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PEPFAR  US President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
PLHIV  People Living with HIV
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Sexual minorities

Categories of people whose sexual identity, orientation or practices differ from the majority of the surrounding society and who are marginalised because of these differences.
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Organisation in Haiti working on human rights of LGBT people
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Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
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Sexual orientation and gender identity

SRV
Socialist Republic of Vietnam

STIs
Sexually transmitted infections

Trans
People appearing or attempting to be members of the opposite sex, such as transsexuals or habitual cross-dressers

Transgender
Person appearing or attempting to be a member of the opposite sex, as a transsexual or habitual cross-dresser

*Travesti*
Term for a person born biologically male who self-identifies as female in South America

UHRA
Uganda Harmonized Rights Alliance

UJCC
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UN
United Nations

UNAIDS
Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS

UNDP
United Nations Development Programme
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United Nations General Assembly Special Session

USAID
US Agency for International Development

UUA
Unitarian Universalist Association
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World Bank

WHO
World Health Organization
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Foreword

This review of the evidence on sexuality and poverty is undertaken by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) as part of a larger Accountable Grant from the UK Government’s Department for International Development (DFID).

DFID is increasingly interested in understanding issues around sexuality, poverty and human rights, and this interest is particularly focused around LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) issues. Recently the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group recommended, inter alia, appointing a human rights commissioner to address homosexuality alongside other human rights issues. In 2011, David Cameron suggested that UK aid might be withheld from those governments that retain anti-homosexuality legislation. He has argued that it is necessary for governments to adhere to ‘proper human rights’ reform if they wish to be recipients of UK aid (BBC 2011). The proposal for conditional aid was poorly received in some quarters. The Ghanaian, Ugandan and Malawian governments responded defiantly. They considered it an act of bullying and would rather forego the money than accept these conditions. Activists, journalists and policymakers argued that LGBT persons are not the only ones whose rights are violated. Singling these groups out might cause an anti-gay backlash. Conditionality is often based on outsiders’ assumptions about African sexualities. Some argued that actions to promote the rights of LGBT persons should be placed within a broader human rights perspective, recognise the role of African civil society groups and show an awareness of the historical fact that many of these discriminatory laws are actually a legacy of British colonial rule (AMSHeR 2011).

This review contributes to the larger Sexuality, Poverty and Law Theme of the Accountable Grant, which aims to produce evidence-based, practical options for activists and policymakers for strengthening legal protection of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersexed, questioning people and for sexual rights more generally. This theme focuses on understanding the links between sexuality and poverty with the aim of improving economic policy and programming to support people marginalised because of their sexuality.

At present, awareness of sexuality is largely absent from the development agenda, despite a small number of committed players in this area, and there is limited understanding of why sexuality might be important in relation to poverty and development. There is a substantial and growing body of work related to poverty, sexuality and HIV and AIDS prevention, treatment and care, but there is limited evidence available on sexuality and poverty. The objective of this review undertaken by IDS is to assess the nature of the association between sexuality and poverty as evidenced in the available literature.

This literature review is not a systematic review. Nonetheless, it pays attention to clear search criteria and makes explicit the categories of inclusion and exclusion in the review in order to advance evidence-based policy.
Executive summary

This review aims to:

- Assess the extent to which research has already examined the role of sexuality in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) specifically in relation to poverty in LMIC and to identify new under-researched areas and questions;
- Apply Chamber’s multidimensional ‘Web of Poverty’ to existing literature in order to identify which dimensions are most applicable to sexual minorities;
- Overview how policy marginalises people through legalising specific behaviours and criminalising others, and identify positive examples of policy change.

The paper uses a definition of poverty related to Amartya Sen’s capability approach to human development and adopted by the UN. As such, poverty is considered to be broader than income and material living standards and also refers to the ability of people to choose between different ways of living that they have reason to value (Sen 1999; 1989; 1985). Poverty is a denial of choices and opportunities for living a tolerable life (UNDP 1997: 2).

Methodology

This literature review builds on an initial scoping note on poverty and sexuality developed in May and June 2013 that drew on insights from 57 relevant articles. This scoping note suggested that LGBT persons and sex workers are often both marginalised and targets of particular policies in LMIC. Therefore, this review focuses on these two categories. Five specific searches on poverty and sexuality using specific search criteria and search strings to identify papers and other sources were undertaken. We used the electronic databases of The Web of Knowledge – Science Citation Index Expanded, Social Sciences Citation Index, Arts and Humanities Citation Index, Conference Proceedings – Science, and Conference Proceedings – Social Science and Humanities, Medline, BIOSIS Citation Index and Google Scholar. In addition, we searched for relevant grey literature from websites of well-known and respected human rights organisations, international non-governmental organisations (INGOs), the UN and governments. The searches were limited to English-language publications on LMIC in Africa, Latin America, Asia and the Middle East in the period between 2003 and 2013.

Literature review findings

The majority of research around sexuality, law and policy in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) in Asia, the Middle East, North and sub-Saharan African countries and Latin America has been in relation to HIV and AIDS prevention, treatment and care. About 25 per cent of all the articles identified were HIV-related.

The sexual behaviour of gay men, sex workers and MSM has been widely researched with regard to HIV prevention, treatment and care. Less attention has been paid to social and economic deprivation, material exclusion and political marginalisation because of sexual orientation or sexual behaviour. Few English-language studies are available on the socioeconomic and cultural aspects of sexuality in the Middle Eastern and North African countries. South Africa and India are comparatively well researched. Inequities are also reflected in the relative invisibility of lesbians and transgender (female to male) and bisexual women in the studies, the exception being studies on lesbians in South Africa.

A need for broader examination of the political economy of sexuality that also takes gender and race relations into account emerges from many studies on sexuality and poverty. All of
the 12 dimensions of poverty described by Robert Chambers’ ‘Web of Poverty’ (2007) have been found in the literature on LGBT people and sex workers. LGBT people and sex workers experience specific disadvantages based on sexuality with regards to ascribed and legal inferiority, lack of political clout, lack of information, educational deficiencies and weak capabilities, barriers to institutions and public access, ghettoisation and spatial marginalisation, insecurities and material poverties. Seasonal dimensions of poverty and poverty of time are difficulties mentioned but these are less unique to these groups.

A multidimensional ‘web of poverty’

In terms of Ascribed and Legal Inferiority, human rights reports by many international organisations attest to serious and widespread violations of human rights of sex workers and LGBT populations in every region of the world. The existence of such reports reflects the willingness of a growing number of people to report the violations, often at great risk to their personal lives, as well as the emergence of grassroots organisations working on LGBT and sex workers’ rights and new policies that make legal redress possible in a growing number of countries. The focus on human rights violations has been on civil and political rights and – with a few exceptions – less on socioeconomic rights. The processes of positive change and the interactions between activists, grassroots organisations, researchers, donors, and national policymakers are not well documented, and are therefore not well understood.

This review shows many instances of Lack of Political Clout and of political exclusion for LGBT persons and sex workers, not least because their very existence is often illegal. This, coupled with negative stigma, excludes them from assuming formal positions of responsibility, including political positions. Challenging this lack of political clout through self-organisation offers both challenges and opportunities, many of which are shaped by broader national and international opportunity structures including weak rule of law, so-called sodomy laws, international funding and civil society. Funding opportunities created through the HIV epidemic has provided opportunities for spaces for self-organisation and the development of networks. Some organisations, which started as small outreach and peer educational organisations, have developed well-known international reputations and now have representation in international fora. However, in other instances, these same circumstances have led to the marginalisation of sex workers and other sexual minorities as issues of education and language come into play. This has led to debate over the quality, relevance and overall meaningfulness of sex worker and LGBT participation as well as questions about the degree to which internationally facilitated participation forces a focus on HIV, rather than on a broader social political agenda driven by sex workers or other sexual minorities themselves. Overall, despite some examples of relative success, LGBT people and sex workers experience difficulties in participating in the political arena. Societal assumptions about gender roles and stigma based on sexual orientation are obstacles for LGBT politicians wishing to participate in politics. In countries where LGBT identity and sex work are criminalised, political organisation has to be done underground or via the internet. HIV and AIDS have brought the needs of these groups to the attention of national and international policymakers as risk groups in relationship to HIV. This in turn has provided political opportunities, in particular for educated and English-speaking elites, but has not challenged – and has possibly reinforced – the deviant status of LGBT persons and sex workers. The transformation of the HIV medical agenda into wider poverty or social development agendas has been challenging. More broadly, the inability of LGBT people to contend for their political interests openly and on an equal footing inhibits them from leveraging the political system to escape the ‘web of poverty’ as other groups might.

Poor people often experience a Lack of Access to Information on a wide range of sexuality and health-care issues and this limits their chances of improving their lives. LGBT people and sex workers, especially those who are clearly visible, experience a lack of information across multiple and intersecting dimensions of their lives, and also experience specific
information gaps that are related to their sexuality. LGBT people and sex workers are at high risk for HIV but lack access to general information on HIV prevention, treatment and care. They also lack access to basic information on sexual and reproductive health in many places around the world. In addition, LGBT people and sex workers require, but often don’t receive, access to specific information to support their lifestyles. Often this lack of access to information stems from their experiences of discrimination and stigma in health and medical facilities. Lack of information is thus both a cause and a result of the multiple forms of physical and social isolation that sexual minorities and sex workers face.

Chambers observes that the Lack of Education, skills, and capabilities has multiple effects on poor people’s ability to extricate themselves from poverty (2007). In the case of LGBT people and sex workers, they may find themselves – and sometimes their children – excluded from education because of their sexual orientation and activities, which in turn limits their economic opportunities. LGBT persons and sex workers are often ostracised in schools through the reproduction of local communities’ heterosexual values, even in contexts where discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation is prohibited. Students whose sexualities do not conform experience isolation, bullying and often dropouts, as their fellow students and teachers are homophobic and appear to act with impunity. Sex work is not always an obstacle to education and many poor women use sex work to fund their children’s education. Nonetheless, the stigma of sex work does affect education dramatically, with mothers working in different cities or countries from where their children attend school in order to minimise their children’s experience of stigma.

This review documented specific problems that LGBT people and sex workers face in terms of Institutions and Access. Sexual minorities, sex workers, and often their children, also face difficulties obtaining official documents, and exclusion from the right to marry and have a family. People whose sexualities do not conform to mainstream conceptualisation of men and women, find themselves excluded from health-care institutions, from both formal workplaces and informal working arrangements and from the institutions that maintain justice in society. In seeking to access all these institutions – health, economics, justice and religion – sex workers and LGBT workers experience stigma, discrimination, harassment, fear of disclosure and concerns about breaches of confidentiality. They also experience verbal abuse, having to pay for services that should be free, violence, coercion to enact sex acts, and occasional blackmail. As a result, many LGBT persons and sex workers avoid these institutions, or seek to remain silent about their sexuality. Lack of access to services and institutions is both a cause and consequence of marginalisation and exclusion of LGBT people and sex workers. LGBT people and sex workers are shown to experience multiple and reinforcing disadvantages in institutional access that trap them into poverty and inferiority.

Poverty of Time is one dimension of poverty that acts to further trap people into poverty. Particular time-related challenges experienced by sex workers and LGBT people include: working during periods of menstruation, additional time required to develop a feminine image, and additional travel for health or children’s education in order to minimise stigma through anonymity or by hiding one’s sexual practices. Pressed for time, sex workers have to accept many clients without time to recuperate, which puts their health at risk. Overall, a lack of time restrains their economic options and, simultaneously, to the extent that LGBT people and sex workers must devote extra time to overcoming other hardships, this becomes another strand of the ‘web of poverty’.

Insecure Spaces and Places are closely correlated with poverty. For LGBT people and sex workers, places of residence can be particularly insecure because of their sexual orientation and occupation. In some cases, LGBT persons are evicted from their homes and end up in poor, unhealthy slums; in other cases they choose these places as they leave rural areas because of the lack of work opportunities. Such poor places are also characterised by a lack
of appropriate space in which sexual relations can take place in privacy. For LGBT people or sex workers, this lack of privacy is compounded by stigma, which makes it difficult to find safe spaces. As a result, hurried sex in streets, parks, or abandoned houses increases their vulnerability. Where safe spaces are in short supply, competition between sex workers to use these spaces also reduces their ability to negotiate safe sexual practices with clients and makes them more vulnerable to harassment and violence. In some instances, when sex workers live and work in the same place, they experience extreme discrimination as the location of their home is coupled with the stigma of their work.

In contrast to these poor and stigmatised places where many sex workers and LGBT persons reside, there are exclusionary queer spaces created by and for the middle classes – which in some cases incorporate members of the working classes. These spaces, created by local organisations, often have their own hierarchical structures and power differentials. In Cape Town and Manila, these ‘gay villages’ maintain ‘safe queer spaces’ that mirror gay villages in the West: they are predominantly white and frequented by the middle class. They are also magnets for gay tourism, and incorporate working-class gay men to provide services for these tourists. For the most part, LGBT people and sex workers, for various reasons, end up living and working in poor areas. Here they experience the same problems as other poor people with regards to violence, overcrowding, pollution and lack of facilities. But the specific controversial nature of their identities and livelihoods also forces LGBT persons and sex workers to seek out isolated ‘safe areas’. While in some cases these safe areas may mitigate other disadvantages or even enhance their economic power, in other cases this isolation can further entrench them in the ‘web of poverty’. When they cannot identify such safe areas, or ways to separate their work and living areas, they are particularly vulnerable to stigmatisation and discrimination.

Sexual minorities experience a range of interlocked and mutually reinforcing Insecurities at the individual, familial, and local community levels that are (re)created and reinforced by state and social institutions. This ranges from verbal abuse and harassment to violence to a lack of social support because minority members are not seen as full members of groups such as families or communities. This results in depression and lack of self-esteem among homosexuals in Nicaragua, female sex workers (FSWs) in Brazil, and bisexuals, lesbians and gays in Mexico leading, in the case of bisexuals, lesbians and gays to suicide ideation, suicide attempts, mental disorders and alcoholism. Other insecurities stem from natural disasters, which may polarise and intensify the inequalities already felt by marginalised groups. The provision of housing or food following natural disasters has not considered the vulnerabilities of sexual minorities and has often been implemented along conventional gender understandings, thus unintentionally reinforcing discrimination.

Physical Ill-being due to hunger, disability, and exhaustion damages earning power and, in so doing, forms another element of Chambers’ ‘Web of Poverty’ (2007). Appearing poor and unhealthy often also disqualifies people from jobs in higher wage sectors. LGBT people’s and sex workers’ higher exposure to HIV and to discriminatory violence places them at greater risk of physical ill-being. Simultaneously, their identities and roles affect overall physical and mental health on a broader scale than the sexual and reproductive health needs conventionally identified through HIV and AIDS medicalisation. In addition, LGBT persons and sex workers are frequently exposed to physical violence and torture, and this has health consequences. Very few studies have examined other aspects of physical health, such as access to screenings and physical examinations for clearly visible LGBT communities in LMIC.

From the perspective of the ‘web of poverty’, Social Relations provide emotional, economic and other support and act as safety nets. In many LMIC countries sexual minorities and sex workers are cast off by their families and excluded from family support structures because of stigma. In certain instances, they form their own support networks and surrogate families that
offer a degree of safety and protection, but can also create new social restrictions and economic obligations. ‘Bad’ social relations and networks can reinforce the ‘web of poverty’ by excluding people from material and immaterial benefits.

This review found that sexual minorities are frequently vulnerable because of their Material Poverties and their lack of income. This vulnerability is compounded by the precarious and informal nature of sex work and other work in the entertainment and beauty industries. In addition, there is literature showing that sex workers are burdened with personal or family debts. These debts are, in turn used as leverage and control mechanisms by their employers and pimps. Economic vulnerability is frequently identified as one of the reasons why sex workers accept clients who do not use condoms, which can exacerbate the spread of sexual diseases and sex workers’ ill-health. Although microcredit programmes have targeted sex workers, the income received does not enable sex workers to extricate themselves from these economic and protective entanglements. Sex work should not however be conceptualised as a direct consequence of material and income poverty as it is also a means to create economic opportunities in resource-poor contexts. In India, many women in the sex industry have tried other informal sector work but do not make enough money. These sex workers are using the labour market to develop ‘different combinations of functioning’ that enable them to survive.

Yet, not all people with marginalised sexualities are able to shape their access to material resources through sex work. High unemployment or very limited employment opportunities in the sex, entertainment and beauty industries, are often the only avenues for people whose sexuality is readily apparent, while others suppress their identity and sexual preferences and present themselves as conventional heterosexual men or women in order to find employment. Ultimately, even when LGBT people and sex workers do find their work empowering and creating opportunities that help them stave off material poverty, the vast majority of sex workers in LMICs are situated towards the bottom of the labour market and often work in informal and/or illegal contexts.

Resistance and opportunities for change
LGBT people and sex workers are ostracised in many ways and experience many of Chambers’ dimensions of poverty, affecting their overall wellbeing including access to health, education, employment, material resources and social resilience. However, there are many changes in the status of LGBT persons and sex workers, which shows that people do take actions, and that marginalisation and exclusion are not static and do not occur in all domains. There is also evidence that the conventional heterosexual views, like any other societal view, can change. Many studies emphasise that individuals are taking action to improve their situations, including but not limited to collective political action. Rather than victimhood, individuals resist being excluded and create opportunities to realise their aspirations.

Summary of positive policy changes
Reports on human rights violations against LGBT people and sex workers might distract from the fact that there are also positive policy changes. Many countries have recently adopted same-sex marriage laws. A few countries have recognised the right to sexual freedom in their constitutions, introduced or adjusted their Equal Age of Consent legislation to recognise homosexual relations, and have made discrimination in employment based on sexual orientation illegal. A limited number of countries have legally recognised the rights of same-sex couples. These policy changes are complicated processes that reflect power contests between different national and international elites and interest groups. Labour laws are usually the first to be amended. The effects of international pressure on these policy processes with regards to LGBT people are mixed and have also included backlashes and defiance. Broader coalitions of rights-based grassroots organisations that have developed a shared framework on gender, rights and sexuality have been able to accomplish policy
changes. With regards to sex work, progress with policies that decriminalise sex work and improve job safety has been very limited. There is wide global recognition of the need to involve sex workers in HIV prevention.

**Future directions**
The recommendations arising from this literature review of sexuality and poverty are as follows:

**Research**
- Explore the links between issues of gender, sexuality and sex work/trafficking recognising both men and women can be trafficked and work in the sex industry.
- Promote research that seeks to understand the political processes underlying mobilisation and collective action towards more inclusive policies. What works? What does not work? Which kinds of actors are significant and in what ways? What narratives are powerful in directing change? What strategies have worked for civil society and social movements advocating for change?
- Promote research on specific dimensions of poverty and sexuality such as exclusion of LGBT people from education, employment and health services that are not related to sexual or reproductive health.
- Develop research processes that work with local communities to build participatory quantitative approaches and methodologies, including joint data analysis that can quantify the experience of people’s marginalisation because of sexuality in sensitive and culturally appropriate ways.

**Policy**
Seek to interrogate and act to eliminate all forms of discrimination based on sexual diversity, in a range of different contexts and in relation to everyday life, such as housing benefits, insurance, access to health or social services etc.

- Recognise that funding for HIV prevention of ‘key’ populations requires the meaningful involvement of these populations but may or may not support these groups to attain wider civil political rights.
- Support and strengthen existing LGBT and sex workers’ civil society groups to build alliances with other civil society groups to develop broad frameworks for change and joint activities.
- Focus initiatives on institutional violence that is directed at sexuality and sexual orientation, including violence in schools, juvenile homes and prisons, and seek ways to make these institutions more accountable.
- Explore the potential to use economic and labour law as a means to effect positive change in countries in an incremental manner.
- Recognise that sexuality is important in shaping people’s ability to choose between different ways of living that they can have reason to value. Poverty is a denial of choices and opportunities for living a tolerable life (Sen, 1985; 1989; 1999).
1 Introduction

What do sexual and reproductive rights have to do with development? Everything. No sector of society is at greater risk of having these rights violated than socially marginalised and economically disenfranchised men, women and young people. ... These abuses of individual human rights not only jeopardise the wellbeing of individuals affected, but also the world's prospects for achieving sustainable development. (St Rachel Ustanny, Chief Executive Officer of the Jamaica Family Planning Association 2013).

Development has always encountered and engaged with issues of sexuality. This is apparent in its programmes of population control, disease and violence (Jolly 2006a; Cornwall and Jolly 2009) but it is less apparent in its mainstream work on economics and poverty reduction. As Bedford argues, through conventional development programmes, such as those undertaken by the World Bank to facilitate gender empowerment, the sexuality of poor men and women is being shaped along the lines of a heterosexual couple in which women ‘work more and men care better’ (Bedford 2005: 295). World Bank development experts and researchers are, however, often unaware of this shaping of sexuality or of its implications (Bedford 2005; also see Lind 2009). Thus, much of this engagement has been implicit, assumed and unexamined and, buried within this, is the idea that sexuality is somehow a negative topic that should be avoided (Jolly 2006a). This ‘invisible’ understanding of sexuality affects the kinds of development programmes that are considered desirable and effective. Vice versa, norms about ‘desirable’ development also affect the sexuality of men and women.

Development programmes often focus on married couples and on heterosexual sex relations (Cornwall and Jolly 2009) or, as Bedford puts it, a ‘two-earner, two-lover model of partnership’ that share the labour of work and of social reproduction (Bedford 2005: 296). As a consequence a wide range of people (sex workers, women who love women, trans people and men who love men, men who raise children without partners, women and men in polygamous marriages) are possibly excluded from development benefits. This review seeks to explore the consequences of these implicit assumptions around sexuality. It relies on the definition of sexuality provided by the World Health Organization, which emphasises diversity in sexuality: in roles, behaviours and relationships, and stresses the sociocultural – rather than biological or natural – construction of identities (discussed in more detail below).

In many societies, people who do not present themselves as heterosexual are excluded from anti-poverty programmes that target ‘families’. They are also at risk of myriad exclusions from their families and communities, denied access to safety nets and social protection and exclusion from policies that only ‘count’ households with partnerships that conform to the norm. When people experience a combination of violence, severe economic impacts and societal exclusion it has consequences in terms of their economic, psychological and physical health. The demographics of sexual orientation in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) are largely unknown, partly because homophobic settings may lead LGBT people not to openly identify, and because peoples’ sexual orientation is diverse, has different meanings in different contexts and can change (Diamond 2003; Murray and Roscoe 1998; Pallotta-Chiarolli 1998; Herdt 1994).

Broadly speaking, development has, over the past 30 years, begun to engage with issues of sexuality and to challenge the idea that heterosexual relations are the norm. This work has taken several strands and has not always been connected up under the rubric of ‘Sexuality’. Although discussed in more detail below, the main themes are:
● Working with trans people, men who have sex with men and sex workers in the light of their particular vulnerability to HIV infection.
● A movement of sexual rights advocates has used human rights to advance their advocacy. One such example is the Amnesty Campaign, which seeks to expose the human rights abuses experienced by individuals who are LGBT.¹
● Growing awareness of the need to focus on sexuality in relation to development. SIDA, for example, sees sexuality and sexual rights as critically related to development, proactively seeking to strengthen sexual rights around the world (SIDA 2010).

Nonetheless, there is still a long way to go in terms of bringing together the different strands of work and developing understandings of the relationship between sexuality and development. These, ‘usually silenced’, issues are emerging as ‘crucial, challenging and exciting ones for development’ (Harcourt 2009: 1). Yet, for many people, sexuality has not yet earned its place on the development agenda because it is conceptualised as less important than material survival and poverty (Jolly 2006a); because queer identities are understood to exist only in the domains of wealth and privilege; or because development actors uncritically associate non-monogamous and/or non-heterosexual relations with tradition or ethnic identity (Bedford 2005) and, as such, as a hindrance to economic modernisation. There are additional factors which have made it difficult to move forward on sexuality including prurience; religious sentiment; the sense that sexuality is ‘private’ and thus neither the domain of development nor governments; the notion that sexuality is somehow ‘frivolous’ and therefore that there are more important development issues to address; and, on occasion, tensions between those working on gender and those focusing on sexuality. We hope this review creates increased awareness of the importance of multifaceted dimensions of sexuality in people’s lives that needs to be integrated and considered in the design of programmes and policies.

This review aims to:

● Assess the scope to which research has already examined the role of sexuality in LMIC specifically in relation to poverty and identify new under-researched areas and questions.
● Apply Chamber’s multidimensional ‘Web of Poverty’ framework to existing literature in order to identify which dimensions are most applicable to sexual minorities.²
● Briefly overview how policy marginalises people through legalising specific behaviours and criminalising others, and identity positive examples of policy change.

### 1.1 Scope of the review

This literature review explores the research around sexuality and poverty in low- and middle-income countries. We take the lives of those marginalised because of their sexuality orientation/identity (including LGBT people) as the starting point of this review and will examine the intersections between these issues as they play out in marginalised people’s lives. Although there is a wealth of evidence on the multiple ways in which the ostracism of LGBT people and sex workers is linked to their sexuality, it is important to also realise that people are agents who can and do take actions, and that people can be marginalised in one

---

¹ see [www.amnesty.org.uk/content.asp?categoryID=876](http://www.amnesty.org.uk/content.asp?categoryID=876)
² Sexual minorities refers to categories of people who are marginalised because of their sexuality, such as sex workers, LGBT people or others. There is no other appropriate phrase to refer to people who do not exhibit mainstream sexualities. The use of terms such as ‘unconventional’ suggests that these categories of people do not have their conventions and sets up a false dichotomy between conventional and unconventional. This in turn reinforces the notion that heteronormative behaviour is ‘normal’ and all other behaviour is ‘not normal’.
domain but respected in others. The review will develop a more nuanced understanding of the realities and needs of these marginalised communities, with a focus on LMIC in Asia, the Middle East, North and sub-Saharan African countries and Latin America. It is hoped that the recommendations offered by this review will support policymaking that is responsive to the needs and realities of those in the global South, particularly the poorest and most marginalised.

This Sexuality and Poverty literature review takes, as a starting point, the 2010 SIDA study entitled ‘Poverty and Sexuality: What are the connections’. Written by Susan Jolly and Kate Hawkins, this study represents a first attempt to draw together literature on sexuality and poverty and to examine the intersections. The key message coming out of the study is the interrelated nature of sexuality and poverty: it demonstrates that the denial of sexual rights can contribute to poverty, while poverty can make people more vulnerable to sexual rights abuses. The study further argues that economic systems are structured around a normative heterosexual model of human relationships and that international development programming can, albeit unintentionally, reinforce these heterosexual structures.

This SIDA study first applied Chambers’ framework of a multidimensional ‘web of poverty’ to sexuality (see Figure 1). This was significant as Chambers’ framework is developed out of a participatory process in which poor people were asked to identify the key defining elements of their situation and the conditions that continue to trap them in poverty (Chambers 2007, 2005). The multidimensional ‘web of poverty’ condenses these conclusions into 12 core elements that keep people in poverty. The SIDA study called for more research into the interconnections between sexuality and poverty as understanding of these linkages remains limited; for those struggling for sexual rights to engage more with economic realities; and for poverty reduction efforts and economic policies to engage with and understand issues of sexual rights. This literature review picks up on the ways forward identified in the SIDA review, namely greater research into the interconnections between poverty and sexuality, and exploring how poverty reduction efforts and economic policies engage with and affect sexual rights. It therefore undertakes, in more detail than the SIDA study, a literature-informed review of the applicability of Chambers’ ‘web of poverty’ framework for issues of sexuality and poverty.

1.2 Definitions

There are important links between gender and sexuality. Gender in this review refers to a broad range of socially constructed relations that are based on, and which tend to correspond with, people’s biological sex (Gupta 2000; Ortner 1974). What it means to be a man or a woman is socially and historically contingent. Many factors influence gender roles and men’s and women’s ‘appropriate’ gendered behaviours, including class, religion, age, residential area, sexual and reproductive behaviour and so forth (Di Leonardo 1991).

We understand sexuality as the human capacity to experience and act upon sexual needs and desires and to live according to self-determined sexual identities. In recognising a wide diversity of sexual behaviours, sexuality is also a consideration of the ways in which social institutions and practices define heterosexual practices such as marriage, the family and biological reproduction as the norm, and thus exclude or ‘discipline’ sexual relations and practices that do not fit the heterosexual model. In line with Manalansan (2006), we treat sexuality as an entry point to examine how sexual behaviours and preferences – which are not geared towards heterosexual marriage, the family and biological reproduction – are excluded from mainstream discourse, institutions and practices.

LGBT persons and sex workers are, as this review will show, two categories of people whose lives are deeply affected by gendered norms about sexuality. Although LGBT persons and sex workers are very different categories – sex work is an occupation, not a sexual
orientation – both exist outside of and may challenge gendered norms about sexuality as an inherently reproductive act.

We use a definition of poverty related to Amartya Sen’s capability approach to human development and adopted by the UN. As such, poverty is considered to be broader than income and material living standards. Poverty refers to the ability of people to choose between different ways of living that they have reason to value (Sen 1999; 1989; 1985). Poverty is a denial of choices and opportunities for living a tolerable life (UNDP 1997: 2). Exclusion and discrimination based on sexual orientation or involvement in sex work are – as this review often shows – frequently associated with a closing down of choice and therefore closely linked to poverty.

Policy is defined as government-led public policy and statements of intent rather than implementation, evaluation and outcome. Law is defined as national-level legislative change on statutory rights or as the use of legal implements to challenge and address discriminatory legal statutes.

Successful and positive policy change is defined as discussion of:

- the removal of explicitly discriminatory legislation or policy;
- the explicit recognition that people need not live in conventionally defined households and partnerships;
- legal recognition of the sexual identity of transgender people in official documents (passports, application forms for jobs) and health and social protection policies.

1.3 Methodology

This literature review is not a systematic review in the Cochrane sense, but has employed clear search criteria and categories of inclusion and exclusion in order to advance evidence-based policy.

An initial scoping note was developed in May and June 2013 that drew on insights from 57 relevant articles. The scoping note was written to take stock of the available evidence, to decide whether a full review would be feasible and valuable and to identify key research areas on sexuality and poverty. Building on the scoping review, we conducted five searches. We conducted two specific searches to identify additional papers and other sources. Search 1 examined the intersections between sexuality and poverty while Search 2 looked for material on sexuality law and rights (the databases and search strings are listed below).

Three supplementary follow-up searches were undertaken as low numbers of papers were initially identified as suitable for inclusion (37 in total) and because the researchers recognised that this was not an accurate reflection of available literature. Particular gaps concerned migration (Search 3), microcredit/finance (Search 4) and trafficking (Search 5).

Search 5, on trafficking, identified 407 papers, which were sorted and classified according to both country origin and destination of migration. This complexity of categorisation, along with the difficulty of exclusion of articles according to search criteria meant that reviewing all these papers was not feasible. We therefore concluded that material on trafficking required separate attention and could not be addressed here. This paper also draws on review articles including academic reviews of data from the United Nations General Assembly Special Session (UNGASS), on HIV and AIDS reports submitted by individual countries to
report on their progress. We also included papers that the authors themselves knew of to fill some of the outstanding gaps. All these searches and identification of literature took place between June and August 2013.

1.4 Databases
Initially the electronic searches for this review were to be carried out in Google Scholar. However, this search engine has been shown to have limitations in terms of functionality, transparency of content, and also the variable weighting given to search terms (Shultz 2007). It was therefore decided to proceed using the electronic databases of The Web of Knowledge: Science Citation Index Expanded, Social Sciences Citation Index, Arts and Humanities Citation Index, Conference Proceedings – Science, and Conference Proceedings – Social Science and Humanities, Medline, BIOSIS Citation Index and Google Scholar.

1.5 Search criteria and search strings
The searches were limited to English-language publications and a date range of 2003 to 2013. The searches were carried out in the topic search field for the electronic databases of The Web of Knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search number</th>
<th>Search term</th>
<th>Total number of hits</th>
<th>HIV-related articles</th>
<th>Final number selected for inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search 1: Sexuality and Poverty</td>
<td>Sexualit* and (sex worker* or prostitute) or (lgbt* or lesbian* or gay or bisexual* or transgender* or homosexual* or queer* or ‘sexual orientation’ or ‘men who have sex with men’ or msm) and (intervention or poverty or exclusion or excluded or marginali* or depriv* or ‘social capital’ or isolat* or discrim*)</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search 2: Sexuality, Law and Rights</td>
<td>Title=(Sexuality, Law, and Rights) AND sexualit* or sex worker or prostitute* or lgbt* or lesbian* or gay or bisexual* or transgender* or homosexual* or queer* or ‘sexual orientation’ or ‘men who have sex with men’ or msm or law* or legislat* or legal or statut* or policy or policies or ‘social protection’ or ‘social transfer’* or ‘public works’ or ‘cash transfer’* or ‘social assistance’ or rights</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search 3: Sexuality and Migration</td>
<td>Migrat* and (intervention or poverty or exclusion or excluded or marginali* or depriv* or ‘social capital’ or isolat* or discrim*) AND sexualit*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search 4: Sexuality and Microcredit/Finance</td>
<td>(‘sex worker* or prostitut*) or (lgbt* or lesbian* or gay or bisexual* or transgender* or homosexual* or queer* or ‘sexual orientation’ or ‘men who have sex with men’ or msm) AND (microcredit or ‘micro-credit’ or microfinance or ‘micro-finance’ or ‘micro-enterprise’ or microenterprise or ‘cash transfer’*)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The review focused on LMIC in Africa, Latin America, Asia and the Middle East. For the selection of countries we referred to the World Bank categorisation as updated on 1 July 2013.  

1.6 Additional sources
We also searched for relevant grey literature by well-known and respected (I)NGOs in the following places: the websites of ELDIS, Human Rights Watch, The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association (ILGA), the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, and NGOs, community organisations, and government websites. The search engines on these websites are limited in comparison to those used for the above-mentioned searches; therefore manual checks were carried out, applying the geographic search criteria and time-frames (see above, search criteria and search strings), in order to capture relevant literature. Citations in these identified documents and websites were then visited and/or checked for pertinent positive legislative and policy changes. These additional searches resulted in 47 reports that were considered relevant for this review. Finally, this review has also drawn on the researchers' prior knowledge and expertise as well as current and ongoing work at IDS.

1.7 Data collection and analysis
Search 1 on Sexuality and Poverty produced a total of 483, while Search 2, on Sexuality, Law and Rights, produced 124 articles. Studies in high-income countries, as identified by the World Bank list of economies (July 2013) and studies without abstracts were immediately excluded. Additional exclusions concerned scholarly discussions on representation of LGBT people in film and novels. The remaining articles were reviewed and relevant papers selected by two reviewers who examined the full text and the relevancy to the themes. Criteria for inclusion were that the articles focused particularly on issues of sexuality and poverty, rather than disease, behavioural features, or health models. Disagreements over inclusion or exclusion were resolved by discussion. At the end of this selection round, 37 articles for Search 1 and 6 for Search 2 were selected for inclusion.

The reviewers’ concern about gaps around the topics of trafficking, migration and microcredit, resulted in additional searches. As mentioned above, Search 3 on Migration produced a further 40 articles and Search 4 on microcredit and finance produced 18 articles. Using the same procedures outlined above, the reviewers decided on the articles for inclusion and analysed which of these studies suited the themes of the research questions, based on the dimensions listed in Chambers' 'web of poverty' (2007, 2005).


5 In preparing the scoping note, it became clear that a large body of material exists around LGBT media and film in peer-reviewed journals. While providing fascinating reading, much of this takes the form of literary criticism which is not directly relevant to the aims of this review.
1.8 Limitations of the study
Using specific search strings may have excluded relevant studies that used different terms and keywords. The vast majority of the studies on sexuality related to HIV prevention, treatment and care, or had a medical or public health approach and keywords. As is evident from Table 1 above, about 25 per cent of all the literature identified in the five searches related to HIV/AIDS.

The choice of the English language means that we have fewer results from some countries, where publications may be in another local or major international language such as Arabic, French or Spanish. This may explain part of the lack of studies on sexuality from the Middle East and North African countries. Although the authors are aware of literature covering sexuality in these countries, it appears that the combination of search terms and thus the connections between poverty, law and rights and, in some instances, the lack of abstracts means that they were not picked up in the searches (see for example, Shannahan 2010; Afary 2009; Babayan and Najmabadi 2008; Ilkkaracan 2008).

South Africa and India are comparatively well researched, and this may skew the overall findings.

Most studies and reports on policy mention the result of a process, such as the presence or absence of certain discriminatory laws. Although these are indicators of change and an update on the legal situation to key stakeholders they provide little or no information on the drivers of legal changes.

The study has focused primarily on people marginalised because of their sexuality; as a result, and because of what material is available, sex worker- and LGBT-related literature feature strongly. The review focuses on particular topics as they are mentioned in articles identified in Searches 1, 2, 3 and 4. However, as mentioned above, the search on trafficking, poverty and sexuality (Search 5) requires a separate review. Religion was not included in any of the search strings and no doubt also includes a review in its own right. Other aspects of sexuality that may be linked with poverty and law such as female genital cutting and forced marriages of young girls are not covered in this study. Substantial bodies of literature exist in these areas but they may not be framed in terms of sexuality, poverty, law and rights and so have not been identified in these searches. Finally, although this review identified many instances of policy change in relation to sexuality, the social movements associated with, and the processes underlying these changes, have not been identified in the literature. Given the often global and intersecting nature of these social movements, as well as the recent developments in this area, this would benefit from a research focus.

1.9 Literature review findings: the relationship between sexuality, poverty and development
Considerable work has now developed the case for sexuality as an appropriate concept for a development agenda (Cornwall 2006; Gosine 2006; Armas 2007; Jolly 2003; Jolly 2000). Critiques of the focus in development – on two fixed gender categories and on heterosexual sex relations – include firstly, that it privileges heterosexuality. Secondly, it projects a sexual identity onto men and women, which essentialises, reifies – and often racialises – notions of sexuality. And third, while identifying and privileging categories of sexual identity such as lesbian, gay, queer, it fails to address the fluidity of these identities and the ways in which identity is understood in diverse contexts. This, in turn, can result in understandings of men and women, often aligned to gender stereotypes, in which men cannot be vulnerable and

---

6 Both LGBT people and sex workers represent categories of people whose sex rights are violated by laws and policies that restrict how they express their sexualities. In addition, individuals within both these categories experience excessive regulation of sexuality, require protection against coercion and violent discrimination and struggle to practise sexual autonomy.
women are seldom powerful or sexual (Cornwall and Jolly 2009). The institutionalisation of these normative heterosexuality norms, or of ‘heteronormativity’ (Jackson 2006), limits the possibilities of more fluid or complex understandings of sexual identities and results in exclusions that have material effects, producing and exacerbating poverty and ill-being. People either have to conform to heterosexual sexualities or they risk being excluded from development and its benefits (Jolly 2006a). Social and political norms about sexuality thus affect people’s ability to choose between different ways of living that they value and this is therefore relevant to discussions on poverty and development.

The WHO defines sexuality as:

Sexuality is a central aspect of being human throughout life and encompasses sex, gender identities and roles, sexual orientation, eroticism, pleasure, intimacy and reproduction. Sexuality is experienced and expressed in thoughts, fantasies, desires, beliefs, attitudes, values, behaviours, practices, roles and relationships. While sexuality can include all of these dimensions, not all of them are always experienced or expressed. Sexuality is influenced by the interaction of biological, psychological, social, economic, political, cultural, ethical, legal, historical, religious and spiritual factors.

(WHO 2006: 5)

This definition is significant in that it differentiates sex from sexuality, and stresses the social and cultural factors that shape people’s experiences, rather than emphasising the biological dimensions that constitute the act of sexual intercourse (Boyce et al. 2007). As such, it recognises that sexuality is a social and political process, constructed through the actions and choices of people, embedded in social life and power dynamics (Corrêa and Jolly 2006) rather than simply the result of biological impulses and acts. The arguments for including sexuality within the development agenda are linked to the acknowledgement of sexuality as a social and political process. They include the recognition that:

- Failing to conform to conventional sexualities can result in death (through ‘honour’ killings or death for gay or transgendered people);
- Sexuality shapes livelihoods and has been shown to limit, or occasionally enhance, some people’s employment and other opportunities to earn a living (Jolly 2006a);
- Sexuality can be a reason to alternatively constrain or force people into mobility (Jolly 2006);
- Failure to recognise the effect of non-conforming sexuality, and the sexuality of marginalised people such as people with disabilities (High-Level Task Force for the ICPD 2013; Frohmader and Ortoleva 2013; Thomas 2005) and women living with HIV and AIDS (Muller and MacGregor 2013) reinforces their marginalisation;
- The ways in which people experience a lack of wellbeing, discomfort and stigmatisation is a social injustice and a human rights issue (Ndashe 2011; Jolly 2006a).

Failing to address sexuality thus undermines broader attempts to ensure human rights and to facilitate empowerment, including participatory development approaches (Ndashe 2011; Ako 2010; Cornwall and Jolly 2009). In addition, recent research demonstrates how assumptions about conventional sexuality can act as a form of exclusion, particularly in relation to policy processes. This in turn translates into material and symbolic disadvantage and violence (Lind 2009). The failure to recognise the ways in which assumptions about sexuality shape political
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7 The term ‘heteronormativity’ thus refers to the normalisation of heterosexual relations, as institutionalised through institutions, structures, practices and processes (Jolly 2011; Berlant and Warner 1998).
processes and development interventions can result in undermining local activities, essentialising identities, and further stigmatising those already marginalised (Overs 2013; Khanna 2009).

A core reason for examining the role of sexuality is that it raises awareness of assumptions about the kinds of relationships that the beneficiaries of development engage in. Bedford argues that development programmes often portray – albeit implicitly – a model of monogamous, caring, married couples, demonstrating social equality and shared responsibility as necessary for surviving in neoliberal contexts (Bedford 2005). Models of monogamous, married couples are also widely shared outside neoliberal contexts. In Vietnam for example, the ‘happy’ family is promoted in many national policies before and after the opening of the market economy (SRV 2002, 1984). The happy Vietnamese family is understood to be composed of two parents and two children, an older daughter and a younger son, all leading productive lives and abstaining from what are considered ‘social evils’, such as gambling, drugs, theft, prostitution and pornography (Oosterhoff 2008). Although the cultural and political contexts differ widely, the nuclear family model involves a series of shared assumptions and failures. The first assumption is that everyone is in heterosexual partnerships and that these constitute the ‘households’ that are to be privileged by development’s encounters. Buried within this is the idea that households are the basis of society and development. Secondly, there is an assumption that the sexual relationships within these households and between these women and men are ‘private’ and only of concern to development in relationship to family planning and HIV prevention. The focus on normative heterosexual relationships and households results in a concomitant failure to incorporate those people who do not live in these kinds of households. It also means that development fails to consider how relationships within heterosexual marriages, as well as those who are outside of these relationships, might have relevance to development. As a result, development reinforces other forms of societal stigmatisation on those who are excluded from this frame and experience this in economic (as well as other) terms. Those who are included in the frame may also be disempowered through a lack of communication, information and engagement with sexuality (Hawkins, Cornwall and Lewin 2011; Jolly 2006a). In contrast, opening up a space to work positively on sexuality has been seen to have beneficial effects for everyone, regardless of their sexuality (Aken’ova 2013; Sharma 2013).

Addressing sexuality may also help shed new light on seemingly intractable issues related to gender and development. While mainstream gender and development work often fails to acknowledge trans people and, despite decades of work, still frequently overlooks men, a sexuality lens sheds light on non-normative gender expression and provides lessons for people interested in gender issues as well as the rights of all other people. By focusing on sexuality, it is possible to move away from understanding women as passive and vulnerable and to recognise that men too are often vulnerable in relation to sexuality. Both Tadros and Dolan’s work on men’s experience of rape demonstrates heightened feelings of shame and consequent silence (cited in Cornwall and Jolly 2009; Tadros 2013). They show how gender norms make it particularly difficult for men to admit that they have experienced sexual violence. Similarly, conventional understandings of gender – which posit in general that women should behave in ‘feminine’ ways, not be or appear too ‘masculine’ or ‘butch’, have heterosexual and monogamous relationships, not be too assertive or independent, perhaps not undertake activities outside of the domestic sphere, and which allocate to men the inverse roles of independence, public activities, ‘masculinity’ and strength (but which can vary considerably in different contexts) – have obscured patterns of migration (such as male care workers) and failed to recognise that migration often has a sexual dimension and may be a route out of poverty (Campuzano 2009; Bandyopadhyay, Gayen, Debnath et al. 2004; Manalansan 2006). In addition, such stereotypical perceptions of how people should look and behave have material ramifications, limiting the economic opportunities for those who do not conform. For example, work in Brazil’s service industry requires people to be
stereotypically good-looking. In the Philippines it is reported that women who look more masculine find it very hard to secure employment (SIDA 2010: 28). Sarda argues that, in Latin America, lesbian women are forced to choose between expressing their sexuality or securing employment, as women who do not conform to gendered behavioural expectations are discriminated against in the labour market. She further argues that exclusion puts enormous pressure on all other men and women to conform. In turn, these norms are reinforced and perpetuated by development agencies and other organisations, further marginalising those who do not fit in (Sarda 2008).

Two main themes have been the focus of research on the interface between sexuality and poverty within a development context:

1. Tackling HIV and AIDS;

1.10 Tackling HIV and AIDS

HIV/AIDS has been the main avenue through which development has addressed sexuality issues along with corresponding issues of regulation and risk management (Cornwall and Jolly 2009). Much of the research found in this review was also linked to funding by large national and international donors; for example, USAID, NIMH, The World Bank, The World AIDS Foundation, The Canadian Institute of Health, and The National AIDS Control Commission of Rwanda.

The necessity of incorporating all populations, and especially those deemed most at risk, which includes MSM and sex workers who are disproportionately affected by HIV, into HIV prevention and treatment strategies has brought sexual minorities into various health-related research agendas, lifting the lid on these under-researched populations. Until relatively recently the very existence of some sexual minorities was not recognised within the public health service discourses and policies of several states. In China sentinel surveillance on HIV began to include MSM in 2002 and a specific strategy to implement a comprehensive response to HIV among MSM only began to be implemented in 2009 (UNAIDS, UNDP and APCOM 2012a). In Namibia, Botswana, Malawi (Baral, Trapence, Motimedi et al. 2009), and Rwanda (Binagwaho, Chapman, Koleros et al. 2009) government funding was not available for HIV prevention and treatment programmes for sexual minorities as recently as 2008, which contributed to this invisibility and marginalisation (Chapman et al. 2011; Fay, Baral, Trapence et al. 2011). These studies explore either the HIV risk or HIV prevalence and risk amongst MSM, and confirm that, similar to other sub-Saharan countries, MSM are disproportionately affected by HIV in Namibia, Botswana, and Malawi. Lorway, in a study among young men engaging in same-sex relations in the township of Katutura in Namibia, questions international public health theories that portray AIDS in Africa as an unambiguous heterosexual epidemic (Lorway 2006). Rather, men have same-sexual relations and engage in sexual behaviours that put them at risk for HIV but they do not necessarily identify as LGBT. Similarly, identifying MSM as a biomedical category, a definition of sexuality or sexual identity is inadequate. For example, in India the proportion of MSM that report recent sex with women varies greatly across states but reaches as high as 66 per cent (UNAIDS, UNDP and APCOM 2012b). Men and women who do not self-identify as homosexual and/or bisexual are less visible, which also makes it more difficult to develop targeted and tailor-made information. This exclusion by governments and NGOs of sexual minorities from health programmes, in particular HIV interventions, is undermining the rights of sexual minorities and damaging the heteronormative HIV and AIDS research and programmes that are already in place (Johnson and Cameron 2007). According to UNAIDS (2012), external funding represents 50 per cent of HIV investments for 21 countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Large international donors such as the Global Fund have demanded that countries collect surveillance data on specific groups’ ‘key populations’ as part of evidence-based planning and results-oriented progress reporting. An increasing number of countries accept this form
of economic conditionality and submit – at least some of – the requested data on HIV prevention, treatment and care among most-at-risk populations in UNGASS (United Nations General Assembly Special Session) country progress reports (Adam, de Wit, Toskin et al. 2009). Such donor policies have clearly contributed to the visibility and awareness of LGBT people and sex workers, especially in Africa, at national and international levels. However, whether and how these policy measures empower these most-at-risk populations is not clear (Overs 2013; HIVOS 2012). What is apparent is that these international efforts towards inclusion and decriminalisation through HIV and AIDS programmes are running parallel to many legal, political and cultural obstacles within a number of African countries who are introducing new discriminatory laws (ILGA 2013: 37).

It is also clear that even with substantial funding in place, research on HIV and AIDS failed to acknowledge – or address – other non-medical aspects of sexuality including emotional aspects. Boyce et al. (2007) argue that these limitations stem from an ‘inadequate conceptualisation of human sexuality’ within HIV and AIDS work (Boyce et al. 2007: 1). Sex, they argue, is not a clear-cut category or activity that exists in all societies; rather, considerable variation and ambiguity exist over which particular acts might be described as ‘sex’ in culturally and contextually diverse settings, but might also not be seen as ‘sex’. Human sexual experience is, they suggest, constructed through cultural understandings, individual experience and interpretation, interpersonal complexity and social diversity and thus what is considered sex or not is infinitely malleable. The complex, ambiguous and contested nature of these issues therefore requires ‘subtle understandings of the interrelated cultural and subjective meanings that frame sexual practice’ (Boyce et al. 2007: 4).

1.11 Addressing human rights

The UN conferences in Cairo and Beijing made the initial connections between sexuality, health, human development and human rights (Corrêa and Jolly 2006). At the level of global policy, the 2001 UN General Assembly Special Session (influenced by the HIV and AIDS agenda) encouraged greater visibility of sex workers and LGBT groups as ‘other voices’ and ‘various UN human rights surveillance committees have adopted recommendations on sexuality related stigma, discrimination and violence’ (Corrêa and Jolly 2006: 9). In 2011, the Human Rights Council, led by South Africa and Brazil, passed a resolution that explicitly addresses human rights violations on the basis of ‘sexual orientation and gender identity’. The UN resolution and the linking of sexual orientation and gender identity to human rights violation affirms the ‘universality of human rights’ and accords concern about the ways in which violence and discrimination marginalise people because of their sexual identities.

There have also been regional developments in relation to sexuality and Ndashe reports that the African Commission on Human and People’s Rights (ACHPR) has experienced a steady growth in organising for the protection of rights for people marginalised because of their sexuality. The strategy of organisation around LGBT rights has sought to identify and reach out to activists who can draw on regional human rights mechanisms and on influencing the ACHPR in relation to issues of sexuality and human rights (Ndashe 2011: 17). African social justice movements are working to address LGBT violations of human rights, which they see not as being constrained around issues of homosexuality but, rather, as being part of a broader context of general human rights violations that affect women (in terms of sexuality) and everyone (in terms of health and food security). There have also been positive developments in relation to policy at national level. Laws and policies have been strengthened. Countries have passed non-discrimination laws, inclusive hate crime laws, comprehensive anti-bullying laws, and relationship recognition laws for gay and lesbian couples. South Africa’s post-apartheid constitution in 1997 was the first in the world to outlaw discrimination based on sexual orientation, and this has survived in the face of opposition. In
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8 www.hrw.org/news/2011/06/17/historic-decision-united-nations
2009 a coalition of civil society groups in India – Voices against 377 – were successful in getting colonial legislation that criminalised homosexuality overturned (Khanna 2013). The interim constitution of Nepal includes clauses protecting transgender citizens from discrimination (Boyce and Coyle 2013). Laws related to discrimination, gender reassignment, marriage, employment and official papers (such as changing gender markers on birth certificates and passports) have all improved in different settings (ILGA 2013, 2012, 2011).

Work in these two areas has contributed to a growing understanding about these specific and important issues, and to a growing awareness of the significance of sexuality for development.

1.12 The significance of sexuality for development

A focus on properly understanding why it might be important to take sexuality into consideration requires an exploration of how and why sexuality matters in relation to well-understood aspects of development such as poverty, education and housing. As suggested above, development has either not ‘seen’ sexuality or seen only those sexualities that have been labelled as ‘bad’ for moral, medical or health ‘risk’-related reasons. HIV and AIDS research made people increasingly aware that sexuality is not just a physical (or natural) process, but one that is deeply cultural. It has also made researchers aware of the limitations of Western models of sexuality, of the difficulty of having standardised approaches for different cultural contexts and of the need for careful, contextual research. Even within one Westernised country, namely the United States of America, ‘the meanings and valences of “straight”, “gay”, or “lesbian” in communities of colour and immigrant communities were radically different from mainstream American society’ (Manalansan 2006: 228). Despite this, as Campuzano and others have argued, the belief that sexuality is ‘natural’, rather than cultural, social and political, has been extremely hard to shift and much of the work relating to development continues to assume a biological underpinning to sexuality (Campuzano 2009).

Notwithstanding these challenges, over the past ten years, there have been several positive trends to grapple with sexuality within development. This has included understanding sexuality more broadly in relation to health services and education; examinations of sexuality in a human rights framework and looking at sexuality in positive, affirming ways (Leiper 2009, Jolly 2007). This trend has also sought to comprehend ‘the particular factors, conditions, and ideologies that shape sexual identities and practices, and how these permeate social institutions’ (Manalansan 2006: 229). Much of this work has also sought to emphasise a social constructivist perspective that sees sexuality, not as a product of biological nature, but as something influenced by choice and agency (Boyce and Coyle 2013; Leiper 2009) and shaped by social, economic, political, religious and other societal structures. For these approaches, explaining sexuality involves a focus on context: positioning sexuality in relation to time, place, situation, individual and recognising how diverse institutions, norms, practices and relations construct and regulate sexuality (Ilkkaracan and Jolly 2007; Bay-Cheng, Burnette and McAnulty 2006).

Although there has been growing recognition of the significance of sexuality in relation to poverty and international development, evidence, data and policy discussions remain at an early stage. There are growing networks of LGBT and sex worker organisations all over the world. But many are emerging and have not yet been able to conduct peer-led research examining if and how sexuality affects different aspects of their lives. In addition, the evidence on sexuality has not yet been linked to broader existing models to measure or map poverty. There is a broad international understanding and acceptance of poverty and development as multidimensional (Sen 1999, 1989,1985; UNDP 1997). Although there is a need to develop a comparative framework and indicators, a fixed list of dimensions or capabilities to measure poverty risks becoming exclusive (Sen 2004). There is thus a need to recognise the interaction between these separate dimensions of poverty and how the total is
more than just the sum of its parts. In the sections below, we take Chambers’ well-known framework, also known as the ‘Web of Poverty’ (Chambers 2007, 2005). Chambers recognises the interaction between these dimensions and the importance of local contexts in defining their meaning. Chambers’ model is a multidimensional, context-specific approach to poverty. It is based on participatory poverty assessments in more than 20 countries and including over 20,000 poor men and women. In this initiative, poor people identified the multiple dimensions both characteristic of their situation and simultaneously operating to trap them in poverty. We use this web or framework as a lens through to look at the existing research that has been done on sexuality and poverty to explore the extent to which these same dimensions operate in relation to sexuality.
2 The role of sexuality in relation to poverty and development – Chambers’ ‘Web of Poverty’

The intersections between sexuality and poverty can be visualised and conceptualised as posing multidimensional disadvantages to individuals and groups, similar to what Chambers (2007, 2005) described as the “web of poverty”’s disadvantages’. Poverty, Chambers argues, contains a multiplicity of interlinked dimensions – material poverties, insecurities, physical illness, lack of information, lack of political clout, ascribed and legal inferiority, lack of education and capability, institutions and access, poverty of time, and seasonal dimensions, as well as a ‘profound lack of opportunity to be heard’ – which act to trap people in conditions of pronounced deprivation and lack of wellbeing (2007, see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Chambers’ (2005) ‘Web of Poverty’ disadvantages
The significance of Chambers’ approach is the capturing of dimensions\(^9\) that poor people themselves articulate as reducing their bargaining power and reinforcing their disadvantage. He argues that these multiple dimensions can be traced through the life stories of poor people (2007). Chambers’ understanding of poverty as multidimensional, interrelated and as both a symptom and a cause finds resonance in issues of sexuality. Indeed, he points to the fact that the importance of bodies to poor people has tended to be under-recognised. Bodies, he argues, constitute many people’s most important asset. And yet, bodies are vulnerable, cannot be insured and are indivisible. They are often weakened by life experiences and can be extremely exposed (Chambers 2007). Despite this resonance, few analyses have sought to apply Chambers’ multidimensional approach to sexuality. The exceptions are Leiper’s analysis of sex workers in Uganda (2009) and Campuzano’s exploration of Latin American travesti\(^{10}\) experiences, each of which is discussed briefly below.

Leiper's analysis of sex work, sexuality and poverty in Uganda occurs in a context where, because of sodomy laws, sex workers experience considerable stigma and abuse (Leiper 2009). This work illustrates the links between sexuality and poverty: through vulnerability to HIV/AIDS, as well as the conceptualisation of poor people as a stigmatised ‘risk group’; through sexual and reproductive health complications; through inability to pay for health services and obtain knowledge and services for sexual protection; and through the many factors – including gender relations, hierarchies and stigma – that constrain women from desiring or accessing these services. Leiper thus argues that sex workers in Kampala experience all 12 of Chambers' dimensions, and she goes on to identify additional limiting factors associated with mobility, psychological ill-being and generational poverty. In addition, ‘as a direct consequence of their legal inferiority, sex workers were unable to enjoy many civil rights and entitlements in terms of police protection and legal recourse’ (Leiper 2009: 39). Overall, Leiper points out that it is the intersection of these dimensions of poverty that adversely affect sex workers. It is the combination of gender codes that sanction violence against women, their inferior status as sex workers and their lack of recourse to police or legal action that makes sex workers so vulnerable. The lack of access to sexual health information combined with poor sanitation, dangerous places, the pressure to satisfy customers quickly and the likelihood of engaging in unprotected sex also make sex workers vulnerable.

Campuzano uses Chambers’ framework of the multiplicity of interlinked dimensions of poverty to explore the experiences of Latin American travesti (2009). He argues that travesti experience ‘all the privations associated with poverty, in all its multiple dimensions’ (2009: 76). Like Leiper, who proposes that it is the intersection of multiple dimensions of ill-being that profoundly affect sex workers, Campuzano argues that it is the combination of structural violence by the state and society, direct violence carried out by anti-social elements and symbolic violence by institutions and people that shapes travestis’ lack of wellbeing. He too identifies additional dimensions of ill-being, namely a poverty of space, which operates in conjunction with Chambers’ 12 dimensions to entrench travestis’ experiences of poverty.

Chambers’ emphasis on the critical and reciprocal nature of intersections has resonance in the exploration of sexuality and poverty. Race, ethnicity, gender and caste, like sexuality, are socially embedded and contextual and are powerful status intersections within the ‘web of poverty’, and they can act to reinforce or circumvent prejudices related to sexuality and poverty. Sexual minorities have an additional continuum along which they position
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\(^9\) He uses dimensions to reflect (a) the interactive nature of these processes, which are simultaneously subjective and objective processes; (b) to bring together the determinants and experiential dimensions of poverty; and (c) to highlight the multiplicity of dimensions, which may be material, economic, social, political, institutional, legal, psychological or physical and to avoid exclusive definitions of deprivations.

\(^{10}\) Campuzano makes the point that travestis cannot be categorised according to binary gender categories, and do not necessarily identify straightforwardly with either homosexuality or heterosexuality. In development terms, they are largely invisible and there is very little information on them.
themselves and are positioned. This influences their social relations in relation to other known dimensions of poverty, such as lack of education or living in remote or isolated areas. Class, caste and gender relations shape all sexual interactions, including commercial or compensated sexual interactions (Ozbay 2010; Fernandez-Davila, Salazar, Caceres et al. 2008, Lorway 2006). Vice versa, sexual interactions also shape class and gender relations. Sex workers often, for example, do this work because they are poor, live in slums, and lack access to institutions and education, and they and often their children are excluded from education and housing because of their sex work (Leiper 2009; O’Neil, Orchard, Swarankar et al. 2004).

Race, poverty, ethnicity and residence also often converge because suburbs and townships are places where poor people reside. Ozbay examines these complex interactions in a study on ‘rent boys’ in the queer social spaces of Istanbul. These heterosexually identified boys come from impoverished socially excluded suburban areas of the city and engage in paid sex with other men in a burgeoning Western-style gay scene. Part of their sexual marketing is to sell a tough image of masculinity that is built on middle- and upper-class stereotypes and fears of young men in poor suburbs. This masculine image helps to mask the undermining effects of paid sex on the rent boys’ sense of themselves. Being from the outskirts with few good employment prospects drives these boys to sex work, and comparative advantage leads them to market themselves in that work as suburban toughs – which in turn makes them less available for the types of work that their clients do, where such an image is not valued. In contrast, a study of black LGBT students in South African townships found that they were often victims of extreme violence, whereas wealthier LGBT students from historically white residential areas experienced far less violence, illustrating the linkages between race, sexuality, gender boundaries and spatial distribution. Similarly, in Cuba, the whiteness of white sex workers acts as camouflage, whereas non-white sex workers are more likely to be singled out for harassment. In Namibia, where homosexuality is illegal and homophobic discourse is rampant in the media, in social and state institutions, and in the church, different ethnic categories experience homophobia in different ways. Lorway (2006) reports that following homophobic hate rhetoric in Namibia by the state and religious organisations at the beginning of the twenty-first century, black LGBT youths from the township of Katutura experienced a violent backlash within their communities, whereas white and coloured11 homosexuals from more privileged backgrounds did not. The experiences of the black LGBT youths within their own communities was further delineated by the ethnic category to which they belonged, with supportive acceptance amongst the Damara ethnicity but virulent homophobia amongst the Ovambo (Lorway 2006). In all the above examples, class, colour and sexual orientation intersect to privilege and protect wealthier, ‘whiter’ categories of people, while masking the violence and vulnerability experienced by poorer members of the same society.

Female and male migrant workers, too, face sexual prejudice that is often racialised and entangled with notions about heterosexuality, gender, class and national identities. Tai-Lüe sex workers from Thailand have been singled out by the Chinese government as carriers of HIV, reflecting not an ethnic and biological trend, but rather a long history of prejudice and stigma against ethnic minorities, foreigners and sex workers (Hyde 2007). Filipina migrants working in the nightlife industries in East Malaysia face social discrimination, due to the assumed sexual nature of their work, their religion, their ethnicity and their language (Hilsdon and Giridharan 2008). This social discrimination in turn prevents them from finding work in other sectors. Sri Lankan women migrants working as domestic servants in Beirut also experience oppression that is related to their class. As uneducated labourers who are often

11 In Namibia, the term ‘coloured’ refers to people of mixed European, Khoisan and African ancestry. The term does not, however, reflect a homogenous population. The term also has political connotations. Given its associations with Apartheid South Africa’s racial classifications, the term was rejected by many during the apartheid era, who preferred to embrace black consciousness and a political identity of resistance against apartheid. More recently, the term has gained popularity and has been embraced as a form of political mobilisation around a marginalised and indigenous identity.
expected to live with their employers, they are expected to not have sexual and intimate relations, even when they are away for several years in their countries of destination (Smith 2010).

The multidimensional and interlinked nature of class, colour, religion, gender, economic opportunity and so forth is clear in all these above examples, despite the diversity in countries and sexualities. In the following sections, we apply Chambers’ multidimensional ‘web of poverty’ (2007, 2005) to people marginalised because of their sexuality based on the existing literature on LGBT persons and sex workers, in order to develop a general understanding of their primary dimensions of ill-being. Unlike Chambers, we are not seeking to collate the voices of the poor in this exercise. Rather, we aim to examine the extent to which publications and researchers have identified multiple dimensions of poverty and sexuality that – as both symptoms and causes – affect people in multiple and interlinked ways. In this respect, the literature is still nascent. Unlike the above applications of Chambers’ multiple dimensions, this meta-analysis seeks to identify the dimensions most relevant to sexuality and poverty. As is evident in the discussion below, much work is still needed to demonstrate the composite ways in which sexuality and poverty intersect. Chambers’ common interconnecting themes, which we discuss in sequence below, are as follows:12

- Ascribed and legal inferiority
- Lack of political clout
- Lack of information
- Lack of education
- Institutions and access
- Poverty of time
- Places of the poor
- Insecurities
- Physical ill-being
- Social relations
- Material poverty

Figure 2, below, provides a visual overview of the key findings in relation to sexuality. We have modified a couple of these categories slightly to better reflect the findings: ‘Places of the poor’ is expanded to ‘Spaces and places of sexual minorities’ and ‘Lack of information’ becomes ‘Lack of access to information’. In the following discussion of how these themes affect people who do not exhibit conventional heterosexual sexualities, we are attentive to people’s agency, and to their abilities and aspirations to resist oppressive and exclusive ideologies and institutes. The dynamics of resistance are often unexpected, unpredictable and possibly contradictory. For example, although the HIV epidemic has been particularly severe among some sexual minorities and sex workers, who face many other types of social exclusion, the epidemic has also created new opportunities for collective public action. Many LGBT groups, in countries where same-sex relations are illegal, started out as HIV prevention groups (ILGA 2013: 37). The literature also found many examples of resistance as well as unexpected sources of support in all parts of the world (discussed in more detail below).

---

12 We do not discuss Chambers’ twelfth dimension – seasonal poverty – which we found to be not highly relevant to people with marginal sexualities. In a more general review of sexuality and poverty, Jolly argues that ‘Men have more money to buy sex after harvest; women have more need to sell sex in the hungry season’ (Jolly 2006b: 2). Leiper (2009) shows that Ugandan sex workers experience low demand when school fees are due and high demand during public holidays and football matches. She considers this a form of seasonal poverty.
In many LMIC countries, sexual minorities and sex workers face difficulties obtaining official documents. In seeking to access health, economic, justice and religious institutions, sex workers and LGBT workers often experience stigma, verbal and physical abuse, harassment and discrimination which cause them to avoid these institutions. Time-related challenges include working during periods of menstruation, additional travel to minimise stigma, additional time to develop a feminine image. Sex workers have to accept many clients without time to recuperate, which puts their health at risk. LGBT people and sex workers may find themselves and their children excluded from education. They are often ostracised in schools through reproduction of local communities’ heterosexual values. Students experience isolation, bullying and often dropouts. LGBT people often end up in poor, unhealthy slums due to eviction or a necessity for work opportunities. The lack of privacy in these areas is compounded by stigma, which makes it difficult to find safe spaces, increasing LGBT and sex workers’ vulnerability to harassment and violence. In some areas the middle classes create exclusionary queer spaces. Human rights reports attest to serious and widespread violations of human rights of sex workers and LGBT populations in every region of the world. There is a growing willingness to report violations, and the emergence of grassroots organisations working on LGBT and sex workers’ rights and new policies. Insecurities experienced by sexual minorities are (re)created and reinforced by state and social institutions. This results in depression, lack of self-esteem, suicide ideation, suicide attempts, mental disorders and alcoholism. Natural disasters can polarise and intensify the inequalities already felt by marginalised groups. LGBT people and sex workers frequently experienced physical violence and torture. LGBT and sex workers’ higher exposure to HIV and discriminatory violence places them at greater risk of physical ill-being, and their roles/identities affect their overall physical and mental health. Institutions and access

Lack of education

Lack of information

Lack of political clout

Ascribed and legal inferiority

Social relations

Material poverties

Physical ill-being

Insecurities

Insecure spaces and places

Time of poverty

Poverty of time

LGBT people and sex workers lack access to general information on HIV prevention, treatment and care. LGBT people and sex workers also require, but often don’t receive, access to specific information to support their lifestyles. In countries where LGBT and sex work is criminalised political organisation has to be done underground or via the internet. Funding opportunities created through the HIV epidemic have provided opportunities for spaces for self-organisation and the development of networks although in some instances it has led to further marginalisation of sex workers.
2.1 Ascribed and legal inferiority

Chambers argues that both socially ascribed and legal inferiority of groups and individuals keep people caught in the ‘web of poverty’ (2007). Certain markers and social classifications, such as gender, ethnicity, caste, or being a refugee or a minor, ascribe a social inferiority to people, which in turn is often reinforced by discriminatory laws. Vice versa, discriminatory laws make some people social outcasts. LGBT people and sex workers also experience this combination of socially and legally prescribed disqualifiers.


Legal prosecution against the perpetrators is rare, which reflects both the legal and social inequities of sexual minorities and sex workers. Heteronormativity may be one of the causes of the lack of attention to the specific violence targeted against LGBT people. Sex workers’ organisations have argued that structural violence against sex workers has been ignored by women’s and human rights movements (Datta 2011).

Criminalisation of sexuality varies considerably across regions and both between and within countries, reflecting sociocultural, political and historical differences (ILGA 2013). Some of today’s discriminatory laws can be traced back to colonial legal heritages, as has, for example, been shown in research on LGBT persons in India and the Philippines (Khanna 2013; Lim and Jordan 2013). However, blaming colonialism alone for current discriminatory laws against LGBT persons and sex workers is inaccurate. Countries have also passed their own laws and determined their own policies since the end of colonialism. Within countries, different regimes have had different views on the legislation of sexuality. In Indonesia in the 1990s, for example, the government responded to international pressure to support same-sex marriage and sexual rights. But after 1998, a conservative Islamic minority pushed for legislation entrenching exclusively heterosexual marriage by criminalising a wide range of sexual practices (Blackwood 2007). Extreme regulation of sexuality in Iran took place after the installation of Islamic government (Bucar and Shirazi 2012). Some of the most restrictive sexual legislation in Africa, such as new proposals to criminalise homosexuality in Uganda, is also recently introduced. Meanwhile, other African countries, including South Africa, have recently decriminalised same-sex relations or are supporting liberal sexuality policies at an international level (ILGA 2013). To understand the current legal inferiority of LGBT persons and sex workers, it is essential to recognise the specific trajectories of individual countries. However, some broad regional tendencies can be identified at the moment, as the following maps on the prohibition of sexual activity between consenting adults around the world illustrate. These maps reflect on the legal categorisation of sex work and homosexuality around the world and, as such, seek to visually display data that are highly variable and context-dependent. Thus, there are some cases where the maps classify countries slightly
differently from how we as authors or others would. Nonetheless, they provide a good visual overview of broad trends and are therefore reproduced here.

**Figure 3: Legal status of homosexual activity by country**

![Map of the world showing legal status of homosexual activity by country](http://chartsbin.com/view/66v)

**Figure 4: Legal status of prostitution by country**

![Map of the world showing legal status of prostitution by country](http://chartsbin.com/view/snb)
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13 Interpretation of legislation, categorisation of countries and differences at the time of reporting are responsible for differences between this visual representation and the ILGA consideration that 76 countries still criminalise homosexuality.
Homosexuality and sex work are both legal in almost all Latin American and Central American countries. Sex work is illegal in the MENA countries (Middle East and North Africa), most of Africa and most of Asia. In some countries sex work *per se* is not illegal although related activities such as running a brothel and solicitation are criminalised.

In Mexico, Argentina and El Salvador homosexuality was already legalised in the nineteenth century, whereas in other countries, such as Nicaragua, homosexuality has only recently been decriminalised (in 2008). ILGA reports that homosexuality is illegal in 76 countries, the majority of which are in Africa and the MENA region (ILGA 2013). Related prison terms range from two months to three years in Burundi, to 30 years to life in Tanzania; in seven countries, namely Sudan, Mauritania, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, parts of Nigeria, and the southern parts of Somalia, the penalty is death. In most of Asia consensual sex between same-sex adults is legal (ILGA 2013). In countries where homosexuality is criminalised, legal constraints on sexuality can extend to other people, such as heterosexual male rape victims, who may experience difficulties obtaining legal redress (Tadros 2013).

Even where same-sex relationships and sex work are legal, LGBT people and sex workers often face violence and restricted access to the legal system because of their social inferiority, as well as other dimensions of the ‘web of poverty’, such as lack of education. For example, South Africa’s constitution recognises the rights of gay, lesbian and transgendered people, but deeply conservative views about gender are widely shared among many South Africans, including leaders and law enforcement agencies. Hate crimes against LGBT people expose the gap between the lived realities of those marginalised on the basis of sexuality and the law (Lewin, Williams and Thomas 2013). Similarly, in Peru homosexuality is not criminalised. *Travesti*, however, encounter stigma and exclusion due to sociocultural gender norms. Because of this social exclusion, *travesti* have fewer opportunities for paid work, and are more likely to become sex workers; this is legal, but highly stigmatised (Campuzano 2009). Likewise, in Colombia, the judicial system recognises the rights of LGBT persons and sex workers, but widespread social contempt for these groups results in inaction when their rights are violated (Colombia Diversia 2011). Brazil’s Ministry of Labor recognises sex work as a formal occupation, and sex workers have the same rights and protections as other occupations (Guimaraes and Merchán-Hamann in Chacham, Diniz, Maia et al. 2007). Yet sex workers continue to face exploitation and abuse (Chacham et al. 2007). In Senegal sex work is legal and regulated, but solicitation and running brothels are criminalised (Mgbako and Smith 2010). Senegalese sex workers are required by national law to register and have regular monthly health checks, and there is a minimum age requirement of 21. Registered sex workers’ children also have access to health care. However, not all Senegalese sex workers are registered, perhaps because they are underage or because they do not wish to disclose their occupation due to social ostracism. These sex workers drift into hidden, marginalised populations (Mgbako and Smith 2010). Filipino LGBT people have some legal protections, but they are also systematically deprived of decent jobs, humane housing conditions, and adequate health care because of a combination of legal and ascribed inferiority. Filipino grassroots organisations emphasise LGBT people’s need for jobs, an end to legal discrimination, and inclusion in government benefits for couples (Lim and Jordan 2013). These examples show that the legal and socially ascribed inferiorities of LGBT persons and sex workers are interrelated and embedded in other dimensions of poverty.

The absence of specific laws criminalising LGBT people and sex workers is important, but it should not be seen as an indicator of respect for the broader civil, economic and political rights of LGBT persons and sex workers, or of the absence of discrimination. One study found that approximately 30 per cent of 42 countries in sub-Saharan Africa had anti-discrimination laws or regulations that specifically provided protection for sex workers (Gruskin and Furguson 2009). The absence of laws that criminalise same-sex relations or sex work does not mean it is easy to operate organisations for LGBT persons, or that there are no other legal instruments that can be used against LGBT persons and sex workers. The
experiences of the Blue Diamond Society in Nepal, for example, are indicative of the
difficulties that organisations for sex workers or LGBT persons often face when registering as
organisations or renewing their operational permits. When they are not registered their civil
rights for collective legal action are restricted, and through that their ability to act legally for
LGBT causes including counselling and HIV prevention (Boyce and Coyle 2013). Sex
workers can be legally caught in a web of specific laws on sex work and a range of other
legislation such as vagrancy, loitering and indecency laws, as experiences of sex workers in
South Africa (Mgbako and Smith 2010), Uganda (Leiper 2009) and India (HIV and AIDS Data
Hub Asia and Pacific 2009) show. Criminalisation of same-sex relations can coexist with respect for other civil and political
rights. African LGBT groups in countries where same-sex relationships are illegal, such as
Uganda, can still take collective actions based on their civil rights, such as the right to
freedom of speech or freedom of assembly (ILGA 2013). Therefore, the interaction of
multiple legal domains needs to be taken into account when assessing legal inferiority or
persecution of LGBT people (ILGA 2013).

The negative effects of legal restrictions on HIV prevention, treatment and care for LGBT
persons and sex workers have been widely documented (HRW 2004). For instance, in
Myanmar, sex between men is punishable by a prison sentence of up to ten years. This
prevents community-based organisations (CBOs) working on HIV prevention among MSM
from being registered with the state and discourages programme beneficiaries from
accessing basic HIV services (UNAIDS, UNDP and APCOM 2012c). Self-reported data from
133 countries reveal that 44 per cent of these countries possess policies, regulations, or laws
that hinder the effective delivery of prevention, treatment, care, and support interventions for
sex workers (Gruskin and Ferguson 2009). In a number of countries running brothels is
illegal and while such restrictions may try to protect sex workers from exploitation, it is also
well documented that brothels can play a positive role in the prevention of HIV and STIs
(seriously transmitted infections) (Ghose, Swendeman and George 2011). Because of these
paradoxes, the need to reach LGBT persons and sex workers for HIV prevention has
resulted in the creation of contradictory laws in a number of countries. For example, in
Vietnam sex work is illegal but outreach to sex workers for HIV prevention is legal. Likewise
in Morocco, outreach to MSM is legal for HIV prevention while homosexuality is forbidden
(ILGA 2013, also see Overs 2013).

These findings in different countries show that LGBT persons and sex workers are faced with
legal and ascribed inferiorities that reinforce each other. Some of the restricted laws go back
to colonial times while others are recently introduced. Social inferiority contributes to the
creation of an environment of impunity for violence against LGBT persons and sex workers,
even when their rights are protected by the law. Social inferiority related to sexuality also
provides a justification for legal loopholes that exclude these groups from social benefits,
housing and rights such as the right to adopt or take guardianship of a child. A holistic and
comprehensive approach to national legal systems is needed to understand the many legal
instruments and processes that exclude and marginalise LGBT persons and sex workers and
keep them in poverty. In looking at the ‘web of poverty’ through the lens of sexuality, these
legal and ascribed inferiorities form one important factor.

2.2 Lack of political clout
Chambers describes lack of political organisation and the exclusionary behaviour of elites as
a component of the ‘web of poverty’ (Chambers 2007). Poor people often lack access, skills
and resources to build their own political organisations and although their votes are often
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14 Although not included in the review for reasons described above, anti-trafficking laws can result in worsening working and
living conditions for sex workers (see Overs 2013).
welcome they are excluded from the political arenas where decisions are made and money is allocated by national elites. Because they lack political clout they are not able to make the structural policy changes that are needed to get out of poverty.

LGBT persons and sex workers obviously face particular obstacles to collective political action in countries where same-sex relations and sex work are criminalised. Indian NGOs working with sexual minorities have also been harassed and sometimes charged under Section 377, a law that until recently criminalised private consensual sex between adults of the same sex (Misra 2009). In Uganda sex workers do not dare to come forward in community meetings because they are seen as criminals (Leiper 2009). Gender barriers prevent women from participating in politics in many countries, and lesbian women therefore carry a double burden. Likewise, travesti in Peru avoid being in politics partly because of existing gender barriers that discourage all women and partly because of specific stigma related to transvestites (Campuzano 2009). LGBT people are considered deviant and are therefore often excluded from positions of responsibility, including political positions. Ascribed social stigma based on sexual orientation therefore prevents LGBT politicians from coming out in public in many countries, with a few brave exceptions (ILGA 2013). In addition, LGBT persons and sex workers can also be excluded from political participation and representation through a selective application and interpretation of restrictive national civil and political laws, such as the earlier described operational licensing in Nepal.

The ability of LGBT persons and sex workers to organise themselves needs to be understood within broader national and international opportunity structures. Although weak rule of law poses difficulties for some forms of political organisation and collective action, countries with a weak rule of law can – and often do – have very vibrant civil societies. In many LMIC countries (I)NGOs, community-based groups and other civil society organisations, for example, take up the space and roles of the state, such as the provision of HIV prevention, treatment and care for LGBT persons and sex workers, often with international funding (Edström, MacGregor and Mudege 2011). International donors can play an important role in building the organisational and political capacity of marginalised populations, not only through funding but also through creating meeting spaces and linkages and learning between groups. In the MENA region, for example, UN organisations have created space for LGBT people to organise themselves and develop networks at national and regional levels (ILGA 2013).

The HIV epidemic has provided earmarked funding opportunities for organisations that can reach people living with HIV and LGBT persons and sex workers for prevention, treatment and care. Under the umbrella of GIPA, the Greater Involvement of People Living with HIV Principle – which seeks to actively engage and support people living with HIV to play a part in the Global Fund decision-making processes, and thus enable them to inform the AIDS response – there is also room for the organisation of LGBT people and sex workers because of the high HIV prevalence rates among these groups. Experiences showed that sex workers and sexual minorities were often marginalised in heterosexual support groups of PLHIV (people living with HIV), and also that they have specific HIV prevention, treatment and care needs that need to be addressed, such as the interaction of hormones and ART (antiretroviral treatment) for transgenders. Although sex work and LGBT identity might be illegal in many countries, international donors, policymakers and AIDS activists, together with local informal groups of LGBT persons and sex workers, managed to create room for HIV prevention and care and support activities for these populations. In many countries LGBT persons and sex workers created special groups for HIV prevention, treatment care and support. This has resulted in a growing number of support groups and networks for LGBT persons and sex workers, doing outreach work through peer educators and providing advice to other people on how to set up support groups. Such groups may have started in a capital and then expanded to smaller towns (Boyce and Coyle 2013). Today many of the pioneers have representation in international fora such as the Global Fund Country Coordination.
Mechanisms (CCMs), which require participation of key populations, including LGBT persons and sex workers. However, the quality, relevance and overall meaningfulness of such participation are the subject of heated debates. Better-educated English-speaking representatives have many advantages in these international environments (Overs 2013). Whilst there have been many positive effects of HIV funding on national organisations of LGBT people and sex workers as outlined above, donor-imposed funding restrictions can in some cases hamper the provision of services. National organisations of Cambodian sex workers were able to mobilise sex workers for action based on the priorities of sex workers themselves such as improving their working conditions. They had membership fees, an institutional structure and reached thousands of sex workers. However, PEPFAR (US President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief) conditions have marginalised sex workers politically and put a focus on HIV rather than a broader social political agenda driven by the sex workers themselves (see Overs 2013).

The difficulties involved in transforming and sustaining organisations that started with HIV funding, or in widening the HIV agenda have been illustrated by the experiences of feminist NGOs in Brazil and South Africa. The projects in Brazil were originally based on STI/AIDS prevention among sex workers but broadened their scope once the programme managers understood that sex workers also have the same needs as other women (Chacham et al. 2007). These projects reached thousands of women but have ground to a halt due to lack of funding and management difficulties. In 2004 one of the projects, the Battle for Health, changed administration and was without funding for a year; during this time the infrastructure became fragmented and, in parallel, donors’ funding priorities shifted from sex work to youth projects. The other project, Get Friendly with Her, was also affected by shifting donor priorities when in 2007 donors emphasised male clients and health workers rather than sex workers.

To capture, validate and understand the socially transformative potential of LGBT and sex workers’ organisations it is helpful to study their influence both inside and outside formal national and international institutional structures. In some of the most restrictive states in the MENA region, such as the Gulf States, individuals have started blogs to express their views and connect with like-minded people. Several online groups, such as AbuNawas (Algeria) and Arab Gay Pride, grew out of these individual initiatives. It is unlikely that these blogs can be transformed into formal political organisations with political clout in a public arena but they are important steps towards forming collectives that provide support to LGBT people. When LGBT people are allowed to meet in person in local groups they may not aim to be involved in politics. Support groups, for example, often derive their strength from the interpersonal, emotional as well as practical relationships of members in their personal and familial lives (Campero, Caballo, Kendall et al. 2010). Not all members of support groups want to or have the capacity to become active in the political arena, and might feel more useful working directly with members and families. But in many countries LGBT and sex work activists who now work at national levels came out of such local groups and still have links. Many organisations for PLHIV and LGBT work simultaneously on different national and local community levels through both informal and formal networks. Organisations like Galang in the Philippines, the Blue Diamond Society in Nepal and the Sonagachi HIV/AIDS Intervention Program (SHIP) in Calcutta advocate for strategic policy reform that is based on the experiences of LGBT persons and sex workers through networks of local groups that are also linked internationally to similar or like-minded organisations and people (Boyce and Coyle 2013; Lim and Jordan 2013). Likewise, not all participants of gay parades may aspire to political clout in parliament, but these events do have political relevance. The preparations and the parade itself can act as a ritual of rebellion, release tensions, and create new political and personal networks. In Vietnam the parade was first not allowed, which is not surprising as most public demonstrations or gatherings are not allowed. But a playful parade of people with rainbow ribbons and flags on scooters in the capital resulted in permission to organise the event (ILGA 2013). The organisers used the lack of funding as an opportunity to
demonstrate and mobilise goodwill as well as generate material support using social media in their personal, national and international networks.

The examples above illustrate the difficulties LGBT persons and sex workers face in participating in the political arena. Societal assumptions about gender roles and stigma based on sexual orientation are obstacles to LGBT people wishing to participate in politics. In countries where LGBT persons and sex work are criminalised, political organisation has to be carried out underground or via the internet. HIV and AIDS have brought the needs of these groups to the attention of national and international policymakers as risk groups in relationship to HIV. This has provided political opportunities, in particular for educated and English-speaking elites, but has not challenged and in fact has possibly reinforced the deviant status of LGBT persons and sex workers. The transformation of the HIV medical agenda into wider poverty or social development agendas has been challenging. HIV funding requirements and conditions have also diverted attention from some of the broader issues that organisations may have had. More broadly, the inability of LGBT people to contend for their political interests openly and on an equal footing inhibits them from leveraging the political system to escape the ‘web of poverty’ as other groups might.

2.3 Lack of access to information
The argument for the inclusion of this dimension in the ‘web of poverty’ is that poor people often lack information on all the dimensions of the web. As a consequence, poor people do not know what their rights are, whether these relate to health, housing or employment. Without information about the quality of goods and services, poor people are at risk of buying too dearly and selling too cheap. This poverty of information can be due to physical isolation because they live in rural areas or suburbs or townships, or a lack of media access, a lack of choice, limited or no work-related networks or all of these and others. LGBT persons and sex workers, especially those who are clearly visible, have these problems and have specific information gaps that are related to their sexuality.

Talking openly about sexuality is problematic in many countries, especially for young unmarried people as people believe that it promotes promiscuity and is not respectful (Bhana 2013; Bradley, Rajaram, Moses et al. 2011; Demaria, Galarraga, Campero et al. 2009; Epprecht and Egya 2011). If there is public discussion about sexuality this is assumed to be heterosexual sex in a couple with specific gendered roles for men and women. This excludes and isolates LGBT persons and sex workers from the discussion and also does not provide them with the information that they need. Sex workers need the same information as other women on sexuality and family planning. Young adolescent FSWs in Zambia, for example, did not know how to protect themselves against unwanted pregnancy (Mukuka and Slonim-Nevo 2006). Sex workers also need additional information, for example on lubricants to prevent irritated dry vaginas and on working safely during menstruation (Ghose et al. 2011; Chacham et al. 2007). Transgenders need specific information on the risks of hormones and liquid silicon (Campuzano 2009) and MSM need specific information on safe anal sex.

Particular sectors of the LGBT community, such as gay men and sex workers, are at high risk for HIV but lack access to information on HIV prevention, treatment and care in many places. Despite decades of HIV prevention work, a study among MSM in LMIC found that HIV prevention responses and access to information need substantial strengthening (Adam et al. 2009). Challenges in HIV prevention work include Lane et al.’s findings that South African MSM experience homophobic harassment from health-care workers when accessing information about sexual health (Lane, Mogale, Struthers et al. 2008). A study in Burkina Faso found that when MSM visit health centres they may not be able to obtain information on HIV, because they do not know what to ask for or feel ashamed to ask (Dah and Koala 2011). Amongst MSM in Malawi, Namibia and Botswana, a survey (Fay et al. 2011) found that, although 94 per cent of respondents had received information on how to prevent HIV transmission between a man and a woman and 93 per cent knew HIV is transmitted through...
anal sex with men, only 67 per cent had ever received information on how to prevent anal transmission.

Social factors, class and education affect access of sexual minorities and sex workers to information on sexual health and socioeconomic rights. In Malaysia, venue-based outreach efforts cater for the educated and well-off and are not located in poor areas, leaving illiterate and unemployed MSM unable to access information (UNAIDS, UNDP and APCOM 2012d). A study in South Africa found that internet information on HIV is less available to MSM with limited education, less integration into gay/bisexual communities, no HIV testing history, limited use of condom-compatible lube, and the unemployed (Wagenaar, Sullivan and Stephenson 2012). What this suggests is that information online is most available to those who already access information that helps them to protect themselves. Lack of access to information is only part of the problem. Barrington et al.’s (2012) study on HIV prevention among male-to-female transgender persons in San Salvador showed that transgender persons reported the highest rates of exposure to HIV educational activities, yet they had the lowest levels of HIV-related knowledge. This demonstrates that access to facts is insufficient, and that the way of delivering information affects the acceptance of it. Information needs to be delivered in a non-judgemental way, needs to be contextualised and relevant to people’s own issues and problems and provided by credible persons in the social network (Barrington, Wejnet, Guardado et al. 2012). LGBT people in the Philippines do not know how to articulate their thoughts about their sexuality and lack knowledge of their rights and due process of law. They do not know if and how their grievances on discrimination and other forms of injustice can be redressed. Lack of awareness of their rights encourages blackmail and extortion and harassment (Lim and Jordan 2013).

Lack of information is both a cause and a result of the multiple forms of physical and social isolation that sexual minorities and sex workers face. This problem is unsurprising given that many societies attempt to constrict sexual identity and behaviour by imposing deliberate ignorance of non-heterosexual and/or non-monogamous practices. Research on the failure of HIV prevention campaigns among heterosexual populations has demonstrated that even people who have accurate health information are often unable to change their behaviour to further their own interests. But the specific kinds of ignorance endemic to, and often imposed upon, LGBT persons and sex workers often form an even greater barrier to exiting the ‘web of poverty’.

### 2.4 Lack of education

Lack of education, skills and capabilities has multiple effects on poor people’s ability to get out of poverty, Chambers observes (Chambers 2005). In the case of LGBT persons and sex workers, they may find themselves – and sometimes their children – excluded from education because of their sexual orientation and activities. The lack of education limits economic opportunities in most modern economies, and this is often taken, uncritically, as one of the reasons why women with limited education may choose to work in the sex industry. In Nepal the combined gross enrolment in education is 58 per cent, with an expected number of years of schooling of 8.9. FSWs are below these national averages with 33 per cent of FSWs being illiterate and only 50 per cent having attended primary school (Ghimire, Smith and van Teijlingen 2011).

LGBT persons and sex workers are often marginalised in or even excluded from schools because sexuality and the social norms surrounding it have profound impacts on education. Schools reproduce the hetero-morality of the local community even in contexts where discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation is prohibited, as in South Africa (Bhana 2013; van Vollenhoven and Els 2013; DeMaria et al. 2009). Transgender people, feminine

boys and pregnant girls are more likely to drop out of school due to bullying, social pressure and lack of support (UNESCO 2012; Almeida and Aquino 2011; Armas 2006; Grant and Hallman 2006). Transgender people, due to their high visibility, are also known to be particularly harassed at school (SIDA 2010; Ferreyra 2008; Armas 2007). In El Salvador, for example, 30 per cent of transgender women had not attended school (Barrington et al. 2012), which is very high in a context where 71 per cent of all appropriately aged children are in school.\textsuperscript{16} Bullying and school uniform requirements lead to LGBT school dropouts in the Philippines (Lim and Jordan 2013). In black township schools in KwaZulu Natal, South Africa, once schoolchildren are suspected of being, or reveal themselves to be LGBT, they experience verbal abuse and violence from their peers and their teachers (Msibi 2012). This is an isolating experience for LGBT students, especially when fellow students and teachers are openly homophobic and appear to act with impunity. This contrasts with the findings of MSM in Africa, where for example the above-mentioned study of MSM in Malawi, Botswana and Namibia (Fay et al. 2011) found that more than 90 per cent of the men had attended secondary school. Among these MSM, education seems to be above average, with respective combined gross enrolment rates of Malawi 68 per cent, Botswana 70 per cent and Namibia 69 per cent.\textsuperscript{17} The reasons for these different trends are not clear. It could be that they are more able to hide their sexuality while at school or that people with a higher education are more likely to identify as MSM because they are more likely to access support networks and information.

Sex work is not always an obstacle to education; poor women may work as sex workers, perhaps in another city or country, precisely in order to pay for their children’s school fees. However, children of sex workers sometimes face barriers, alienation, and discrimination in their education because of their mothers’ work (CASAM 2008; Sircar and Dutta 2011). Women of the Nat community in India, among whom sex work is an important source of income, make sure that their children attend schools located far away from their villages in order to avoid the stigma linked to the sex work (O’Neil et al. 2004).

Universal access to education is among the key levers that poor people can use to extricate themselves from the ‘web of poverty’. To the extent that LGBT persons and sex workers, and their children, are excluded from the educational system, that lever is unavailable to them.

### 2.5 Institutions and access

Poor people, Chambers notes, have difficulties engaging with institutions and finding their way in public and private systems (Chambers 2005). Because they are poor they are treated rudely and with disrespect, and pay additional or under-the-table fees to get services or documents.

Identification papers, such as a passport, are necessary to vote, travel and access social services. A few countries including South Africa, Nepal, India, Mexico City, Brazil, Argentina, Colombia and Uruguay have anti-discrimination laws in place that protect the rights of transgender people and their access to official documentation (ILGA 2013; Godwin et al. (2010) cited in UNAIDS, UNDP and APCOM 2012b).

In terms of engaging with institutions, the importance of health facilities for LGBT persons and sex workers has already been touched on above in terms of access to information. Many studies and reports point out the specific problems that LGBT persons and sex workers face in accessing sexual and reproductive health care and communicating with health workers (UNAIDS, UNDP and APCOM 2012e, 2012f; Fay et al. 2011; Lorway 2006). Men who have sex with men in Malawi, Namibia and Botswana are silent about their sexual practices (Fay
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\textsuperscript{16} The number of students enrolled in primary, secondary and tertiary levels of education, regardless of age, as a percentage of the population of theoretical school age for the three levels, \url{http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/indicators/105906.html}

\textsuperscript{17} \url{http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/indicators/105906.html}
et al. 2011). For Namibia, Lorway suggests that this stems from discrimination, fear of disclosure and breaches of confidentiality (Lorway 2006). Fay et al.’s (2011) review of the three countries shows that very few MSM (17 per cent) reported disclosing their same-sex practices to health professionals and 19 per cent reported being afraid to seek health care. Only a small group (5 per cent) reported actual exclusion from health-care services, but fear of verbal abuse, discrimination, and blackmail resulted in these men avoiding services. In Sri Lanka and Mongolia negative societal attitudes towards homosexuality are also reported to discourage access to critical health services targeted at MSM (UNAIDS, UNDP and APCOM 2012e, 2012f).

FSWs in Nepal have limited access to health care due to a combination of shortage of time on the part of the FSWs and the discrimination and rude behaviour that they experience (Ghimire et al. 2011). However, this might not be disproportionate to what other poor people face as factory workers do not have much time either. Travesti in Peru have to pay bribes for ART and get treated rudely by health staff (Campuzano 2009). Sex workers in Uganda cannot receive appropriate health care because of fear and harassment (Leiper 2009). Barbosa and Facchini’s study of women who have sex with women in São Paulo, Brazil showed that those who have difficulty in accessing gynaecological care also have lower incomes, never had sex with men, or have masculine body language. Although technically illegal, discrimination by health-care staff is a reality. Such discrimination does not stop women from searching for health care, but – as is the case for MSM (described above) – it silences them about their ‘erotic practices’ and preferences (Barbosa and Facchini 2009).

Discrimination and harassment, and/or fear of discrimination and harassment within formal and informal workplaces, are also widespread (Lim and Jordan 2013; Ugarte, Valladares Cardoza and Essen 2012; Wagner et al. 2012; Estrada Montoya and García-Becerra 2011; Mgbako and Smith 2010; Campuzano 2009; Leiper 2009; Misra 2009; Chacham et al. 2007; Armas 2006). Sex workers in Uganda are unable to report crimes such as thefts or robberies to the police (Leiper 2009). LGBT people in the Philippines are forced into insecure and low-paid work because of their sexuality and they are excluded from the public sphere because same-sex partnerships are not recognised (Lim and Jordan 2013). Ugarte et al. (2012) found in a study of MSM in Leon, Nicaragua that more than 50 per cent of the MSM feared that they would lose their job if their sexuality was disclosed. Many reported that they had previously been refused work because of their sexuality. They were therefore very conscious that their work options were limited due to discrimination and that they faced both economic and social restrictions. Likewise, MSM in Lebanon (Wagner et al. 2013) faced discrimination within their work environments, coupled with verbal and physical violence outside the workplace. For sexual minorities working in the informal sector, with its lack of regulation, harassment is frequently violent and brutal for sex workers in LMIC, for example in Africa (Mgbako and Smith 2010), Brazil (Chacham et al. 2007), and India (George, Sabarwal and Martin 2011). There are also instances in India where NGO representatives working with sexual minorities are harassed (Misra 2009). Transgender women and effeminate men tend to experience more discrimination due to their higher visibility and simultaneously have less access to work opportunities (Estrada Montoya and García-Becerra 2011; Armas 2006). Thus, sexual minorities within LMIC live under the constant threat of the withdrawal of their economic security, which in some cases is already precarious, based on their sexual orientation.

Religious institutions take different positions in relation to sexuality. The identified literature in this review focused on large denominations of Christianity such as Catholic or Protestant faiths in relation to debates about sexuality. There is also more literature from countries with vocal and strong churches. There is continued vocal support for the criminalisation of homosexuality within churches, in which the role of African churches has been particularly well documented. Bagnol et al. (2010) report that following the disclosure of the sexual orientation of a black lesbian from Pretoria, South Africa on national television, she was
asked, none too politely, to leave her church. Churches in Namibia have frequently expressed their homophobia via church sermons (Lorway 2006), encouraging LGBT people to leave the country, as have church leaders in Uganda. Bishops from the Uganda Joint Christian Council (UJCC), an ecumenical body comprising the Anglican, Catholic and Orthodox churches, support the Ugandan ‘anti-gay bill’ (Daily Monitor 2012), a bill which seeks to further criminalise homosexuality in Uganda, underpinned by American churches.18 The Evangelical Fellowship of the Zambia Pastoral Statement on the State of the Nation (2012) also supports the continued criminalisation of homosexuality in Zambia. Travesti are also excluded from churches in Peru (Campuzano 2009).

These religious institutions are also very closely connected with governments and, in contrast to people who are marginalised because of their sexuality, have considerable political clout (see for example, Charles 2013). However, in a recent survey of Latin American countries by the Pew Research Centre, Catholics in Bolivia, Brazil, Chile and Venezuela were found to be more tolerant of homosexuality than non-Catholics (Poushter 2013). This contrasts with the position of the Vatican as exemplified by Archbishop Silvano Tomasi who in 2011 vocally opposed the first UN Human Rights Council resolution on sexual orientation and gender identity (Palacios 2011). In the Philippines, a secular country with a constitution that mandates the separation of church and state, the Roman Catholic Church blocked a decade-old anti-discrimination bill that would protect LGBT people from discrimination in schools, workplaces and public institutions (Lim and Jordan 2013).

Despite the virulent homophobia within Uganda and other countries mentioned above, there are other churches – such as the Unitarian Universalist Church of Uganda – that support human rights for all and are active advocates for LGBT equality. They work in partnership with the Eddobozi Human Rights Defenders Network, which has strongly condemned the murder of David Kato, a Ugandan LGBT human rights activist and a leading opponent of the Ugandan ‘anti-gay bill’ (UUA 2011). Other churches also engage with the LGBT community in Africa. The Inclusive and Affirming Ministries (IAM) and the Rainbow Project of Namibia held the First African Dialogue on Christian Faith and Sexuality in South Africa in 2009 (Nell and Shapiro 2013). The meeting proved to be a success and included participants from a range of African countries. The church has played similar positive roles in other countries.

Research on the roles of Islamic institutions is scarce but human rights reports highlight negative attitudes towards any form of sexuality not oriented to reproduction (ILGA 2013). Research in India on Hindu institutions reports changing attitudes, with what is considered to be a traditional acceptance towards sexual diversity and sex work becoming less common (O’Neil et al. 2004).

The police force is another institution where discriminatory attitudes result in sex workers and LGBT people struggling to access fair treatment in terms of law enforcement, protection of life and property, and criminal investigations. Police corruption and extortion of sexual minorities is also pervasive and reported by human rights organisations like Human Rights Watch in different part of the world, from Honduras (Nieto 2009) to Tanzania (Ghoshal 2013) as well as researchers working on Namibia (Lorway 2006), Nicaragua (Ugarte et al. 2012), Egypt (Tadros 2013), South Africa (Lewin et al. 2013), Nepal (Boyce and Coyle 2013) and Sri Lanka (Miller 2002). Approximately 20 per cent of interviewed MSM in Malawi, Namibia and Botswana answered yes to the question ‘Ever been blackmailed because of sexuality?’ (Fay et al. 2011). The police corruption in relation to LGBT persons and sex workers is found

18 The Centre for Constitutional Rights (CCR), a United States rights-based NGO that specialises in using the law to promote positive change, filed a lawsuit in March 2012. The suit was filed on behalf of the non-profit umbrella organisation for LGBT advocacy groups in Uganda – Sexual Minorities Uganda – and against the President of the Abiding Truth Ministries, Scott Lively. The groundbreaking case, filed in the United States, alleges that Lively’s activities and encouragement of anti-gay efforts in Uganda, including his active support for the removal of LGBT people’s fundamental rights, constitutes persecution. CCR, LGBT Uganda fights back, http://ccrjustice.org/LGBTUganda/
in all regions. For example, transgender sex workers in India (Ghose et al. 2011) are bundled into vans and coerced into having sex with the police and then to pay the police for the service. The brothels where FSWs work in Bangladesh are often raided by the police, during which FSWs face physical violence and are bribed by the police to avoid further disruption and violence (Khosla 2009). Gay men in India also face blackmail and physical violence from the police who threaten them with arrest if they do not comply (Misra 2009). In Namibia, gay and bisexual men are subject to unprovoked attacks by the paramilitary police (Lorway 2006).

Lack of access to services and institutions is both a cause and consequence of marginalisation and exclusion of LGBT persons and sex workers. As shown above, sexual minorities, sex workers, and often their children, face difficulties obtaining official documents, exclusion from the right to marry and have a family, overt or covert exclusion from employment, or unwarranted disciplinary actions from religious and public institutions and health-care services. They may also have to pay bribes, be subjected to blackmail, or attempts at sexual re-education or cures for sexual deviance. When sexual minorities report physical or sexual assault, or rape to the police they are often ignored and the police do not pursue an investigation. Claimants are left feeling humiliated and powerless, with no form of legal redress. LGBT persons and sex workers thus face multiple disadvantages in institutional access that trap them into poverty and inferiority.

2.6 Poverty of time

Chambers also identifies poverty of time and energy as one of the dimensions of poverty that acts in conjunction with the other dimensions to further trap people into poverty (Chambers 2005). Many, but not all, of the time-related conditions described below pertain both to poor people and to sex workers or LGBT people.

Because of their low incomes and economically vulnerable situation, sex workers in Uganda and Brazil have to work during periods of menstruation (Leiper 2009; Chacham et al. 2007). Travesti in Peru spend hours each day grooming themselves to look as feminine as possible, have to wait long hours for health services, and work long hours as sex workers (Campuzano 2009). The literature makes reference to the additional time required by LGBT persons and sex workers in order to travel away from their communities in order to avoid stigma (see discussion on education above). In South Africa, MSM have to travel to services due to the lack of appropriate and non-discriminatory health services. These men travelled between 15 and 25km in order to use sexual health clinics where they knew they would receive non-discriminatory service, rather than endure harassment and homophobia in clinics closer to home (Lane et al. 2008). This behaviour was mirrored by members of the Nat community in Rajasthan, India who travelled to health clinics located far from home in order to remain anonymous and avoid the discrimination that they would face if their status as members of a ‘traditional’ sex workers’ community was known (O’Neil et al. 2004). The Ghimire et al. (2011) study of FSWs in Nepal found that their access to health services was restricted because the opening times of the clinics clashed with their working hours, and outside of their working hours they were busy with domestic chores. Similarly financial considerations prevented them from taking time off work to attend government hospitals because of long waiting times that could be between three and six hours.

LGBT persons and sex workers nonetheless spend time waiting for or travelling to services, especially health services, which could be spent on more productive and lucrative tasks. Pressed for time, sex workers have to accept many clients without time to recuperate, which puts their health at risk. Lack of time restrains their economic options. To the extent that LGBT persons and sex workers must devote extra time to overcoming other hardships, this becomes another strand of the ‘web of poverty’.
2.7 The places and spaces of sexual minorities

Chambers argues that poor people live in places that keep them poor, because of their isolation and lack of infrastructure and services including security and police protection (Chambers 2007). In addition, poor people often live in unhealthy, exposed and polluted areas with poor water and sanitation facilities that make them sick and which, in turn, perpetuate and entrench poverty.

For LGBT persons and sex workers, places and spaces can be particularly poor and insecure because of their sexual orientation and occupation. Many sexual minorities within LMIC live in places that are extremely lacking in terms of infrastructure, services, security and so forth. Some Filipino LGBT people are kicked out of their family homes and end up in poor, unhealthy urban slums (Lim and Jordan 2013). In other cases, departure from the family is more voluntary in nature. Filipino gay hosts travel from their rural homes where there is little opportunity to secure work to Malate (Collins 2005). While their rural homes are places often without basic amenities and with high unemployment, their urban residences are located in places with high crime rates. Thus the black townships of Katutura in Namibia (Lorway 2006), of Johannesburg and Pretoria (Lane et al. 2008), or the impoverished slums of the Philippines (Lim and Jordan 2013) are locations where the lives of sexual minorities are played out and where they are shunned by various members of their community.

The lack of appropriate space, in which sexual relations can take place in privacy, is certainly not limited to homosexual men or LGBT people, and many urban and rural poor also have to deal with this. But when homosexuality and sex work are illegal or stigmatised, safe spaces are especially difficult to find. Fernandez-Davila et al. (2008) found that homosexual men and mostaceros19 in Peru are reduced to having hurried sex in streets, parks or abandoned houses because they are refused entry into motels, leaving little time for a pleasurable encounter or safe sex. The ‘bar girls’ of Nazareth, Ethiopia have difficulties negotiating their private and public spaces as these two spaces merge. Their home is often a shared single room, attached to the bar where they work, which they share with other ‘bar girls’ (van Blerk 2011). This shared room with a mattress or two on the floor, is both where they live and where they see their clients, thus making it difficult to hide their sex worker identity from the wider community. Likewise, sex workers in the red light districts of India (CASAM 2008) live and work in the same location. They and their families face instant discrimination and disadvantages because the location of their home is coupled with the stigma of sex work. Thus not only are sexual minorities stigmatised, the places they call home, the areas where they work, and those who associate with them, most often their immediate family, are also stigmatised. Public and private spaces are generally organised and used along the lines of socially accepted gender norms. Deviations from established gender norms in a public space can result in harassment and verbal or physical abuse.

Over-congestion and the lack of space also results in disputed spaces. Sex workers working on the streets of Sonagachi, India (Ghose et al. 2011) vie for customers and because of their exposure on the streets they are more vulnerable to harassment and violence, and less able to obtain agreement to safe sexual practices with their customers. The Sonagachi HIV/AIDS Intervention Program found that brothels in Sonagachi create secure environments from which FSWs could operate safely, and furthermore these spaces enable them to negotiate prices and safe sexual practices from a position of power.

A number of organisations work with LGBT communities to create safe spaces for invisible categories of people. Such organisations include GALANG, a feminist organisation that works with LGBT people in the Philippines (Lim and Jordan 2013), and Grupo OREMI, which was the first state-sponsored lesbian organisation in Cuba (Saunders 2009). Whereas it was
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19 The term mostaceros is a popular term for men who identify themselves as heterosexual, but who have sex with other men, often for compensation.
initially thought that transgender people were the least publicly visible, black lesbians were subsequently identified as the category who were most isolated. Grupo OREMI has thus sought to create a safe space for black lesbians in Havana (Saunders 2009).

In contrast to the poor places where many sex workers and LGBT people reside, there are also exclusionary queer spaces created by and for the middle classes – and which in some cases incorporate members of the working classes if they perform a certain role. These spaces, created by local organisations, often have their own hierarchical structures and power differentials. This is demonstrated within the gay spaces of Cape Town (Tucker 2009) and Manila (Collins 2005). The economic and racial legacies of apartheid are re-enacted and renegotiated in Cape Town’s gay ‘village’. The ‘village’ is within a former white area and epitomises Cape Town’s gay culture, which is propounded as a gay Mecca. Here, however, ‘non-white’ gays are excluded for various non-racial reasons, such as non-adherence to a dress code. When a complaint was filed in the Equality Court against a popular nightclub in the village, the club admitted to having a discriminatory policy in place. Thus the gay ‘village’ maintains the ‘safe queer space’ from which it originated. It has been said by many that this gay ‘village’ mirrors many other gay villages in the West that are predominantly white and frequented by a particular type of gay ‘cultural clone’. This globalisation of the Western normative queer sociocultural space is also replicated in the Philippines, in Malate, a gay enclave in Manila (Collins 2005). Malate, like Cape Town, is a magnet for gay tourism. Working-class Filipino gay hosts act as paid ‘travel companions’ to middle-class, foreign gay men. These Filipino men cannot afford to live in this area but are welcomed by the Malate community, which includes middle-class Filipino gay men, when in the presence of a foreigner. Similar to other transactional sex workers (Hawkins, Price and Musa 2009), these Filipino gay hosts create a space in which they position themselves as equal partners in genuine relationships with the foreigners. They do not see themselves as sex workers with the associated shame. Here in Malate there is also concern about the physical space that is gradually being gentrified and, which like gentrification elsewhere, has pushed out the original residents and FSWs as the state attempts to throw off Manila’s reputation as a city with a thriving sex industry (Collins 2005).

In other tourist destinations, the demarcation between tourists and low-income sexual minorities who cater to them are equally stark. In the Dominican Republic, like other Caribbean tourist destinations such as Jamaica, the indigenous population are excluded from the benefits and the spaces of the formal economy. They have few options and are either consigned to low-paid jobs or seek work in the informal sector often as sex workers whose clientele are tourists (Cabezas 2008). All-inclusive resorts sit alongside shanty towns, with no basic infrastructure, such as running water. The space designated to accommodate the Dominicans contrasts sharply with the ostentatious all-inclusive resorts developed for tourists.

LGBT persons and sex workers, for various reasons, end up living and working in poor areas due to rejection by families, the absence of regulations and the need for privacy. In these areas they experience the same problems as other poor people with regards to violence, overcrowding and lack of facilities. But the specific and controversial nature of their identities and livelihoods also forces LGBT persons and sex workers to seek out isolated ‘safe areas’. While in some cases, these safe areas may mitigate other disadvantages or even enhance workers’ economic power, in other cases this isolation can further entrench them in the ‘web of poverty’.
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2.8 Insecurities

Chambers notes that insecurities such as natural disasters, crime, war and civil disorder, loss of work and legal insecurities such as residence permits and macro-economic volatilities affect poor people disproportionately (Chambers 2007). Poor people have fewer resources to adjust to periods of severe hardship. The literature identified in this review showed that sexual minorities experience a range of interlocked and mutually reinforcing insecurities at the individual, familial, and local community levels that are (re)created and reinforced by state and social institutions.

Sexual minorities are also likely to suffer verbal abuse and harassment in all areas of their life, in the home, in the community, and from people in positions of power. This affects where they can safely live, and how secure they feel in their home environments. One sex worker in Nepal (Ghimire et al. 2011) was 'outed' by a health professional at a clinic within hearing of a neighbour and was subsequently forced to move home. MSM in Nicaragua (Ugarte et al. 2012) are subject to harassment from the police in their own homes, 20 per cent of men within the study feared being ejected from their homes because of their sexuality. Constant intimidation and the threat of violence can lead to depression and lack of self-worth. In an exploration of the sexuality and behaviour of MSM in Nicaragua, 50 per cent of the men felt suicidal due to problems they experience because of their sexual identity or orientation (Ugarte et al. 2012). Likewise, for FSWs in Brazil, the threat of violence and harassment from clients, police, and hotel managers are factors that lead to depression and stress (Chacham et al. 2007). A study to estimate the prevalence of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, mental disorders and alcoholism in bisexuals, lesbians and gays in Mexico City found considerably higher prevalence rates among these populations than among the general population as discrimination was associated with suicide attempts and mental disorders (Ortiz-Hernandez and Garcia Torres 2005).

Literature exploring the ways in which natural disasters are experienced by LGBT persons is very rare. Nonetheless, there is some suggestion that natural disasters polarise and intensify the inequalities already felt by marginalised groups. The International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission and SEROvie (IGLHRC and SEROvie 2011) report on the impact of the earthquake in Haiti on sexual minorities. The major findings relate to the right to food, housing and security, where both government and relief agencies failed to address the needs and vulnerabilities of sexual minorities. Hijras20 in India faced similar problems following the tsunami in Tamil Nadu (Pincha and Krishna 2008). In both cases sexual minorities were inadvertently excluded from disaster relief and their physical safety and health compromised because of their sexual orientation or identity. With respect to housing, LGBT people in and around IDP (internationally displaced person) camps in Haiti were subject to physical and sexual violence, lesbians and bisexual women reported being ‘treated’ by ‘corrective’ rape, and were forced into sexual encounters in exchange for food; whilst in Tamil Nadu Hijras did not receive any temporary accommodation following the tsunami. Access to food was also restricted in Haiti because of fear of physical violence whilst queuing for food; this was especially so for masculine-looking lesbians and effeminate gay men, who were also the targets of sexual violence (IGLHRC and SEROvie 2011). In Tamil Nadu, some Hijras felt unable to apply for ration cards as intersex was not an option on the application form, resulting in difficulties and embarrassment when attempting to explain their predicament to officials (Pincha and Krishna 2008). Hijras did not receive disaster relief from the government, nor were they compensated for injuries sustained in the tsunami.
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20 The term Hijras refers to physiological males who have a feminine identity, adopt women’s gender roles and clothing. Most see themselves as neither men nor women. They play an important role at the birth of a male child, confirming its sex. Hijras are also identified as intersex people. A few have been born with male intersex variations, or have undergone rituals to modify their genitals. Hijras generally do not attempt to pass as women.
Evidence that LGBT persons and sex workers are disproportionately vulnerable to disaster is at most suggestive. But poor people’s strategies to escape the ‘web of poverty’ are often fragile. Methods of insurance against catastrophe among the poor are based on mutual reliance in social groups. Where LGBT persons and sex workers are not seen as full members of the group, they may be left exposed in the case of economic or physical disruption.

2.9 Physical ill-being
Physical ill-being due to hunger, disability, lack of food and exhaustion all damage earning power, forming another element of Chambers’ ‘web of poverty’. Appearing poor and unhealthy often disqualifies people from a range of opportunities, including jobs in higher wage sectors. Many diseases of the poor are preventable diseases and are caused by unhealthy environments and lack of access to medical care.

Health issues of sexual minorities need to be seen in the context of socioeconomic and political gaps within countries that affect all citizens (Lim and Jordan 2013). In many countries, poor and marginalised people and women experience extreme forms of physical ill-being in sexual violence regardless of their sexuality (ILGA 2013; Tadros 2013; Amado 2004).

LGBT persons’ and sex workers’ higher exposure to HIV and to discriminatory violence places them at greater risk of physical ill-being. LGBT identities and roles affect overall physical and mental health on a broader scale than the sexual and reproductive health needs conventionally recognised through HIV and AIDS medicalisation. LGBT people and sex workers are frequently exposed to physical violence and torture, and this has health consequences (HRW 2010, 2013; Ortiz-Hernandez and Garcia Torres 2005). Very few studies have been undertaken that look at other aspects of physical health, such as access to screenings and physical examinations for clearly visible LGBT people in LMIC. In addition, exclusion from access to formal health institutions leads some sexual minorities to access drugs and undertake bodily transformations without medical supervision. Campuzano (2009) documents how Latin American travesti are sent ART drugs by other migrant travesti, how they inject liquid silicon into their bodies to mould their buttocks, breasts or hips and how they administer hormones to enhance their physical appearance, all without any interaction with health facilities or medical expertise.

2.10 Social relations
Chambers talks of ‘bad’ social relations as a significant dimension of the ‘web of poverty’. This dimension encapsulates many aspects, including hierarchical gender relations, discrimination and exclusion, a lack of decision-making power, weak or inadequate safety nets, social exclusion and social inferiority (Chambers 2007). In contrast, ‘good’ social relations involve being able to settle with one’s children, being in a position to help others, to make decisions and having a supportive social and cultural environment (Ludi and Bird 2007; Chambers 2005). Social relations act as safety nets against poverty through redistributing income, assisting in productive investments such as housing and education and providing emotional and practical support. Social safety networks often have rules and norms that exclude certain categories of people such as widows, or single mothers or certain ethnicities, contributing to their poor status. In many LMIC countries sexual minorities and sex workers are excluded from these networks.

In addition, sex workers often lack social capital and may have been rejected by their families because of their work (CASAM 2008). FSWs in Uganda report that they are stigmatised by family members even though their families are dependent on the income generated by them (WONETHA and UHRA 2010: 9). This was also the case for adolescent ‘bar girls’ in Nazareth, Ethiopia. Other sex workers migrated from rural areas to look for better
opportunities, but found themselves in urban or peri-urban slums with no family or social safety nets to support them and limited opportunities outside sex work (van Blerk 2011; WONETHA and UHRA 2010). Without family and kinship networks, sex workers are dependent on others, like their pimps and other brokers. Sex workers also organise themselves in informal and flexible networks that allow them, to refer well-behaving clients and improve working safety between members. Sex workers on the street, for example, set up peer surveillance systems. Such networks are practical and also provide unique emotional support. A study in Cambodia by Hoefinger explored the sexuality, subculture and solidarity of ‘professional girlfriends’ and ‘bar girls’ – young women who work in the hospitality and entertainment sectors in Cambodia. As sex work is illegal, all sex workers would have to re-label themselves led as girlfriends, bar girls and entertainment workers (Overs 2013; Hoefinger 2011). The term ‘professional girlfriend’ preceeds PEPFAR and has been used by sex workers and signifies the broader, more emotional, often long-term, relationships that sex workers may have with their clients. Hoefinger describes the intense social relationships and friendships between these women, which are also hierarchical and competitive. Permanent professional girlfriends – or women who have managed to marry a client – are at the apex of the hierarchy within the group of professional girlfriends (Hoefinger 2011).

Likewise, LGBT people and others with marginalised sexualities frequently have to form new social networks and surrogate families when they are rejected by their families. Few LGBT persons are willing or able to fight their families for their rights, such as land or inheritance rights. A few exceptional persons, such as Prince Manvendra Kumar Singh Gohil of the former princely state of Rajpipla in India, manage to challenge family decisions of exclusion because their sexuality does not conform (McClean 2009). Being alienated from their own families, LGBT people often form alternative social networks in diverse settings like El Salvador and Manila that provide practical and emotional support (Barrington et al. 2012; Saunders 2009; Collins 2005; Helie 2004). However, these networks can also be exclusionary; for example, heterosexual female sex workers might have close relationships with each other but exclude transgender and travesti sex workers. Transgender and travesti sex workers also have close networks and those who display a highly visible ‘hyperfemininity’ can be more vulnerable as sex workers, especially on the street (Estrada Montoya and Garcia-Becerra 2011; Campuzano 2009).

Social relations and networks can reinforce the ‘web of poverty’ by excluding people from material and immaterial benefits. Excluded from their own familial networks, sex workers and LGBT persons rely on others and create their own networks, which can help them overcome disadvantages but can also create new social restrictions and economic obligations. These combined factors operate to keep many trapped in the ‘web of poverty’.

2.11 Material poverties
Chambers identified material poverties as being about deficits: lack of clothing, shelter, furniture, accessories (mobile phone, radio, television, personal means of transport, etc.) and lack of income (Chambers 2007). This dimension is about the absence of wealth, the low quality of assets and accessories. Another dimension of this relates to inadequate access to services (discussed above). As Chambers points out, the poor face unemployment and low wages, and are frequently confined to the informal economy; they lack assets and may find it difficult to pay taxes, dowries and other social costs. In a few cases, sex work and LGBT identity open up paths to economic profit that can be invested in social networks or education, but in many cases they close economic opportunities.

Lack of assets, informal employment, illiteracy and limited employment opportunities place sexual minorities in vulnerable positions. Coupled with this is the precarious nature of sex work and other work in the entertainment and beauty industries that compounds these vulnerabilities. In these informal economic activities there are many factors that impact on,
for example, sex workers’ earning capacity: prices for services are unstable, clients may refuse to pay, sex workers may be forced to hand over their earnings, there is no sick leave or insurance (Ghose et al. 2011; CASAM 2008). An analysis of FSWs in Andhra Pradesh, India (George et al. 2011) finds that at least 60 per cent of FSWs are burdened with personal or family debts, more than 60 per cent have dependants, and more than 55 per cent have no education. In addition, those FSWs who are economically vulnerable are more likely to face violence. The debts of FSWs are used as leverage and control mechanisms by their employers and pimps. In Brazil, FSWs are subject to abuses because of their debts (Pimenta, Corrêa, Maksud et al. 2010b). Their income may be controlled and they are subject to indiscriminate confinement. Economic vulnerability is frequently identified as one of the reasons why sex workers accept clients who do not use condoms, which can exacerbate the spread of sexual diseases and sex workers’ ill-health. Most studies on microcredit and sex workers examine the scope for microcredit to empower women and reduce HIV risks. In these studies, economic empowerment is seen to assist women in the prevention and mitigation of the disease. This is one of the reasons why microcredit programmes have targeted female sex workers (Skovdal 2010; Dworkin and Blankenship 2009). Research in India, Ghana and Kenya suggests that such interventions are successful in reaching sex workers and improving knowledge on STI and HIV prevention, and access to alternative sources of income has reduced high-risk behaviour (Euser, Souverein, Gowda et al. 2012; Sherman, Srikrishnan, Rivett et al. 2010; Wojcicki 2005). However, women lose a major share of their income to brokers and pimps, and continue to face sexual harassment and exploitation (Jayasree and Parvathy 2004). The income received from microcredit is insufficient and does not enable sex workers to extricate themselves from these economic and protective entanglements (Swendeman, Basu, Das et al. 2009). These studies all suggest that if sex workers are in a situation where they are not able to keep their income due to other disadvantages, especially lack of freedom of movement, wider transformations are needed for sex workers to financially benefit from microcredit.

Sex work should not be conceptualised as a direct consequence of material and income poverty. As suggested above, sex work also creates economic opportunities in resource-poor contexts. In many LMICs, gendered poverty means that there are very few income-generating opportunities for women with limited education. A Pan-India survey of female sex workers showed that many women in the sex industry have experiences with other work in the informal sector where they do not make enough money (Sahni and Shankar 2013). They have these jobs because they have little education and because gender discrimination has a bearing on the kind of jobs uneducated women can get. These sex workers are demonstrating their capability or freedom (Sen 1985) to pursue different options and to use the labour market in ways that suit them and that offer greater – although quite probably not enough – access to material resources. Sahni and Shankar (2013) argue that these women are using the labour market to develop ‘different combinations of functioning’ that enable them to survive and manage, given their limited circumstances. Research in other settings also found that sex work usually generates more income than could be gained from alternate available employment (NPR News 2011; van Blerk 2011; Hawkins et al. 2009; O’Neil et al. 2004). Adolescent transactional sex workers of Maputo, Mozambique earn high incomes in comparison to their peers (Hawkins et al. 2009). They do not engage in this activity only to meet their basic needs; rather, they seek to develop and maintain a consumerist identity, and this is one means to do so. Similarly, a former health technician from Rio, Brazil, now undertaking sex work, points out that her monthly income has increased fourfold (NPR News 2011).

Yet, not all people with marginalised sexualities are able to shape their access to material resources in this way. LGBT people, like sex workers, are frequently banished from their families, homes, and communities because of their sexual orientation, which forces them to set up their own household in townships or slum areas (Lorway 2006). This exclusion of sexual minorities from the traditional family safety net and social welfare, with no access to
alternative resources, increases their economic and social vulnerability. High unemployment is widespread in the slums of Lima and Trujillo in Peru and affects MSM employment opportunities (Fernandez-Davila et al. 2008). In addition, effeminate gay men and transgender people often find themselves confined to sex work, or work in the entertainment and beauty industries (Estrada Montoya and Garcia-Becerra 2011; Khosla 2009; Armas 2006; Lorway 2006). In the Lima slums, transgender people and effeminate gay men use their identity to undertake feminine occupations. They work in hair salons or are entrepreneurs who own beauty parlours (Fernandez-Davila et al. 2008). In other countries and contexts, however, men who display a feminine identity tend to be unemployed with little chance of obtaining formal work. Hijras in Bangladesh (Khosla 2009) and India (Sahastrabuddhe, Gupta, Stuart et al. 2012; Pincha and Krishna 2008) traditionally earned money as entertainers, but frequently need to support themselves through begging and sex work and are economically and socially extremely marginalised (Ghose et al. 2011). In Namibia, effeminate gay men suppress their identity and sexual preferences and present themselves as conventional heterosexual men in order to find employment (Lorway 2006).

In some cases, sex work and LGBT identity may open up avenues to economic profit that can be invested in social networks or education. But in most cases, rejection by their families – even if these families depend on them financially – and exclusion from mainstream employment avenues form another link in the ‘web of poverty’. Ultimately, even when LGBT people and sex workers do find their work empowering and creating opportunities that help them stave off material poverty, the vast majority of sex workers in LMICs are situated at the bottom of the labour market and often work in informal and/or illegal contexts. Here, lack of regulation is frequently a disadvantage, trapping sex workers and others in situations of labour servitude to pay off debts and making them highly vulnerable to violence and other forms of abuse. The informal economy nonetheless also has some benefits, allowing sex workers and LGBT people to remain invisible if they choose to or indeed need to.

2.12 Resistance and opportunities for change
As shown in the above discussion, LGBT persons and sex workers are ostracised in many ways and experience many of Chambers’ dimensions of poverty. This affects their overall wellbeing including access to health, education, employment, material resources and social resilience. However, there are many changes in the status of LGBT persons and sex workers, which shows that people do take action, and that marginalisation and exclusion are not static and do not occur in all domains. Peruvian transvestites lost their social and familial positions and economic status when they began cross-dressing. By investing money they have earned through sex work and beauty parlours in respectable church processions, they try to gain back some of their previous status (Campuzano 2009). Laws and policies change within countries. In many countries there are contradictory policies and laws, for example with regards to HIV prevention and criminalisation of sex work and same-sex behaviour, which can both hinder and help sexual minorities to take action, resist and change at individual and collective levels (ILGA 2013; Helie 2004).

Studies show how LGBT people find ways and places to meet and enjoy same-sex intimacy in both the physical and virtual worlds. Lesbian women in mainland China are forming new organisations (Chen and Chen 2006). In Manila, Filipino gay-identified hosts create a gay space and develop their own ways of being Filipino and gay (Collins 2005). Homosexual men in Hong Kong met in their parents’ homes and public toilets in the 1940s and 1950s, when homosexuality was a crime. Today they meet in their own homes (Kong 2012). As is evident in the discussions on the Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) list 21 which provides a space for discussions and strategies related to sexuality, sexual rights, sexual

21 http://arc-international.net/network-development/sogi-listserv/policy
orientation, gender, gender identity and gender expression – LGBT people and others discriminated because of their sexuality use social media to connect with each other and with like-minded people across national boundaries (ILGA 2013).

There is also evidence that the conventional heterosexual views, like any other societal view, can change. In Nigeria, negative public views towards homosexuality among students occur alongside a high degree of curiosity, awareness of the existence of secret relationships, and a desire for greater education and understanding (Epprecht and Egya 2011). In South Africa, as shown above, ‘racial’ and other forms of discrimination towards LGBT people are well documented (see for example, Lewin et al. 2013; Nath 2011; HRW and IGLHRC 2003), yet young people are embracing their rights to sexual orientation and shaping new mixed identities (Bagnol et al. 2010). South African parents thus seek both to perpetuate heterosexual morality and are open to discuss and learn about other sexualities (Bagnol et al. 2010). Stigma associated with same-sex relationships and human rights violations against LGBT people is well documented, yet Wagner (Wagner et al. 2013, 2012) shows that disclosure of sexual orientation does not always lead to stigmatisation. In Beirut, MSM reported that disclosure of sexuality to family and friends received a supportive rather than an antagonistic response, which ranged from acceptance to encouragement and emotional support. It is in this diverse and sometimes highly contradictory context that examples of resistance and agency have translated, in some countries, into positive policy change.
3 Sexuality and policy change

Policies that marginalise and criminalise LGBT persons and sex workers are highly varied, some have existed for a long time, some are emerging and some changing at national and international levels. Policy changes are complicated, chaotic historical processes that reflect power contests between different national and international elites and interest groups. The effects of international pressure and interference on national policies are highly contingent on these national political contexts and policy discourses. In Indonesia during the 1990s state Islamic discourses on sexuality shifted in response to international pressures to support same-sex marriage and sexual rights (Blackwood 2007). In contrast in Egypt in the 1940s, the al-Mahalla local community accepted the licensed prostitution quarter, and resisted secret prostitution, while the nationalist anti-colonial discourse constructed one virtuous nation that resulted in outlawing sex work in 1949 (Hammad 2011). The recent defiant responses of Uganda, Ghana and Malawi to a proposed economic conditionality by the UK government illustrate that international pressure can provoke and alienate national leaders. These leaders did not protest against economic conditionality presented in a different way through HIV prevention and AIDS treatment and care programmes for ‘at risk’ populations by the Global Fund and PEPFAR. And, in a case in 2008 that concerned the rights of two women arrested and harassed by police who suspected them of same-sex relations, the Ugandan High Court recognised the women’s right to privacy and dignity because of international instruments and international sentiment (Ako 2010). Evidence such as this suggests that some policy changes at national level are shaped and informed by international legislation as well as by networking across and between local, regional, national and international levels. However, very little about the processes of change for sexuality is being published in journals or research fora. At present, much of the information on activism and policy change on LGBT persons and sex workers exists as blogs, NGO knowledge and grey literature that takes a particular perspective in its presentation of the data. There are few academic articles or reports that undertake an analysis both of the processes informing and underlying change, and of the diverse actors, interests and perspectives invested in the process. Academic research on policy changes and policy engagement with issues of sexuality has not always been connected directly to ‘sexuality and development’ but has instead tended to be focused on human rights, or the history of medical education, or the history of religion, or feminism. Movements are developing and emerging and so is the academic field that seeks to understand this, but work on sexuality in relation to development lags behind.

Much of the literature on policy and sexuality identified for this review focused on two areas:

1. Histories and impact of policies and social movements;
2. Human rights of LGBT people and sex workers.

3.1 Histories and impact of policies and social movements

LGBT persons and sex workers do not necessarily benefit from progressive policy measures for women as illustrated by experiences in Brazil, Bolivia, Chile and Venezuela, as they often focus on the needs of heterosexual women (Friedman 2009). Some social movements have sought to challenge the heterosexual bias within social policy (Seranno-Amaya 2011) and there are several examples of actual revisions of policy in order to better accommodate diverse sexualities in which civil activism has played an important role.

Broad coalition-building between local LGBT-based and other rights-based groups, such as child and labour rights groups, may be needed to achieve successful policy changes, as was shown in India (Misra 2009). Research suggests that to build such broad coalitions, single-issue interest groups need to develop a shared broader framework on gender, sexuality and
human rights, and to have knowledge about legal reforms (Amado 2004). In 2007, after a decade of mobilisation, lobbying and advocacy, Bogotá’s mayor guaranteed the rights of LGBT people in Bogotá. This is a significant change given that LGBT people previously faced a range of stigmatising and cruel treatment (Seranno-Amaya 2011). While applauding these successes, researchers have argued for more inclusive policy that has better awareness of sexuality both generally and in the specific policy areas of health and education (Overs and Hawkins 2011; Mulé, Ross, Deeprose et al. 2009; Jolly 2000).

Analysing public policies through the lens of sexuality is also a way of raising the profile of sexuality in relation to public agendas and promoting broader sociocultural and political change (Seranno-Amaya 2011). Over the past year, IDS has undertaken policy audits that seek to do precisely this. In the South African Policy Audit, this explored the forthcoming White Paper on families. As a government document, it has been designed to articulate the vulnerabilities and needs of families and it may well ultimately affect the distribution of government resources. The Policy Audit reveals, however, the White Paper’s uncritical acceptance of a nuclear family, characterised by working male heads and home-based wives, despite the massive variation in family arrangements within the country. This formal government document brushed aside unconventional families and made no attempt to address vulnerabilities in same-sex families or in migrant families (Charles 2013). The South African White Paper on families has not yet been implemented and the consequences of this conservative policy approach cannot yet be known. The Philippine Policy Audit by Lim and Jordan (2013) shows, however, how assumptions of nuclear and heterosexual families – as the basic unit of society, and thus entrenched in policies – can have particular consequences that reinforce dimensions of poverty for those who do not conform. Assumptions about definitions of families ultimately affect which kinds of people and families are prioritised for government resources such as social housing. Without any explicit understanding of different types of families, LGBT households are systematically excluded and disadvantaged (also see Mountian 2014; Lim and Jordan 2013; Nirantar 2013).

These policy audits confirm, as Friedman has pointed out, that even where homosexuality is not penalised in law, LGBT persons and their partners are frequently unable to access equal rights before the law in terms of marriage, immigration, adoption, access to pensions, work-related benefits and social security benefits. LGBT people and others with diverse sexualities face social, cultural and economic hardships that are not affected by changes in partnership laws. These policy audits thus argue for research, policy and actions that are rooted in the recognition of people’s daily struggles (De Vos 2007; Lim and Jordan 2013). Little material exists that critiques heterosexuality in social policy practice or as an issue within the discipline of social policy even though sexuality issues are often a concern of policy – e.g. debates around teenage pregnancy, sex education, the age of consent, sex tourism, etc. Social policy is thus, as Carabine argues, ‘a focus for the politics of sexuality – a site where various issues and “truths” about sexuality are contested, challenged, transformed and reformed’ (Carabine 1996: 32). Policy audits on sexuality and poverty point to the ways in which definitions of families and assumptions of what is ‘normal’ obscure processes of exclusion for LGBT people. Thus Carabine proposes greater recognition of the fact that sexuality embedded in social policy affects ‘all men as well as all women while recognising the differential effects of the power relations involved between women and men and women and women’ (Carabine 1996: 56; original emphasis).

3.2 Human rights of LGBT people and sex workers

There is a substantial literature examining sexuality and human rights (Sheill 2006; Ndashe 2011; Corrêa 2006), including detailed discussion of different cultural values and rights (for example, Amado 2009; Touray 2006; Epprecht 2006; Kapur 1999). Over the past 20 years, there has been a growing recognition of the relativity of sexual norms and of the difficulties of accepting Western conceptions of sexuality in Africa and elsewhere, including gay rights and
public recognition of same-sex relationships (ILGA 2013: 33). Harcourt argues that ‘(u)nder the umbrella of human rights, sexual rights must include the right of all persons to sexual fulfilment and to freedom from coercion, discrimination and violence around sexuality, whatever their sexual orientation or sexual identity’ (Harcourt 2009: 2). A number of international agreements offer protection to sexual minorities, including the:

- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which has, along with its monitoring body, the Human Rights Committee, supported the protection of LGBT people and requested that states take steps to repeal their sodomy laws;
- The Universal Declaration on Human Rights (Universal Declaration);
- The International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).

This ‘international human rights framework imposes a tripartite obligation on state parties to international human rights instruments to “respect”, “protect” and “fulfil” fundamental human rights for all persons’ (Ako 2010: 12). In combination, these international human rights agreements seek to ensure that all people, regardless of their race, colour, sex, religion, or any other status, have the right to dignity, bodily integrity and privacy, based on a central premise that these are entitlements that every human being should be able to claim. These treaties are captured in the Yogyakarta Principles, which draw together all the rights in international treaties that deal with sexual minorities (ICJ 2007). States that ratify these agreements should be seeking to protect the rights of sexual minorities. There is, however, a massive gap between ratification and implementation and there is no binding international treaty that targets sexual minority rights directly. As such, these treaties are only consequential when drawn upon or implemented at a national level. In this regard, they can be used to influence and shape debates over sexuality and law in many countries. In March 2012, the UN Human Rights Council devoted – for the first time – a special session to LGBT legal issues, violence and discrimination, and called for greater legal protections (UN News Centre 2012).

There are clear challenges in linking sexuality and non-discrimination to the protection of human rights. As work with the ACHPR has shown, these challenges involve overcoming widespread societal prejudice (also see Langford and Dugard 2011: 55). Another challenge concerns the labelling and categorisation associated with rights. As suggested by African social justice activists, there is a danger of privileging LGBT experiences and sexuality over other categories of people. In addition, as explored in the above discussions around HIV/AIDS, people’s experiences do not easily correlate with categorical definitions of sexual behaviour or sexuality such as LGBT. Sharma (2006) too warns against a narrow application of rights-based language and of the need to recognise and acknowledge the many ways in which sexuality connects with other dimensions of identity including gender, class and caste. Finally, as Rothschild points out (Rothschild 2004), pursuing sexuality issues through a human rights focus often involves rendering ‘visible the very communities who sometimes seek safety in invisibility’ (Rothschild 2004: 169).

Sheill argues that human rights and sexual rights frequently serve as a pivot around which civil, political, social and economic rights intersect, for example on HIV and AIDS (Sheill 2006). Policies on HIV and AIDS can have positive and negative effects on the status of LGBT persons and sex workers. Positive policies on HIV and AIDS emphasise solidarity and equity, recognise the importance of human rights and equity and decriminalise sex work and same-sex relations, as was for example illustrated by the experiences in Brazil (Berkman, Garcia, Munoz-Laboy et al. 2005). The struggle against HIV/AIDS is undermined by criminalisation of same-sex relationships and sex work. Positive policies support the struggle against HIV and AIDS. The UN has largely focused on sex work in terms of HIV vulnerability and lately increasingly also in relation to labour rights, including the rights of adult sex
workers to decide whether to remain in or leave sex work (UNAIDS 2009). In contrast, as illustrated in Cambodia, heteronormative policies that focus on nuclear families to criminalise sex work as a means of combating HIV and AIDS or policing trafficking can make it much harder to address violence against sex workers (Overs 2013).

3.3 Positive policy changes

Although the research by human rights organisations on LGBT people’s experiences and sex workers gives much reason for concern, it is important to note that there are also positive policy changes taking place. ILGA notes that:

2012 and 2013 will definitely be remembered as the years of same-sex marriage laws, as a sort of chain reaction seems to spread from continent to continent, from Latin America (Argentina, Uruguay), to Europe (France and most probably the UK) to Oceania (New Zealand), thus bringing the total of countries where same-sex couples can marry to 14. (ILGA 2013: 5)

These changes have not gone unchallenged and Helfer talks of a ‘fractured international landscape’ characterised by a ‘groundswell of change’ that is ‘met by resistance’. Nonetheless, positive change is on the agenda. Over the period considered in this review (2003–2013), there has been a lot of positive policy change involving the prohibition of discrimination based on sexual orientation. A few countries have taken this much further and have recognised the right to sexual freedom in their constitutions. Many countries have introduced or adjusted their Equal Age of Consent legislation to recognise homosexual relations. In terms of employment, discrimination based on sexual orientation is no longer legal in a wide range of countries. It is no longer legal to cite sexual orientation as an aggravating circumstance in hate crimes and/or as an incitement to hatred in a wide range of countries. And finally, a limited number of countries have legally recognised the rights of same-sex couples.

These positive changes have occurred in a wide range of countries, and there are some insights that can be drawn from them. First, when reviewing the temporal sequence of changes to law, it is evident that labour laws are usually the first to be amended. A number of countries have recently passed laws prohibiting discrimination in employment based on sexual orientation even though homosexual acts are still illegal or where the general legislation does not specifically protect LGBT rights (for example, Macedonia). Several countries in southern Africa and the Indian Ocean (Botswana, Mozambique, Mauritius and Seychelles) have adopted legislation to prevent discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation in workplaces, while at the same time their penal codes retain provisions to punish those who engage in same-sex sexual acts among consenting adults (ILGA 2012). And finally, there seems to be some evidence that, after amending labour laws, countries go on to effect other positive changes.

23 In 2005, the Marshall Islands made homosexuality legal; in 2008 Nepal, Nicaragua and Panama followed suit. Fiji did the same in 2010, and most recently, in 2012, Lesotho.
24 These include Bolivia (2009), Brazil (2011 in six states) and Ecuador (2008) and Nepal.
28 Ecuador (2009) and Colombia (2009) now recognise some, but not all, the rights associated with marriage. South Africa (2006), Uruguay (2013), Mexico (in federal Districts in 2010) and Argentina (2010) have legalised marriage for same-sex couples and both Argentina and Brazil made joint adoption by same sex couples legal in 2010.
Much of the global advocacy for policy change and for the decriminalisation of sex work is related to HIV prevention, treatment and care. UN guidance notes with regards to sex work focus on comprehensive approaches to HIV prevention and the need to build supportive environments, reduce vulnerabilities and address structural issues related to HIV and sex work. The ILO (International Labour Organization) is advocating for the legal recognition of sex work by calling on governments to acknowledge sex work as an economic sector and Lim (1998) notes that, for adult sex workers, policy issues are primarily focused on the recognition of ‘a legal occupation with protection under labour law and social security and health regulations’ (Lim 1998: 2). The UN guidance note similarly gives an outline for a comprehensive package of sex workers’ services to facilitate expanding choices, including access to housing, credit and education for life, but this document mostly sets moral rather than practical standards. It is clear from the above discussion and from the very small body of literature that focuses on positive policy change that international agreements and pressure from external aid agencies are insufficient to develop positive policy change in relation to sexualities. While considerably more work is needed to understand the influences that result in positive policy change, there is some indication that an economic approach – combined with strong civil society engagement and the development of new alliances – might be a constructive starting point.
4 Conclusion

The field of sexuality and development is relatively new and much of the literature identified in this review is currently focused on HIV/AIDS and sex workers. A body of literature on sexuality and development is emerging, but there is still much to be done to make this more coherent and understand if and what trends there are. The review did not identify any quantitative assessments of exclusion and marginalisation because of sexuality. This is an area of work that is yet to be developed. Nonetheless, in terms of qualitative understandings of sexuality and poverty, this review has examined the literature through the lens of Chambers’ understanding of a multidimensional ‘web of poverty’. While much of the literature focuses on individual countries or specific dimensions of LGBT persons’ or sex workers’ experience, when viewed collectively it is clear that sexuality and poverty are deeply interwoven. People marginalised because of their sexuality experience interconnected and multidimensional poverty. Their access to formal employment is restricted because of their low educational qualifications, demonstrating how the lack of education is a dimension that affects material poverty. Access to microcredit goes some way towards ameliorating the conditions of poverty, but does not change the overall structure of LGBT and sex workers' work or its economic precariousness. In terms of access to employment, there is some evidence that sex workers and LGBT people are able to accumulate some earnings and generate economic profit, yet at the same time their activities tend to remain within the informal economy. This is partly because of stigma, captured in Chambers’ ‘web of poverty’ in the ascribed inferiority dimension, which results in exclusion from mainstream employment opportunities. These limitations on formal employment also result, in part, from LGBT persons' and sex workers’ lack of access to information and from the restrictions they experience in terms of freedom of movement in public and institutional spaces and places. Stigma also affects their relationships with their families and many people experience rejection (despite contributing to family incomes). This rejection reflects the social deprivation dimension of poverty (discussed below) and forms another link in the ‘web of poverty’. Being situated within the informal sector makes LGBT people and sex workers particularly vulnerable to debt servitude and violence, and acts to reinforce their lack of political clout, another dimension of their ‘web of poverty’. It also limits their ability to negotiate the terms of their work or sexual engagement (such as the use of condoms) and, as such, reinforces their physical ill-health – a further dimension contributing in turn to their inability to secure formal employment and entrapping them deeper within the ‘web of poverty’. The informal economy enables sex workers or people with diverse sexualities to remain invisible should they choose to, or should their activities be illegal. This is, at one level, an advantage. However, it also reinforces other dimensions of poverty, particularly legal and ascribed inferiority and lack of access to institutions.

This review has demonstrated the complexity surrounding policies that marginalise and criminalise LGBT persons and sex workers. They are highly varied, some have existed for a long time, some are emerging and some changing at national and international levels. Thus, while reports on human rights violations against LGBT persons and sex workers and many countries’ intractable stance against homosexuality are cause for concern, there have also been a series of positive policy changes directly relating to sexuality. Many countries have recently adopted same-sex marriage laws. A few countries have recognised the right to sexual freedom in their constitutions, introduced or adjusted their Equal Age of Consent legislation to include homosexual relations, and discrimination in employment based on sexual orientation is no longer legal. A limited number of countries have legally endorsed the rights of same-sex couples. These policy changes are complicated processes that reflect power contests between different national and international elites and interest groups. As such, they have been chaotic and it has been difficult to identify positive sources of change. Researched examination of these positive policy changes are hard to find and much of the
current information on activism and progressive policy change exists as blogs, NGO knowledge and grey literature. More research is required to explore and analyse the processes informing and underlying change, the diverse actors, interests and the perspectives invested in the process. Civil activism and coalition-building have played an important role and there appears to be evidence that an important entry point for change may be in the arena of labour and law. This needs to be combined with international pressure – even though the effects of international pressure on these policy processes with regards to LGBT people are mixed and have also included backlashes and defiance – and broader coalitions of rights-based grassroots organisations and civil society that put forward a shared framework on gender, rights and sexuality.

4.1 Future directions
In terms of future directions, the conclusions arising from this literature review of sexuality and poverty are as follows:

4.1.1 Research
- Explore the links between issues of gender, sexuality and sex work/trafficking, recognising both men and women can be trafficked and work in the sex industry.
- Promote research that seeks to understand the political processes underlying mobilisation and collective action towards more inclusive policies. What works? What does not work? Which kinds of actors are significant and in what ways? What narratives are powerful in directing change? What strategies have worked for civil society and social movements advocating for change?
- Promote research on specific dimensions of poverty and sexuality, such as exclusion of LGBT from education, employment and health services that are not related to sexual or reproductive health.
- Develop research processes that work with local communities to build participatory quantitative approaches and methodologies, including joint data analysis that can quantify the experience of people’s marginalisation because of sexuality in sensitive and culturally appropriate ways.

4.1.2 Policy
- Seek to interrogate and act to eliminate all forms of discrimination based on sexual diversity, in a range of different contexts and in relation to everyday life, such as housing benefits, insurance, access to health or social services, etc.
- Recognise that funding for HIV prevention of ‘key’ populations requires the meaningful involvement of these populations but may or may not support these groups to attain wider civil political rights.
- Support and strengthen existing LGBT and sex workers’ civil society groups to build alliances with other civil society groups to develop broad frameworks for change and joint activities.
- Focus initiatives on institutional violence that is directed at sexuality and sexual orientation, including violence in schools, juvenile homes and prisons, and seek ways to make these institutions more accountable.
- Explore the potential to use economic and labour law as a means to effect positive change in countries in an incremental manner.
- Recognise that sexuality is important in shaping people’s ability to choose between different ways of living that they can have reason to value. Poverty is a denial of choices and opportunities for living a tolerable life (Sen 1999, 1989, 1985).
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