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Summary
This project starts from the observation that in recent decades the public perception of both religion and sexual diversity has changed fundamentally. While religion is increasingly considered to be a private matter, sexual diversity has gained public importance. And whereas religious identity, long accepted as a matter of course, steadily has become contested in its public and most characteristic manifestations, acceptance of sexual diversity is now often presented as a prerequisite for modern citizenship. Conflicts about religion and homosexuality are, therefore, an important source for studying the connecting and dividing functions of religion in contemporary society. This project, then, focuses on the strategic and ideological assumptions, interests, and effects of present-day constructions of (homo)sexuality and religion in public discourse. Its aim is to map out the social, political, and cultural dimensions of framing religion and homosexuality as polarized constructs. The central question is: how are religion and homosexuality construed as oppositional pairings in contemporary Dutch society? The central (PhD) project will uncover and analyze oppositional pairings of religion and homosexuality in political debates, public counseling and information, and popular culture. Two postdoctoral projects put the research in a comparative perspective by looking into recent history (1946 to 2005) and three other European countries (Sweden, Serbia, and Spain). The critical analysis, bearing on feminism and queer studies, will unmask stereotypes and uncover subtexts with alternative constructions of both homosexuality and religion, contributing to ways of overcoming the polarized state of affairs.

Background of the project
To understand the ways in which religion serves to connect and divide people within contemporary Dutch society, it is helpful to look at its critical junctures. One of the most telling examples is the oppositional pairing of religion and homosexuality, figuring prominently in contemporary public debate. Traditional religious constructions of homosexuality repeatedly clash with the public visibility of individual sexual preferences and the increasing acceptance of sexual diversity (Ganzevoort et al. 2011; Korte et al. 1999). These clashes between ‘imagined communities’ (Anderson 1991) reflect changing public perceptions of sexualities, while simultaneously indicating shifting boundaries between ‘the secular’ and ‘the religious’ and between the public and the private spheres in modern western societies (Vattimo 1999; Woodhead 2007; Bracke 2008; Habermas 2008). Conservative religious groups have made the struggle against equal acceptance of homosexuality an important identity marker (Harding 2000; MacCulloch 2003; Bates 2004; Jacobsen & Pellegrini 2004; Cobb 2006; Viefhues-Baily 2010; Samson et al. 2011).
Conversely, LGBT rights movements have traditionally critiqued monotheistic religions for their patriarchal, colonial and homophobic tendencies, and often positioned themselves as secular (Braidotti 2008; Göle 2010). Right wing nationalists call for a ‘defence of homosexuals’ against ‘religious fundamentalist attacks’ and claim the acceptance of sexual diversity to be essential for Dutch citizenship (‘homonationalism’, Puar 2007; 2011). These ‘culture wars’ (or oppositional identity politics) not only reveal a changing public perspective towards sexual diversity but also towards religion, social identities, and citizenship (Butler 2008; Mepschen et al. 2010; Dudink 2011). Well into the twentieth century, the social identities of Dutch citizens were primarily marked by their religious or ideological affiliation (pillarization), whereas sexual orientation was privatized to the degree of invisibility. Today, acceptance of sexual diversity seems ‘typically Dutch’, whereas expression of religious identity is relegated to the private sphere. As a result, religious opposition to acceptance of sexual diversity is sometimes disqualified as outdated bigotry.

This research project assumes the shifts and tensions in the public constructions of religion and sexuality to denote a fierce renegotiation of power positions, as the vigor of debates about the rights of LGBT and religious minorities may indicate (Kuntsman 2008; 2009; Jordan 2011; El-Tayeb 2012). In this struggle, both discourses tend to gravitate around strategically useful essentialist notions, eclipsing a subtext of more nuanced and fluid conceptions of both religion and sexuality and their multiple and layered interconnections as ‘critical conjuncture’.

This project then focuses on the strategic and ideological assumptions, interests, and effects of present-day constructions of (homo)sexuality and religion in public arenas. The aim is to describe the social, political, cultural, and spiritual dimensions of framing religion and homosexuality as polarized constructs, and to offer more nuanced analyses that will allow for dialogue and mutual understanding. The central question is: how are religion and homosexuality construed as oppositional pairings in contemporary Dutch society? The analysis of the discursive formations of oppositional pairings of religion and homosexuality in contemporary public discourse in the Netherlands, informed by comparative analyses for the recent past and for other European contexts, will serve to clarify the connecting and dividing functions of religion in a (post-)secular society (Butler et al. 2011; Taylor 2007).

**Theory and methodology**

The research project consists of an explorative appraisal and critical analysis of the discursive formations of oppositional pairings of religion and homosexuality in contemporary public expressions in the Netherlands (as part of, and in comparison to analogous discourse in the recent past and in European contexts). By studying these controversies on religion and homosexuality in public arenas, the project aims to clarify the connecting and dividing functions of religion in a (post-)secular society in an innovative and societal relevant way.

The emergence and circulation of polarized stances on religion and homosexuality in public discourse have recently become subject of research in various disciplines, such as theology, sociology of religion, cultural anthropology, law and human rights studies, and gender & queer studies. Large scale migration, globalization, fast changing gender positions and kinship formations, and modern individual and social identity-formation each have been identified as factors contributing to the establishing and solidifying of these tensions (Rodriguez & Ouellette 2000; Gudorf 2001; Schachter 2004; Peek 2005; Schnoor 2006). The impact of certain ingrained theological and moral framings of sexuality and the specific functioning of religious authority and religious belonging in modern and secularizing
societies have been designated as important factors as well (Yip 2002; Starks & Robinson 2009; Henrickson 2009; Pitt 2010; Rohy 2012).

Of central importance to the present project is the assumption that the shifts and tensions not only reflect changing public perception of sexual diversity, but also reveals new positions toward the place, role, and rights of religion in society. An integrative approach that aims to chart and evaluate these changes in their concrete and multi-layered interrelatedness is therefore required.

We study the polarized constructs of religion and homosexuality in public discourse under three interrelated angles:

1. as struggles over public representation (Fairclough 1989; Van Dijk 2002) and political and social recognition (Ricoeur 2005) of, and within, religious and LGTB communities, related to profound renegotiations in power positions in modern (post-)secular societies;
2. as ‘identity markers’ of and over and against these communities, often casted in highly significant and evocative expressions, images and gestures, and articulated at the intersection of identity and alterity, marginality and dominance, privilege and exclusion, connection and alienation (Cobb 2006; Kuntsman 2009; Viefhues-Baily 2010);
3. in their actual ‘workings’ and effects in public arenas, rhetorically connecting religion and homosexuality, and contributing to the creation of ‘imagined others/intruders’ and to the formation of collective national, cultural, and religious identity, a.o. by a rhetoric of affects associated with homosexuality (e.g., fear, anxiety, disgust, insecurity) (Castaneda 2002; Ahmed 2004; 2006).

These research interests are operationalized by the following questions: What are the strategic and ideological assumptions (interests, stakes) and affective resonances of present-day constructions of homosexuality and religion in public debates? How do these constructions simultaneously shape and limit public discourse? What are the social, political and cultural effects of this way of framing and polarizing religion and homosexuality?

In this study we investigate the polarized positions on homosexuality from a cultural studies perspective, integrating various critical theories (Hall 1990). Bearing on post-structuralism, feminist and queer theory have deconstructed ‘truths’ about gender and sexuality. Contrary to religious, social, and scientific discourses that claim to know what men and women, gays, lesbians and straight ‘really’ are, they expose gender as a technology (De Lauretis 1987) or a performance (Butler 1990; 1993) and sexuality as socially constructed (Weeks 1985; Seidman 2003; Vance 1989; Katz 2007). This unmasking also reveals how power works through discourse (Foucault 1979). Religious views of homosexuality may impose upon people an identity and a life-style in which ‘appropriate’ gender roles are prescribed (Rich 1980), while LGBT movements aim to construct gay and lesbian identities as coherent and ‘real’ alternatives (Butler 1993; Wadsworth 2011).

Ahmed’s (2004) concept of ‘sticky signs’ provides us with both a theoretical lens and a methodological tool to investigate how constructions of sexuality and religion operate in connecting and dividing ways within religious and secular contexts. Sticky signs are signs (images, symbols, words) that accumulate value and effect through repetition. In the context of our research, these might be words like ‘homofiel’ (‘homophile’), ‘fundamentalist’, or ‘allochtoon’ (‘migrant’). Their repetitive use connects easily to iconic roles (the celibate homosexual, the backward Christian, the unenlightened Muslim) while others may blocked out (the queer Christian, the educated Pietist, the liberal Muslim). We regard sticky signs as markers revealing a discourse’s ideological history and offering clues for alternative identities, narratives, and modes of identification of the non-hegemonic (Ahmed 2006). They
play a major role in processes of ‘selfing’ and ‘othering’ and their inherent ‘grammars of identity/alterity’ (Baumann 2004).

Subprojects
This research interest will be carried out in a central PhD project and two post-doctoral projects, contributing comparative analyses from relevant historical and international contexts. Following principles of the ‘community of learners’ approach, we will integrate projects of qualified MA-students and associate researchers to broaden the research base and impact.

Project 1 Contemporary Dutch arenas
The PhD project will analyze selected cases of current public arenas for the conjunction of religion and homosexuality in Dutch society. Following the angles described above, the research questions focus on visibility, naturalness, authenticity: Are religion and/or homosexuality seen as belonging exclusively to the private sphere or as deserving also public expression and political support? Are religion and homosexuality primarily seen as naturally given or as personal choice? To what extent do expressions of religious conviction and of sexual preference – notably the expression of objections to religion or to homosexuality – make a claim to ‘authenticity’ (Taylor 1991; Yip 2005)?

The project will identify important cases of such public expressions by distinguishing three arenas of public expression: political debate, public counseling and information, and popular culture. In the arena of political debate, at least four cases deserve attention: 1) The debate, involving many politicians and representatives of religious or LGBT organizations, about the inclusion of sexual diversity education in the main learning objectives (kerndoelen) for secondary schools. 2) Responses to statements by the Pope in defense of marriage and the family, and to conflicts between Catholic parish priests and openly gay parishioners (esp. the so-called ‘hostiegate’ in 2010). 3) Debates about registrars with objections of conscience to marrying same-sex couples (weigerambtenaren). 4) Conflicts within and about political party ChristenUnie with respect to the position of gay and lesbian officials/representatives and the party’s co-responsibility (2007-2010) for the Dutch government’s policy on LGBT emancipation. These heated and widespread responses are remarkable in a post-Christian, secular culture; they seem to affect the general conception of religion; and they are suitable for international and historical comparisons. In the arena of public counseling and information the main question will be: what messages regarding homosexuality and religion are communicated in LGBT, religious, and general websites and magazines (maroc.nl, refoweb.nl, gay.nl, Expreszo etc.; cf. Geytenbeek et al. 2006)? It will be particularly interesting to compare and connect the construction of homosexuality in arenas defined by religion and the construction of religion in arenas defined by homosexuality. In the arena of popular culture the focus will be on cases of self-presentation and presentations of fictional characters (as well as responses to it), such as that of gay-friendly Christian celebrity Arie Boomsma, Muslim semi-closeted gay character Bilal Demir from the popular soap opera GTST, or the critical artistic performance from the typically Dutch genre of cabaret (e.g., Hans Teeuwen, Najib Amhali).

The corpus of material selected for this project will be contemporary, taking the year 2001 as a starting point (marked by the legalization of same-sex marriage in the Netherlands and the El-Moumni affair in which a Moroccan imam called homosexuality a disease). A wide variety of sources will be used: written sources including online and printed newspapers and
newsmagazines (notably columns and editorials) and proceedings of the Dutch Parliament, as well as also (audio)visual material from soap operas and Youtube clips and news illustrations and cartoons. These video clips and images are easily shared through social media and have proven suitable means for satire and critique. The analysis will look into the power arrangement of voices representing or defending religious or LGBT communities, and the effects of processes of silencing or ‘othering’ (in selected cases). What terms do participants in these arenas use to characterize their opponents (e.g. ‘fundamentalists’, ‘secular humanists’, ‘pagans’, ‘multiculturalists’, ‘moralists’, ‘moral relativists’)? To what extent do they refer to ‘Dutch national identity’, or to even grander cultural constructions such as ‘Western civilization’, ‘monotheism’, ‘Judeo-Christian tradition’, or ‘Enlightenment’? What fundamental rights, values, or moral principles (e.g. ‘freedom of religion’, ‘equality’, ‘tolerance’, ‘family values’) are at stake, in their respective views?

Project 2 Dutch arenas 1946-2005

This post-doc project aims at reconstructing and analyzing how religion became rhetorically connected with homosexuality, and vice versa, in post-war Dutch public arenas. The main questions it seeks to answer are:

(I) When and how did the idea develop that it is particularly in their attitudes towards homosexuality that religions or denominations differ from one another and from secular worldviews? How were these differences explained, both by denominational insiders and by outsiders? How were they ‘framed’ and ‘staged’ in public arenas?

(II) What conceptions of religion emerge from these exchanges? At various points in time, was religion primarily conceived of as a ‘given’ – a tradition, a heritage, an inalienable part of a person’s social or cultural identity – or rather as ‘a matter of choice’? Was religion thought to be primarily individual, located in people’s inner selves as a way of believing or perceiving, or primarily social, located between people as a way of belonging or relating to others? Was religion believed to belong primarily, or even exclusively, to the private or to the public sphere? These three questions will also, mutatis mutandis, be addressed with regard to homosexuality (cf. Bos 1994).

As the inquiry will cover the period from 1946 to 2005 and a wide scope, the corpus will be selective rather than exhaustive. It builds on previous research on the history of homosexuality in the Catholic Church (Oosterhuis 1992), Protestant denominations (cf. Toulouse 2002; Oomen et al. 2009; Bos 2010a), and ethnic communities (Duyvendak et al. 2010; Hekma 2010a; 2010b; Bos 2010b; cf. Bencheikh et al. 2012). Through a longitudinal research design we will identify changes in conceptions of both homosexuality and religion and gain insight into the ways in which oppositional pairings were transferred from one arena of contestation (e.g., ‘liberal Protestants vs. conservative Protestants’) to another (e.g., ‘Enlightenment vs. religion’). Contingencies and discontinuities will emerge in the exploration of comparable cases in widely different eras, arenas, or discursive genres. The selection will focus on instances of public upheaval about religion and/or homosexuality: the public response to court cases (e.g., on blasphemy or hate speech), political debates (e.g., on approving COC, or on equal treatment legislation), radio and television programs (e.g., God verandert mensen, Zo op zondag), cabaret (e.g., by Jos Brink, and Paul Haenen, Najib Amhali), demonstrations and manifestation (e.g., EO familiedagen, the Pope’s visit to the Netherlands, or the 1977 Miami Nightmare, against US evangelical Anita Bryant).
The main sources of this part of the project will be news papers and periodicals, many of which can be easily accessed through special archival databases such as Digibron, KDC, HDC and IHLIA, and analyzed with the help of techniques of ‘text mining’ (e-humanities). This project does not aim at describing such instances in full detail, but at analyzing -- from a ‘dramaturgical’ perspective (Gusfield 1984; cf. Hilgartner & Bosk 1988) – the ways in which religion and homosexuality were ‘framed’ and ‘staged’. It will specifically do so by tracing the discursive careers of various ‘characters’ (cf. Mooij 1998) in debates on religion and homosexuality, such as ‘the gay-friendly pastor’, ‘the homophile neighbor’ (and his or her father and/or mother), ‘the gay pastor’, ‘the anti-gay clergyman’, ‘the anti-religious queer activist’, ‘the ex-gay, born-again believer’, ‘the ex-ex-gay ex-evangelical’, the weigerambtenaar (registrar who refuses same-sex couples, because of objections of conscience). Prototypical cases of sexual and religious conversion (cf. Erzen 2006) like novelist Gerard van het Reve (from Communism to camp Catholicism; cf. Bos 2006), singer-songwriter Robert Long (from gospel pop to queer, fiercely anti-religious cabaret) and nurse Johan van de Sluis (born again ex-gay) will offer important material to be linked to fictional characters and their conversions in youth novels (e.g., J.F. van der Poel’s Waarom ben ik anders? and Mohamed Sahli’s Blijf van me af!), regional novels or formula fiction (e.g., W. van Zijtveld-Kampert, De weg van Renske), television drama (e.g., Hoera, een homo! or Shouf, shouf, de serie) and movies – notably Paul Verhoeven’s controversial Spetters.

The analysis will clarify:
(a) when, where, and how these ‘characters’ crystallized, possibly in succession of, conjunction with, or opposition to one another;
(b) how some of these characters were frequently invoked in public debate, and re-created in fiction or other expressions of popular culture, whereas others are conspicuous by their absence (e.g., ‘the gay-friendly imam’);
(c) how some of these characters (e.g., ‘the homophobic pastor’) were easily transferred from one arena of contestation – or one country – to another, whereas others were not (witness the unfamiliarity of ‘the understanding Muslim parent’); and
(d) how these various characters related to ‘narrators’, i.e., to what extent did they speak for themselves?

Project 3 Contemporary European arenas: Sweden, Serbia, Spain

This post-doc project investigates whether and how the oppositional pairing of religion and homosexuality is related to the religio-political configurations in different national contexts, i.e., processes of identity-formation in terms of the nation, the secular, and church-state relations. The project seeks to answer the following question: How do religio-political configurations and cultural perspectives on national and religious identity and alterity inform the religion-homosexuality nexus in public debates in Sweden, Serbia and Spain?

The construction of religion and (homo-)sexuality will be related to the importance ascribed to changing church-state relations, human and civil rights, national identity and European integration. The Dutch post-pillarized context with its fragmented and politically marginalized religious landscape champions notions of LGBT rights which non-Western immigrants and Eastern European countries should accept. To assess to what extent this configuration defines the debates in the Netherlands, this project will analyze arenas in countries that differ considerably in their religio-political configurations: Sweden, Serbia, and Spain. In Post State-Church Sweden most citizens are affiliated with the Church of Sweden, widely accepting of sexual diversity and queerness (Kulick 2005). Post-communist Serbia has
seen a revival of the Serbian Orthodox Church, which emphasizes traditional family values, offers a mode of national identification (Bigović 2009), and frames LGBT-rights as a Western European threat to national identity (Spencer-Dohner 2008). Post-Franco Spain widely supports same-sex marriage, even though the Roman Catholic Church — to which most inhabitants belong — fiercely opposes this development.

The comparison between these countries will focus on one socio-political and one cultural case. The socio-political case study will be the debates about the legalization of same-sex marriage. Both Spain and Sweden legalized ‘gay’ marriage (in 2005 and 2009 respectively); LGBT groups in Serbia are beginning to press for legal changes for example through controversial gay pride parades. In all three countries, same-sex marriage — which confronts society with the changing role of religion in defining institutions such as marriage — leads to religious opposition. The cultural case study will be ‘iconoclastic art expressions’, investigating the public reaction towards art that assembles homosexuality and religion in a provocative way. In its portraying of a gay Jesus surrounded by transsexuals the exhibition ‘Ecce Homo’ by Swedish artist Elisabeth Ohlson Wallin, held in both Sweden and Serbia, is one of such iconoclastic exhibitions engendering much debate. Likewise in Spain the exhibition ‘Circus Christi’ by Fernando Bayona Gonzales, also portraying Jesus as a homosexual, sparked much controversy. This project, then, seeks to reveal whether similar arenas (the meaning of marriage, freedom of art expression) lead to different discourses on religion and homosexuality in different national contexts.

The first phase of the project will consist of a literature study resulting in a general overview of the relevant religio-political and cultural developments in the three countries at hand. This literature study will be conducted in close consultation with experts abroad. During the second phase material for the case studies will be gathered. This fieldwork by the postdoctoral researcher will consist of interviews conducted with experts on relevant national debates such as politicians, activists, employees at LGBT organizations, church leaders, artists, journalists and academics. These interviews will form the guidance for MA students (partly from the countries at hand) who will complement the material with articles in newspapers and magazines, political documents, NGO statements, television debates and websites. Collaboration with researchers and activists in all three countries is ensured. Data collection will be followed by discourse analysis focusing on the question of how ideologies of state-church relationships and national identity are related to the construction of religion and homosexuality. More specifically, the question is in what way sticky signs (Ahmed 2004) ascribed to the religious or homosexual Other facilitates the construction of imagined political, cultural and national identities and communities (Anderson 1991). Clues for answering these questions will be taken from the religious, national and political identity-markers used by various groups / stakeholders in the debates to represent and define themselves in opposition to others / the Other. We expect to find these markers precisely at moments of eruption/debate where the meaning of (collective) identity is questioned, and thereby hope to reveal its constructed nature and consequently the struggle over representation that precedes identity-formation (Butler 1990; 1993).

Cohesion and relevance

As may be clear from the description, the three projects share a similar approach in their general conceptual and methodological discourse analytical approach, their corpus consisting of socio-political and cultural material, and their overall research question. While the first project is closest to the central research question, the historical and international
dimensions are indispensable for making a warranted interpretation. The senior researchers / project leaders will see to the development of the general conceptual framework and the consistency and adequacy of the methodological approach. They will each contribute to the design and fine-tuning of the theoretical framework by means of an academic publication on this topic in the first year of the project; together they will edit the volume consisting of the papers of the closing scientific conference.

Debates about religion and homosexuality reveal opposing views of the role and place of both religion and sexual diversity in Dutch society. Although these debates are not as fierce as in some other contexts, they contribute to polarized cultural conflicts. These conflicts easily undermine the peaceful coexistence of religious and sexual minority groups. They also come to the detriment of individuals who find themselves caught in the middle, e.g., because they are homosexual and religious (Ganzevoort et al. 2011; Rahman 2010). The proposed analysis and deconstruction of debates on religion and homosexuality in public arenas can contribute to more balanced representations and will offer insights and materials for improving policies, strategies, and dialogues. The participation of key societal partners from ethnic, religious, and sexual minority backgrounds as well as policy maker and expertise centers will ensure the dissemination of these insights and materials.

Homosexuality is not in and of itself the most pertinent issue for religion in contemporary society. Debates about homosexuality however, often follow the oppositional pairing with religion, which reveals as much about religion as it does about homosexuality. This research project focuses precisely on the ways in which religion serves to connect and divide people within contemporary Dutch society. Exploring the arenas of political debate, public consultation, and popular culture will inform the study of religion especially in reconstructing specific dimensions: the degree to which religion is assumed to be publicly visible and/or private, personally chosen and/or naturally ‘given’, individual and/or social, affective and/or normative, and so on. In that sense this project offers a much needed detailed analysis of the transformation of religion in contemporary society to complement more generic sociological (Casanova, Davie) or philosophical (Taylor) analyses, clarifying and challenging academic debates about the public-private and secular/post-secular dimensions of religion in contemporary society.
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### Composition of the research team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Mths</th>
<th>fte</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. dr. R.Ruard Ganzevoort</td>
<td>VU, Amsterdam</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>Main appl.¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. dr. Anne-Marie Korte</td>
<td>UU, Utrecht</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>Co-appl.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David J. Bos</td>
<td>UvA, Amsterdam</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>Post-doc²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disciplinary expertise of the research team:
R.R. Ganzevoort: practical (empirical) theology, psychology of religion, media studies.
D.J. Bos: sociology, history of religions, mental health.
M. van den Berg: religious studies, gender studies, governance studies.
M. Derks: systematic theology, queer theology.
M. Ajouaou: Islamic theology.
A. Gil: religion and LGBT issues in Spain.
G. Hallonsten: sociology of religion, religion and LGBT issues in Sweden.
B. Plate: religious studies, media studies, religion and art.
D. Valic: media studies, religion and LGBT issues in Serbia.
J. Verheul: digital humanities, cultural history.
D. van der Veur: human rights, sexual diversity.

The research team will incorporate qualified MA-students and associate researchers. At this point we expect to include such projects on Islam and homosexuality, religious debate about same-sex marriage, and the gay pride controversy in Serbia (S. Sremac MA).

11. Collaboration societal organizations
Most of the organizations that will participate in the process of the dissemination of the result of our intended research, face the reality of the oppositional pairings of homosexuality and religion in their work. Some of them have a strong focus on LGBT issues, others less. Some organizations have a religious and/or migrant background, others not. Their core activities vary from activism to policy making, and from reflecting and debating to counseling and training. The following organizations are interested in our research, expect to benefit from its outcomes, and are willing to co-operate with us to increase the social impact of the outcomes of our research:
- Evangelische Broedergemeente Nederland (Moravian Church in the Netherlands)
- COC Netherlands (national LGBT organization)
- EduDivers (centre for education and sexual diversity)
- ForumC (institute for faith, science and society)
- IHLLIA (international LGBT archive)
- LKP (umbrella organization of the Christian LGBT movement in the Netherlands)
- MOVISIE (Netherlands centre for social development)
- Nieuwemoskee (Islamic platform for critical thinkers)
- OCW (Department of Emancipation of the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science)
- SMN (union of Moroccan Dutch people)
- Werkverband van Queer Theologen (society of queer theologians)
- Rutgers WPF (centre for sexual and reproductive health and rights)

**Affiliated organisations**
- The HGJB (reformed youth organization), Al Nisa (organization of Muslim women in the Netherlands), IOT (organization for participation of Turkish people in the Netherlands) and IWFT (expertise network on gender and religion) do not have the time/money to cooperate, but are interested in the outcomes of our research and are willing to help us on an occasional basis.
- Museum Catharijneconvent (national museum of religious art in Utrecht) has the clear intention of collaborating in organizing an exhibition, but was unable to provide a declaration of support at this stage.