or a group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, of the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves. (Taylor, 1994, s. 25).

To deny someone recognition is to deprive them of essential requirements for a person to feel valuable and to see himself or herself as equal: “Misrecognition shows not just a lack of due respect. It can inflict grievous wounds, saddling its victims with a crippling self- hatred” (Taylor, 1994, s.26). Taylor is of the opinion that recognition, when withheld, is not just a lacking factor to our self-image, but it causes great pain. With time and consistency, the holding back of recognition or projection of an inferior image, Taylor says, “can inflict damage on those who are denied it...The projection of an inferior or demeaning image on another can actually distort and oppress, to the extent that the images are internalized” (Taylor, 1994, s. 36). He even goes as far as to state that, “due recognition is not just a courtesy we owe people. It's a vital human need.” (Taylor, 1994, s. 26).

However, Fraser disagrees. She proposes that instead of seeing misrecognition as an attack on the relation-to-self, one should reply to misrecognition by saying that

> it is unjust that some individuals and groups are denied the status of full partners in social interaction simply as a consequence of institutionalized patterns of cultural value in whose construction they have not equally participated and which disparage their distinctive characteristics, or the distinctive characteristics assigned to them. (Fraser, 2003, pg. 29).

Fraser explains this by stating that “viewing recognition as a matter of justice is to treat it as an issue of social status” (Fraser, 2003, pg. 29), which she illustrates with what she calls the status model of recognition.

2.2.3 The Status Model of Recognition

The status model of recognition portrays misrecognition in unison with institutionalized patterns of culture and the effect those patterns have on the people in said culture. For example, if I were to live in a culture where, through institutionalized patterns, white people were constituted as peers, capable to participate equally with one another, I would experience reciprocal recognition and status equality. However, if I were to belong to a society where the institutionalized patterns were such that white people were constituted to be less than full partners in social interaction, or furthermore, excluded from participating, then accordingly, I would experience misrecognition and status subordination. On the status model, Fraser explains,

> Misrecognition is neither a physical deformation nor an impediment to ethical self-realization. Rather, it constitutes an institutionalized relation of subordination and a

> violation of justice. To be misrecognized, accordingly, is not to suffer distorted identity or impaired subjectivity as a result of being deprecated by others. (Fraser, 2003, pg. 29).

It is instead a victimization by the social institutions in which one lives, on the premise that one is being withheld from participating on an equal level. Fraser offers examples such as marriage laws that exclude same-sex-partnerships, “racial profiling”, “male-headed households” are proper, and “female-headed households” are not, straight is normal and gay is perverse, etc. (Fraser, 2003, pg. 29). The remedy for each case requires recognition, by defeating subordination.

According to Fraser, there are four main advantages to the status model, when compared to the self-realization theory predominantly represented by Honneth and Taylor. These advantages are as follows:

1. “Justify claims for recognition as morally binding under the modern conditions of value pluralism” (Fraser, 2003, pg. 30), meaning that the status model is deontological and non-sectarian, which accordingly means that one cannot justify claims for recognition based on the sole account of self- realization. Instead, the concept of justice should be rooted in a diverse interpretation of good. (Fraser, 2003, pg. 30-31)

2. “Conceiving misrecognition as status subordination, it locates the wrong in social relations, not in individual or interpersonal psychology” (Fraser, 2003, pg. 31), Often, when misrecognition is identified with internal struggles of malconformation, it looks as if it is alarmingly similar to victim- blaming. Rather than equating misrecognition with personal predicaments, the status model looks to deinstitutionalize cultural patterns of value that hinder equal participation for all members of society, with the aim to change the patterns, not the people. (Fraser, 2003, pg. 31)

3. “Avoids the view that everyone has an equal right to social esteem” (Fraser, 2003, pg. 32) What seems to be one of the influential parts of the theory of justice based on self-realization is indeed that everyone is morally entitled to social esteem. Fraser finds this condition indefensible and points to the essential distinctiveness that the status model offers, namely that it calls for an *equal chance* for everyone to pursue esteem under fair conditions (Fraser, 2003, pg. 32)

4. “By construing misrecognition as a violation of justice, it facilitates the integration of claims for recognition with claims for the redistribution of resources and wealth” (Fraser, 2003, pg. 33). By treating both redistribution and recognition as matters of justice, the status model integrates recognition into the universal deontological idea of distributive justice, which means that both

recognition and redistribution co-exists within the same moral framework, and not separately as diagonal ideas of moral justice (Fraser, 2003. Pg. 33).

Fraser claims that the status model clearly illustrates why and how recognition is better suited as a matter of justice and not as self- realization. As she points out in part 4 of this multifaceted status model, the focus on justice allows for a coexistence of recognition and redistribution within one and the same framework, which would not be the case if the focus of the matter were to be on recognition alone.

Summary

Fraser's theory is centered around the idea of parity of participation. This means that the notion of justice hinges on equal opportunities to be free and take part in society. Misrecognition alone, she claims, is not enough to demand justice, because misrecognition in itself is an experience that fluctuates between different people. In such case, the demand for recognition based solely on self-realization cannot be met equally for all people. However, a calibrate that measures misrecognition based on peoples basis for participation, brings about a clarity of people's standing and more importantly, the root of the misrecognition. By setting the standard of justice at the parity of participation, the hindering factors of such participation, such as structural relations and cultural traditions, will be exposed and, through what Frasers addresses as 'transformative action' people have a chance to amend and rectify such structures instead of compensating for the following wrongful outcomes (Fraser 2003, pg. 36; Holst 2010, pg. 169). Fraser's principle of parity of participation is not meant to be applied solely on a political or institutionalized level, but to a broader spectrum of activities, such as taking part in volunteer organizations, religious fellowships, cultural activities, and otherwise social life. In summary, being a free agent means being able to exercise one's autonomy and to partake in all kinds of social and political activities, on the same level as everyone else. (Fraser, 2008, pg.344)

'

Section 2

3. The Importance of Recognition and the Consequences of Misrecognition

Recognition, as presented by Taylor, Honneth and Fraser, can be divided into two main sections, in order to better comprehend the essential intersubjectivity, as well as fundamental differences. Let us therefore address these sections as internal recognition and external recognition. As the names indicate, the internal recognition is the kind of recognition that is assembled from within, whereas the external recognition is the one received from the outside world.

Internal recognition is the form of recognition you create yourself. The need for internal recognition more often than not comes about when one is experiencing an absence of external recognition to the extent that it negatively affects their self-image, as Honneth would say, or when it affects the possibility to participate equally in society, as Fraser would focus on. In summary, internal recognition comes from within, and reflects the image of identity that one wishes to be mirrored in society.

External recognition, on the other hand, consists of the type of recognition that is directly received from society. It can appear in the form of feedback, mirroring, confirming/rejecting, laws, protection, subsidies, economic and legal goods etc. External recognition is received from the state, the municipality, neighborhoods, the judicial system, the school system, workplaces and people who run private or public businesses and ventures. In other words, all feedback that is not from within the individual.

The lack of external recognition is, as previously mentioned, by both Honneth and Taylor, a catalyst for a group of people to act independently. Recognition from within, or intersubjective recognition as it is called in this paper, is a form of recognition that a group creates for themselves. Since we are referring to groups of people who have been subjected to oppression, the negative consequences of not receiving recognition nor rectification from society have been established. As explained by Taylor, the damaging effects of misrecognition can cause self-hatred and other kinds of distorted identity image (Taylor, 1994, p. 26). If the feedback one gets is mainly of the negative variety, one will, over time, adopt that image one is being mirrored and end up hating the same aspects of oneself as society expresses dislike towards. In turn, the struggle for internal recognition will be strenuous, as it is attempting to even out the discrepancies between the internal and external image of oneself.

Taylor also explains that “equal recognition is not just the appropriate mode for a healthy democratic society. Its refusal can inflict damage on those who are denied it…. The projection of an inferior or demeaning image on another can actually distort and oppress, to the extent that the images are internalized” (Taylor, 1994, p. 36). This is a clear example of the struggles found in the LGBTQ+ communities to this day, especially for transgender people: “The suicide attempt rate among transgender persons ranges from 32% to 50% across the countries. Gender-based victimization, discrimination, bullying, violence, being rejected by the family, friends, and community; Harassment by intimate partner, family members, police and public; Discrimination and ill treatment at health-care systems are the major risk factors that influence the suicidal behavior among transgender persons” (Virupaksha H., Muralidhar D. & Ramakrishna J., 2016). This statistic illustrates the fatal consequences of negative and lacking recognition, while resembling Axel Honneth’s claim that positive recognition is a universal human need, since in these instances it can contribute to save lives.

By comparing external and internal recognition, we get a clear picture of their dissimilarities, in the form of role, importance and consequence. What is important to point out is that these two sections of recognition are dependent on one another. When people who are subjected to misrecognition fight to change their position in society, it is a matter of intersubjective balance between the two sections of recognition. In the chapter about Pride, I briefly mention other political groups who took recognition into their own hands with the goal of escaping their suppressed position in society. That is to say, the imbalance between the internal and external recognition was so displeasing that it called or a readjustment. Groups like the women’s right movement, the Black Rights Matter movement and people with disabilities, to mention a few, all share the common background of a low and vulnerable position in society. Being disadvantaged from this, and having to fight for the recognition they believe they deserve, they are exercising the intersubjective notion, centering the internals’ dependence on the external. In the chapter about gay pride, we shall see how the LGBTQ+ community succeeds in creating their own form of validation, as intersubjective recognition, through demonstrations, organizations, gatherings, awareness, celebration etc.

3.1 The Case of Conversion Therapy

One of the more significant disincentives to the recognition of the LGTBQ+ is the existence of gay conversion therapy. Due to its predominant role in the western democratic societies conversion therapy is a problem that is difficult to avoid, nor should it be, when discussing the struggle for recognition for the LGBTQ+ community. In this chapter I will disclose the issues such practice brings about, and what is means for the LGBTQ+ community and their fight for justice

Conversion therapy or reparative therapy, is a widely practiced procedure. This is a practice aimed at changing an individual's sexual orientation from non-heterosexual to heterosexual or gender identity from trans to cis. In the United States, this is a particularly common approach to LGBTQ+ youths by parents and caretakers who are under the impression that being non-heterosexual or trans- gendered is a sickness that can be cured. In Norway this issue has also been widely discussed in the recent month, and in December 2019 a vote will take place in Norwegian parliament, deciding whether gay conversion therapy should be illegal or not, when practices in the name of religion.

The term "reparative therapy" has often been used interchangeably with conversion therapy. The term "reparative therapy," however, supports an inaccurate theoretical construct, namely, that homosexuality and bisexuality are a form of "brokenness." Conversion therapy, on the other hand promotes the idea that sexuality is a matter of choice that can be influenced, changed, or redirected. Is a sense, the terminologies in themselves are restrictive of recognition.

Both health care professionals as well as uneducated people often practice conversion therapy in the name of religion or spirituality. In January 2018, The William Institute of the UCLA School of Law estimated that 698,000 LGBT adults (ages 18-59) in the U.S. had received conversion therapy, including about 350,000 LGBT adults who received treatment as adolescents. In addition, it estimated that 20,000 LGBT youths (aged 13-17) would receive conversion therapy from a licensed health care professional before they reach the age of 18 in the 41 states that do not ban such practice. Furthermore, it is estimated that 57,000 youth (ages 13-17) across all states will receive conversion therapy from religious or spiritual advisors before they reach the age of 18 years old (Mallroy, Brown & Conron, 2018, pg.1). The issue of conversion therapy therefore appears to be widespread in the LGBTQ+ community in the United States, perhaps because of the strong religious influences in society.

Conversion therapy is spread all throughout the world to some degree, but in the U.S. it has been practiced for over a century: Academic literature has documented instances of conversion therapy being used as early as 1890s and continuing through the present day (Mallroy, Brown & Conron, 2018, pg.1). The practice of conversion therapy is performed by using aversion and non-aversive techniques. Aversion treatment includes the inducing of nausea, electro shock, and other types of physical pain or discomfort afflicted when the individual in treatment experiences arousal from same-sex erotic images or thoughts. The non-aversion treatment consists of changing thought patterns, attempting to reframe desire, performing hypnosis, and more. In essence, both aversive and non- aversive types of treatments generate the idea that non-heterosexuality is something one can and should be cured of, in other words non- heterosexuality is a disease.

The widespread use of conversion therapy in the United States, and the duration in which this practice has been exercised has, despite numerous legitimate medical institutions outspoken animosity towards it, lead large parts of non-heterosexuals and their families to truly believe that they are in fact suffering from a disease or a defect. The repetitive feedback from society that one can be accepted and eventually be treated as an equal, but only when and if one is cured, leads to great identity distress for the individuals it concerns. Although several activist groups and politicians have expressed their concern with conversion therapy and work towards a ban of the practice, the leaders of the country have not made this a priority. In fact, this month the democratic state of New York issued a repeal of the state's ban on conversion therapy, leaving only minors protected from the practice (Mays, 2019).

This comes to show that even the more liberal states in the country seem to not be opposed to a practice that is typically and widely supported by the conservatives. Leaving the politics aside, the point is the image this practice paints for the people who belong to the LGBTQ+ community, namely an image that non-heterosexuality and transgenderism is a pathology.

3.2 The Case of Conversion Therapy through Honneth's Spheres of Recognition

In light of Honneth's theory, the conversion therapy practice seem to be problematic on a number of levels.

Love

On account of the intimate sphere, the sphere of love relationships, there is no doubt that conversion therapy practice is rendered problematic. It appears to be so that the process of entering into conversion therapy begins within families. That is not to say that the idea of partaking in such practice has its roots in family constellations, for that might just be an issue of a different sphere altogether. However, it is not to be swept under a rug that parents and other caretakers are very often the ones who encourage or forcefully send their children to conversion therapy. While this might seem, to many, to be evidence of neglect or hate, this is often intended as an act of love from the parents. Many parents who send their kids to conversion therapy do so thinking that their children have a disease and that conversion therapy will heal them, very much like they would send their children to the hospital if they had a physical illness. Although the intention might be rooted in love and affection, the outcomes are rarely positive for neither children, nor parents. Seeing that conversion therapy actually does not convert non-heterosexuals into heterosexuals, there is very little chance for anyone to feel satisfied, when going through with such a program and, unavoidably, not succeed. While conversion therapists claim that their practice works and that they can convert sexual orientation, "even the most enthusiastic of conversion therapists claim roughly a 30% "success" rate" (Haldeman, 1999, pg.119), which comes to show that most people entering into conversion therapy will leave the program feeling like a failure. One might say that this result is nothing short of adding insult to injury, if seeing that the real damage is not necessarily going through that kind of therapy but being urged to participate in the first place.

Honneth's account basic self- confidence has everything to do with the capacity to express one's desires and needs without the dread of being abandoned as a result. Accordingly, being urged to attend conversion therapy is very much like being abandoned. There is a definite breach in the 'mother- child' relationship, here, which is damaging, if not utterly destructive to the love relationship symbiosis. By asking someone to get treatment for something they simply cannot help, one is clearly stating that there is something wrong with that person, and that they are not accepted for who they are. To illustrate, when children express to their loved ones that they are non-heterosexual and are met with a "cure" instead of accept and acknowledgement for their sexuality, the love relationship suffers, leaving the child with a distorted identity due to the breach in recognition. Furthermore, such a breach in a love- relationship can also be an impediment for a healthy identity development. Coming to learn that a significant part of one's self is considered, by loved ones, to be sickening or unnatural, will inevitably obstruct a person's sense of freedom to be their true self.

Legal

In the sphere of rights and self- respect there is an obvious disincentive in the fact that there is such a thing as legal gay conversion therapy. This is to say that gay conversion therapy in itself is restrictive of recognition.

Honneth refers to a quote by Hegel which describes the mutual relation between the state and the people:

> in the state…man is recognized and treated as a *rational* being, as free, as a person; and the individual, on his side, makes himself worthy of his recognition by overcoming the natural state of his self- consciousness and obeying a universal, the will that is in essence and actuality will, the *law*; he behaves therefore, toward others in a manner that is universally valid, recognizing them- as he wishes others to recognize him- as free, as persons. (Hegel in Honneth, 1995, pg. 108)

The point here is that the personal autonomy of an individual is contingent with a reciprocal relation that is incorporated in legal recognition. Following, is the assumption that any bearer of legal rights is also recognized as a free and autonomous member of the social collective. Therefore, in the case of gay conversion therapy, the absence of legal protection for non-heterosexuals allows for a situation where that group of people can be considered to not be free people worthy of legal protection.

Although there is a large number of countries in the world that officially ban such practices, there is a significant impact in the fact that the most powerful and influential country in the world does allow for this to happen in a majority of its states, which is to say that it is not a practice that is prohibited by federal law. The fact that most non-heterosexual people in the U.S. will be affected by this type of practice is a breach of recognition alone, however, it should not be forgotten that this speaks volumes and is reaching non- heterosexual people far beyond the limits of the American borders.

Social

The influence of American culture is widespread, and the role of non-heterosexual 'culture' in the U.S is a chapter that is revealed to the rest of the world through both news channels, popular culture and social media. What follows from this is not only that non-heterosexuals all over the world are receiving the implicit message that only heterosexuals and cis-people are the only people worthy of self- respect and social esteem, but it is also sends the message that being non-heterosexual or trans is a defect or an illness. In turn, gay conversion therapy and its position in society is not simply a hindrance of recognition for LGBTQ+ people in the United States, but a hindrance of recognition to all non-heterosexuals and trans people.

I think it is worth making a point out of the fact that people who have partaken in conversion therapy are commonly referred to as 'gay conversion therapy survivors'. In an era where victims of crimes and other traumatic incidents are making their way through shame and silence and putting PTSD on the map as a common and serious disorder, the people who have endured gay conversion therapy conspicuously enter into the category of victims. This goes to show that enduring gay conversion therapy is first of all traumatizing on a variety of levels, and secondly that not being positively recognized for being non-heterosexual or trans is one of those levels of trauma.

Many non-heterosexual and trans people wrestle with the issue of faith, partly due to the strong religious ties to conversion therapy. Religion, for many, serves as a comfort and a positive perspective on the world, as well as the basis for a social environment which shares the same religious values of acceptance and love. However, on the issue of being LGBTQ+, many experience the opposite, through being told that it's wrong or unnatural, and even being pushed into entering conversion therapy as a requirement if one wishes to continue being a part of the religious community.

In the episode *The Life Threatening Dangers Of Gay Conversion Therapy* from the Refinery29 documentary series called *State of Grace*, made this year, host Grace Baldridge explores what it means to identify as a Christian as well as a member of the LGBTQ community. She reports that around 40% of all LGTBQ+ people in the United States are of Christian faith (12:10), and that a devastating number of these people experience rejections and that many have gone through conversion therapy. Baldrige also refers to a study which has found that “LGBTQ+ adolescents that experience conversion therapy or rejections from their families and faith communities are eight times more likely to attempt suicide than those from accepting environments”(Refinery29, 2019: 11.06)

While most people who have endured gay conversion therapy advocate for the dangers and destructivity of it, it also appears that a large portion of people who have performed gay conversion therapy and then left the community, has had a turnaround in their set of beliefs and claim that it does in fact not really work. Indeed, many actually ‘come out’ as non-heterosexual themselves.

In January 2019 former gay conversion therapist, David Matheson, said in an interview with Channel 4 News that

> any therapy that is based on the idea that being gay is a psychological disorder, which it’s not, that believes that gay is wrong or bad, which it’s not, and that it can be changed and ought to be changed, and therapy that is based on that idea has a great potential of harming people. And that kind of therapy should be stopped (Channel4News: 5.10).

The point here is not necessarily that gay conversion therapy is a hoax, and a quite dangerous one too, it is merely to shed some light on the impact of practices that work actively against positively recognizing LGBTQ+ people. In consideration of recognition theory, gay conversion therapy plays an antagonistic part of a deterrence. As mentioned already, gay conversion therapy is inherently an infringement on all three spheres of Honneth’s recognition. However, what Honneth’s recognition theory fails to address is how the view of non-heterosexualism as a disorder is a breach of recognition on a level that goes beyond self-realization. This leads to the question of whether sexual minorities can achieve justice based on the self-realization alone, or if Honneth’s three spheres are simply designed for a certain amount of relief in the otherwise all consuming struggle for recognition.

As formerly explained, Honneth’s theory addresses recognition through a set of self- realizing spheres, which are designed to ensure a holistic approach, which encaptures what he considers to be the necessity for people to feel recognized. A breach in this theory; an unfulfilled sphere, will lead to a distorted image of self. What happens then, Honneth explains, is that “the experience of being socially denigrated or humiliated endangers the identity of human beings, just as infection with a disease endangers their physical life" (Honneth, 1996, pg. 135). In other words, the lack of positive and rightful recognition is a hindrance for a healthy life for all humans, in fact, such an absence in simply right out dangerous for our mental health.

The focus on mental health is an issue that is finally reaching a point in time where it is getting its much-awaited attention, in both healthcare and politics. Whereas this was close to a non-issue in the past, it has proven to be an aspect of human health, which we have come to know, is as essential to keep in good condition as our physical health. To summarize, Honneth's theory considers the lack of recognition to be discriminatory and simply unfair due to the damage it causes the self- confidence, self- respect, and the self- esteem for individuals and for groups of people.

According to Honneth we all need recognition on a variety of levels, via the three spheres, in order to live a good life. However, as I mentioned above, this only seems to be infallible to the degree in which it provides a 'relief' and not an unerring solution. The reason to my claim is that Honneth seems to leave it to each and every one for themselves to decide what within their identity ought to be recognized in interaction with other people. Without an objective foundation of what are just groundings for recognition, all people are free to claim recognition for whatever they find to be of most importance for themselves. In turn, since Honneth does call attention to the point of recognition as a reciprocal practice, people can and probably will not grant recognition for other people where they do not think it is due. To illustrate, imagine those people who believe they are worthy of certain rights and that others are not worthy of any rights based on the color of their skin. Should racists be able to claim recognition to ensure a healthy identity image, confirming their views of themselves and the world? Or what about those who believe that women are inferior to men and should only stay inside the home taking care of children? Do male chauvinists deserve to be recognized on the same level as everyone else? And if so, how do we co-exist in a society where people feel entitled to different legal recognition and social esteem? These are potential complications Honneth fails to address, and also what leads to my doubt concerning what seems to be his disregard for justice. With interest in the identity imagery for sexual minorities this compels us look beyond Honneth's theory, and in this case, look at the matter in the light of Nancy Fraser's recognition theory.

3.3 The Case of Conversion Therapy through Fraser's Juxtaposition of Recognition and Redistribution

Fraser's theory adds the scope of distribution to the discussion, which gives us a wider perspective on the question of recognition. For not only will non-heterosexualism viewed as a disorder distort the self- image, self- respect and self- esteem for LGBTQ+ people, but it will also prevent the case of parity of participation, which is at the core of Fraser's theory. The obvious reason for this is the case where adolescents are taken out of school to partake in the therapy program, which can take anything from weeks to months, and in some cases years. By missing out on school the therapy participants will experience gaps in their education and in the social scene, not to mention the social stigma they might experience if or when people find out about their situation. For many young people holes in their education can be destructive to the degree that they do not recover from it and end up falling out of the educational system, which leaves them with very few job opportunities, low self- esteem, and quite possibly feelings of resentment and bitterness.

In the social scene, it is rarely unnoticeable or unproblematic for adolescents to be taken out of school for longer periods of time and then try to return and fall back into the social environment without a struggle, whether it be due to illness, family issues or gay conversion therapy. This leaves the person in question with a number of disadvantages, and to the level, I believe Fraser would argue, that it deprives them from participating on an equal level to those who have not been taken out of school to partake in gay conversion therapy.

However, the disparity of participation is not only the case for adolescents who have been taken out of school, although that is the obvious example. I would argue that there is also a disparity for adults who are urged to undergo gay conversion therapy. While there is no destructive gap in the social development like there might be with younger people, there is definitely a disturbance in any job situation and therefore a gap in income. And again, the damage of stigma is present in any case where it comes out that one has partaken in gay conversion therapy. People believe in the therapy and then judge the person for being gay or having non-heterosexual feelings, or people either accept the non-heterosexual lifestyle but then judge the therapy the person has been submitted to or pity them for it. Either way, if the person is open about what they are enduring, there will be some sort of negative feedback on both sides of the argument.

There is also the alternative of not being open about what one is dealing with, which leaves the person in question in a situation where they have to cover up and lie about their whereabouts for the period of time they were in conversion therapy, or they have to keep their feelings about the therapy to themselves. Again, there is a situation of disparity of participation in the fact that this person has to cover up and avoid speaking the truth, and in turn, not being able to fully be themselves. Being in therapy with the goal of being converted into a heterosexual can also bring about a disparity of participation in terms of romantic relationships and love. If you are being told that your attraction to a person of the same sex is wrong, but can be fixed, you will likely put off ideas of allowing yourself to enter a partnership or creating a family.

The examples presented in the text above is of a seemingly practical character. Nonetheless, there are side-effects to the existence of conversion therapy which goes beyond just the practical scope of things. If we remove the practical aspect from the equation, we are left with the intention of changing a central part of a person's self. Similarly to interrupting someone's course of education by taking them out of school for conversion therapy, is the interruption of a person's identity development by disrupting their self-image. Being able to participate on any arena- social or political- has to imply that that such participation is being practiced by free individuals. If a person is not free to be themselves, they are not free to participate on an equal level as everyone else, and consequently, there is no notion of parity of participation.

3.4 Summary

Although Fraser and Honneth seem to agree on the case of recognition and redistribution being highly important political measures, they diverge when it comes to the matter of analyzing and reconstructing the normative claim for recognition, and where such claim ought to be placed in the scope of critical theory. As we have seen, Honneth's model for recognition theory is based on self-realization and the problematic consequences, as well as the destruction of identity image, when there is a lack of recognition that hinders individuals and groups from experiencing self-confidence, self-esteem, and self-respect. Fraser, on the other hand, has based her recognition model on the practice of institutionalized systems that keep individuals and groups from participating in their society on an equal level to everybody else.

As pointed out above, in Honneth's theory, there is an absence of an objective statute of what are justifiable claims for recognition, and therefore recognition is solely based on individuals personal experiences. This seems to be a problem to Fraser as well, who specifies in the status model that in order to claim recognition as a matter of justice, there needs to be legitimate precedence of requirement fairness that is integrated in institutions and not in intersubjective relationships or cultures (Fraser, 2003. pg. 224). As Fraser puts it, "Only by looking to integrate approaches that unite redistribution and recognition can we meet the requirements of justice for all" (Fraser, 2003, pg. 94). In summary, Fraser calls for a means of measurement that gives a universal overview of what people can demand in terms of recognition. For Fraser, this point of fairness is based on parity of participation. All people need to be able to have the same chance to part take on social and political platforms as free people.

What we have seen in the case of conversion therapy is a gross misrecognition, which hinders the notion of parity of participation, and at the same time it distorts the process of self- realization which Honneth claims is fundamental to the development of a healthy identity image.

Section 3

In this section, I will discuss the history leading up to pride, the meaning and outcomes of the pride parade, as well as the support of minority stress theory in accordance with sexual minorities.

4. The Historical Development of the Pride Demonstration and Celebration

> *Gay propaganda from the 1950's is characterized by what might be called the pale of respectable society, but 'a creature who bleeds when he is cut, and who must breathe oxygen in order to live*

- (Harris in Sullivan, 2003, pg. 23)

4.1 The Founding Ideas Which Lead to the Development of the Pride Celebration

Carl Heinrich Ulrichs, a German lawyer, published several texts in the timeframe of 1864 to 1879, where he defended homosexuality as natural and claimed that therefore it could not be a sin or a criminal act. Being a homosexual himself, he claimed that sexual preference was congenital- "a kind of interior androgyny, a hermaphroditism of the soul" (Ulrichs in Sullivan, 2003, Pg. 4), which is what we today usually would consider to be more of a heterosexual woman in a man's body [transgenderism], rather than homosexuality. However, Ulrichs argued that

> the Urning [a 'feminine' male who is sexually drawn to men] who satisfies his sexual drive with another male is behaving as naturally and thus as appropriately as the Dioning [a heterosexual man] who satisfies his sexual drive with a woman. (Ulrichs in Sullivan, 2003, Pg. 5-6)

Ulrichs used this argument to demonstrate that same sex love was just as natural as heterosexual love, and therefore should not be considered a crime. He writes:

> You cannot study fish by comparing them to birds or vice versa, because they belong to different species… This prosecution {of Uranian love} is as senseless as...punishing hens for laying eggs instead of chicks, or cows for bearing calves instead of laying eggs. The current day persecution of {Uranian} love is just as foolish as the persecution of heresy and witchcraft. It, too, was unsuccessful. You can drive nature out with a pitchfork, but it will always return! (Ulrich in Sullivan, 2003, Pg. 6).

While there today are certain shortcomings to Ulrich´s theory in terms of gender roles and transgenderism, his writings did inspire many psychiatrists, lawyers, sexologists etc. in the years to come. One of them was German- Austrian psychologist Richard von Krafft-Ebing, whose research on sexuality and sexual pathology was mostly based on forensic psychiatry. Although his most important work, *the Psychotahia Sexualis* from 1886, was a medical project written mainly for doctors, he did influence the legal aspects of homosexuality as well. Krafft-Ebbing agreed with Ulrichs in that homosexuality was congenital. However, he believed such sexuality to be a sign of unfinished development and therefore, he argued, it should be considered to be a disease, and not a crime (Sullivan, 2003, Pg. 7). Ulrich's attempt to normalize homosexuality was thus used as an argument against the positive recognition of LGBT people, by Krafft-Ebbing agreeing with the aspect of it being natural, but adding that it was a natural deformity.

In 1897 in Berlin, Germany, Magnus Hirschfield founded the world's first homosexual rights organization, the Scientific- Humanitarian Committee. The committee had as its goal to repeal the German sodomy statute, which stated that sexual relations between two males was criminal, and to educate people on issues concerning same-sex relations (Sullivan, 2003, pg.12). Although the organization was dissolved by the Nazis in 1933, Hirschfield continued his work with great success and stood his ground throughout his career, claiming that attempts to cure homosexuality were pointless and misguided. What he did promote instead of a cure for homosexuality was a so called 'adjustment therapy' in which "homosexuals would come to accept, embrace and perhaps even celebrate their sexuality" (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 12). In a sense, then, Sullivan says, "Hirschfield's works could be said to be central to the development of what in the mid-late twentieth century came to be known as gay pride" (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 12).

Although we often refer to the Stone Wall riot and the Gay Liberation Front as the first political movements for gay rights, the activism dates back a little bit further than that. In the U.S., such groups formed in the 1950s under the umbrella term of Homophile Movement. The groups most associated with this movement, Sullivan writes, are the Mattachine Society which was founded in 1951, and the Daughters of Bilitis, founded in 1955 (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 22). These groups' work was aimed at educating the masses, and tearing down the 'wall of disparity' between heterosexuals and homosexuals, in addition to advocating for civil rights. CAMP- Campaign Against Moral Persecution, founded in Australia in 1970 described their political agenda thus:

> As far as the wider society is concerned, we should concentrate on providing information, removing prejudice, ignorance and fear, stressing the ordinariness of homosexuality and

> generally reassuring and disarming those with hostile attitudes. Concerning homosexuals, we think a policy of development of confidence and lessening of feelings of isolation and guilt, where they exist, is vital. (Quote in Sullivan, 23).

Sullivan points out that these groups were what we today refer to as assimilationist groups, which means their aim was to be accepted into and absorbed by the mainstream culture. There is a central belief in a common humanity where both homosexuals and heterosexuals belong to the same extent in society. In essence, claims made by groups in the Homophile Movement were centered around the sameness of homosexuals and heterosexuals and not focused on differences. However, it is only by standing out and creating awareness, that one has a chance of becoming known enough to be part of the normality. This train of thought is something we still see is being practiced through the gay pride activism to this day. The importance of exposure for minority groups is essential in their struggle for recognition. It is undoubtedly a challenge to demand recognition from a society who merely seem to see you through preconception and animosity that has been presented to them. Similarly, it seems like it might be too much to ask of people to examine what is to them unknown. If a society is not familiar with sexual minorities and what they are about, it seems to be on the minority's shoulders to expose such information. That being settled, how the information shared by the minority group is being received is out of their hands, and this, I would argue, is where the battle for recognition takes place. I will come back to the importance of exposure in the chapter about Pride.

4.2 LGBTQ+ Assimilation Groups In the Early Process of Demanding Equal Rights

Assimilation groups and pride promoted sameness over difference and assimilationist strategies over revolutionary ones. The assimilation groups believe in a common humanity to which both homosexuals and heterosexuals belong and, in turn, their main goal was to become one with mainstream culture. The common ground between the minority of homosexuals and the heterosexual dominant group, they believed, was the fact that they were all human beings despite "differences in secondary characteristics such as the gender of our sexual object choices" (Sullivan, 2003, pg.23), and that such common ground should be the basis of equal treatment and respect. In summary, the idea was that tolerance could be achieved "by making differences invisible, or at least secondary, in and through an essentializing, normalizing, emphasis on sameness" (Sullivan, 2003, pg.23).

The assimilation groups approached homosexuality as a notion of nature in that they stressed that it was matter of congenitality. Accordingly, sexual preference as a matter of nature and not choice comes with benefits, such as the perspective of natural as in ‘supposed to be’, and disadvantages, such as it being used in the perspective of ‘born with sickness and in need of help’. While promoting a theory that renders them in a category of helplessness, it also leaves it to the opposing party to call for such biological anomaly as subject to treatment, again leaving sexual minorities in the ‘sickness category’. It is; understandably, quite clear that by equating homosexuality with biology, assimilation groups exposed themselves to criticism due to their consequential welcoming of the normalizing imperative of medical discourses and discursive practices, as discussed. This is not to say that assimilation groups endorsed such practices, in fact groups like the Mattachine Society and CAMP Inc. spoke out and protested against gay conversion therapy and other inhumane attempts to cure sexual preferences (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 23).

Another area where the assimilation groups received a good amount of criticism was their commonly held belief in that the private and public sphere were two distinct matters, and so should sexuality be. Thus, they believed homosexuality to be a private matter, which had no place in politics. What seems to have been the intention was their desire to avoid statutory injunction of homosexual relationships. However, by proposing that the legal sphere is to have no interaction with the private sphere opens up to the depoliticizing of other private affairs that might need public protection. Many have argued that completely separating the legal and private sphere allows for, for example, rape in marriage, domestic violence and honor killing to go undetected (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 24-25). Not only is this an area of concern for the assimilation rhetoric, but this is also a breaking point between recognition politics and liberal justice theory.

The discussion of the relationship between the public and private is one that often comes up in regard to minorities, sexuality, gender, and feminism; all topics that are not far apart in terms of politics of recognition.

Fraser claims that viewing recognition as a matter of justice is to treat it like an issue of social status. By this, she means that institutionalized patterns and cultural values are what affect the social standing and means of justice for people. Thus, when we experience misrecognition or a lack of recognition it is due to social patterns. For Fraser, as mentioned earlier, recognition is a matter of justice, and not self- realization. Therefore, the matter of sexuality might seem like it is also a matter of private concern and detached from public concern, as long as there are laws in order to allow homosexuals to participate on an equal level to heterosexuals. However, this is not necessarily a point in Fraser's theory where she fails to accommodate justice within the four walls, as much as it is a matter that forces us to be specific about the what the basis of participation should and must look like to ensure justice in the private sphere as well as in the public sphere. As already established, justice, to Fraser, is a matter of institutionalized patterns, thus it belongs to the public sphere. However, as we examined in the case of conversion therapy, misrecognition happening within the private sphere restricts sexual minorities from parity of participation.

As long as there is what Fraser refers to as *despised sexuality*, a stigma surrounding non-heterosexualism, making them a subject to a sexual form of status subordination, there will clearly be injustice in the private sphere (Fraser, 2003, pg. 18). The remedy for such forms of injustice, Fraser claims, is to shift the focus from redistribution to recognition:

> change the relations of recognition, that is, and the maldistribution will disappear. In general then, overcoming homophobia and heterosexism requires changing the sexual status order, deinstitutionalizing heteronormative status patterns and replacing them with patterns that express equal respect for gays and lesbians (Fraser, 2003, pg. 19).

Again, Fraser illustrates a case of how a two-dimensionally subordinated group of people need both redistribution and recognition in order to regulate the differences experienced in the private and public sphere.

Honneth, I would argue, provides us with a more straightforward approach to the issue of the private versus the public. By seeing injustices solely as a matter of misrecognition, and by creating the three spheres [love, state, social] of recognition to ensure a complete sense of self, he also paints a clear picture of how the two [private and public] are intertwined beyond the possibility of separation in a western democratic society.

Despite much resistance and criticism, there is no denying that the assimilation approach to making sexual minorities part of the larger society had a significant impact in the LGBTQ+'s fight for recognition in the years to come- years which would be severely reformed by the infamous Stonewall riots. Although Stonewall, by many, is often referred to as a myth, due to the numerous variations of stories about what really happened that night on the 28th of June, 1969, Sullivan writes that "the Stonewall riots are often posited as the founding movement of the inauguration of the Gay [and Lesbian] Liberation movement, and the associated death of the homophile movement" (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 26). I will talk more about the Stonewall riots in the sections to come, as it is central to the recognition aspect. However, I will not go into detail about the event, as I believe that would be a divergence from the main topic of this thesis.

4.3 The 'New Left' Movement in the 1970s Calling for Equal Rights and Liberal Policies

> *Liberation for gay people is to define for ourselves how and with whom we live, instead of measuring our relationships by straight values… To be a free territory, we must govern ourselves, set up our own institutions, defend ourselves, and use our own energies to improve our lives*" .

- Quote from Carl Wittman's account of Gay Liberation in Refugees from *America: A Gay Manifesto* (1970) (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 29).

The 1960s and the 1970s was a time of emergence of leftist, radical political movements and opposition groups which made their marks on the socio-political map. The Stonewall riots 1969 was the beginning of a new era for the LGBTQ+ community in the West.
Amongst political groups such as those who fought for anti-war sentiments, women's rights, black power groups, and especially political student groups, there was also the gay liberation movement- a movement which blossomed in the aftermaths of the Stonewall riots. These groups are what one could consider to be the 'New Left', and what they seem to have had as their common denominator was their shift away from assimilation attitude and their demand for legal reforms (Sullivan, 2003, p. 29).

For the 'new left', the liberationists, it was a goal to turn the status and position of homosexuality into something positive and resourceful rather than the standard idea of homosexuality as a biological accident and something one should have to defend or apologize for. In order for such a change in attitude towards homosexuality to come about there needed to be a significant shift in institutions, communities and belief systems. Gay rights activist pioneer, Dennis Altman said that "gay liberation...is concerned with the assertion and creation of a new sense of identity, one based on pride in being gay" (Altman in Sullivan, 2003, pg. 29). Thus, the liberationist approach is clearly a rebuttal to the image of sexual minorities as something of which to be ashamed.

Similarly, to how the assimilation approach to homosexuality as a congenital matter received criticism due to the possible portrayal of homosexuals as helpless of their nature, victims of sickness etc., the liberation approach did not go without denunciation. As the liberationists attempted to replace the understanding of homosexuality as congenital with the notion of choice, they opened up to a logic that gave homophobes and religious moralists "an ideological loophole they needed to attack a segment of the population once protected by the mawkish, if effective, rhetoric of powerlessness" (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 30). When analyzing the liberationist approach and history, it is not difficult to understand the intention behind the plan to replace homosexuality as a matter of nature with the idea of homosexuality as a matter of choice. With the goal of turning their [homosexuals´] status around from a place of sickness and helplessness to a pace of pride and strength, it seems reasonable to want to escape the role of victims. By exterminating the notion of congenitality, which implied that homosexuality was a flaw by nature, they wanted to destroy the image of homosexuals as powerless over their own status in society. In turn, what they did wish to do was to promote the strength of character and pride connected to the LGBTQ+ lifestyle.

The question of the nature of homosexuality, has been, as established in this chapter, central to the development of the LGBTQ+ community, and still is today. However, as far as Fraser is concerned, this is not a question of justice and therefore not a vital part of the discussion. Nonetheless, whether homosexuality is a matter of congenitality or not, it is a matter participation and therefore well within Fraser's platform of interest. After all, the Stonewall riots happened because homosexuals were kept from participating in the social scene. They were not allowed to dance with members of the same sex, dress in clothes meant for a different gender than the one assigned at birth, let alone show affection for members of the same sex. By not being allowed to participate in society as a free and autonomous agent, who does not interfere with other's business and who does not keep others from exercising their freedom, the case of keeping homosexuals from exercising their freedom as sexual beings, like heterosexuals are allowed to, is a matter of Fraser's take on injustice.

Honneth's theory, on the other hand, has a more overt approach. He suggests that

> key forms of exclusion, insult, and degradation can be seen as violating self-confidence, self-respect, or self- esteem, the negative emotional reactions generated by these experiences of disrespect provide a pre- theoretical basis for social critique. (Anderson in Honneth, 1995, pg. xix).

In other words, he believes injustice can be traced back to our experiences of social interaction. What we see here then, although not in the most obvious manner, is that Honneth and Fraser reaches an agreement on some level.

4.4 The Case of 'Coming Out of the Closet' for LGBTQ+ as a Demand for Recognition

Associated with the liberationist rhetoric of pride and strength, was the feat of 'coming out'. By declaring non-heterosexualism as a choice, and a brave one at that, the New Left played a central part in paving the way for 'closeted' homosexuals [and lesbians] to come out and be open about their sexuality.

In *A Critical Introduction to Queer Theory* there is a quote from an Australian gay liberation newsletter, *Gay Pride Week News* (1976):

> We believe that it is so important to remind everyone that you are a homosexual- COMING OUT- for yourself so you won't be subjected to anti-homosexual acts against yourself, and so other homosexuals who haven't come-out or are not confident of their homosexuality can realize other people are homosexuals and that they enjoy it" (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 31).

The matter of coming out to the public as a non-heterosexual person brings about both benefits and disadvantages.

On the one hand the exposure will generate a considerable amount of attention if one lives in a society where being queer is unusual. In the 1970's in the United States coming out as a homosexual or as a lesbian would undoubtedly cause a significant increase in attention due to the hetero- conformative status of the society. As this was indeed a time and place of very little recognition of sexual minorities, the attention directed towards those who came out and lived openly as non-heterosexual was rarely of a positive or supportive nature. In fact, since there was already this idea of homosexuality as a disease or, if chosen, an intentional deviance from the norm, many people despised those who came out and who were proud when they, in many people's opinion, ought to be ashamed. However, as mentioned, there were also benefits to coming out of the 'closet'.

The whole concept of coming out was based on the idea of fundamental liberation which Altman defined as "freedom from the surplus repression that prevents us from recognizing our essential androgynous and erotic natures" (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 31). In other words, the idea was based on the negative consequences of living a suppressed life, which in turn presupposes that the action of coming out is in itself transformative (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 31). As Altman stated, being openly gay would free homosexuals from anti-homosexual act against oneself, and allow one to enjoy being true to oneself. For most people who are vaguely familiar with the history of sexual minorities, or involved with the status quo of sexual minorities today, the idea of 'solving' an identity crisis by coming out of the closet is both naïve and somewhat untrue. This is not to say that being openly gay is not better for one's wellbeing than being closeted, but, as illustrated in this paper; there are many problematic layers to being an openly non-heterosexual person. This is, however, not a discussion of pros and cons of being openly gay, but rather an attempt to highlight the rhetoric that preceded what came to be the pride parade.

For those who decided to 'come out of the closet' and live as an openly gay or who were open about their gender dysphoria, work life and personal economy in many cases became a struggle, due to discriminative rules and policies in most workplaces, or rather, a lack of rules and policies which would protect all people. For example,

> LGBT individuals lived in a kind of urban subculture and were routinely subjected to harassment and persecution, such as in bars and restaurants. In fact, gay men and women in New York City could not be served alcohol in public due to liquor laws that considered the gathering of homosexuals to be "disorderly." until 1966

The disparity of participation in the nightlife scene was apparent,

> In fear of being shut down by authorities, bartenders would deny drinks to patrons suspected of being gay or kick them out altogether; others would serve them drinks but force them to sit facing away from other customers to prevent them from socializing (History.com, 2019).

Furthermore, members of the LGBTQ+ community were exposed to extreme amounts of psychological and physiological violence. Beatings of homosexuals, for example, was quite common and neither disapproved or frowned upon by law enforcement at the time. In fact, a lot of the police brutality back in the day was aimed at the queer community. Similarly, the emotional persecution of LGBTQ+ was in many places so common that it was considered to be common sense, rather than harassment. The real crime in this, some would say, is in fact not the beating in itself, nor foul words, but the overall lack of due respect and positive recognition.

A fundamental part of the ‘coming out movement’ was that it was not only focused on the freedom of sexual minorities but on the freedom of all people:

> ...liberationists believed that in order to achieve sexual, and political freedom, it was necessary to revolutionize society in and through the eradication of traditional notions of gender and sexuality and the kinds of institutions that informed them and were informed by them (Reynolds in Sullivan, 2003, pg. 31)

They led the movement into an era of activism that focused on inclusion and equality for all. At this point, I would like to highlight that there are plenty of shortcomings and weak points in the ‘equality for all’ chapter for gay pride history, most of which are the topic of many past and current debates. There are obvious discrepancies in the treatment and inclusion of people of color, women, disabled people and trans-people, which ought to be brought to attention. Those are groups of people who do not necessarily identify with this specific exposition of pride, as their experiences often are polluted by external factors beyond the issue of homophobia in politics and culture. However, I will not be addressing the problems of such topics in this paper, as the scope of this assignment is limited.

4.5 Intersubjetive Realtions in the Eyes of Post-Structuralism

Going back to the Hegelian tradition of developing the self, there are several similarities between Honneth's theory of recognition and the theme throughout gay pride parade. Sullivan points out that the

> focus on difference both between and within subjects necessarily involves a critique of, and challenge to, the humanist notion of the subject as a unique, unified, rational , autonomous individual whose relations with others are secondary and whose desires and actions are transparent to him or herself. For post- structuralist theorists there is no true self that exists prior to its immersion in culture (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 40-41).

Evidently, there is the idea of the self as constructed through relations with people and with systems, as we presents with in the chapter about Honneth’s theory.

Post- structuralist theorists are most often concerned with analyzing and deconstructing the differences between people and within the structure of cultural systems. Michel Foucault, a post-structuralist thinker, has claimed that “there are no objective and universal truths, but that particular forms of knowledge, and the ways of being that they engender, become ‘naturalized’, in culturally and historically specific ways” (Sullivan, 2003, pg. 39). Following this train of thought, the debate about recognizing sexualities outside the narrow scope of heterosexualism, puts the question of justice in a different and brighter light. If there is no objective, truth that can grant heterosexualism and cisgenderism as the sole blueprint of sexuality, it naturally follows that there is no objective truth to the claim that non-heterosexualism and transgenderism are of an illegitimate or less valuable rank. In short, Sullivan says, “Heterosexuality, as it is currently understood and experienced, is a truth-effect of systems of power/knowledge” (Sullivan, 2003, pg.39). By saying this, she is also directing us to the point of culture and power- driven truth as a subject to change. Thus, according to post-structuralist theory, changes in society and culture might also mean changes in the power rankings of different sexualities.

Another philosopher who has pitched in on the idea of society- driven basis of gender construct is the renowned feminist thinker, Simone de Beauvoir. Although her discussions revolve around the ideas of the feminine versus the masculine, which is why her philosophy is not heavily relied on in this paper, it is worth highlighting the correspondence to both post-structuralism, as well as to recognition theory and redistributive politics as presented by Honneth and Fraser. Beauvoir claims that “humanity is something more than a mere species: it is a historical development; it is to be defined by the manner in which it deals with its natural, fixed characteristics, its *facticité*” (Simone in Feminist theory, 83). Beauvoir is referring to an individual’s freedom and lack of freedom. Because we are born into established economic and historical systems and cultural structures, and fixed relational situations, we are on some level unfree. The framework of social systems we are born into plays a central part in laying out our choices and our limits in life.

In the book *Filosofiens Annet Kjønn* (*The Second Sex of Philosophy*’) Tove Pettersen states that such situation, of being born into a fixed social framework, is “with its patriarchal ideology influencing how we perceive and think about the world, and what goals we set for ourselves and others” (Pettersen, 2011, pg. 95). Pettersen, when dissertating de Beauvoir’s *Second Sex*, points to the argument that it is the people, and not the nature, that is responsible for the differences applied to genders and sexuality in our culture. This is a vital point for the LGBTQ+ community, because, with the argument of sexuality bias as a matter of anthropogeny, it logically follows that only humans can invalidate such predisposition. With the knowledge of our own sense of power, should we not be asking what we ought to do with it?

Moreover, in addressing the question of ethics, Pettersen brings forward the notion of freedom. In *The Second Sex* we are presented with the notion of freedom which entails the freedom of consciousness, and the notion of freedom which hinges on situation, political rights and economy. Given the idea of considering human freedom as a basic good, one must also apply to freedom the highest form of normative value, which means that we are compelled to consider our freedom, as well as other people's freedom when we act (Pettersen, 97). Pettersen states,

> Those who suppress and harm others, limit other people's freedoms, and those who allows themselves to be suppressed, limit their own freedom. Neither the suppressor or the suppressed has moral freedom (Pettersen, 97). [2]

This quote seems to overlap well with the theories of both Fraser and Honneth. On the one hand, there is the notion of parity of participation in the idea of not being or allowing oneself to be suppressed by others. If one's freedom is being restricted one is also prevented from participating on an equal level as those who are free. On the other hand, there is the notion that by discriminating or otherwise hurting other people, one is also distorting their image of identity, which in turn is a restriction of their freedom.

> In the second sex Beauvoir suggests that freedom and liberation is not simply an abstract ideal for far-flung liberation movements or in wide- extending ethics, but that freedom is of individual meaning to every human being in their specific situation in life. (Pettersen, 98).[3]

Beauvoir claims that there is no godly or natural predisposition of what a human being is supposed to be like or what they are supposed to do. Because she believes that all humans have to create their own idea of what they want to do and who they want to be, and decide what is meaningful to them, her theory consequently becomes an opponent to the oppression of the LGBTQ+ community today. According to Beauvoir, people who live in a state of oppression,

[2] Original text: "Den som undertrykker og skader andre, begrenser andres frihet, og den som underlegger seg andre, innskrenker sin egen frihet. Verken den som undertrykker eller den som lar seg undertrykke, har moralsk frihet" (Pettersen, 97)

[3]Original text: "I *det annet kjønn* viser Beauvoir at frihet og frigjøring ikke bare er et abstrakt ideal for fjerne frigjøringsbevegelser eller i en livsfjern etikk, men at frihet er av individuell betydning for eneste menneske i dets konkrete livssituasjon" (Pettersen, 98)

whether it be due to violence, poverty, the lack of rights etc., are in a mode of immanence, meaning that there is an absence of control, choice and freedom. To live in a state of immanence is

> is something that contributes to make people foreign in their world, isolate them and make it lonely without genuine possibilities to complete themselves… Because it is by utilizing our freedom to engage in a common human world that we can establish meaning and content in our lives, a severe restriction of freedom constitutes a dehumanization[4] (Pettersen, 98).

4.6 Summary

The picture painted of homosexuality and people's and society's way of viewing it, has been a subject which has brought about much confusion, despair, strange conceptions of reality as well as questioning methods of labeling individuals. The representations of homosexuality over time, not to mention the legal and the medical practices that has been engendered gave rise to numerous civil rights groups the Mattachine Society, the Daughters of Billitis, the Gay Liberation Front, and more. The political activism of such groups contributed greatly to the fight for equal rights for the LGBTQ+ community. Although the approaches to the nature of homosexuality varied between political groups and with time, they all acted on the basis of external misrecognition.

The case of 'coming out of the closet' did over time become a coined term to describe non-heterosexuals who decided to be open about their sexuality. Despite extreme misrecognition from society, the LGBTQ+ community promoted the sense of pride in homosexuality, which was a key factor for the movement in the 1970s, and it still is today.

The intersubjective correspondence between interaction and identity is one confirmed by post-structuralist philosophy as a vital part of developing a sense of self. According to post-structuralism, there is no objective truth that scores heterosexualism and cisgenderism as the one

[4] Original text: "noe som bidrar til å gjøre mennesket fremmed i verden, gjøre det isolert og ensomt uten reelle muligheter til å realisere seg selv...Siden det er gjennom å bruke vår frihet til å engasjere oss i en fellesmenneskelig verden vi skaper mening og innhold i våre liv, utgjør en vesentlig innskrenkning av frihet en dehumanisering. (Pettersen, 98)

answer to sexuality. Accordingly, there is also objective truth to the idea of homosexuality as a form of deviance.

5. The Pride Celebration As Developed from Demonstration to Celebration

"Gilbert Baker, an artist and gay rights activist, to create an emblem that represents the movement and would be seen as a symbol of pride. Baker designed and stitched together the first rainbow flag, which he unveiled at a pride parade in 1978. The following year, in 1979, more than 100,000 people took part in the first National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights" (History.com, 2009).

5.1 The Starting Point of Pride as a National and International Tradition

As mentioned earlier in the text, the Stonewall riots in New York City, is broadly considered the catalyst of what would eventually turn into the demonstration and celebration we know as the gay pride parade today. The Stonewall Inn was a mafia driven gay bar in the Greenwich Village neighbourhood in Manhattan, New York, known as one of the very few establishment who catered to gays, lesbians, drag queens and trans people in the 1950's and the 1960's. Although the sources are many and the stories of Stonewall of an even bigger number, the main storyline is that the riots started after a police raid. It was common at the time for the police to raid gay bars and arrest those who either took part in same sex sexual activity or wore clothes originally made for the opposite gender. That night, on the 28th of June, the police supposedly made some quite violent arrests at the Stonewall Inn. Albeit not an unusual event, this was purportedly the tipping point for the LGBTQ+ community who frequented Stonewall, and they fought back. The fight turned into a week long riot and marked the beginning of a battle for safety, respect and rights which is still ongoing to this day.

A year after the riots at Stonewall, in 1970, New York City community members marched through local streets in commemoration of the event. The march was called Christopher Street Liberation Day, and is considered to be the first gay pride parade. In the years to follow, annual walks were organized in other big American cities as well, and eventually the pride parade has turned into more or less of a worldwide gay rights activist phenomenon (Holland, 2017).

Considering the fact that the 1970's was a time of little to no legal nor status recognition for LGBTQ+ people, the early gay pride parades were a first and foremost demonstrations calling for rights to be in same sex relationships and to not be the subject of discrimination and police brutality. Compared to the gay pride parades we see today, those demonstrations did not have musical floats and dancers in sequined bikinis and feathers. Instead, they had signs and megaphones, similar to what we often think of as regular political demonstrations. The reason I mention this is not for the visual effect, but to point out that the difference in appearance from the beginning until present day, I would argue, lies not in the graphics but in the underlying level of confidence.

5.2 The Present Case of Pride

L. Craig Schoonmaker was part of the Christopher Street Liberation Day March planning committee. In a 2015 interview with *The Allusionist* he discussed pride rhetoric:

> When they were looking for a slogan for the event, it was Schoonmaker that suggested "Pride." The idea of "Gay Power" was thrown around, but Schoonmaker said gay individuals lacked real power to make change, but one thing they did have was pride"

He went on to explain that "a lot of people were very repressed, they were conflicted internally, and didn't know how to come out and be proud. That's how the movement was most useful, because they thought, 'Maybe I should be proud.'" (Holland, 2017).

This shows that the gay pride parade was not simply an attempt to be liberated from violence and discrimination, but also a battle for recognition. Repression is not turned around by a recantation of discrimination.

There is also the issue of status. The official chant for the march became, *Say it loud, gay is proud*, which was a manifest of both problem and solution. Not only was it a cry for LGBTQ+ people to fight against the shame and abnormality they were indoctrinated to feel, but it was also incitement for everyone to make people listen and for those who had been silenced to take up space.

Compared to other political movements and other political demonstrations, the pride parade stands out in the way it conveys their message. By focusing on pride, as in 'proudness', they are aiming the attention on themselves rather than projecting their agenda onto the society around them. There are several reasons why I find this not only to be original and effectful, but also a winning recipe for political activism.

5.2.1 Peaceful Demonstration

First of all the pride parade is a peaceful demonstration. Even in the 1970's when it was generated by protests against police brutality and persecution, there was an underlying semblance of non-violence. Pride has over decades of protesting demonstrated that one can be angry and vulnerable without being aggressive and offensive. This is not to say that pride parades have not faced challenges and physical restrictions. In fact it is quite normal for protesters of the LGTBQ+ community to show up to pride events with megaphones and posters, shouting offensive slogans and trying to shame pride participants from being out and proud. While that in itself is a hindrance, there is also the more serious and dangerous aspect of pride being physically interrupted by protesters or by police force. In many countries, pride parades are illegal or frowned upon to the extent that they are being shut down. These scenarios are often of a violent character and many times they result in pride participants being injured or imprisoned. However, this is not a reflection of the pride parade, but rather a reflection of societal challenges and shortcomings.

5.2.2 Visibility

Secondly, by creating a pride parade, one which takes place on every continent on the planet, they have made themselves visible. Pride has definitely proved to be an effective way of introducing the LGBTQ+ community to a world that generally suffers from ignorance, preconception and xenophobia. Thus, by taking up space and by not staying silent they indirectly demand people to notice them. A dominating and problematic part of xenophobia is lack of knowledge. For many people the LGBTQ+ community is an exponent of hatred because they do not know very much about them or simply have not knowingly been in their presence. Arguably, the pride parade can come off as too intense as it does have a high 'in your face' factor to it. For some people this will be interpreted as blasphemy or indecency. However, many people who fear that the LGBTQ+ people are going to infiltrate their lives or affect cultural values etc. will see that the pride parade is not an attempt to take anything away from anyone, or to keep people from going about with their lives, it is simply an event by them and for them. If one can appreciate people demonstrating *for* themselves and not demonstrating *against* someone else, one should also be able to appreciate the visualization of the LGBTQ+ community.

5.2.3 Rights

Thirdly, it seems safe to argue that the LGBTQ+ community is not asking too much by demonstrating for their right to be in love, being in consensual relationships, working the same kinds of jobs as heterosexual people, and generally to feel as safe as everyone else in society. The demands called for by the LGBTQ+ community are not demands that surpasses the scope of equality. It is important to remember here, that the LGBTQ+ community is not in the business of becoming a subculture within the heteronormative culture, on the contrary, their quest is aimed at becoming conjoined with the norm; an equal part of the bigger picture. To illustrate, let us compare the LGBTQ+'s struggle for recognition with another type of minority: indigenous people.

In the UN Declaration of the rights of indigenous peoples from 2006 the General Assembly recognize and reaffirm "that indigenous individuals are entitled without discrimination to all human rights recognized in international law" while also recognizing "that the situation of indigenous peoples varies from region to region and from country to country" (UN, 2007,pg. 7). Furthermore, affirming that "all doctrines, policies and practices based on advocating superiority of people or individuals on the basis of national origin, racial, religious, ethnic or cultural differences are racist, scientifically false, legally invalid, morally condemnable and socially unjust" (UN, 2007, pg. 3). These demands seem fairly 'standard' in the sense that these are often the demands we refer to when talking about human rights. However, the key difference between the groups of indigenous people and the group of sexual minorities lies in the *different kind of recognition* they are seeking. In the case of indigenous peoples the goals is not necessarily equal rights, but specific rights that will ensure equal status, opportunities and quality of these peoples compared to those who are doing well in society

Both minorities are asking for a recognition that will resemble justice; however, these kinds of recognition are nothing alike. Unlike the group of indigenous people, the LGBTQ+ community has not been deprived of their own land, so therefore they cannot ask for any material atonement. They do not speak their own language, and they are not part of any native descend. The LGBTQ+ community never had anything in the first place that was specifically theirs, and therefore cannot ask for anything to be returned. Also, being non-heterosexual is not equivalent to being of a certain culture that is different from a heterosexual culture. Accordingly, the LGBTQ+ community is not asking for a separate set of rights, as the indigenous people can do - they are simply asking for the right to be a corresponding part of their own culture and for parity of participation.

5.2.4 Education and destigmatization

Fourthly, the pride parade is part of a process which aims to destigmatize and educate the masses. Over the years, the LGBTQ+ community has taken the opportunity to incorporate education into pride by creating a number of events in accordance with pride. Since the pride parade usually is set on a weekend, it is common for there to be arranged events that bring about attention and extend information in the week leading up to the parade. Many cities have what is known as pride park, which is an outdoor area with various booths where people from different organizations connected to the LGBTQ+ community hand out flyers and promotes knowledge through different mediums. Other cities also host events such as informational talks, panels, and debates on the topic of LGBTQ+ rights, health, politics, literature, art, relationships, education, etc. Most of the time these events are open to everyone, both non-heterosexuals and heterosexuals. In Oslo, the pride park attracts more and more people every year, and they have events for families, couples, youth, older people, heterosexual allies, etc.

5.3 Summary

Back in the 1970's the pride parades were less established, but even then the parade was also acting as a platform for educating the masses, with large numbers of signs and slogans that evolved around destigmatizing homosexuals and demystifying same sex love.
Pride´´ position in society matters. When people ask why they have to have a parade, this is it.

6. The LGBTQ+ Community Experiencing Minority Stress and the Lack of Justice

In the article *Prejudice, Social Stress, and Mental Health in Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations: Conceptual Issues and Research Evidence*, professor of clinical sociomedical sciences, Ilan H. Meyer examines external stress factors in correlation with mental health problems. As a result of examining research evidence on the prevalence of mental disorders in LGBTQ+ people, and using meta-analysis, he finds that LGBTQ+ people have a higher prevalence of mental disorder than heterosexual people do. Dr. Meyer describes the excess of prevalence of disorder by using a concept called *minority stress*, which portrays stigma, prejudice, and discrimination proponents of a hostile and stressful environment that causes mental health problems.

The concept of social stress suggests that conditions in the environment, not only personal events are sources of stress that may lead to mental and physical ill effects. Minority stress is a division of social stress that presupposes that individuals who experience excess stress are targeted due to their social, and often a minority position. Meyer reports that social comparison and symbolic interaction theorists consider social environment as a provider of meaning to people's world and of organization to their experiences. Thus, they say, "interactions with others are therefore crucial for the development of a sense of self and well-being" (Meyer, 2003). Drawing a line from the socio- psychological perspective to philosophical theory, this aligns well with the hegelian theory presented by both Taylor and Honneth; namely that we develop a sense of self through interaction with other people and through the feedback from our surroundings. One of Meyer's sources, C.H. Cooley, referred to other people, our sources of feedback, as 'the looking glass' of the self, which is to say that we see ourselves through the eyes of other people. Accordingly, it also means that we are not capable, at least not in all respects, to not accept and absorb other people's feedback as true mirroring. Similarly, Meyer says, "symbolic interaction theories thus suggest that negative regard from others leads to negative self-regard" (Meyer, 2003).

This, I would argue, brings about a great support to what L. Craig Schoonmaker said in the 2015 interview with The Allusionist, about the terrible self images amongst LGBTQ+ people. It also makes sense that the only way to achieve justice for sexual minorities is to claim recognition. This is not to say that recognition alone will bring about the notion of justice. As already discussed, there is a fundamental requirement of parity of participation, as presented by Fraser.

However, by investigating the origins of gay pride parade and the rhetoric still employed today, it is quite apparent that above anything else is the call and necessity for recognition.

While there are various components to stress theory, most of which I do not have the opportunity to address in this thesis, there appears to be at least one unifying concept that is central to sexual minorities. Meyer addresses this as 'conflict' or 'mismatch between the individual and his or her experience of society as the essence of all social stress. If a sense of harmony with one's environment is the basis of healthy living; deprivation of such a sense of harmony may be considered the source of minority stress. (Meyer, 2003). As we learned from Honneth's theory of recognition, through the medium of spheres, the presence of positive feedback from one's surroundings is essential for respect for, confidence in, and image of oneself. In Honneth's view, all sorts of injustices can be explained by a lack of recognition through the spheres of love, state and society.

Although Honneth does not refer to the troublesome consequences of missing recognition as stress, it seems safe to assume that Meyer's take on stress is comparable to Honneth's discourse due to Meyer's focus on three significant conditions of minority stress:

> (a) unique—that is, minority stress is additive to general stressors that are experienced by all people, and therefore, stigmatized people are required an adaptation effort above that required of similar others who are not stigmatized;
> (b) chronic—that is, minority stress is related to relatively stable underlying social and cultural structures; and
> (c) socially based—that is, it stems from social processes, institutions, and structures beyond the individual rather than individual events or conditions that characterize general stressors or biological, genetic, or other non-social characteristics of the person or the group. (Meyer, 2003)

Part (a) is concerned with the uniqueness of the minority, which is the component that elevates the matter from stress to minority stress. In other words, the element that separates the minority from the majority of people is also what is cause extensive damage. For LGBTQ+ people the uniqueness is the non-heterosexual aspect. Furthermore, the stigmatization of non- heterosexual people is the causer of the stress, not the sexual orientation in itself- although that is often how it is portrayed. As long as there is a negative association with non-heterosexualism, whether it be the notion of blasphemy, sickness, perversion, sodomy, obscenity, etc., there will be a disharmony between the non-heterosexual individual and society. For example, high school is a stressful period for most young people. There is a lot of pressure to fit in, to be accepted, to have the right clothes, socialize with the ‘right’ people, take part in extracurricular activities, deal with hormones and puberty, all on top of having to attain a whole lot of new knowledge and achieve good grades. For most people, high school brings about high levels of stress. That being said, for those people who are outside the norm, in this case LGBTQ+ people, there will be additional stress in the fact that they are different from the norm and that their difference if a matter of stigmatization. In turn, high school will most likely be a source exceptional stress which consecutively will be damaging to the individual.

Part (b) is a matter of consistency in the sources of stress. More often than not stigmatization is a matter of commonly shared ideas rooted in and nourished through societal systems. By that I mean that stigmatization necessarily is an idea shared by the larger part of society, and cannot simply be ideas fronted by individuals. Although stigma is an inherent part of a culture, does not mean that it is permanent. It does, nonetheless, mean that such change is time consuming and a matter of cultural change and modification of social structures. Because of this, those who suffer under stigmatization due to their minority attachment, cannot expect their suffering to end. Their stress is consistent. For instance, there is still this idea today that romantic relationships ought to consist of a man and a woman. While many people have come to terms with the fact that there are other types of romantic relationships, such as same- sex relationships, non-heterosexuals in relationships must often answer to inherent heteronormative idealistic questions like “who the man is” in a lesbian relationship or “who the wife is” in a homosexual marriage. The question on its own might not seem like much trouble, however it does represent an ancient idealism that appears to not be going anywhere. And it is just this, the consistency of the matter, that creates the damaging stress for sexual minorities.

Part (c) pertains to the social structures beyond the individual, which characterize general stressors. As talked about earlier, the stigma centering around non-heterosexualism in religious environments is widespread and strongly embodied within sectarian culture in the U.S. This form of stigma has been established through decades and has proven to be such an integral part of the religious culture that they seem to protect even when legislations and modern culture move forward and attempt to break down such stigma.

This is also an important point to Fraser, who thinks the notion of measurement for recognition is not only for those who crave it, but also for those who are not aware they should have it, or perhaps, feel like they should not. As social structures often are incredibly well established, they also hold an enormous power in terms on influence. For many people, especially minorities and others in oppressed living situations, social structures might influence them to think that the way society is, is the way it ought to be.

The case of minority stress in form of uniqueness seems to be closely related to Fraser's take on hinderance from equal participation. The people of the LGBTQ+ community are experiencing all the stressors that heterosexual people experience. Furthermore, they also experience added stress that comes with being a LGBTQ+ person in a heteronormative society. Stressors based on not being able to be 'out of the closet' and not being able to be themselves either with family, with friends, or at work is definitely an added stress factor that LGBTQ+ people deal with. Other factors of stress, such as dealing with stereotypes, stigma and prejudice are also additional stress that comes with being a sexual minority. And perhaps, one of the greatest stress factor of them all, as discussed in detail in this thesis, the case of conversion therapy, which calling a stress factor is a gross understatement. The fact is that there are several additional stressors in the daily life of a non-heterosexual person, some which are obvious to the heterosexual eye, and some only non-heterosexuals experience in quiet.

The matter of minority stress being heavily institutionalized in society is one that overlaps with both Honneth's legal and social sphere, and with Fraser's focus on cultural structures. Honneth claims that as the individual takes part in an institutionalized form on interaction they expect to be recognized in accordance to the norms that constitute that specific form of interaction. For the legal sphere, then, the individual expects to be recognized as a free and rational agent, equal to anyone else in the eyes of the law. However, as the law does not protects LGBTQ+ citizens as it does heterosexual citizens, they are exposed to an extra layer of stress in terms of exposure to unequal legal treatment and in terms of safety. The social sphere is based on the individual gaining recognition through social status and how they contribute to society. In a society where LGBTQ+ people are struggling to get work; their sense of contribution is severely threatened. Furthermore, as long as there is stigma connected to anything LGBTQ+, escaping a lower status seems like stressor, way beyond the scope of what the heterosexual population faces today. Nancy Fraser and her theory on parity of participation corresponds, significantly, with all three sections of the minority stress model, because they all display a disparity of participation.

Tackling additional stress is, as previously discussed in the case of for example high school, a factor that I believe Fraser would categorize one that can easily keep people from taking part in several platforms of interaction. In addition, not being able to be ‘out of the closet’ is a disparity of participation of the most obvious forms, as those individuals cannot fully participate as themselves. Moving on to the matter of chronic state of minority stress, we find ourselves right in the heart of Fraser’s argument about looking to the social institutions and cultural structures for the basis of justice. Our sense of justice is often rooted in the institutionalized patters of our society. These patterns have been established over time and give the impression of being somewhat fixed or hard to rock. In the case on social institutions practicing discriminatory behavior, they also bring about the idea that such behavior is the norm, and that it will not change. For those who suffer under cultural patterns of discrimination, such as the LGBTQ+ community, there seems to be little to no hope for an abrogation of such culture. Having such consistent stress keeps individuals from taking part on social and political platforms.
However, the turnaround for many sexual minorities, or at least a bettering of the situation, is often found through the celebration of pride.

7. Conclusion

When I started working on this paper, my goal was to highlight the purpose and outcome of the gay pride parade as an activist measure to secure some sense of justice in a society that greatly suffers from inequality of status and funds.

The problems statement was as follows: It appears as if the LGTBQ+ community has taken it upon themselves to answer this question by creating, expanding and maintaining the gay pride parade. Have they found the ultimate solution to counteracting a discriminatory society by publicly achieving recognition on their own?

- How can recognition be understood as a means of justice in philosophical theory?
- Can misrecognition be a cause of injustice, and how so?
- How can the intersubjectivity of internal and external recognition in the pride celebration contribute to a more just society?

In order to provide the best possible answer I could think of, I decided to examine the philosophy of Axel Honneth and Nancy Fraser.

Honneth explained injustice as a lack of recognition. Through three spheres of recognition, the personal (love), legal (state), and social (solidarity) sphere, he claims to cover the need of recognition that, if met, will readjust the sense of injustice and bring about a sense of equality. Honneth has based his philosophy off of the Hegelian tradition of recognition theory, which explains his focus on recognition as a matter of self-realization rather that a matter of distribution of financial goods.

Fraser on the other hand believes recognition is a matter of justice, and not self- realization. Accordingly, her philosophy leans more toward a Kantian perspective of an equal basis for all. The key point Fraser is making is that there needs to be a universal measurement of recognition that creates what she refers to as the parity of participation. A parity of participation will ensure an equal opportunity to claim recognition and to take part in society.

To summarize the key differences, Honneth builds on the tradition where injustice can be traced to recognition, which is as a matter of self-realization, and Fraser believes there needs to be a merge of both redistribution and recognition, to best ensure justice. However, they both agree on the idea of participation and inclusion as vital components for justice, however, Honneth focuses on subjective experiences of discrimination, while Fraser focuses on institutions and cultural patterns.

The case of conversion therapy is an immense threat to the LGBTQ+ community, as it acts as a restriction of participation and promotes experiences of offense, both which are crucial elements of injustice. Conversion theory is a widespread concept in many western countries and mostly within the religious community. It's not a practice that has proven to be successful, on the contrary, it has proven to have negative and destructive effects on those who are exposed to it. In this paper I have argued that it is even destructive to those who are not subjected to it, simply due to its existence. In Norway the practice of conversion therapy is legal, and therefore an obstacle to the justice for people of the LGBTQ+ community. This is a very 'hot topic' these days as the proposal for its legality is being reconsidered in the parliament before the end of this year.

An important part to the understanding of pride, and its importance, is learning about its origin and development. By examining the history of rhetoric and medical aspects that lead up to what came to be a historical wave of political activism in the LGBTQ+ community, I believe I was able to highlight the contributions and pay offs from the pride parade. From the beginning, when pride was strictly a demonstration, and to this day, as it has, in most western countries, turned into a celebration; pride has been a platform of external and internal recognition. Internal, in the sense that it has been a place for LGBTQ+ people to feel proud and to value their own selves. It is a platform that promotes 'coming out' and so it promotes freedom for those who are living in the captivation of shame and fear. The external recognition is being highly exercised, as pride is primarily a demonstration for equal rights for sexual minorities. It is also a platform that invites society to take part in their celebration, by focusing on their own agenda and not projecting their grief and anger at society. By doing so, they create a space where people are made to feel welcome and to learn. Most pride parades are open for anyone who would like to attend. This, as shown in several parades over the years, has served as a unifying arena between the LGBTQ+ community and several representatives for the state, for political parties, and for organizations and businesses.

As I find the topic of recognition and sexual minorities extremely interesting, I would love to continue with my research. I believe an interesting direction to go would be to look at the case of 'backhanded recogntion', which, in the case LGBTQ+ is called 'pinkwashing'. Pinkwashing is the practice of a state or company presenting itself as gay-friendly, an LGBTQ+ ally, and politically progressive, in order to profit from it, whether it be monetarily or through gaining "humanitarian points" for their social status. In most western societies today it is often considered old-fashioned, conservative, or flat out xenophobic to not support the LGBTQ+ community; synonyms which are definitely bad for businesses. Especially damaging is it for businesses that attract a younger crowd, such as clothing companies, restaurants and hotel businesses, festivals, and, of course, within the beauty industry. What has increasingly played out over the past decade is companies' pursuit to associate with the LGBTQ+ community. This in itself is not problematic, as it provides a sense of recognition. However, many people question companies profiting on the back of an oppressed community, and whether there ought to be some sort of regulations on such profit. There seems to be a question, then, of where the line goes between recognition and appropriation. However, this is a question for another paper.

Reference

Ring, Trudy. (2016, October 26.) Expanding the Acronym: GLAAD Adds the Q to LGBT. Hentet 3.oktober, 2019 fra https://www.advocate.com/media/2016/10/26/expanding-acronym-glaad-adds-q-lgbt

Catalyst, Quick Take. (2019, June 17). Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Workplace Issues. Hentet 28. oktober, 2019 fra https://www.catalyst.org/research/lesbian-gay-bisexual-and-transgender-workplace-issues/

Channel 4 News (2019, January 21) *Gay conversion therapist' comes out: Exclusive interview* [videoklipp] Hentet fra *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pDME5MhRKyM*

Fraser, Nancy. (2008). *Scales of Justice, Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. UK/USA: Polity Press.

Fraser, Nancy. (2008). *Adding Insult to Injury- Nancy Fraser Debates Her Critics*. London: Verso.

Fraser, Nancy & Axel Honneth. (2003). *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. London: Verso.

GLAAS. (u.å). "Glossary of Terms - Lesbian / Gay / Bisexual / Queer." *GLAAD Media Reference Guide.* Hentet 3.oktober, 2019 fra *https://www.glaad.org/reference/lgbtq*

Haldeman D. (1999). Therapeutic Antidotes: Helping Gay and Bisexual Men Recover From Conversion Therapies. I A. Shidlo, M. Schroeder, & J. Drescher (Eds.), *Sexual Conversion Therapy: Ethical, Clinical and Research Perspectives*, Volume 5, 2001. New York: Hawthorne Medical Press.

History.com Editors. (2009, October 29). March on Washington. *HISTORY.* A&E Television Networks. Hentet 14. oktober fra https://www.history.com/topics/black-history/march-on-washington

History.com Editors. (2017, June 28). Gay Rights. *HISTORY*. A&E Television Networks Hentet 19. oktober fra https://www.history.com/topics/gay-rights/history-of-gay-rights

Holland, B. (2017). *How Activists Plottet the First Gay Pride Parades. HISTORY*. A&E Television Networks. Hentet 27. september fra https://www.history.com/news/how-activists-plotted-the-first-gay-pride-parades

Holst, C. (2010). *Nancy Fraser – Kritisk teori uten filosofi?* I J. Pedersen (ed.), *Moderne politisk teori*. Oslo: Pax forlag.

Honneth, A. (1995). *The Struggle for Recognition*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lysaker, O. (2015). Axel Honneth- Frihet Gjennom Anerkjennelse. *Salongen Nettidsskrift for Filosofi og idéhistorie*. http://www.salongen.no/axel-honneth/

Mallroy, Brown & Conron. (2019). Updated: Conversion Therapy and LGBT Youth. *The William Institute of the UCLA School of Law.* Hentet fra https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/demographics/conversion-therapy-and-lgbt-youth/

Mays, C. (2019, 12.september). New York City Is Ending a Ban on Gay Conversion Therapy - Here's Why. *New York Times.* Hentet fra https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/12/nyregion/conversion-therapy-ban-nyc.html

Meyer I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological bulletin*, *129*(5), 674–697. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674

Pettersen, T. (2011). *Filosofiens Annet Kjønn*. Oslo: Pax Forlag.

Taylor, C. (1994). *Multiculturalism- Examining The Politics of Recognition*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Refinery29- The State of Grace. (2019, January 26). *The Life Threatening Dangers of Gay Conversion Therapy* [videoklipp] Hentet fra https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HL5ThApf0IA

Regjeringen. (2018, 12.oktober). Antall Tilskuddstellende Medlemmer i Tros- og Livssynssamfunn i 2018. Hentet fra https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/tro-og-livssyn/tros-og-livssynssamfunn/innsiktsartikler/antall-tilskuddsberettigede-medlemmer-i-/id631507/

Saul, J.M. (2003). *Feminism- Issues and Argument*s. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sullivan, N. (2003). *A Critical Introduction to Queer Theory*. New York: New York University Press.

United Nations. (2007). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Hentet fra https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf

Virupaksha, H. G., D. Muralidhar, & J. Ramakrishna. (2016). Suicide and Suicidal Behavior among Transgender Persons. *Indian journal of psychological medicine*, *38*(6), 505–509. doi:10.4103/0253-7176.194908

Young, I. (2013). *Responsibility for Justice* (1.utg.) New York: Oxford University Press.