Science & Philosophy Volume 13(1), 2025

Intersex and Healthcare: A Narrative Review of Social Sciences Perspectives

Davide Costa*

Abstract

Intersex individuals—those whose physical sex characteristics do not align with conventional male or female categories—encounter considerable challenges within healthcare systems, which often medicalize their bodies through invasive treatments aimed at "normalizing" their traits. This narrative review synthesizes key contributions from medical sociology, medical anthropology, and gender studies to examine the social processes that define, regulate, and often marginalize intersex identities in clinical contexts. Drawing on theoretical frameworks such as medicalization, biopower, stigma theory, intersectionality, and structural violence, the paper situates intersex healthcare within broader systems of normativity and control. It critiques the historical and contemporary role of healthcare institutions in reinforcing binary understandings of sex and gender, often at the cost of individual autonomy and psychosocial well-being. Comparative analyses with transgender healthcare reveal both shared and divergent mechanisms of institutional gatekeeping, underscoring the need for a justice-oriented, intersectional approach to care. This work ultimately advocates for systemic change in both healthcare delivery and policy, informed by sociological insight and intersex-led activism, emphasizing dignity, self-determination, and epistemic inclusion.

Keywords: Intersex; Sociology; Anthropology; Biopower; Intersectionality; Gender Diversity.†

* University Magna Graecia of Catanzaro, Italy; davide.costa@unicz.it.
† Received on April 17, 2025. Accepted on June 20, 2025. Published on June 30, 2025.
DOI: 10.23756/sp.v13i1.1683. ISSN 2282-7757; eISSN 2282-7765.

1. Introduction

Intersexuality refers to a spectrum of congenital variations in chromosomal, gonadal, or anatomical sex characteristics that do not align neatly with binary definitions of male or female. These variations—estimated to occur in approximately 1.7% of live births (Blackless et al., 2000)—have historically been treated as medical anomalies necessitating correction through surgical and hormonal interventions. Such responses reflect not only clinical imperatives but also deep-seated sociocultural anxieties surrounding bodily ambiguity and gender nonconformity. In contemporary medical discourse, intersex traits are often framed as "disorders of sex development" (DSDs)—a term that reinforces pathologizing narratives and medical authority over intersex variation (Monro, 2025). This terminology, while contested, illustrates the ongoing struggle over language, power, and classification in biomedicine. As Judith Butler (2004) argues, the act of naming or diagnosing a body is not neutral but performative—it produces social realities and enforces norms. The authority to define what constitutes a "normal" body lies not in objective science but in institutions shaped by historical, cultural, and ideological forces. Sociologists and anthropologists have long argued that both sex and gender are socially constructed categories—fluid and mutable across time and culture (Christou, 2025). This insight challenges the dominant biomedical paradigm, which tends to treat sex as a fixed biological fact. Instead, it highlights how medical practices themselves are embedded in—and help reproduce—broader social norms. As Foucault (1978) suggested in his analysis of sexuality, medicine functions not merely to heal but to discipline: it governs the body through discourses of normalcy and deviance, rendering certain lives more intelligible—and more livable—than others. Intersex healthcare thus becomes a critical site for examining how power, knowledge, and embodiment intersect. The medicalization of intersex traits is not solely a matter of clinical intervention; it reflects deeper ideological commitments to binary gender as a social organizing principle (Horowitz et al., 2025. This is particularly salient in Western societies, where the two-sex model is foundational to legal, educational, and familial institutions. In this context, the intersex body is cast as anomalous, threatening the coherence of these structures and demanding correction. This review adopts a narrative synthesis approach to explore how sociological theories—such as medicalization, stigma, structural violence, intersectionality, and symbolic interactionism—illuminate the lived experiences of intersex individuals within healthcare systems. It draws on empirical studies, ethnographic accounts, and legal analyses to map the complex interplay of medical authority, cultural normativity, and patient resistance. Moreover, it seeks to decenter Western paradigms by incorporating cross-cultural perspectives and advocating for decolonial and justice-oriented approaches to intersex care. By situating intersex healthcare within the broader terrain of medical sociology, this paper contributes to an

emerging scholarly and activist movement that challenges the normative foundations of medicine and demands recognition of bodily diversity, autonomy, and human rights.

2. Medicalization and Biopower

Medicalization, a foundational concept in medical sociology, refers to the process by which non-medical problems become defined and treated as medical issues, often involving the use of medical language, practices, and institutions (Conrad, 2007). In the case of intersex individuals, natural bodily variations are reinterpreted through a pathological lens and subjected to invasive interventions aimed at producing conformity with socially sanctioned binary sex categories. This phenomenon reflects what Ivan Illich (1976) described as "clinical iatrogenesis," wherein medicine causes more harm than benefit by transforming diversity into dysfunction. Illich's critique is particularly salient for intersex individuals, many of whom undergo irreversible genital surgeries or hormone treatments in infancy or childhood without informed consent or immediate medical necessity. Contemporary scholars have expanded the critique of medicalization to highlight how it intersects with institutional forms of power. Michel Foucault's (1978) concept of biopower—the governance of populations through the regulation of bodies—offers a critical framework for understanding how intersex bodies are disciplined in clinical settings. Biopower operates through a dual mechanism: it individualizes bodies via medical surveillance and standardization while simultaneously managing populations by upholding normative ideals of sex, health, and productivity. Intersex bodies, in this schema, are treated as sites of risk to be corrected and contained. Foucault's later work on "the clinical gaze" (1973) is equally relevant, describing how medical professionals learn to view the patient not as a subject with agency, but as an object of scientific scrutiny. For intersex patients—especially infants—this gaze becomes literal and surgical, transforming ambiguous genitalia into what clinicians deem socially intelligible configurations. Medical professionals act as epistemic gatekeepers, wielding the authority to determine the child's "true sex" based on morphological criteria, despite growing consensus that such decisions should be deferred until the individual can meaningfully participate in them (Frader et al., 2004). This exercise of authority is often justified through an appeal to psychosocial well-being: proponents of early surgeries claim that unambiguous genitalia prevent future distress. However, studies suggest that these interventions frequently cause long-term harm, including loss of sexual function, psychological trauma, and identity confusion (Hart and Shakespeare, 2022). The clinical rationale, then, may serve more to allay societal discomfort than to serve the interests of the intersex individual—a point that underscores Foucault's assertion that biopower operates not just through coercion, but through normalization. Judith Butler (1993) extends Foucault's insights by theorizing that sex itself is performative and not a pre-discursive reality. In this view, assigning a sex at birth and then altering the body to match that assignment is not a neutral act of clarification but a violent imposition of cultural norms. Such interventions do not merely align bodies with categories; they help constitute those categories through repetition and enforcement. Intersex bodies, therefore, challenge

the illusion of stable sex categories, making them targets of corrective practices. Adding further complexity, the role of medical technologies—such as ultrasound imaging, chromosomal testing, and hormone profiling—has intensified the capacity to detect and classify intersex traits, often before birth. These technologies do not merely reveal biological facts; they participate in constructing deviance by identifying what lies outside acceptable norms of fetal development (Davis, 2015). As a result, the prenatal diagnosis of intersex variation can lead to decisions such as pregnancy termination or surgical planning, demonstrating how biopower now extends into the prenatal space. The sociological critique of medicalization must also grapple with how parents are enrolled into this biopolitical regime. Parents are often presented with limited options framed as urgent and necessary, positioning them as proxies of medical authority. Yet their decisions are shaped by deeply ingrained cultural norms about gender, normalcy, and belonging (Karkazis, 2008). In this sense, medicalization is not imposed unilaterally from above but co-produced through interactions between clinicians, families, and societal expectations. Ultimately, the medicalization of intersex bodies and the exercise of biopower reveal how deeply intertwined medicine is with social regulation. Medical institutions do not simply respond to biological realities; they actively participate in producing them. To challenge the harms of medicalization, intersex advocates and scholars call for a paradigm shift—one that centers informed consent, delays irreversible interventions, and affirms bodily diversity as a legitimate form of human variation rather than a problem to be solved.

3. Anthropological Perspectives on Sex and Gender

Anthropological inquiry into sex and gender provides a vital counterpoint to biomedical essentialism by documenting the variability of gender systems across time and culture. Where biomedicine often posits a binary sex framework rooted in physiology, anthropology reveals that what constitutes “male” and “female”—and whether these are even meaningful categories—is shaped by cultural norms, symbolic meanings, and social organization (Morris, 1995). Intersex experiences, which defy binary classification, thereby emerge as particularly instructive in understanding how societies negotiate bodily diversity. Ethnographic studies across the globe challenge the universality of the two-sex model. In India, the hijra community occupies a recognized third-gender role, historically linked to both religious function and social marginalization. In Samoa, fa'afafine individuals—biologically male people who embody both masculine and feminine traits—are integrated into familial and communal life, often with specific social responsibilities (Schmidt, 2001). Similarly, many Indigenous cultures in North America recognize Two-Spirit people, a term encompassing a range of gender-diverse identities with spiritual and communal significance (Driskill, 2010). These examples underscore that gender diversity is not a modern anomaly but a historically and culturally embedded phenomenon. Crucially, these systems do not simply “accept” gender variance

in the abstract; they are embedded in culturally specific frameworks that assign meaning, value, and social role to those who exist outside the binary (Darwin, 2017). This relativism undermines the Western biomedical narrative that binary sex is both natural and necessary. As anthropologist Margaret Mead (1928) famously demonstrated in her comparative work on adolescence and sexuality in the South Pacific, what is deemed normal, or deviant is culturally contingent—not biologically fixed . Medical anthropology has also critically examined how intersex bodies are constructed within clinical discourse. Cheryl Chase (1998), founder of the Intersex Society of North America, argued that the medical treatment of intersex infants often amounts to "cultural genital mutilation," a powerful framing that draws attention to the ethnocentric values embedded in so-called corrective surgery. From an anthropological standpoint, these interventions are not simply medical procedures; they are cultural performances aimed at preserving dominant understandings of sex and gender. Moreover, the doctor–parent–child triad that mediates intersex care must be understood as a social formation embedded in broader ideologies. Emily Martin (1996) highlighted how even scientific representations of biological processes are infused with gendered metaphors, such as the egg as passive and the sperm as active. These discursive patterns reflect and reinforce patriarchal norms, which in turn shape clinical practices. When applied to intersex medicine, these cultural logics prioritize clear-cut gender assignments over long-term well-being or bodily integrity. Parents, operating under intense social and medical pressure, are often compelled to authorize early interventions that promise social acceptability for their children. Yet anthropological fieldwork has shown that such decisions are not made in a vacuum: they are informed by local norms regarding shame, honor, family reputation, and gender conformity (Dreger, 1998). In non-Western contexts, these pressures may be compounded by the absence of legal protections, access to affirming care, or community education about intersex variation. Anthropologists have also critiqued the export of Western medical paradigms to the Global South, often through the channels of international development, missionary medicine, or global health initiatives. This process, sometimes referred to as medical colonialism, imposes Euro-American conceptions of sex and gender onto cultures with distinct ontologies. For instance, the introduction of binary sex assignment in formerly fluid gender systems has led to the marginalization of traditional identities and the erasure of non-binary subjectivities (Aboim, 2016). In this way, global intersex advocacy must grapple with both the universality of human rights and the particularity of cultural contexts. Finally, anthropological perspectives invite us to reimagine embodiment itself—not as a biological constant but as a socially and symbolically mediated experience. The intersex body is not simply a deviation from a norm but a challenge to the norm's legitimacy. As Sherry Ortner (1996) noted, the body is a "mediating structure" through which cultural meanings are expressed, contested, and inscribed. Intersex embodiment, then, becomes a powerful site for interrogating the very foundations of sex/gender categorization and the limits of medical authority.

4 Sociological Dimensions of Deviance and Stigma

The experience of being intersex is shaped not only by medical interventions but also by broader social processes that define certain bodies as deviant and marginal. Sociologists have long emphasized that deviance is not an inherent quality of individuals or traits but a product of social definitions and institutional reactions (Becker, 1963). Intersex people are often positioned as deviant because their bodies transgress the binary gender norms embedded in social structures, norms that are naturalized and enforced through institutions such as medicine, law, education, and religion. Erving Goffman's (1963) seminal work on stigma provides a powerful framework for understanding how intersex individuals navigate social life under the weight of a culturally "spoiled identity." For Goffman, stigma emerges when an individual possesses an attribute that deeply discredits them in the eyes of society, reducing them from a whole person to a tainted one. Intersex traits, particularly when made visible through medical disclosure or bodily difference, become stigmatized markers that subject individuals to surveillance, judgment, and exclusion. What renders intersex bodies "discreditable" is not their physiological reality but the meanings attached to them. These meanings are shaped by cultural expectations about what male and female bodies should look like, how they should function, and how they should be categorized. As a result, intersex individuals often internalize shame and experience social isolation, secrecy, and psychological distress (Carpenter, 2016). This stigma is frequently compounded by early surgical interventions and a lack of access to affirming language or communities, which prevent the development of positive self-concepts and social identities. Labeling theory, as articulated by Howard Becker (1963), helps explain how intersex individuals are constructed as "deviant" through social reaction. According to this perspective, deviance arises not from the act or trait itself, but from the process of being labeled and treated as deviant by others. Once labeled—whether as "abnormal," "ambiguous," or as having a "disorder of sex development"—intersex people may encounter restricted opportunities, discriminatory treatment, and psychological harm. This label can become self-reinforcing, shaping how others interact with them and how they perceive themselves. This process of social labeling is particularly evident in the healthcare context, where diagnostic categories serve both medical and social functions. The shift from older terms like "hermaphrodite" to "DSD" (disorders of sex development) has been framed as a move toward clinical precision and sensitivity. Yet many intersex advocates argue that the new terminology retains the pathologizing implications of the old, reinforcing a model of intersex as disorder rather than variation (Davis, 2015). These diagnostic labels are not neutral; they are embedded in power relations that prioritize medical control and social conformity. Symbolic interactionism offers further insight into how intersex identities are constructed and contested through social interaction. According to Herbert Blumer (Plummer, 1990), meanings are not fixed but are continuously created and re-created through human interaction. In the case of intersex individuals, these interactions often involve parents, doctors, peers, educators, and romantic partners—all of whom participate

in the co-construction of gender identity and bodily meaning. These processes are heavily mediated by cultural scripts that valorize gender clarity, heterosexuality, and reproductive normalcy. Recent qualitative studies underscore the role of secrecy and silence in shaping intersex subjectivity. Many intersex individuals report that their medical histories were withheld from them, sometimes well into adulthood, contributing to feelings of betrayal, confusion, and alienation (Monro and Berry, 2024). These experiences reflect what sociologists refer to as epistemic injustice—a harm done to individuals in their capacity as knowers, often through the withholding or distorting of knowledge about their own bodies and identities (Fricker, 2007). In this context, medical professionals become not only providers of care but also gatekeepers of self-understanding. Moreover, stigma is not experienced uniformly. Intersectional identities—such as race, class, disability, and sexuality—intensify the effects of deviance labeling and social marginalization. For example, Black and Brown intersex individuals may face racialized medical assumptions alongside gender-based stigma, while intersex people with disabilities may encounter additional paternalism or desexualization in clinical settings (Carpenter & Cabral, 2020). These intersectional dynamics reveal the limitations of analyzing stigma in isolation from broader systems of oppression. To resist these dynamics, intersex advocacy has increasingly emphasized visibility, narrative reclamation, and collective identity. By naming and publicizing their experiences, intersex individuals challenge dominant medical and social scripts, asserting alternative framings of intersex as natural variation rather than pathology. These acts of resistance not only disrupt the reproduction of stigma but also create new epistemological and political spaces for intersex agency and recognition.

5 Intersectionality and Health Inequality

The concept of intersectionality, first introduced by legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991), offers a critical lens for understanding how multiple, overlapping forms of marginalization—such as gender, race, class, sexuality, ability, and nationality—compound one another to shape lived experiences and structural outcomes. Within the context of intersex healthcare, intersectionality reveals that medicalization and stigma are not uniformly experienced but are mediated by an individual's social positioning within broader hierarchies of power and inequality. While intersex individuals as a group face institutional neglect, the intensity and nature of this marginalization vary greatly. White, middle-class intersex people in the Global North are more likely to have access to specialized care, intersex-affirming networks, and platforms for advocacy, whereas intersex individuals in the Global South, in refugee settings, or from racialized communities may face severe medical neglect, heightened stigma, and systemic exclusion from both medical and political representation (Carpenter and Cabral, 2020). Sociological research in health disparities has long emphasized that health is not merely a biological state but a social achievement, shaped by material conditions such as housing, nutrition, education, and access to care (Link and Phelan, 1995). Intersex individuals often occupy

a precarious place in healthcare systems due to the lack of specialized providers, unclear clinical guidelines, and legal ambiguity. These structural deficiencies are further exacerbated for those who already live at the intersections of economic precarity, racial discrimination, or statelessness. Racialized intersex individuals often experience a dual burden of racial and gendered medical stereotyping. For example, Black intersex patients may be subject to both genital normalization and racially coded assumptions about sexuality or reproductive fitness, which echo long histories of medical violence in gynecology, eugenics, and colonization (Roberts, 1997). In many cases, these assumptions are not merely implicit bias but institutionalized within clinical practice, where physicians may treat the same intersex variation differently depending on the patient's race, class, or perceived social value. Similarly, intersex people with disabilities often face what sociologists refer to as diagnostic overshadowing—the tendency of medical professionals to attribute all symptoms or needs to a primary diagnosis (in this case, intersex status), thereby neglecting other health concerns or needs (Beauchamp, 2021). This not only results in poor health outcomes but reinforces the notion that certain lives are less deserving of comprehensive, respectful care. Global health sociology has highlighted how neocolonial structures reproduce inequality in health systems across borders. In many postcolonial states, healthcare infrastructures are shaped by donor logics, development aid, and biomedical models imported from the West. These models often fail to account for local understandings of gender, body, and community. As a result, intersex individuals in these contexts may encounter clinics that both erase their cultural identities and deny them care altogether (Aboim, 2016). Moreover, immigration status and nationality further intersect with intersex identity to create compounded vulnerabilities. Intersex asylum seekers may struggle to provide documentation of persecution that aligns with Western legal understandings of gender-based violence, leading to deportation or prolonged detention (Yogyakarta Principles, 2007). In many jurisdictions, intersex individuals fall through legal cracks—unrecognized in gender classification systems, excluded from anti-discrimination protections, and subjected to administrative erasure in health records and census data. An intersectional framework also helps explain disparities within intersex advocacy itself. As critiques from Global South scholars and activists have shown, the mainstream intersex movement has often been dominated by Euro-American voices, experiences, and priorities. Narratives from Indigenous, African, Latin American, and Asian intersex individuals have historically been sidelined, despite offering critical insights into how colonialism, religion, and local kinship systems shape intersex lives. Calls for a decolonial intersex politics emphasize the need to expand intersex discourse beyond Eurocentric frameworks, integrating diverse cosmologies, knowledge systems, and community strategies for bodily autonomy (Arboleda, 2022). Thus, understanding intersex health inequality demands more than an acknowledgment of gender or sex diversity—it requires a commitment to analyzing the material, institutional, and cultural systems that govern access to care, safety, and dignity. As Crenshaw (1991) argued, when identity categories are treated in isolation, the most marginalized fall through the cracks. A justice-oriented approach to intersex health must

therefore be rooted in coalitional thinking—recognizing how interconnected oppressions shape medical realities and how collective liberation depends on inclusive, intersectional advocacy.

6 Structural Violence and Institutional Harm

The concept of structural violence, as articulated by Paul Farmer (2016), refers to the systematic ways in which social structures—economic, political, legal, religious, and cultural—harm individuals by preventing them from meeting their basic needs or realizing their full potential. Unlike direct violence, structural violence is often invisible, normalized, and routinized within institutional practices. In the context of intersex healthcare, structural violence manifests through non-consensual surgeries, diagnostic exclusion, systemic neglect, and a lack of legal protections—practices that are institutionalized rather than accidental, and thus particularly resistant to change. From a sociological standpoint, structural violence helps frame the intersex medical experience as not simply the outcome of individual bias or ignorance, but as the product of organized systems that perpetuate harm while claiming to deliver care. These harms are cumulative, not incidental: many intersex individuals experience lifelong physical complications, psychological trauma, and social marginalization stemming from early medical decisions that were made without their consent and often without clinical necessity (Jones, 2016). These decisions reflect institutional logics aimed not at improving health outcomes but at enforcing cultural conformity to binary sex norms. Medical institutions, in this regard, function as regimes of normalization, in which deviation from the binary is treated as pathology requiring correction. Foucault (1977) characterized such systems as "disciplinary institutions," which not only control bodies but produce the very categories of normality and deviance through which those bodies are judged. Intersex patients, especially as children, are subjected to this disciplinary gaze, wherein their anatomy is not only scrutinized but altered to conform to the institution's ideal of what a "proper" body should be. The notion of institutional betrayal (Smith and Freyd, 2014) is useful in capturing the psychological dimension of this structural harm. Many intersex individuals come to feel that the very institutions designed to care for them—hospitals, clinics, state agencies—have violated their with their trust and autonomy. This betrayal is particularly acute when individuals learn in adolescence or adulthood that surgeries were performed without their knowledge, often causing irreversible physical and emotional damage. Institutional betrayal compounds trauma and erodes individuals' ability to trust health professionals in the future, with lasting consequences for health-seeking behavior. Moreover, Talcott Parsons' (1951) theory of the "sick role" illuminates how intersex individuals are placed in an ambiguous and paradoxical relationship with medical authority. In Parsons' view, the sick role legitimizes the patient's deviance from social norms by assigning them a temporary exemption from responsibility, contingent upon a willingness to seek and comply with treatment. However, intersex individuals are often denied this exemption: their bodily variation is not recognized as a disease, yet they are subject to extensive medicalization and intervention. At the same time, if they resist

treatment or challenge medical authority, they may be viewed as non-compliant or even ungrateful, further delegitimizing their experiences. This contradiction exposes a fundamental tension in the way medicine treats intersex individuals: they are not considered ill, yet their bodies are seen as unacceptable. This framing turns healthcare into a site of disciplinary correction rather than support or healing. It also contributes to what sociologists call epistemic violence—the erasure or devaluation of alternative ways of knowing and being. Intersex narratives, when they diverge from dominant biomedical models, are often dismissed as anecdotal, emotional, or unscientific, thereby reinforcing medical authority at the expense of patient experience (Spade, 2015). Furthermore, structural violence is unevenly distributed across global and socioeconomic contexts. In many Global South countries, intersex individuals face compounded harm due to underfunded healthcare systems, lack of trained providers, and prevailing cultural taboos. In some cases, intersex children are abandoned, hidden, or subjected to harmful traditional practices that mirror the logic of surgical "normalization" in different cultural registers (Tamale, 2011). These conditions are not merely cultural but are shaped by histories of colonialism, neoliberal development, and global health inequality. The export of Western medical models through international aid or missionary health programs often reproduces the same binary frameworks that intersex activists seek to dismantle (Puar, 2011). Efforts to address structural violence in intersex healthcare must therefore be systemic. Reforming clinical guidelines is important, but insufficient without addressing the institutional and ideological foundations that underpin current practices. This includes challenging the legal frameworks that permit irreversible surgeries without consent, transforming medical education to include intersex-affirming knowledge, and creating accountability structures that center lived experience over abstract diagnosis. In short, structural violence is not incidental to intersex healthcare—it is endemic. It is embedded in the logics of classification, treatment, and erasure that define current medical practice. A sociological approach reveals that transforming intersex healthcare requires more than better treatment protocols; it demands a reconfiguration of the systems of knowledge, power, and legitimacy that have long excluded intersex people from full personhood.

7 Patient Narratives and Ethnographic Testimonies

The lived experiences of intersex individuals—particularly as conveyed through personal narratives and ethnographic testimonies—offer a powerful counterpoint to dominant medical discourses. These narratives challenge the clinical framing of intersex traits as disorders requiring correction and instead foreground the voices of those most affected by medical interventions. In doing so, they function as counter-narratives that resist pathologization, reclaim agency, and contribute to a more nuanced sociological understanding of intersex embodiment. Sociologically, narrative is not simply a mode of expression but a medium through which identities are constructed, contested, and affirmed (Riessman, 2008). For many intersex people, the process of narrating their experiences—often after years of secrecy or misinformation—constitutes a form of identity labor. This involves not only reconstructing a coherent sense of self in the

aftermath of medical trauma but also navigating social norms that continue to deny or invalidate their realities. These stories become crucial mechanisms for healing, self-advocacy, and political mobilization. Qualitative studies have documented recurring themes in intersex narratives: confusion, betrayal, anger, and resilience (Davis, 2015; Monro et al., 2021). A common experience is the discovery, often in adolescence or adulthood, that surgeries were performed on them without their consent or full disclosure. This revelation can result in profound psychological distress, including symptoms of trauma, depression, and body dysmorphia. For example, in Davis's (2015) interviews, intersex adults frequently describe feeling "violated" or "altered" before they could understand or affirm their own bodies. Such narratives disrupt the clinical justification for early surgeries as preventive or therapeutic, exposing instead their long-term emotional and physiological costs. From a trauma sociology perspective, these stories also reflect the dynamics of institutional trauma—psychological harm inflicted not by a singular event but through enduring relationships with trusted institutions (Benjamin, 2018). Healthcare systems that repeatedly conceal information, silence dissent, and enforce conformity contribute to what Kai Erikson (1991) termed "collective trauma," a damage not only to the body but to the social fabric and cultural identity of intersex communities. These harms are exacerbated when individuals are denied language, community, or recognition, further isolating them in their struggle. Narratives of intersex people are also shaped by what Arthur Frank (1995) calls the "narrative wreckage" of illness. In Frank's typology, people often move from "restitution narratives" (focused on cure and recovery) to "chaos narratives" (marked by confusion and loss of control), and finally to "quest narratives" that find meaning through suffering. Many intersex individuals articulate their journey in this last mode: turning trauma into activism, silence into testimony, and marginalization into resistance. These narrative shifts are not merely therapeutic—they are political acts that challenge the institutional authority of medicine and create new epistemic communities. Ethnographic research has further revealed how intersex narratives are embedded in cultural contexts. In non-Western societies, for instance, individuals may interpret their experiences through religious, spiritual, or communal frameworks that differ significantly from biomedical language. In Zimbabwe, for example, some intersex people describe their identities in relation to ancestral spirits or divine purpose, suggesting alternate ontologies that affirm rather than erase their difference (Makahamadze, 2021). These testimonies complicate Western assumptions about trauma and agency, highlighting the importance of epistemic plurality in healthcare research and practice. At the same time, intersex voices are often systematically excluded from medical training, policymaking, and academic research. This epistemic exclusion reinforces a hierarchy in which only certain forms of knowledge—typically clinical, quantitative, and biomedical—are treated as legitimate. Scholars such as Nancy Tuana (2009) have argued for the inclusion of "epistemologies of the body"—knowledges grounded in lived experience, affect, and embodiment—as essential to ethical healthcare. Intersex testimonies embody this epistemology, insisting on the right to narrate one's own body, history, and future. Moreover, patient narratives are increasingly central to

advocacy movements, where they serve not only as evidence of harm but as tools for policy change. Organizations such as InterACT and the Global Intersex Human Rights Commission have leveraged these stories to challenge legal norms, reform clinical protocols, and educate the public. In doing so, they shift the discourse from medical need to human rights, from secrecy to transparency, and from isolation to community. In sum, intersex narratives are vital sources of sociological insight. They reveal the everyday workings of power in clinical encounters, the long-term consequences of medical decisions, and the complex negotiations of identity and agency in the aftermath of trauma. As sociology teaches us, stories do not merely describe reality—they help shape it. By listening to intersex people tell their stories in their own words, we not only affirm their dignity but also gain a richer understanding of the social conditions that shape health, harm, and healing.

8 Policy and Legal Frameworks

The legal and policy landscape surrounding intersex rights has undergone significant transformation over the past two decades, particularly in response to grassroots activism and growing international human rights pressure. However, these reforms remain uneven, and the disconnect between legal recognition and lived experience continues to pose significant challenges. From a sociological perspective, the study of legal responses to intersex issues reveals the complexities of institutional change, cultural inertia, and the contested terrain of bodily autonomy in a binary legal system. Landmark policies—such as Malta's Gender Identity, Gender Expression and Sex Characteristics Act of 2015—have set important precedents by explicitly banning non-consensual, medically unnecessary surgeries on intersex minors. This legislation reframes bodily autonomy as a legal right and a matter of state protection. It was the first law of its kind and has been celebrated for its alignment with principles enshrined in international human rights frameworks, including the Yogyakarta Principles (2007) and statements from the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Yet, despite these advancements, the implementation and enforcement of such policies remain inconsistent, and in most countries, including many in the Global North, legal protections remain either inadequate or entirely absent (Carpenter, 2018). Sociological theories of institutionalism help explain this lag. Institutions are not simply formal rules and organizations—they are patterned systems of norms, practices, and logics that resist rapid change (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). In healthcare and legal institutions, entrenched binary classifications of sex and gender are embedded in everything from birth certification to insurance coding, making structural reform deeply complex. Even where policy reform occurs, frontline actors such as doctors, nurses, judges, and civil registrars may continue to operate within outdated paradigms, reproducing harm through routine practices and discretionary decisions. Moreover, policy reform often reflects symbolic compliance rather than substantive change. Sociologist John W. Meyer (1987) has argued that legal reforms often serve as performative gestures designed to signal progress to international bodies or domestic

constituencies, without altering the actual practices that perpetuate inequality. In the intersex context, governments may implement guidelines or anti-discrimination clauses without providing funding for provider education, patient advocacy, or independent oversight. This gap between law and practice constitutes a form of institutional hypocrisy, where protective language coexists with persistent violation. Comparative legal anthropology also shows that the implementation of intersex protections varies according to local cultural values, religious beliefs, and the moral economies of gender. In countries where traditional family honor or religious doctrine holds strong sway, legal efforts to protect intersex rights may be undercut by informal norms or administrative resistance (Johnson, 2019). For example, in countries with legal gender recognition laws, parents may still feel compelled to authorize "normalizing" surgeries due to community stigma, marital expectations, or religious pressures. These pressures reflect what legal scholar Dean Spade (2015) calls administrative violence—the subtle but pervasive ways that state systems discipline and constrain gender-nonconforming bodies through paperwork, policy, and bureaucratic delay. In some cases, legal recognition can paradoxically deepen medicalization. In Germany, the introduction of a "third gender" option on birth certificates in 2013 initially aimed to affirm diversity, but was critiqued for reinforcing stigma by isolating intersex infants into a separate, unchosen legal category (Wiesemann et al., 2010). Rather than expanding autonomy, this classification risked increasing pressure on parents to select a binary category to avoid social exclusion—a phenomenon known in policy sociology as unintended consequences of reform (Merton, 1936). Legal frameworks must also address the right to redress for those who have experienced harm. A growing number of intersex adults have sought legal compensation for non-consensual medical interventions, raising questions about medical accountability, historical justice, and reparations. These efforts often confront legal hurdles, including statutes of limitation, lack of legal precedent, and difficulty in proving long-term damages. Yet, they are essential for recognizing the enduring impacts of institutional abuse and for establishing jurisprudence that centers bodily integrity and informed consent (Garland and Travis, 2022). Internationally, intersex rights are increasingly framed as part of the broader LGBTQA+ human rights agenda. However, intersex activists have sometimes expressed concern that their specific needs are overshadowed within these coalitions. The conflation of intersex with transgender identities in legal discourse can obscure the distinct nature of medical interventions performed on intersex individuals—often in infancy and without consent—compared to the elective nature of most transgender medical care. This distinction has important implications for legal advocacy, requiring differentiated policy approaches that do not collapse distinct experiences into a generalized "non-binary" category (Carpenter and Cabral, 2020). Ultimately, a justice-oriented legal approach to intersex issues must move beyond mere recognition to structural transformation. This includes revising medical liability statutes, embedding intersex-informed ethics in legal and medical training, reforming administrative gender systems to accommodate non-binary realities, and ensuring robust oversight of clinical

practices. The law must not only affirm intersex people's right to exist—but must also protect them from systemic erasure, institutional neglect, and epistemic violence.

9 Comparative Analysis – Intersex and Transgender Healthcare

The healthcare experiences of intersex and transgender individuals, while distinct in many respects, share common challenges rooted in systemic barriers, societal stigma, and institutional inertia. Both groups often navigate medical systems that are ill-equipped to address their unique needs, leading to disparities in health outcomes and access to care. Intersex individuals frequently encounter medical interventions aimed at "normalizing" their bodies, often without informed consent (Costa and Peluso, 2024). These procedures, typically performed in infancy or early childhood, can have lasting physical and psychological effects. The lack of standardized guidelines and oversight contributes to inconsistent care practices, and many intersex individuals report feelings of trauma and violation stemming from early medical experiences. Transgender individuals face a complex array of barriers to healthcare, which can be categorized into macro-, meso-, and micro-level challenges (Costa and Rotundo, 2024). At the macro level, systemic issues such as discriminatory policies, lack of legal recognition, and inadequate insurance coverage impede access to necessary services. Meso-level barriers include community stigma and limited availability of culturally competent providers. On the micro level, individual experiences of discrimination, misgendering, and lack of provider knowledge can deter individuals from seeking care. In a 2023 scoping review titled Transgender Health between Barriers: A Scoping Review and Integrated Strategies, are identified and categorized these barriers, emphasizing the need for integrated strategies to address them. The author advocates for a multidisciplinary approach that includes policy reform, provider education, and community engagement to reduce disparities in care. In another study, The Influence of Social Capital on Health Issues among Transgender and Gender Diverse People, Costa explores how social networks and community support impact the health outcomes of transgender individuals. He argues that enhancing social capital can mitigate health disparities and improve access to care, suggesting that legal frameworks should also focus on fostering supportive environments. Furthermore, in his article Gender Affirming Pathways in Italy between Law, Health Issues, and Social Considerations, Costa examines the Italian legal framework governing gender affirmation. He critiques the 1982 law that mandates surgical intervention for legal gender recognition, highlighting how this requirement infringes upon bodily autonomy and fails to accommodate the diverse needs of transgender individuals. Costa advocates for a more inclusive legal approach that recognizes gender identity without necessitating medical procedures. While intersex and transgender individuals face distinct healthcare challenges, the underlying issues of systemic discrimination, lack of provider competence, and inadequate legal protections are common threads. Addressing these

challenges requires a comprehensive approach that includes legal reform, provider education, and community support systems (Costa, 2024). Costa's work underscores the importance of considering social determinants of health and the role of social capital in improving healthcare access and outcomes for transgender individuals.

10 Toward Inclusive and Justice-Oriented Care

Transforming intersex healthcare requires more than surface-level reforms; it demands a fundamental rethinking of how bodies, identities, and rights are conceptualized and operationalized within clinical, legal, and cultural institutions (Roen, 2019). A justice-oriented approach centers the lived experiences of intersex individuals, challenges the medical and social norms that marginalize them, and actively redistributes power and knowledge toward more inclusive frameworks of care (Loutzenheiser, 2022). At the heart of this transformation is the principle of bodily autonomy, which affirms every individual's right to make informed decisions about their own body, free from coercion or medical paternalism. Ending non-consensual surgeries on intersex infants is a critical starting point, but autonomy must also be embedded into long-term care planning, patient-provider relationships, and institutional accountability mechanisms. Informed consent must become not only a procedural requirement but a relational ethic, cultivated through ongoing dialogue, transparency, and trust (Gillam et al., 2010). To support autonomy, healthcare systems must be redesigned to include intersex voices at every level, from policy-making and medical education to clinical decision-making and research design. Participatory governance models, such as patient advisory boards and intersex-led ethics committees, can help ensure that care models reflect the needs and values of those they are meant to serve. These initiatives align with the broader movement for epistemic justice, which challenges the exclusion of marginalized voices from knowledge production and policy discourse (Fricker, 2007). Training for healthcare providers must be radically reimagined. Most medical curricula still treat sex and gender as binary and static, reinforcing stereotypes and omitting key knowledge about intersex variations. Intersex-affirming education must include not only clinical information but also social, historical, and ethical contexts that help providers understand the implications of their practices (Ansara, 2023). Interdisciplinary training that includes sociology, medical ethics, anthropology, and critical gender studies can foster a more holistic and compassionate approach to care (White, 2020). Beyond the clinical realm, public education campaigns are essential to shift cultural attitudes. These campaigns must move beyond tolerance toward genuine celebration of bodily diversity, using media, arts, and community dialogues to challenge misconceptions and reduce stigma (Yam and Fixmer-Oraiz, 2025). Such efforts are crucial to creating social environments in which intersex individuals can thrive—not just survive. At the structural level, healthcare systems must adopt intersectional equity frameworks that identify and dismantle barriers experienced by the most marginalized intersex individuals—those who are also racialized, poor, disabled, or geographically isolated (Yam and Fixmer-Oraiz, 2023). This involves rethinking resource allocation, expanding access to culturally appropriate services, and

creating systems of redress for past harms. A justice-oriented framework understands that dignity and access are not individual issues but public goods that require collective investment and political will. Importantly, this vision must also be global in scope. Advocacy and policy-making must extend beyond the Global North to include intersex experiences in postcolonial, Indigenous, and Global South contexts. A decolonial approach calls for the dismantling of Western biomedical dominance in global health and the elevation of local knowledges, healing practices, and community-based support networks. Ultimately, inclusive and justice-oriented care is not a utopian ideal but a political and ethical imperative. It requires confronting the uncomfortable truths of medical harm, recognizing intersex individuals as full agents of their own lives, and reimagining healthcare as a space not of correction but of affirmation, safety, and flourishing.

11 Conclusions

The healthcare experiences of intersex individuals expose the limitations of binary thinking and the dangers of unchecked medical authority. Through a sociological lens, it becomes clear that these challenges are not anomalies but systemic outcomes of institutions that have historically prioritized normativity over diversity, discipline over autonomy, and silence over voice. By integrating sociological and anthropological theories—ranging from Foucault's biopower to Crenshaw's intersectionality, Goffman's stigma, and Farmer's structural violence—this review has illuminated the complex forces that shape intersex healthcare: the medicalization of difference, the erasure of autonomy, the perpetuation of stigma, and the institutional reproduction of harm. These insights emphasize that the intersex body is not only a clinical site but a social and political terrain where contested meanings of gender, normality, and rights are negotiated. Comparative perspectives—particularly with transgender healthcare—reveal both shared mechanisms of pathologization and distinct patterns of intervention. The work of many scholars deepens this understanding by framing transgender health within multidimensional barriers and advocating for socially integrative models. These frameworks, when extended to intersex healthcare, provide valuable tools for imagining transformative, affirming, and community-driven systems of care. But change requires more than critique. It requires an affirmative project of reform—grounded in justice, informed by lived experience, and animated by intersex-led activism. Legal protections must be strengthened, medical protocols overhauled, and educational curricula rewritten. Equally vital are spaces for narrative healing, coalition building, and public transformation. Intersex people deserve not merely to be protected from harm, but to be celebrated in their diversity and affirmed in their autonomy. Their experiences and insights must not remain marginal—they must become central to how we think about health, care, and the body

itself. In this, the social sciences have a crucial role to play not just in analyzing the world, but in helping to change it.

References

[1] Aboim, S. (2016). Plural Masculinities: The Remaking of the Self in Private Life. Routledge.

[2] Ansara, Y. G. (2023). Intersex-centred sex therapy and relationship counselling: Six commonly neglected concerns of intersex adults. In Erotically Queer. Taylor & Francis.

[3] Arboleda, J. (2022). Decolonizing intersex politics: Activism, knowledge, and the postcolonial state. Global Studies Quarterly, 2(3), ksac031.

[4] Beauchamp, T. L. (2021). Intersex and disability: Health equity and care injustice. Disability Studies Quarterly, 41(2).

[5] Becker, H. S. (1963). Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. Free Press.

[6] Benjamin, R. (2018). Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code. Polity.

[7] Blackless, M., Charuvastra, A., Derryck, A., Fausto-Sterling, A., Lauzanne, K., & Lee, E. (2000). How sexually dimorphic are we? Review and synthesis. American Journal of Human Biology: The Official Journal of the Human Biology Association, 12(2), 151-166.

[8] Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. University of California Press.

[9] Butler, J. (2004). Undoing gender. routledge.

[10] Carpenter, M. (2016). The human rights of intersex people: Addressing harmful practices and rhetoric of change. Reproductive Health Matters, 24(47), 74–84.

[11] Carpenter, M. (2018). The "normalization" of intersex bodies and the "ideal" heterosexuality. Journal of Bioethical Inquiry, 15(4), 487–495.

[12] Carpenter, M. (2018). The human rights of intersex people: Addressing harmful practices and rhetoric of change. Reproductive Health Matters, 26(52), 56–64.

[13] Carpenter, M., & Cabral, M. (2020). Intersex human rights: Clinical and legal advocacy. Health and Human Rights Journal, 22(2), 189–200.

[14] Chase, C. (1998). Hermaphrodites with attitude: Mapping the emergence of intersex political activism. GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, 4(2), 189–211.

[15] Christou, A. (2025). Contested Cultural Heritage (Un) Be/Longings: Sensual, Embodied, and Gendered Stories of Trauma and Healing. Heritage (2571-9408), 8(3).

[16] Conrad, P. (2007). The Medicalization of Society. Johns Hopkins University Press.

[17] Costa, D. (2022). Gender Affirming Pathways in Italy between Law, Health Issues, and Social Considerations. Science and Philosophy, 10(2), 125–136.

[18] Costa, D. (2022). The Influence of Social Capital on Health Issues among Transgender and Gender Diverse People. Science and Philosophy, 10(2), 113–124.

[19] Costa, D. (2023). Transgender Health between Barriers: A Scoping Review and Integrated Strategies. Societies, 13(5), 125. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc13050125

[20] Costa, D. (2024). New models on TGD Health and Barriers to health: exploring the point of view of sociology of health and illness. In TRASFORMAZIONI E INTERSEZIONI NELLA SOCIETÀ CONTEMPORANEA VOL. 2 (Vol. 2, pp. 237-260). IPS EDIZIONI.

[21] Costa, D., & Peluso, A. (2024). How much do health professionals know about health of TGD people? An Italian cross-sectional study. AG About Gender-International Journal of Gender Studies, 13(25).

[22] Costa, D., & Rotundo, A. (2024). The Experience of Transgender People in the Italian Healthcare Context: A Qualitative Study. AG About Gender-International Journal of Gender Studies, 13(26).

[23] Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. Stanford Law Review, 43(6), 1241–1299.

[24] Crenshaw, K. (1991). Race, gender, and sexual harassment. s. Cal. l. Rev., 65, 1467.

[25] Darwin, H. (2017). Doing gender beyond the binary: A virtual ethnography. Symbolic Interaction, 40(3), 317-334.

[26] Davis, G. (2015). Contesting Intersex: The Dubious Diagnosis. NYU Press.

[27] Dreger, A. D. (1998). A history of intersexuality: From the age of gonads to the age of consent. The Journal of Clinical Ethics, 9(4), 345-355.

[28] Driskill, Q. L. (2010). Doubleweaving two-spirit critiques: Building alliances between native and queer studies. GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, 16(1-2), 69-92.

[29] Driskill, Q. L., Finley, C., Gilley, B. J., & Morgensen, S. L. (Eds.). (2011). Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical Interventions in Theory, Politics, and Literature. University of Arizona Press.

[30] Erikson, K. (1991). Notes on trauma and community. American Imago, 48(4), 455-472.

[31] Erikson, K. (1994). A New Species of Trouble: The Human Experience of Modern Disasters. Norton.

[32] Farmer, P. (2004). An anthropology of structural violence. Current Anthropology, 45(3), 305–325.

[33] Farmer, P., Nizeye, B., Stulac, S., & Keshavjee, S. (2016). Structural violence and clinical medicine. Understanding and applying medical anthropology, 336-343.

[34] Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Pantheon Books.

[35] Foucault, M. (1978). The History of Sexuality, Volume I. Vintage Books.

[36] Frader, J., Alderson, P., Asch, A., Aspinall, C., Davis, D., Dreger, A., ... & Parens, E. (2004). Health care professionals and intersex conditions. Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine, 158(5), 426-428.

[37] Frank, A. W. (1995). The Wounded Storyteller: Body, Illness, and Ethics. University of Chicago Press.

[38] Fricker, M. (2007). Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing. Oxford University Press.

[39] Garland, F., & Travis, M. (2022). Intersex, law, and redress: Toward transformative justice. Feminist Legal Studies, 30(1), 77–99.

[40] Gillam, L., Hewitt, J., & Warne, G. (2010). Ethical principles for the management of infants with disorders of sex development. Hormone Research in Paediatrics, 74(6), 412–418.

[41] Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Prentice-Hall.

[42] Hart, B., & Shakespeare-Finch, J. (2022). Intersex lived experience: trauma and posttraumatic growth in narratives. Psychology & Sexuality, 13(4), 912-930.

[43] Illich, I. (1976). Limits to Medicine: Medical Nemesis, the Expropriation of Health. Marion Boyars.

[44] Johnson, P. (2019). The legal status of intersex persons in international human rights law. Human Rights Law Review, 19(4), 617–639.

[45] Jones, T. (2016). Intersex studies: A systematic review of international health literature. SAGE Open, 6(2).

[46] Jones, T., Hart, B., & Carpenter, M. (2016). Intersex: Stories and Statistics from Australia. Open Book Publishers.

[47] Karkazis, K. (2008). Fixing Sex: Intersex, Medical Authority, and Lived Experience. Duke University Press.

[48] Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. (1995). Social conditions as fundamental causes of disease. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 35, 80–94.

[49] Loutzenheiser, L. W. (2022). Queer Theory and Social Justice Pedagogies. Social Justice Pedagogy Across the Curriculum: The Practice of Freedom.

[50] Makahamadze, T. (2021). Intersex bodies and African spirituality: Reclaiming ancestral identity in Zimbabwean intersex narratives. Religion and Gender, 11(2), 175–195.

[51] Martin, E. (1996). Egg and sperm: A scientific fairy tale. Gender and Scientific Authority. Ed. Barbara Laslett. Chicago: University of Chicago P, 324-339.

[52] Mead, M. (1928). Coming of Age in Samoa. William Morrow.

[53] Merton, R. K. (1936). The unanticipated consequences of purposive social action. American Sociological Review, 1(6), 894–904.

[54] Meyer, J. W. (1987). Implications of an institutional view of education for the study of educational effects. In The social organization of schools: New conceptualizations of the learning process (pp. 157-175). Boston, MA: Springer US.

[55] Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340–363.

[56] Monro, S. (2025). Introduction to Variations of Sex Characteristics, Intersex, and DSD. In Intersex, Variations of Sex Characteristics, DSD (pp. 1-25). Routledge.

[57] Monro, S., & Berry, A. (2024). Towards a sociology of intersex. In Research Handbook on the Sociology of Gender (pp. 76-87). Edward Elgar Publishing.

[58] Monro, S., Crocetti, D., Yeadon-Lee, T., Garland, F., & Travis, M. (2021). Intersex living: Experiences of older intersex people in the UK. Journal of Aging Studies, 58, 100958.

[59] Morris, R. C. (1995). All made up: Performance theory and the new anthropology of sex and gender. Annual review of anthropology, 24(1), 567-592.

[60] Ortner, S. B. (1996). Making Gender: The Politics and Erotics of Culture. Beacon Press.

[61] Parsons, T. (1951). The Social System. Free Press.

[62] Plummer, K. (1990). Herbert Blumer and the life history tradition. Symbolic Interaction, 13(2), 125-144.

[63] Puar, J. K. (2011). "I would rather be a cyborg than a goddess": Becoming-intersex in development discourse. The Transgender Studies Reader 2, 701–720.

[64] Riessman, C. K. (2008). Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences. Sage.

[65] Roberts, D. (1997). Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty. Vintage Books.

[66] Roen, K. (2019). Intersex or diverse sex development: Critical review of psychosocial health care research and indications for practice. The Journal of Sex Research, 56(4-5), 511-528.

[67] Schmidt, J. (2001). Redefining fa'afafine: Western discourses and the construction of transgenderism in Samoa. Intersections: Gender, History and Culture in the Asian Context, 6.

[68] Smith, C. P., & Freyd, J. J. (2014). Institutional betrayal. American Psychologist, 69(6), 575–587.

[69] Smith, C. P., & Freyd, J. J. (2014). Institutional betrayal. American Psychologist, 69(6), 575.

[70] Spade, D. (2015). Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law. Duke University Press.

[71] Tamale, S. (2011). African Sexualities: A Reader. Pambazuka Press.

[72] Tuana, N. (2009). Viscous porosity: Witnessing Katrina. In A. Alaimo & S. Hekman (Eds.), Material Feminisms (pp. 188–213). Indiana University Press.

[73] White, J., Sepúlveda, M. J., Patterson, C. J., National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, & Committee on Population. (2020). Coverage, Access, and Utilization of Evidence-Based Health Care. In Understanding the Well-Being of LGBTQI+ Populations. National Academies Press (US).

[74] Wiesemann, C., Ude-Koeller, S., Sinnecker, G. H., & Thyen, U. (2010). Ethical principles and recommendations for the medical management of intersex children. European Journal of Pediatrics, 169(6), 671–679.

[75] Yam, S. Y. S., & Fixmer-Oraiz, N. (2023). Against gender essentialism: reproductive justice doulas and gender inclusivity in pregnancy and birth discourse. Women's studies in communication, 46(1), 1-22.

[76] Yam, S. Y. S., & Fixmer-Oraiz, N. (2025). Doing Gender Justice: Queering Reproduction, Kin, and Care. JHU Press.

[77] Yogyakarta Principles (2007). Principles on the application of international human rights law in relation to sexual orientation and gender identity.