CHAPTER- 5

HOMOSEXUALITY & SOCIETY

5.1 INTRODUCTION
Hetronormativity is the corpus of social institutions, structures and cultural discourse that are shaped by and reinforce the reasoning: human beings are made up of males and females; heterosexual intercourse is elemental to the perpetuation of society. The continuation of society requires that heterosexual intercourse be institutionalized through marriage, family, property rights, education, religion, state, etc; and that the man-woman unit is the primary and indivisible unit which give rise to family, kinship, community, and nation\cite{173}. Thus, hetronormativity reasoning constantly repeats and reinforces normative relationships between notions of biological femaleness or maleness, notions of feminity and masculinity, and heterosexuality\cite{174}. Society mainly has two views of homosexuality. These are conservative view and the progressive view. The conservative view propounds that Homosexuality is an aberration, the orientation is a disorder, and the behaviour is pathological. The progressive view propagate that Homosexuality is a normal variant in the human condition and that homosexual behaviour is natural. Conservative thinkers argue that an individual's upbringing can directly influence sexual orientation. Also tied in with many of these debates is the morality of homosexuality. Sexual orientation is experienced in complex and variable ways, which are undoubtedly influenced by both biological and societal factors.

*As homosexuality is practiced in society, this chapter aims to study its correlation with the society in the light of various sociological theories. It also analyses a survey conducted globally with respect to acceptance of homosexuality in society.*


5.2 INTROSPECTION OF HOMOSEXUALITY IN THE LIGHT OF VARIOUS SOCIOLOGICAL THEORIES

There are various sociological theories, which are studied in this research work in brief to draw an analogy between homosexuality and society. These are:

1. Functionalist theory.
2. Labeling theory.
3. Conflict theory.
4. Control theory.
5. Deviance theory.

5.2.1 Functionalist Theory: Functionalism interprets each part of society in terms of how it contributes to the stability of the whole society. Society is more than the sum of its parts; rather, each part of society is functional for the stability of the whole society. The different parts are primarily the institutions of society, each of which is organized to fill different needs and each of which has particular consequences for the form and shape of society. All parts or components in society are dependent upon each other.

For example, the government, or state, provides education for the children of the family, which in turn pays taxes on which the state depends to keep itself running. The family is dependent upon the school to help children grow up to have good jobs so that they can raise and support their own families. In the process, the children become law-abiding, taxpaying citizens, who in turn support the state. If all goes well, the parts of society produce order, stability, and productivity. If all does not go well, the parts of society then must adapt to recapture a new order, stability, and productivity.

Functionalism emphasizes the consensus and order that exist in society focusing on social stability and shared public values. From this perspective, disorganization in the system, such as deviant behavior, leads to change; because societal components must adjust to achieve stability. When one part of the system is not working or is dysfunctional, it affects all other parts and creates social problems, which leads to social change.
**Analogy between homosexuality & functional theory**

When we draw analogy between functional theory of sociology & homosexuality, we can clearly state that the correlation can loosely be established. Homosexuality has by no way contributed to the stability of society as a whole. Homosexuality has served no function to maintain social solidarity. Also, our society is no way dependent upon homosexuals, except that a class of transgender homosexuals (who are called as hijras) in India & some other nearby countries like Bangladesh & Pakistan, are considered as auspicious & are welcomed to shower their blessings on new born & married couples. Otherwise, they are nowhere welcomed & live a secluded life, within their closely attached & united community. Also, the functionalist views a homosexual couple’s inability to reproduce as deviant and unbenefficial.

**Functionalist theoretical view regarding between homosexuality & same-sex marriage in India**

From the perspective of marriages in India, marriage between a male and female is a significant role of human reproduction, which furthers a society in development. Due to the theory of societal equilibrium, it is questioned whether or not a same-sex married couple would contribute to a society’s well-being and balance. But functionalists also recognize that a family’s role is not only reproduction, but also socialization. Another concern of functionalists is the role of religion in our current society. Because religion still plays a large role in our society’s norms, *functionalists believe that the traditional perspective on marriage, held by those who are religious, will ultimately dictate the course of same-sex marriage.* Indeed, religious teachings have led even some staunch supporters of gay rights to oppose same-sex marriage on religious and spiritual grounds.

**5.2.2 Labeling Theory:** *Labeling theory is based on the idea that behaviors are deviant only when society labels them as deviant.* As such, conforming members of society, who interpret certain behaviors as deviant and then attach this label to individuals, determine the distinction between deviance and non-deviance. Labeling theory questions who applies what label to whom, why they do this, and what happens as a result of this labeling. Powerful individuals within society (politicians, judges,
police officers, etc.) typically impose the most significant labels. To mention a few, Labeled persons may include drug addicts, alcoholics, criminals, delinquents, prostitutes, sex offenders, and psychiatric patients, & of course, Homosexuals too. The consequences of being labeled as deviant can be far-reaching. Social research indicates that those who have negative labels usually have lower self-images, are more likely to reject themselves, and may even act more defiantly as a result of the label.

**Analogy between homosexuality & labeling theory**

The analogy between homosexuality & labeling theory can be straightaway drawn on following parameters:

- Homosexuals are generally labeled as a class of people who have a deviant sexual orientation having low moral values, less of behavioural sense & are characterized with biological, sexual or psychological incompatibility.
- When a homosexual identifies himself having a different sexual orientation from the mainstream & knowingly or unknowingly allows it to reflect on the people around, he is labelled by the society as a deviant individual, a homosexual.
- Due to this labelling, homosexuals live a life with lower self-esteem, lack of confidence which ultimately puts a negative effect on all aspects of their life, whether it is personal, professional or social life.

**5.2.3 Social Conflict Theory:** Social conflict theory is a Marxist based social theory which argues that individuals and groups (social classes) within society have differing amounts of material and non-material resources (such as the wealthy vs. the poor) and that the more powerful groups use their power in order to exploit groups with less power. Social conflict theorists argue that money is the main mechanism which creates social disorder, apart from other factors, such as caste, race, region, descent, etc. The theory further states that society is created from ongoing social conflict between various groups.

**Analogy between Homosexuality & Social Conflict Theory**

While drawing analogy between homosexuality & social conflict theory few assumptions can be taken in my opinion:
• If we assume that the money/wealth is the only factor which leads to societal conflict, then result will be that everyone in spite of his class, religion, race, caste, sex as well as sexual orientation (homosexuals) will never have any conflicting interest in society.

• In such situation, everyone will consider all equal in rights, duties, respect & dignity. But the reality is that societal conflict is not due to any single factor, rather it’s due to multiplicity of factors.

• Though the observed reality is that homosexuals are never treated at par with dignity & respect even if they belong to wealthy class of people, as they are looked down by society at large.

**5.2.4 Control Theory:** The control theory lays down a distinctive rule to define things in sociological perspectives. Control theory asks a different question than most of the others; it does not ask "why does someone commit deviance?" but rather control theory explains "why do most of us not commit deviance? In other words, why do most of us, most of the time, act "correctly?"

*The control theory answers this question in a way that "normal behavior" is shaped by the power of social control mechanisms in our culture. Put differently, the social bonds that connect people help to keep us from committing deviance.*

Following are the basic social factors/components of a social bond between individuals:

1. **Attachment** -- a measure of the connectedness between individuals.
2. **Commitment** -- a measure of the stake a person has in the community.
3. **Involvement** -- a measure of the time/energy a person is spending on activities that are helpful to the community.
4. **Belief** -- a measure of the person's support for the morals and beliefs of the community.

**Analogy between Control Theory & Homosexuality**

The analogy between homosexuality & control theory is straightly drawn. It is a fact that the control theory fails to apply when we test homosexuality against it. The core elements of social bonds, attachment, commitment, involvement & belief are missing
in the life of a homosexual, resulting in loose social bonding. Homosexuals are neglected, hated and detached from the family itself, as many times the family itself does not have faith, confidence and belief in a Homosexual’s real identity. All this leads to poor social connectivity, less sense of responsibility, low self esteem etc.

5.2.5 Deviance Theory: This theory focuses and claims that: “All behavior is learned; therefore deviant behavior is also learned.” The theory focuses on the key variables involved in learning. These variables are:

1. Age of the "learner"
2. Intensity of contact with the deviant "teacher"
3. Ratio of "good" to "bad" social contacts in the "learner's" life

Theory predicts that the younger the "learner" is, in an intense relationship with the deviant "teacher", and the more contacts with significant others who are "deviant", then the greater the likelihood the "learner" will also be deviant. Deviance provides the key to understanding the disruption and re-calibration of society that occurs over time. Deviance helps create social stability to present explanations to what are non-normative and normative behaviors. Systems of deviance create norms and tell members of a given society on how to behave by laying out patterns of acceptable and unacceptable behavior. Social parameters create boundaries between populations and enable an “us-versus-them” mentality within the two groups. Deviance provides the key to understanding the disruption and recalibration of society that occurs over time. Some traits that could cause social disruption will be stigmatized. It traces how a trait comes and becomes acceptable in society. As traits become more mainstreamed, society will gradually adjust to incorporate the formerly stigmatized traits.

For example, as in case of homosexuality, in urban America 50 years ago, homosexual behavior was considered deviant. On the one hand, this fractured society into those marked as homosexuals and those unmarked as normative heterosexuals. While this ‘us-versus-them’ mentality solidified social identities and solidarities within the two categories, there was nevertheless an overarching social schism. As time went on, homosexuality came to be accepted as more mainstream.
5.3 SOCIETY: OBSCENITY & VAGRANCY LAWS

**Obscenity Laws** in many countries rely on what the ‘reasonable’ or average man would find obscene, lascivious or that which appears to prurient interest. The decision in *Miller v. California* defines obscene as that which inspires emotions of disgust and revulsion. The judgment also refers to the etymology of obscene that derives from ‘caenum’ – the latin word for filth. *Miller v. California* and the Hicklin test (laid down in *R. v. Hicklin*) were referred to in the case that largely determines obscenity jurisprudence in social context.

In obscenity law, the emotion of disgust and arousal on the same sidling scale as far as determining whether something obscene is concerned.

**Vagrancy Laws** essentially target people wandering on the streets with no purpose. However, the wanderers are selectively identified as migrant labourers, poor people, beggars, thief, urchins, and mentally unstable persons. The ‘undesirable’ wanderers now also includes, ‘queer’ on the street. Among the new class of people in this category are those who are lewd, indecent, and obscene, more specifically woman soliciting/prostituting on the streets, homosexual men, and particularly transgender sex workers. Thus, vagrancy laws, as far as homosexual and transgender men are concerned, were drafted on the assumption of ‘sodomy’ and target men who the law understands as ‘habitual sodomities’. This can also be termed as ‘Khairati Rule’: you look transgender or homosexual so you must have committed sodomy.

The vagrancy Act in England sub divided vagrants into three classes that distinguish first-time offenders like idle or disorderly persons, from repeat offenders like rogues

---


177 Vagrancy laws are defined in terms of being rather than in terms of acting, for example, criminalise prostitution, which is based not on act, but ‘prostitutes’ themselves.

178 Homosexual prostitution/solicitation was a crime under section 32 of the English Sexual offences Act 1956.
and vagabonds; and incorrigible rogues. This distinction of the habitual vagabond was followed in the Sudanese Penal code. SPC did not punish consensual sodomy. However it compensates for its lack of sodomy related proscription by creating a new identity- related category of a vagabond that describes the catamite, but more particularly the transgender. SPC defines seven types of ‘vagabonds’, one of whom expressly includes the ‘catamite’. A ‘catamite’ is defined as any person ‘who-

i. Dresses or is attired in the fashion of a woman in a public place’ or

ii. ‘Practices sodomy as a means of livelihood or as a profession’.

Thus the appearance of a man in the attire of a woman indicates a strong likelihood of criminality, presumably sodomy. Gledhill while commenting on the Sudanese provision agrees that it is directed at ‘the male prostitute’ and clarifies that the second paragraph applies to a ‘habitual’ offender of sodomy. He further adds that ‘it is not necessary to prove when and where any individual act of this nature occurred’. The inclusion of a habitual sodomite as a vagabond in the Sudanese provision, qualified by an appearance and a professional role as a prostitute, only requires that the ‘catamite’ be found. No other proof is mandated or required for his/ her arrest and incarceration.

The British considered the Hijra community in India a ‘distasteful nuisance’. Laurence Preston’s work highlights the manner in which the traditional role of Hijras to enjoy the ‘revenues’ of land and money owned by them were obstructed by the British in concert with the village authorities. The anti-beggary law for example, in

180 Section 448 (2)( e) of the Sudanese Penal Code. This provision is followed by the Northern Nigeria Penal Code in section 405 (2) e).
182 Ibid.
184 Ibid
the Bombay and Bengal presidencies also criminalised the traditional right of the Hijras to beg.

However, the real distaste for them was linked to the strong association of the Hijras with the offence of sodomy. Here the colonial vagrancy laws were adapted to make the ‘personal condition’ of being a Hijra or eunuch a criminal offence. The criminal tribes Act of 1871 in India, inspired by vagrancy laws, termed entire tribal communities, as dacoits, thieves, and therefore criminal. Thus, even to be born in a community that was notified as a criminal tribe carried a mark of criminal. The 1897 amendment to the Act, expressly included ‘eunuchs’ as a notified tribe under the Act. Under the Provisions of this Statute, any eunuch who appeared ‘dressed or ornamented like a woman in a public street…or who dances or plays music or takes part in any public exhibition, in a public street, could be arrested without warrant and punished with imprisonment of up to two years or with fine or both.’ The local government was required to keep a register of the names and residencies of all eunuchs who were ‘reasonably suspected of kidnapping or castrating children or of committing offences under section 377 of the Indian Penal Code.

The criminal categories of vagrant catamite and the criminal ‘eunuch’ allow the state-the sole authority that may judge and punish- to arrest transgender people without proof of an actual act. The presumption of sodomy and the association of certain communities/identities with the ‘abominable act is enough. This legitimizes harassment, abuse, arrest and detention of homosexual and transgender persons merely for being who they are, based on certain acts, traits, bodily marks, or appearance. Thus the ‘personal conditions’ creates a very strong ‘presumption of sodomy’.

5.4 WHETHER HOMOSEXUALITY IS ACCEPTED IN SOCIETY?

As the United States and other countries grapple with the issue of same-sex marriage, a new Pew Research Center survey finds huge variance by region on the broader question of whether homosexuality should be accepted or rejected by society.
The survey of publics in 39 countries finds broad acceptance of homosexuality in North America, the European Union, and much of Latin America, but equally widespread rejection in predominantly Muslim nations and in Africa, as well as in parts of Asia and in Russia. Opinion about the acceptability of homosexuality is divided in Israel, Poland and Bolivia. Attitudes about homosexuality have been fairly stable in recent years, except in South Korea, the United States and Canada, where the percentage saying homosexuality should be accepted by society has grown by at least ten percentage points since 2007. These are among the key findings of a new survey by the Pew Research Center conducted in 39 countries among 37,653 respondents from March 2 to May 1, 2013.


186 Results for India are not reported due to concerns about the survey’s administration in the field.
The survey also finds that acceptance of homosexuality is particularly widespread in countries where religion is less central in people’s lives. These are also among the richest countries in the world. In contrast, in poorer countries with high levels of religiosity, few believe homosexuality should be accepted by society. Age is also a
factor in several countries, with younger respondents offering far more tolerant views than older ones. And while gender differences are not prevalent, in those countries where they are, women are consistently more accepting of homosexuality than men.

Where Homosexuality Is Most Accepted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Homosexuality should be accepted</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Korea</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palest. ter.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only countries surveyed in 2007 and 2013 shown.
PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q27.

The view that homosexuality should be accepted by society is prevalent in most of the European Union countries surveyed. About three-quarters or more in Spain (88%), Germany (87%), the Czech Republic (80%), France (77%), Britain (76%), and Italy
(74%) share this view, as do more than half in Greece (53%). Poland is the only EU country surveyed where views are mixed; 42% say homosexuality should be accepted by society and 46% believe it should be rejected.

Canadians, who already expressed tolerant views in 2007, are now even more likely to say homosexuality should be accepted by society; 80% say this, compared with 70% six years ago. Views are not as positive in the U.S., where a smaller majority (60%) believes homosexuality should be accepted. But Americans are far more tolerant today than they were in 2007, when 49% said homosexuality should be accepted by society and 41% said it should be rejected.

Opinions about homosexuality are also positive in parts of Latin America. In Argentina, the first country in the region to legalize gay marriage in 2010, about three-quarters (74%) say homosexuality should be accepted, as do clear majorities in Chile (68%), Mexico (61%) and Brazil (60%); about half of Venezuelans (51%) also express acceptance. In contrast, 62% of Salvadorans say homosexuality should be rejected by society, as do nearly half in Bolivia (49%). In the Asia/Pacific region, where views of homosexuality are mostly negative, more than seven-in-ten in Australia (79%) and the Philippines (73%) say homosexuality should be accepted by society; 54% in Japan agree.

**Where Homosexuality Is Rejected**

Publics in Africa and in predominantly Muslim countries remain among the least accepting of homosexuality. In sub-Saharan Africa, at least nine-in-ten in Nigeria (98%), Senegal (96%), Ghana (96%), Uganda (96%) and Kenya (90%) believe homosexuality should not be accepted by society. Even in South Africa where, unlike in many other African countries, homosexual acts are legal and discrimination based on sexual orientation is unconstitutional, 61% say homosexuality should not be accepted by society, while just 32% say it should be accepted.
Overwhelming majorities in the predominantly Muslim countries surveyed also say homosexuality should be rejected, including 97% in Jordan, 95% in Egypt, 94% in Tunisia, 93% in the Palestinian territories, 93% in Indonesia, 87% in Pakistan, 86% in Malaysia, 80% in Lebanon and 78% in Turkey. Elsewhere, majorities in South Korea (59%) and China (57%) also say homosexuality should not be accepted by society; 39% and 21%, respectively, say it should be accepted. South Korean views, while still negative, have shifted considerably since 2007, when 77% said homosexuality should be rejected and 18% said it should be accepted by society.

Religiosity and Views on Homosexuality

There is a strong relationship between a country’s religiosity and opinions about homosexuality. There is far less acceptance of homosexuality in countries where religion is central to people’s lives – measured by whether they consider religion to be very important, whether they believe it is necessary to believe in God in order to be moral, and whether they pray at least once a day.

Religiosity is measured using a three-item index ranging from 0-3, with “3” representing the most religious position. Respondents were coded as “1” if they believe faith in God is necessary for morality; “1” if they say religion is very important in their lives; and “1” if they pray at least once a day. The mean score for each country is used in this analysis.
There are some notable exceptions, however. For example, Russia receives low scores on the religiosity scale, which would suggest higher levels of tolerance for homosexuality. Yet, just 16% of Russians say homosexuality should be accepted by society. Conversely, Brazilians and Filipinos are considerably more tolerant of homosexuality than their countries’ relatively high levels of religiosity would suggest.

In Israel, where views of homosexuality are mixed, secular Jews are more than twice as likely as those who describe themselves as traditional, religious or ultra-Orthodox to say homosexuality should be accepted (61% vs. 26%); just 2% of Israeli Muslims share this view.

**Gender, Age and Views of Homosexuality**
In most of the countries surveyed, views of homosexuality do not differ significantly between men and women. But in the countries where there is a gender gap, women are considerably more likely than men to say homosexuality should be accepted by society.

In Japan, Venezuela and Greece, where about six-in-ten women say homosexuality should be accepted (61% in Japan and 59% in Venezuela and Greece), fewer than half of men share this view (47%, 44% and 47%, respectively). About half of women in Israel (48%) express positive views of homosexuality, compared with just 31% of men. And, while majorities of women and men in Britain, Chile, France and the U.S. say homosexuality should be accepted by society, women are more likely than men to offer this view by at least ten percentage points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Homosexuality should be accepted</th>
<th>Men %</th>
<th>Women %</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only countries with a double-digit gender gap shown.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER Q27.
In many countries, views of homosexuality also vary across age groups, with younger respondents consistently more likely than older ones to say homosexuality should be accepted by society. Age differences are particularly evident in South Korea, Japan, and Brazil, where those younger than 30 are more accepting than those ages 30-49 who, in turn, are more accepting than those ages 50 and older.
For example, in Japan, 83% of those younger than 30 say homosexuality should be accepted, compared with 71% of 30-49 year-olds and just 39% of those 50 and older. Similarly, 71% of South Koreans in the younger age group offer positive views of homosexuality, but just about half of 30-49 year-olds (48%) and 16% of those 50 or older do. In Brazil, about three-quarters of those younger than 30 (74%) say homosexuality should be accepted, compared with 60% of those in the middle category and 46% of those 50 or older.

In the EU, solid majorities across age groups in Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Italy and the Czech Republic express positive views of homosexuality, although Italians and Czechs ages 50 and older are considerably less likely than younger people in these countries to say homosexuality should be accepted. At least eight-in-ten Italians younger than 30 (86%) and ages 30-49 (80%) share this view, compared with 67% of those ages 50 and older. In the Czech Republic, 84% of those ages 18-29 and 87% of those 30-49 say homosexuality should be accepted, while 72% of those ages 50 and older agree.

In Greece, where acceptance of homosexuality is not as prevalent as in most of the EU countries surveyed, majorities of 18-29 year-olds (66%) and 30-49 year-olds (62%) say homosexuality should be accepted by society; far fewer Greeks ages 50 and older (40%) share this view.

People ages 50 and older in the U.S., Canada, Argentina, Bolivia and Chile are also less likely than those in the two younger age groups to say homosexuality should be accepted by society, although at least half of those 50 and older in all but Bolivia are accepting, including 75% in Canada. In the U.S., 70% of those ages 18-29 and 64% of those ages 30-49 are accepting of homosexuality, compared with about half of Americans ages 50 and older (52%). In Bolivia, however, 53% of 18-29 year-olds and 43% of 30-49 year-olds say homosexuality should be accepted, but just 27% of those in the older group share this view.
Mexicans and Chinese ages 18-29 are more likely than those in each of the other two age groups to offer positive views of homosexuality, but there is no significant difference between the views of 30-49 year-olds and those 50 or older. And in Russia, El Salvador and Venezuela, those younger than 30 are more tolerant of homosexuality than are those ages 50 and older, while the views of those ages 30-49 do not vary considerably from those in the youngest and oldest groups.

Across the predominantly Muslim countries surveyed, as well as in the six sub-Saharan countries, solid majorities across age groups share the view that homosexuality should be rejected by society. In Lebanon, however, there is somewhat more acceptance among younger respondents; 27% of Lebanese younger than 30 say homosexuality should be accepted, compared with 17% of 30-49 year-olds and 10% of those 50 or older.

**A Broad Analysis of the Pew Survey can be summed up as:**

- **Acceptance of homosexuality is particularly widespread in countries where religion is less central in people’s lives.** There is far less acceptance of homosexuality in countries where religion is central to people’s lives – measured by whether they consider religion to be very important, whether they believe it is necessary to believe in God in order to be moral, and whether they pray at least once a day. These are also among the richest countries in the world. In contrast, in poorer countries with high levels of religiosity, few believe homosexuality should be accepted by society.

- **Age is also a factor in several countries, with younger respondents offering far more tolerant views than older ones.** And while gender differences are not prevalent, in those countries where they are, women are consistently more accepting of homosexuality than men.

- **Publics in Africa and in predominantly Muslim countries remain among the least accepting of homosexuality.** Overwhelming majorities in the predominantly Muslim countries surveyed also say homosexuality should be rejected.
In most of the countries surveyed, views of homosexuality do not differ significantly between men and women. But in the countries where there is a gender gap, women are considerably more likely than men to say homosexuality should be accepted by society.

Regrettably, this survey was not carried out in India, hence societal acceptance of homosexuality in India is not included.

5.5 CONCLUSION

Thus, homosexuality being a distinct part of sexuality; sexuality being a part of individuality’ and individuality being a part of Humanity are all inter-related. Most of the societies which are religiously dominated and less developed scientifically have prejudices against homosexuality set on basis of morality, religious prohibitions and order of nature. One of the biggest apprehensions against accepting homosexuals in society is that; if they are accepted in society, such deviance sexual practices will mushroom as the present generation is already low on moral standards and quick on experimentation without analyzing the pros and cons for the same. With effect of such experimentation the heterosexual may also turns homosexuals.

I do understand the apprehension of such people, but here it should be understood by all of us that first of all, it is not a mental disease and only people who are born with such orientation practices homosexuality. Secondly, this generation is experimental but if due awareness and education be given to them in their schools/ colleges through sex education & sensitization workshops, it will serve following purpose:

- The real homosexual, who is born with such sexual dysphasia or sexual orientation, will understand that he/ she is not a mentally sick person and his/ her struggle with oneself becomes easy, whereby his/ her correct sexual discovery be assured.
- The sensitization workshops will also help heterosexuals by guiding them about correct, timely sex education, informing them to restrain themselves from sexual experimentation, unsafe sexual practices etc.
• The classmates, colleagues, society at large will also become sensitive and an empathic attitude will be developed because of which discriminatory attitude, harassment and violence against homosexuals will automatically reduce.

• The values of ‘inclusiveness and respect for all human rights’ can be taught to the society, whereby all people belonging to different gender, caste, race, sexual orientation, social, economic and cultural background be taught to be a good human being & law abiding citizen of a country.

• In brief the broad message of ‘Humanity above Sexuality’ be given to all considering the global values of human rights in the world.