

II. STATE SECURITY VS. HUMAN SECURITY

A sense of insecurity and fear is gaining ground. Security, a goal shared by states and individuals, has become the source of policies that either feed our fear or throw millions of people into total insecurity.

State of insecurity

'HUMAN SECURITY' SHOULD BE ENSURED BY STATES. HOWEVER, STATES OFTEN FACE DIFFICULTIES WHEN IT COMES TO DECIDING TO WHAT EXTENT THEY OFFER THEIR GUARANTEES. TERRORIST ATTACKS AND NATURAL DISASTERS CHALLENGE THE STATE-INDIVIDUAL RELATIONSHIP AND SHOW THAT 'HUMAN SECURITY' IS ONE THING WHILE 'STATE SECURITY' IS SOMETHING VERY DIFFERENT.

The concept of 'human security' emerged in the mid-1980s as a substitute for 'national security', which had been the term used until then. The simplest way to think about this is to associate it with 'non-violence' and think of it as a state of daily life in which individuals are not threatened with some type of physical aggression that puts their lives at risk. War, civil conflict, crime, terrorism and state repression all have an impact on the degree of security a society may offer its members.

However, there is a more comprehensive concept of 'human security' which is not exclusively focused on violence. The very etymology of the word 'security' goes beyond the mere idea of 'peace' since it stems from the Latin words 'securitas' and the latter 'securus' (unconcerned). It is clear that people's concerns in today's world are not (and should not be) exclusively about being alive and safe.

Thus, according to experts on the subject, there are two major ways of defining 'human security'. Those who opt for the first, restricted definition determine the degree of human security simply by measuring the amount of violence that threatens individuals in a community. This threat can be external (war), internal (social insecurity, armed conflicts) or involve the state (repression, harassment) - and in the last 100 years many more people have died at the hands of their own government than as a result of international armed conflict.

A more comprehensive definition adds factors such as hunger, diseases or natural disasters to the threat of violence since these kill more people than wars, genocides and terrorism put together. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), in its *Human Development Report 1994*, for example, follows this line of analysis.

All analysts agree that states - according to Max Weber, the only political entities authorized to exert legitimate violence¹ - have the absolute responsibility as guarantors of the security of individuals. For many theorists, the institutions of the state originally had no other purpose.

It is the state's role to do the optimum to make society more or less vulnerable (unsafe) - something that does not necessarily relate to its level of development or wealth. Every now and then terrorism, war, internal violence or natural disasters - such as the terrorist attacks in London and Madrid or Hurricane Katrina in the US - prove that human security is not guaranteed by the level of development and that state responses, even in the most powerful of countries, can be late, deficient and chaotic.

Security and development

In the poorest countries, the weaknesses are self-evident. Data on infant and maternal mortality, malnutrition, unemployment, illiteracy or low life

expectancy reveal situations of extreme insecurity. Many countries in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia - as well as some in Latin America, such as Haiti, Nicaragua and Guatemala - perform poorly in almost all the indicators that contribute to the security of their people. Certainly any areas affected by armed conflict threaten their inhabitants - including displaced people, refugees and orphans - with the crudest forms of human insecurity.

The developing world, on the other hand, experiences another kind of vulnerability. Even countries with medium and medium-high development indicators - such as Uruguay, Argentina and Brazil - show extremely impoverished social sectors, where human security is highly deficient.

When war, poverty, debt and hunger shape the whole reality of a country, little is to be expected in terms of security from a dismantled state, which will limit itself to managing the extremely scarce resources and fighting for its own survival in the storm. A weak state is unable to protect anybody.

In other less critical situations, the state has to focus on managing different options and choosing the paths that lead to the development of the country. This management is basically reduced to distributing the somewhat less limited resources available and fulfilling its international commitments. Such states are usually more stable but have limited room for maneuver. An overwhelmed state can offer limited protection.

1. Max Weber, 'Politics as a vocation'.

Finally, there is the case of countries with strong states, which manage plentiful resources and have countless possibilities for action. However, as we have already seen, the security of their people cannot always be assured. In part this is due to the fact that the state spends too much on its own security. A state that places itself as top priority is unable to protect its citizens in an effective way.

In view of the terrorist attacks carried out since 2001 in the US, London and Madrid, the idea of 'security' should be re-analyzed. These hammer blows turned out to be successful in spite of the huge sums of money that modern industrialized powers (particularly, the US and UK) allocate to 'national security'. Even so, none of the attacks, no matter how successful, posed a threat to state security, although they all were dreadful blows against 'human security'.

Dream of invulnerability shattered

On 11 September 2001, people in the US had their dream of invulnerability - which had led their government to waste

billions in a quest for a 'Star Wars' style missile shield - turn into a nightmare, as a few suicide attackers, using their own education, technology and fuel, could bring a little of the 'outer world' to their home territory.

Four years later, a long-announced hurricane - among the many that sweep along the coast of the Caribbean and Southeast Asia - much photographed and analyzed by satellites, went even further. The 'outer world' met the US then, like a wedge embedded in the south, and produced TV pictures showing floating wrecks, crying children and destroyed families, seeming no different from those in Thailand, Indonesia or Sri Lanka. The images of armed civilians trying to survive the chaos, looking for food or looting stores, brought New Orleans closer to Puerto Principe, Mogadishu or Sarajevo.

The idea of 'state security' vaguely revealed its logic when, in the middle of the crisis and with paralyzed rescue systems, the authorities explained that no officers could be sent to the disaster area because it would not be safe for them.

The state machinery capable of plowing the seas and skies all over the world in the name of invasion and occupation did not feel safe to rescue its own stricken people.

Again, notwithstanding the magnitude of the crisis, and unlike cases such as Haiti, Somalia or Sarajevo, the US State was never in danger, which shows that 'human security' and 'state security' are far from going together.

These terrorist attacks and natural disasters have changed the relationship between the state and civil society in developed countries by revealing a crack in the foundations.

The situation is not equivalent to that of other countries in conflict. The American, Spanish and British people are not under daily threat of violence. Madrid is not Baghdad with car bombs in every street, nor are starving people lurking in the corners of London or New York to steal food. Yet people living in those cities have learned to suspect that neither the state's wealth nor its 'legitimate violence' can ensure their security. ■

Resorting to 'just war'

THOSE INVOLVED IN A WAR TEND TO REGARD THEIR OWN FIGHT AS LEGITIMATE. WHETHER THEY ARE DEFENDING THEMSELVES FROM ATTACK, OR LAUNCHING AN ATTACK ON ANOTHER, THEY UPHOLD THE IDEA THAT JUSTICE ENDORSES THEIR WAR. THE 'JUST WAR' DOCTRINE, AMONG OTHER THINGS, UNDERLIES 'PRE-EMPTIVE' OR OTHER TYPES OF WARS LAUNCHED BY THE US GOVERNMENT, WHICH TEND TO THREATEN OR AFFECT ISLAMIC COUNTRIES.

Classical Antiquity ignored the concept of a just war. In Ancient Greece the concept of supremacy prevailed, which legitimated interventions against barbarians, regarded as inferiors. Talking about justice made no sense when the consequences of war, even for the conquered enemy, were positive: they benefited from Greek civilizing action.

Rome had a collective security concept. What legitimated the wars of the Republic, and later on those of the Empire, was the need to secure an area of international stability. But Rome was different from Greece: it admitted diversity, rapidly absorbed foreigners and incorporated many of their customs.

Christianity, which supplied the powers ruling the Western world until the fall of the Roman Empire with important ethical foundations, included commands as radical as love thine enemy, forgive those

who offend you or pray for those who do you wrong.

Augustine of Hippo (354-430), better known as St Augustine, was one of the first theologians to attempt to reconcile the teachings of Jesus with the defense of an empire that was beginning to accept Christianity and tried to survive the onslaught of barbarians. The Augustinian synthesis admitted private pacifism but accepted the legitimacy of the Empire's military defense.

The scholastic doctrine of just war, widely treated by Thomas Aquinas (St Thomas, 1225-1274), was articulated around three axes: legitimacy of self-defense, commensurate response and possibility of success.

The Spanish Dominican Francisco de Vitoria (1483-1546), the father of international law, had a foot in scholastic

doctrine but with a humanist emphasis. He only admitted defensive wars as just and stated that, in a case of serious aggression, a response may be admitted, as long as it is proportional to the aggression received. Among conditions for a just war were declaration of war by the governing authority (usually a prince), the inevitability of conflict in order to protect security, and a commensurate use of victory.

Vitoria did not regard as just wars waged over religious differences, wars of conquest or for glory. He condemned the cruelty of the Spanish conquistadors in America and the slaughter of innocents and prisoners. He proposed what today is known as 'conscientious objection': 'If a subject is convinced of the injustice of a war, he may not serve in it, even though his sovereign commands'.

Holy war

For French philosopher René Guénon (1886-1951) holy war, referred to by multiple holy texts (especially Eastern), should be understood as a symbol of restoring a spiritual order, more than inciting to the destruction of an external enemy. Often the Arab term *jihad* is interpreted as 'holy war', although it actually means 'effort'. It refers to the struggle the faithful must carry out to overcome adversity, often represented by the opposition of others.

In the Middle Ages, in the 12th century, when the Crusades began - a typical holy war initiated by Christianity - St Bernard said: 'War must be waged as little as possible, analyzing each case... Among Christians it is only just when the unity of the Church is in danger; against Jews, heretics, pagans violence shall be avoided, since truth is not imposed through force. Christians must convince, and only a defensive war is justified'.

Neither Christian nor Islamic texts encourage a war of aggression against the different, although both religions endorse active conversion of infidels. Reality showed that both faiths could co-exist when Al-Andalus, the Iberian land ruled by Muslim princes, became a place of fruitful exchange between Muslims and Christians. Religious intolerance only arose as a justification of political enmity.

Contemporary thinkers Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri say that renewed interest in the just war doctrine is a renaissance of the idea of 'empire'. According to them, the development of US military hegemony has turned all world conflicts into 'domestic' ones. The ease with which the US Government defines its enemies as rogues (including them in an 'axis of evil') makes sense within a conception of globalization as an imperial sphere.

Pre-emptive war

The current US Government maintains that it has the right to use military force against any alleged enemy, even before being attacked, to prevent a possible aggression. This peculiar way of legitimizing belligerent action is based

on the idea that some governments have information about aggressive intentions from other governments or terrorist groups. Only military secret services have the power to identify and define potential risks to US safety and interests. According to this point of view, any country may be subject to a legitimate attack from the US due to assumptions or potential dangers.

When in early 2003 the US attacked Iraq based - so it said - on secret service reports regarding the existence of weapons of mass destruction, the chain of justification was sustained on extremely fragile links. First, the mere existence of weapons becomes the means to justify an attack. There is never an attempt to show that weapons will be used. Second, those who apparently decide to launch the war are not the rulers, but certain agencies supplying information. In the case of the war on Iraq, both the US and UK governments eventually admitted that the information from their intelligence services was mistaken.

The structure of both points of departure - the enemy's alleged intention as reason for war, and the information supplied by secret services - should suffice to invalidate the pre-emptive war doctrine. On the one hand, war is waged to avoid war, which is obviously contradictory; on the other hand, prevention is forced to take into account information not wholly confirmed, and therefore, even without considering the existence of illegitimate interests, it is subject to error.

The just war doctrine was used by the US to explain its interventions in Korea and Vietnam. It was used to justify its invasion of Panama in order to carry out the detention order by a US judge against an alleged drug dealer (General Manuel Noriega, the ruler), thereby extending Washington's jurisdiction throughout Central America and ignoring the principle of national sovereignty. Just war doctrine also lay behind the use of force to enforce UN resolutions (the first Gulf War). Later on, 'humanitarian intervention', a variation of just war, replaced international law in Kosovo.

The invasion of Iraq is the first pre-emptive war carried out by the US, but its warnings to Iran and North Korea lead many to believe it is only the beginning of a war cycle in which pre-emption will replace justice as a source of legitimacy.

Pre-emptive holy war

While the just war doctrine has advocated among theologians (like Augustine) and philosophers (like Thomas Aquinas or the American John Rawls [1921-2002]), pre-emptive war is advocated by US President George W Bush's administration and not by the lucubration of any thinker.

In philosophical terms pre-emption relates most closely to Manichean conceptions of good and evil (Augustine was, before he converted to Christianity, a believer in the dualist doctrine of Mani, a Persian sage who lived in the third century in what is now Iraqi territory).

During the annual State of the Union address by the US President to Congress in January 2002, Bush referred to an 'axis of evil' in which he placed Iran, North Korea and Iraq. He defined the Iraqi threat in these terms: 'This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.' With this vague definition of the obscure character of its enemy, the US launched a war of aggression that cannot be defended by just war doctrine.

Although the US Government does not officially identify Islam as the enemy, there is a clear trend in most of the Western mass media to identify Islamic communities with forces opposed to 'civilization', a term used to define the culture of Western capitalism in developed countries. The use of terms such as 'axis of evil' and 'civilization' recalls the feudal princes in medieval Europe rallying people to holy war.

Like the ancient Greeks, the US Government seems convinced that its actions are beneficial, even toward its enemies; like the Romans, its wars of conquest are complemented by a practice of cultural assimilation and multi-ethnic immigration. But in modern terms the US notion of war is certainly breaking new ground. ■

The rule of fear

THE WORLD IS INCREASINGLY PERCEIVED AS AN INSECURE, DANGEROUS AND MENACING PLACE. THE GLOBAL IDEOLOGY OF FEAR SEEMS TO HAVE BECOME THE BASIS FOR ALL ANALYSIS.

Reports from organizations monitoring armed conflicts and the plight of refugees and displaced people worldwide seem to indicate that between 1992 and 2004 there were fewer wars.

The *Human Security Report 2005 (HSR 2005)*¹ offers concrete data reflecting this trend: between 1992 and 2004, the number of armed conflicts worldwide fell from 44 to 32 (a reduction of over 40 per cent). Wars between countries only amounted to five per cent of armed conflicts in that year. Military coups d'état or attempted coups (which totalled 25 in 1963) amounted to ten in 2004, all of which failed.

Wars are also reported to be currently less deadly than they were 50 years ago: in the 1950s the average number of casualties was 38,000 a year, whereas they amounted to 600 in 2002.

Meanwhile *Alerta 2005*², a report on conflict and human rights published by the School of Peace Culture at the Autonomous University of Barcelona, documents 25 armed conflicts at the end of 2005 and 21 during the first quarter of 2006.³

As regards terrorism, the *HSR 2005* states that this started to decrease as from 1980 and, although an increase has been

registered as of 2001, terrorist activities still produce a negligible fraction of the mortality associated with wars.

According to the most recent report by UNHCR⁴, the current number of refugees in the world (a fact closely linked to armed conflicts) amounted to 9.2 million at the beginning of 2006, this being the lowest figure registered over the past 25 years, though there has been an increase in internal displacement.

Despite these data, the general perception prevails that we are living in an increasingly insecure world, with more wars and a greater number of casualties as a result of violence. Reality and the perception of that reality not only differ, they are utterly divergent. The *HSR 2005* suggests that the feeling of insecurity is brought about by a series of myths, 'some of them originating in the media; others propagated or restated by international organizations and NGOs'.

Swiss writer Tariq Ramadan argues that global terrorism and the 'war on terror' promoted by the US after the attacks of 11 September 2001, both equally foster the 'global ideology of fear'. According to Ramadan, in the North as well as in the South, particularly in those communities where the population is mainly Muslim,

'fear is omnipresent, deeply rooted everywhere'. He adds that such fear has an unmistakable impact on human beings' perception of the world. This fear, in a natural and often subconscious way, engenders mistrust and fosters potential conflict with the 'Other'. 'We observe facts,' he says, 'condemn their consequences, reject individuals together with their motivations and actions, but every principle of causation seems to have vanished from the analytic horizon'.

The global 'war on terror' seems to have changed the landscape: we are living in a land of supposition, not of analysis. The US and its allies maintain that it was the terrorist attack on the Twin Towers that changed the world irreversibly. The logic of fear, reconverted into state security, completely disregards Human Rights and security. Thus, UNHCR reports that 'since the 11 September 2001 attacks in the United States, state security concerns have come to dominate the migration debate, at times overshadowing the legitimate protection needs of individuals.' It is the fear itself that, paradoxically, leads to defenselessness. ■

1. Human Security Centre, *Human Security Report 2005, War and peace in the 21st Century*, Oxford University Press, January 2006.

2. Escola de Cultura de Pau (ECP), *Alerta 2005. Informe sobre conflictes, Drets Humans y construcció de pau*, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Icaria, 2005.

3. Each organization uses different criteria for including an event as an example of 'armed conflict' and thus their overall numbers differ. However, the trend is similar in both cases.

4. UNHCR, *The state of the world's refugees. Human displacement in the new millennium*. 2006, www.unhcr.org

SEXUAL MINORITIES AND THE LAW: A WORLD SURVEY

Today the issues of homosexuality and transgender are being hotly debated in parts of the world where they had been just a hushed whisper. It has become harder for political and religious leaders to maintain the 'homosexuality is not part of our culture' as home-grown lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender groups have sprung up in Africa, Asia and Latin America, to fight unjust laws and demand freedom from discrimination and persecution. This 'internationalization' of sexual minority rights has coincided with the rise in internet activism and support from international human rights organizations. However, the situation for many lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LGBT) people in the world remains dire. In nine countries homosexuality incurs the death penalty, while in some 80 states it is illegal, sometimes incurring long prison sentences. Currently, many governments are making constitutional and legal changes to combat centuries of discrimination. Pioneers in this area have included countries like the Netherlands or Denmark, with established liberal traditions, but also South Africa, Brazil and, more recently, the Philippines.

F= female. M= male. LGBT: Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender.

<p>AFGHANISTAN Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Imprisonable for up to 15 years. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>AUSTRIA Homosexuality: Legal. Anti-discrimination laws apply. Prepared to grant asylum to LGBT refugees. Transgender: Gender reassignment legal or openly performed without prosecution. All personal documents may be reissued following change.</p>	<p>BOTSWANA Homosexuality: Illegal. M (F not mentioned in law). Imprisonable for 5 years. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>CHILE Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent higher (18). No anti-discrimination laws. LGBT citizens have been granted asylum by other countries. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>
<p>ALBANIA Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent equal. LGBT citizens have been granted asylum by other countries. Transgender: Gender reassignment ('sex change') is illegal.</p>	<p>AZERBAIJAN Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent equal. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>BRAZIL Homosexuality: Legal. Equal age of consent. Anti-discrimination and anti-vilification laws exist in several states; civil unions recognized in some. But high levels of homophobic violence; LGBT citizens have been granted asylum by other countries. Transgender: Gender reassignment ('sex change') legal or openly performed without prosecution.</p>	<p>CHINA Homosexuality: Not illegal but considered 'unacceptable'. Legal in Hong Kong with equal age of consent. LGBT citizens from mainland China have been granted asylum by other countries. Transgender: Gender reassignment ('sex change') legal or openly performed without prosecution.</p>
<p>ALGERIA Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Imprisonable for up to 3 years. LGBT citizens have been granted asylum by other countries. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>BAHAMAS Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent higher for lesbians and gay men. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>BRUNEI Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Imprisonable for 10 years. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>COLOMBIA Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent equal. Social intolerance can be extreme and LGBT citizens have been granted asylum by other countries. Transgender: First country to restrict genital mutilation of intersex children without their, or before age of, consent.</p>
<p>ANDORRA Homosexuality: Legal. Transgender: Gender reassignment ('sex change') is illegal.</p>	<p>BAHRAIN Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Imprisonable for up to 10 years; deportation for 20 years. Transgender: Gender reassignment illegal.</p>	<p>BULGARIA Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent equal. Anti-discrimination laws apply. Transgender: Gender reassignment ('sex change') legal or openly performed without prosecution.</p>	<p>COMOROS Homosexuality: Legal. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>
<p>ANGOLA Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>BANGLADESH Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Imprisonable for life. LGBT citizens have been granted asylum by other countries Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>BURKINA FASO Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent equal. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>CONGO Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent equal. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>
<p>ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA Homosexuality: Legal. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>BARBADOS Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Imprisonable but rarely enforced against private behaviour. Laws currently under review. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>BURUNDI Homosexuality: Illegal. M (F not known). Punishable as an 'immoral act'. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>CONGO DEM REP Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Imprisonable for 5 years under 'crimes against the family' law. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>
<p>AOTEAROA / NEW ZEALAND Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent equal. Legal protection for sexual orientation under the Human Rights Act. Same-sex civil unions recognized. Prepared to grant asylum to LGBT refugees. Transgender: Gender reassignment ('sex change') legal or openly performed without prosecution. All official documents may be reissued to reflect change.</p>	<p>BELARUS Homosexuality: Legal. Equal age of consent. But severe discrimination persists. Transgender: Gender reassignment legal or openly performed without prosecution. No data on reissue of documents.</p>	<p>CAMBODIA Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent equal. Former King Sihanouk has called for legalization of gay marriage. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>COOK ISLANDS Homosexuality: Illegal. M (F not mentioned in law). Imprisonable for 7 years. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>
<p>ARGENTINA Homosexuality: Legal. Civil unions recognized in some regions. Anti-discrimination laws apply. Social intolerance can be extreme and LGBT citizens have been granted asylum by other countries. Transgender: Gender reassignment ('sex change') legal or openly performed without prosecution.</p>	<p>BELGIUM Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent equal. Same-sex couples can marry and adopt. Anti-discrimination laws apply. Prepared to grant asylum to LGBT refugees. Transgender: Gender reassignment legal or openly performed without prosecution. All personal documents may be reissued following change.</p>	<p>CAMEROON Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Imprisonable for 5 years. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>COSTA RICA Homosexuality: Legal, though 'scandalous' homosexuality illegal. Age of consent equal. Laws against discrimination apply but same-sex marriage is banned. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>
<p>ARMENIA Homosexuality: Legal. Some residence rights for bi-national gay couples. LGBT citizens have been granted asylum by other countries, but now some support for LGBT refugees from elsewhere. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>BELIZE Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Imprisonable for 10 years. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>CANADA Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent higher for anal sex (18). Legal recognition of same-sex partnerships, marriage and adoption rights. Constitutional laws against discrimination apply. Prepared to grant asylum to LGBT refugees. Transgender: Gender reassignment legal in some states and provinces.</p>	<p>CÔTE D'IVOIRE Homosexuality: Legal. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>
<p>ARUBA Homosexuality: Legal. Protection for sexual orientation under Dutch law but challenged by Aruban authorities. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>BENIN Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>CAPE VERDE Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. 'Repeat offenders' may be imprisoned. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>CROATIA Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent higher for lesbians and gay men (18). Registered partnerships. LGBT citizens have been granted asylum by other countries. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>
<p>AUSTRALIA Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent higher for gay men in some states. Anti-discrimination laws apply. Domestic partnership recognition in some states but federal ban on same-sex marriage. Same-sex adoption and donor insemination services available in some states. Prepared to grant asylum to LGBT refugees. Transgender: Gender reassignment legal in some states. Specific protection from discrimination exists for transgendered people.</p>	<p>BHUTAN Homosexuality: Illegal. F/M. Imprisonable for life. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>CAYMAN ISLANDS Homosexuality: Legal. British laws apply. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>CUBA Homosexuality: Legal but LGBT associations are banned. No laws against discrimination. LGBT citizens have been granted asylum by other countries. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>
	<p>BOLIVIA Homosexuality: Legal. No anti-discrimination laws. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent equal. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>CYPRUS Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent equal. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>
	<p>BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA Homosexuality: Legal. Equal age of consent. Anti-discrimination laws apply. No legal recognition of same-sex partnerships. Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	<p>CHAD Homosexuality: Legal. Age of consent higher (18). Transgender: No data or legal situation unclear.</p>	