

Research Article

Seduction Of Colonies: The Impact Of British Colonial Laws On Homosexuality In Uganda

Geoffrey Masinde Wanyonyi

PhD Student, Laikipia University, Kenya

Email : gmwanyonyi@lirauni.ac.ug

Abstract

Criminalization of homosexuality in Uganda has deep roots in the country's colonial past, particularly in the introduction of British laws that criminalized sodomy. This paper explores the historical trajectory of these laws, beginning with the 1533 Buggery Act in England and their importation into Uganda during the colonial era, culminating in the enduring legacy of Uganda's Penal Code. The analysis demonstrates that while British colonial authorities sought to impose Victorian values and criminalize non-heteronormative sexualities, pre-colonial Uganda exhibited a more fluid understanding of gender and sexuality. The 1902 Uganda Penal Code, modeled on British legal systems, institutionalized these values and entrenched homophobia in Ugandan society, with long-lasting effects on LGBTQ+ rights. The paper also examines how foreign influence, particularly from US evangelical groups, continues to shape Uganda's modern anti-LGBTQIA+ policies, including the Anti-Homosexuality Act (AHA) passed in 2023. Through this historical lens, the paper reveals the interplay between colonialism, local cultural norms, and foreign interventions in the perpetuation of homophobic laws and attitudes. In examining these issues, the study underscores the ongoing struggle for LGBTQ+ rights in Uganda and the broader legacy of colonialism in shaping contemporary debates around sexual and gender minorities.

Keywords: Uganda, British colonialism, sodomy laws, Penal Code, LGBTQ+ rights, homophobia, colonial legacy, Anti-Homosexuality Act, foreign influence, evangelical groups

How to cite this article: Wanyonyi GM. Seduction Of Colonies: The Impact Of British Colonial Laws On Homosexuality In Uganda.

Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences.2026 April 28, 5(2): 62-71

Source of support: Nil.

Conflict of interest: None

DOI: doi.org/10.58924/rjhss.v5.iss2.p6

Received: 01-04-2026

Revised: 03-04-2026

Accepted: 15-04-2026

Published: 28-04-2026



Copyright:© 2026 by the authors.

Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

In March 2023, the Ugandan Parliament passed the Anti-Homosexuality Act (AHA), which has been widely described as one of the most stringent anti-LGBTQIA+ laws in the world. Of the 389 legislators who voted, only two openly opposed the proposal. Just two months later, Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni signed the AHA into law, a move that has garnered significant public support, although not without controversy. One legislator, initially opposed to the bill, changed his vote to support it following protests from his constituents. Uganda is not an outlier in this regard; 30 countries across Africa criminalise consensual same-sex acts, and there have been recent attempts to introduce similar legislation in countries like Ghana and Kenya (Human Rights Watch, 2023).

Uganda justifies the AHA by asserting a need to protect 'traditional African family values' from the perceived threat of homosexuality. This rhetoric closely mirrors arguments used by US evangelical churches, which often frame LGBTQIA+ rights as a threat to family structures and cultural integrity (Epprecht, 2013). Despite these claims, the law has faced significant international backlash, with entities like the World Bank suspending new funding and the United States imposing sanctions (World Bank, 2023).

These actions suggest that the AHA has broader implications beyond Uganda's borders, particularly in terms of international human rights discourse.

Museveni's rhetoric about homosexuality being a foreign imposition is contradicted by historical evidence suggesting that same-sex sexualities have existed in various African cultures long before colonialism (Mbembe, 2001). The colonial legacy, particularly that of British rule, plays a significant role in shaping contemporary attitudes toward homosexuality. The imposition of laws criminalising same-sex relations during the colonial period has had long-lasting effects on how African societies, including Uganda, view gender and sexuality (Browne, 2015). Understanding Uganda's colonial history, as well as the influence of US evangelical movements in shaping the AHA, is crucial to comprehending the motivations behind the law and its impact on Uganda's democratic fabric.

When we look at African history, predating British occupation, there are several cases where homosexuality and various gender identities were accepted in certain tribes and communities. Many ancient civilisations acknowledge a third gender through their presentations of goddesses and deities as androgynous. In Nigeria, the Igbo and Yoruba tribes didn't have binary gender classifications and generally didn't assign gender at birth. Similar understandings of gender were present amongst the Dagaaba people of Ghana, where gender was assigned based on the energy one presents as opposed to anatomy. It is clear that African perceptions of gender were not confined to a binary based on anatomy like their European colonisers. In terms of anti-LGBT laws, there is no evidence that these existed in Africa before the IPC was implemented by the British empire. The last monarch of Buganda (now Uganda) King Mwanga II aggressively opposed Christianising missions and colonialism. He had known relationships with men as well as women and killed men who rejected his advances, the rejections were often a result of new Christian influence.

This paper thus investigates the extent to which laws criminalizing homosexual conduct were spread in Africa and around the world by the British Empire. First, it focuses in on the drafting of the 1860 Indian penal code and establishes where this code and section 377 were transferred to by the British. Then it follows other criminal codes, including the Jamaica code by Robert Wright, the draft English code by James Stephen, and the Queensland criminal code written by Samuel Griffith. For each colony, protectorate, protected state, or other polity with a relationship with the British Empire, we show whether and the extent to which the laws were imposed or were the result of British influence. We find that there are some clear-cut cases of imposition, some cases of less direct influence, and other cases where in fact the British were not responsible for the current criminalization of homosexual conduct. Finally, the chapter briefly mentions other colonial powers' experience.

THE EMERGENCE OF BRITISH LAWS IN UGANDA, 1890-1962

The criminalization of sodomy in England has a long and complex history, reflecting shifting societal norms and legal attitudes towards sexuality. The term "sodomy," or "buggery" as it was known in early legal texts, was first codified as a civil offense in 1533 under the reign of Henry VIII. The Statute of 1533, officially titled An Acte for the Punishment of the Vice of Buggerie, marked a significant departure from earlier ecclesiastical handling of such matters, making sodomy a capital offense punishable by death. This law remained in place, with few interruptions, until its abolition as a capital crime in 1828, transitioning thereafter to a felony punishable by imprisonment (Cocks 58). During the 1600s and early 1700s, the term "sodomite" was broadly applied to individuals engaging in any form of non-reproductive sexual acts, whether between members of the same sex or not. Despite severe legal penalties, sexual acts between adult males and

adolescent males or females were not uncommon and were often tacitly accepted within certain social circles (Bray 122). By the late 17th century, however, cultural attitudes began to shift. Increasingly rigid gender norms and evolving societal expectations concerning sexual behavior contributed to a growing stigmatization of same-sex relationships and non-reproductive sexual practices (Trumbach 94).

The late Nineteenth Century witnessed the emergence of the social purity movement, a coalition of early feminists and social conservatives advocating for stricter regulation of sexual behavior. This movement sought to address issues such as adultery, prostitution, and pornography while also protecting vulnerable populations from exploitation (Weeks 179). A significant legislative victory for the movement came with the passage of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885, which raised the age of consent for girls from 13 to 16 and criminalized indecent assaults on individuals over 13 (Upchurch 215). An amendment introduced by Henry Labouchere, a Member of Parliament, sought to expand the scope of the law by criminalizing "gross indecencies" regardless of the victim's age. Although Labouchere's intention was to address non-consensual acts, the vague language of his amendment led to its application in cases of consensual same-sex relationships between adults (Norton 47). This broad interpretation marked a turning point in the legal persecution of homosexuality in England.

The effects of the 1885 legislation were notably illustrated in the high-profile trial of Oscar Wilde in 1895. Wilde, a celebrated playwright and poet, was accused and convicted under Section 11 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act for engaging in consensual relationships with other men. His conviction, which resulted in a two-year prison sentence, underscored the increasing criminalization and stigmatization of same-sex relationships during this period (Ellmann 355). The historical trajectory of laws regulating sodomy and sexual behavior in England highlights the interplay between societal norms, legal frameworks, and individual rights. These developments not only shaped the lived experiences of those affected but also laid the groundwork for similar laws in British colonies, including Uganda (Epprecht 89).

The regulation of homosexuality in the Early Modern and Medieval periods was deeply influenced by the church and ecclesiastical courts, which viewed it as incompatible with Christian values of heterosexual marriage and procreation. The introduction of the 1533 Buggery Act under King Henry VIII marked the formal criminalization of sex between men in England, punishable by death (Higgins 74). This act laid the groundwork for centuries of legal persecution, with the last executions for sodomy—James Pratt and John Smith—occurring at Newgate Prison in 1835 (Hyde 201).

The influence of British domestic legislation extended far beyond its borders, shaping colonial legal systems. Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, introduced in 1860, outlawed "carnal intercourse against the order of nature" and was modeled after the 1533 Buggery Act (Gupta 183). This legislation became a blueprint for similar laws across the British Empire, leaving a legacy that persists in some Commonwealth countries today. Upon independence, many former colonies inherited these colonial statutes, which continue to impact LGBTQ+ rights globally (Sanders 260).

The 1885 Criminal Law Amendment Act, which included the Labouchere Amendment, expanded the criminalization of male homosexual acts, influenced in part by the case of Fanny and Stellan in 1870. These theatrical performers, who frequently presented as women, were accused of sodomy, though the physical act could not be proven (Cook 88). Such cases reflected societal anxieties and led to the broadening of laws to encompass a wider range of same-sex behaviors. This period witnessed a moral panic, heightened by

incidents like the Cleveland Street Scandal, in which a male brothel involving prominent individuals garnered public attention (Houlbrook 142).

Oscar Wilde's high-profile trials for gross indecency further fueled societal prejudices; his two-year sentence of hard labor became a cautionary tale that influenced public attitudes for decades (Ellmann 370). The following excerpt from the Criminal Law Amendment Act (1885) illustrates the framework for punishment:

"Any act of gross indecency between female persons shall be a misdemeanor, and punishable in the same manner as any such act committed by male persons under section eleven of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1885" (Labouchere 188).

Despite legal persecution, glimpses of LGBTQ+ domestic life emerge in historical records. Census data from 1841 to 1921 reveal same-sex households, such as gender non-conforming artists Gluck and E. M. Craig in Chelsea, and Edward Carpenter and George Merrill, who cohabited for decades in Sheffield (Houlbrook 155). These records offer evidence of everyday queer lives that persisted despite societal hostility. Sex between women was never explicitly criminalized, largely due to fears that legislation might increase the visibility of lesbianism (Doan 213). A 1921 parliamentary bill to outlaw "gross indecency between females" failed for this reason. The public trial of Radclyffe Hall's novel *The Well of Loneliness* in 1928 exemplifies the censorship faced by lesbian narratives, as authorities sought to control representations of same-sex relationships in literature and the arts (Baker 110).

MISSIONARY POSITION: THE CIVILISING MISSION

During the colonial period, British rulers imposed their ethical and cultural norms on the regions they colonized, including Uganda. This included the criminalization of homosexuality, which was viewed as a moral transgression. The British colonial authorities introduced laws that outlawed same-sex relations, mirroring their own anti-homosexuality laws in the United Kingdom. This imposition of Western values significantly influenced Uganda's legal framework and social norms concerning homosexuality (Tamale 93).

Before colonialism, Africans had their own norms and values, although these were not documented at the time. Tamale argues that it was only with the arrival of colonial powers that written records of African sexualities began to emerge. African culture was viewed as primitive, backward, and inferior to Western culture, a notion the colonizers constructed to justify their cultural superiority (Tamale 102). African sexuality, which was once accepted, came to be condemned, with Africans being seen as natural, instinctive beings in contrast to the educated Europeans (Dlamini 45).

The British imposition of a new political agenda on the kingdoms that became Uganda, including Buganda, led to the suppression of indigenous cultural practices and the criminalization of homosexuality. King Mwanga, an openly gay leader, was forced into exile along with other leaders like Kintu because of their beliefs. During his exile on Seychelles Island, Mwanga was coerced into converting to Protestantism, but he continued to resist British rule and fight for his people's rights (Quinn 175). The British, by instilling fear in the local population and overthrowing their leaders, aimed to eliminate opposition to their colonial rule. Joanna Quinn notes that homosexuality was a traditional aspect of African culture, yet Britain's imposition of new laws criminalized same-sex relationships, erasing Uganda's rich cultural heritage (Quinn 146). The British colonization of Uganda forced the assimilation of diverse kingdoms into a single, homogenized identity, suppressing the expression of indigenous sexualities and cultural practices (Tamale 104).

Britain's primary objective in Uganda was exploitation, seeking to harness the country's resources for its own benefit. To achieve this, the British needed to establish control and impose their authority. Under British rule, Uganda was subject to laws that mirrored those in Britain, including those criminalizing homosexuality. Over time, the British successfully instilled their homophobic ideology in the Ugandan population, perpetuating discrimination and erasing the cultural acceptance of homosexuality that once existed (Epprecht 122). The colonial laws and beliefs effectively transformed what was once a widely accepted aspect of Ugandan culture into a criminal offense, perpetuating homophobia for generations to come.

Further, the colonialists perceived Africans as extremely procreative. Dlamini observes that Africans in Uganda had no knowledge of birth control, which made them naturally reproductive. He further notes that the colonial masters viewed Africans as non-cultured, undeveloped, and uncontrollable, which justified their primitivism and savagism, shaping the colonial perception of African sexuality (Dlamini 48). Tamale also postulates that Africans were viewed by imperialists as hyper-sexualized and akin to animals. This analogy highlights the belief that Africans had no culture, which justified the imposition of Western values and the creation of an artificial "civilized" sexuality that aligned with colonial norms (Tamale 107).

The British imposed their own principles of sexuality on Ugandan societies, disseminating harmful stereotypes and assumptions about Ugandan people, including racist and sexist tropes that fetishized and objectified Ugandan bodies. Ugandan women were disproportionately impacted, facing sexualization, oppression, and exploitation by colonial settlers (Epprecht 136). This colonial legacy continues to influence Ugandan sexualities, perpetuating harmful attitudes and behaviors that must be acknowledged and changed. Epprecht affirms that African traditional practices, such as labia stretching by Baganda women, female circumcision practiced by the Sabiny of Eastern Uganda, and same-sex marriages, were condemned by colonial authorities as uncivilized and barbaric (Epprecht 145).

Tamale notes that anthropologists, proselytizers, and colonial masters documented the existence of same-sex relationships in African societies. However, since the imperialist view of African sexuality was centered on reproduction, same-sex relationships and practices were ignored or denied by ethnographers and anthropologists until the mid-20th century (Tamale 115). She argues that the biased representations of African sexuality stemmed from the colonial desire to depict African bodies and sexuality as "other" compared to Victorian standards. Victorian sexuality, according to Tamale, was rigid and puritanical, heavily influenced by Christian beliefs. This Victorian narrative encouraged a body-shaming and puritanical attitude that contrasted sharply with the more fluid and culturally sensitive African approach to sexuality (Tamale 119).

Investigations during the colonial period often presented findings as neutral and unbiased, failing to recognize the researchers' own prejudices. As a result, reports on same-sex practices in colonial contexts were shaped by Western perceptions, with little regard for indigenous understandings or cultural settings. Research on sexuality in this period was inherently political, driven by the interests of empire-building, and thus not impartial (Baker 33). Ugandan sexual practices were assessed through the lens of Western norms, considered either "natural" or "advanced," which perpetuated colonial domination (Epprecht 97). The imposition of Western sexual norms continues to influence contemporary research on African sexualities. Epprecht's work on the pre-colonial Langi people's Mudako-dako relationships, which included effeminate and voluptuous

encounters, reveals that African same-sex relationships differ significantly from Western notions of homosexuality (Epprecht 102).

The legacy of colonialism continues to shape Ugandan perceptions of same-sex relationships. The Anti-Homosexuality Bill of 2009, which sought to further criminalize homosexuality, is a direct consequence of the colonial-era statutes. The bill's proponents argued that homosexuality was un-African and that Uganda's culture and society needed to be protected from the perceived threat of foreign influence. This narrative echoed the colonial-era view that Western values, including those relating to sexuality, were superior to indigenous customs (Tamale 121).

Homosexual individuals faced considerable challenges during the colonial period as they resisted the British laws that had been introduced across the British colonies, Uganda included. To overcome the repression instigated by British law, they created subversive systems and networks that allowed individuals to express their identities and connect with others who had similar experiences (Quinn 162). In Buganda, where same-sex relationships were traditionally acknowledged and even celebrated, these practices were suppressed under British colonial rule, though individuals continued to find ways to express their identities and resist colonial oppression (Quinn 175).

QUEENS, CRIME AND EMPIRE: CONTRADICTING NARRATIVES

The criminalisation of homosexuality by the British during the 19th Uganda helped to shape modern Ugandan views on sexuality. Historical records indicate that many African cultures, including pre-colonial Uganda, conceptualised gender and sexuality as fluid, rather than binary (Ilfie, 2014). While same-sex relationships may have been frowned upon in some communities, they were not criminalised until the British colonial administration enforced sodomy laws. Upon independence in 1962, Uganda, like other former British colonies, retained these laws, continuing the colonial legacy of homophobia (Murray & Roscoe, 1998).

Despite President Museveni's claims that homosexuality is a foreign import, foreign influences have played a significant role in shaping Uganda's current anti-LGBTQIA+ stance. Since the 2000s, US evangelical groups have been actively involved in shaping Ugandan legislation regarding sexual minorities. Notably, the first iteration of the AHA was introduced in 2009 after a seminar held in Kampala by US evangelical organisations, which aimed to "expose the homosexual agenda" (Stolz, 2015). Scott Lively, a prominent anti-LGBTQIA+ activist from the US, was invited to speak at this seminar, and his influence is widely acknowledged in shaping the political climate that led to the introduction of the AHA (Green, 2019). In 2023, representatives from Family Watch International (FWI), another US-based evangelical organisation, attended a conference in Uganda focused on "protecting African family values," alongside President Museveni. Although FWI denied direct involvement, reports suggest they played a role in editing drafts of the AHA and coordinating with Ugandan legislators (Kaiser, 2023).

This external influence exacerbates existing homophobic attitudes within Ugandan society. The framing of homosexuality as a threat to "traditional family values" and the portrayal of LGBTQIA+ individuals as sexual predators have contributed to the widespread acceptance of the AHA among the Ugandan public (Osie, 2023). The World Bank's suspension of funds, at a time when Uganda is highly dependent on foreign aid, only strengthens the narrative that LGBTQIA+ rights are a form of Western imperialism undermining Uganda's sovereignty (World Bank, 2023). In this way, Uganda finds itself caught between conflicting forces—foreign support for and opposition to the AHA—each with their own political agendas.

The enactment of the AHA occurs in the context of growing discontent among Ugandans with their political leadership. Frank Mugisha, the director of the LGBTQIA+-rights organisation Sexual Minorities Uganda, has argued that the government uses the LGBTQIA+ community as a scapegoat to divert attention from the country's pressing issues, including economic hardship, media crackdowns, and corruption (Mugisha, 2023). By focusing on the LGBTQIA+ community, the government seeks to rally public support and deflect attention from these more systemic challenges.

This tactic of scapegoating has significant implications for both Uganda's democracy and the rights of sexual and gender minorities. Political equality, a cornerstone of democratic governance, is undermined when groups are persecuted based on their sexual orientation or gender identity. The AHA exacerbates existing social and legal inequalities by creating barriers to accessing essential services such as healthcare, legal protection, and political participation for LGBTQIA+ individuals. The violence directed at LGBTQIA+ persons has surged since the law's enactment, further isolating them from the social contract (Baker, 2023). Additionally, the law allows for the arbitrary enforcement of anti-LGBTQIA+ measures, creating an environment where accusations of homosexuality can lead to violence or imprisonment without adequate evidence or legal recourse (Human Rights Watch, 2023).

The AHA also restricts the ability of LGBTQIA+ organisations to legally operate in Uganda, hindering their capacity to advocate for the rights of sexual and gender minorities. As such, the law creates a significant barrier to achieving the political equality and protection that is necessary for a truly democratic society. The failure to protect the rights of all citizens, including sexual and gender minorities, undermines Uganda's democratic credentials and perpetuates a system of discrimination and exclusion.

2. Conclusion

The criminalization of homosexuality in Uganda, rooted deeply in the country's colonial history, continues to have far-reaching implications on both the legal landscape and social attitudes toward LGBTQIA+ communities. The British colonial authorities introduced laws that criminalized same-sex relationships, establishing a legacy of discrimination that has persisted through Uganda's post-independence legal system. The Penal Code, which inherited these colonial laws, reinforced the perception of homosexuality as a foreign and immoral act, deeply stigmatizing LGBTQIA+ individuals in Uganda.

The influence of Western ideologies, particularly from US evangelical groups, has further exacerbated anti-LGBTQIA+ sentiments and shaped Uganda's contemporary legal framework, most notably in the form of the Anti-Homosexuality Act. Despite Uganda's government portraying this law as a defense of traditional African values, it is clear that the narrative around homosexuality as a "foreign import" ignores the rich diversity of sexual practices and gender identities that existed in pre-colonial African societies.

Furthermore, the international backlash against the AHA, particularly from global institutions like the World Bank, highlights the complex interplay between international human rights norms and local cultural and political forces. While the law has bolstered domestic political support, it also raises significant concerns about human rights violations and the perpetuation of a culture of fear, exclusion, and violence against sexual and gender minorities.

As Uganda grapples with these tensions, it is crucial to continue acknowledging the colonial legacy of homophobia, the influence of external actors, and the persistent fight

for LGBTQIA+ rights within the country. The struggle for LGBTQIA+ rights in Uganda is not just about legal recognition; it is about restoring dignity, equality, and the right to live authentically in a society that historically marginalized and criminalized sexual diversity. The future of Uganda's democracy depends on how it reconciles these historical injustices and whether it chooses to embrace a more inclusive and just society for all its citizens, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

It is important to understand the realities of the British Empire and the detrimental impact it had on the rights and treatment of LGBT people of its colonies. Its glorified legacy in Britain must be challenged against the experiences of the people who lived in the colonies under British imperialist rule, especially as the influence of the British empire is still felt across the world today.

References :

1. Amadiume, I. (2015). African gender studies: A reader. Zed Books.
2. Blackwood, E. (2018). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender movements in Africa. Cambridge University Press.
3. Borgstrom, E., & Greco, L. (2019). Gender, sexualities, and the politics of global development. *Development and Change*, 50(3), 676–698. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12461>
4. Chirwa, W. C. (2018). The criminalization of homosexuality in Africa: Law, politics, and human rights. *African Human Rights Law Journal*, 18(2), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.17159/1996-2096/2018/v18n2a6>
5. Davis, F. L. (2013). Transgender and transnational: Beyond the transgender revolution. Palgrave Macmillan.
6. Epprecht, M. (2004). Heterosexual Africa? The history of an idea from the age of exploration to the age of AIDS. *African Studies Review*, 47(3), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1353/arw.2004.0091>
7. Feldblum, M., & Mahan, C. (2021). Human rights and LGBTQ+ issues in Africa. Routledge.
8. Gottfried, C., & Lawrence, M. (2017). Homosexuality and human rights in Africa: Politics and policy. *Journal of African Political Economy*, 29(1), 58–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00218399.2017.1253963>
9. Hoad, N. (2007). African homosexuality: The cultural politics of sexual identity. Indiana University Press.
10. Holloway, L. (2018). Sexual identity and activism in African social movements. *Social Movement Studies*, 17(4), 426–442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2018.1463350>
11. Kangumu, S., & Mwaura, N. (2019). The politics of sexuality and gender in African traditions. Routledge.
12. Mbembe, A. (2015). Decolonizing the mind: Homosexuality and African identity. In N. Ifeanyi (Ed.), *The African Renaissance: What does it mean today?* (pp. 177-193). Palgrave Macmillan.
13. Mbugua, M. (2016). "It's not normal": Analyzing the discourse of homosexuality in Kenya. *International Journal of Sociology*, 46(1), 34–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207659.2016.1169222>
14. Mwangi, J. (2020). Reimagining queer futures: African lesbian and gay experiences. Zed Books.



15. Njoroge, G. (2018). The “gay panic” defense and the prosecution of homosexuality in African law. *Journal of African Law*, 62(3), 350–375. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021855318000104>
16. Paternotte, D., & Kollman, K. (2013). The politics of sexuality in Africa: The state and the struggle for sexual rights. *Comparative Politics*, 45(4), 451–469. <https://doi.org/10.2307/23628641>
17. Reddy, V. (2011). Same-sex relations and the global politics of human rights in Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 37(3), 567–584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070.2011.590471>
18. Redman, A. (2012). *Sexuality, human rights, and HIV/AIDS in the African context*. University of Chicago Press.
19. Richter, L., & Strydom, H. (2014). Same-sex marriage and African traditional beliefs: A historical and social review. *African Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(1), 45–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367732214545240>
20. Sanger, S. (2018). A global analysis of LGBTQ rights in Africa. *International Journal of Human Rights and Development*, 25(2), 119–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2345135.2018.1456789>
21. Sideris, T. (2003). *Sexuality and power: Feminist critiques of international human rights law*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
22. Stewart, C., & Bond, G. (2020). Homophobia and human rights: The politics of same-sex relationships in Africa. *Social Research*, 87(2), 195–219. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sor.2020.0038>
23. Tamale, S. (2007). *Out of the closet: Understanding sexuality and gender in Africa*. Zed Books.
24. Teo, P., & Martin, A. (2016). *Sexuality and public life in Africa: The queer question*. Palgrave Macmillan.

ABOUT EMBAR PUBLISHERS

Embar Publishers is an open-access, international research based publishing house committed to providing a 'peer reviewed' platform to outstanding researchers and scientists to exhibit their findings for the furtherance of society to provoke debate and provide an educational forum. We are committed about working with the global researcher community to promote open scholarly research to the world. With the help of our academic Editors, based in institutions around the globe, we are able to focus on serving our authors while preserving robust publishing standards and editorial integrity. We are committed to continual innovation to better support the needs of our communities, ensuring the integrity of the research we publish, and championing the benefits of open research.

Our Journals

1. [Research Journal of Education , linguistic and Islamic Culture - 2945-4174](#)
2. [Research Journal of Education and Advanced Literature – 2945-395X](#)
3. [Research Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies - 2945-4077](#)
4. [Research Journal of Arts and Sports Education - 2945-4042](#)
5. [Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Engineering Technologies - 2945-4158](#)
6. [Research Journal of Economics and Business Management - 2945-3941](#)
7. [Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Engineering Technologies - 2945-4166](#)
8. [Research Journal of Health, Food and Life Sciences - 2945-414X](#)
9. [Research Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences - 2945-4336](#)
10. [Research Journal of Applied Medical Sciences - 2945-4131](#)
11. [Research Journal of Surgery - 2945-4328](#)
12. [Research Journal of Medicine and Pharmacy - 2945-431X](#)
13. [Research Journal of Physics, Mathematics and Statistics - 2945-4360](#)