

University of Groningen

Secular Practices

Wiering, Jelle Oscar

DOI:
[10.33612/diss.135296628](https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.135296628)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2020

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Wiering, J. O. (2020). *Secular Practices: The Production of Religious Difference in the Dutch field of Sexual Health*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen.
<https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.135296628>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Propositions

1. The study of the secular could benefit from more research that focuses on practices that delineate the religious from the secular.
2. The Dutch societal emphasis on problems ascribed to religion, makes other problems go unnoticed.
3. Current forms of sex education classes in the Netherlands communicate an understanding of sexuality that encourages women to take the active role of sexuality managers and men the role of passive observers.
4. Dutch forms of sex education are heteronormative.
5. The suggestion of a safe environment in the classroom where anything can be said without repercussions is treacherous and frequently incorrect.
6. A supposedly open conversation about sex is in practice often closed.
7. Conversations about sexuality can serve as an Othering tool that highlight Cultural difference and that may polarize minority versus majority perspectives.
8. Feeling hesitant about engaging in a conversation about sex is nothing to be ashamed of.
9. There is no such thing as a neutral organization.
10. Sex education could benefit from ways of teaching that draw on the body in different ways, for example by using live music or theater play.
11. It is insightful to take more seriously the emotional registers that anti-religious messages presented in political debates or newspapers draw upon.