

# The Network Newsletter: tackling social exclusion in libraries, museums, archives and galleries

Number 228, February 2020

(Formerly published as *Public Libraries & Social Exclusion Action Planning Network Newsletter*, issue 1, May 1999 – issue 29, September 2001)

The Network's Website is at [www.seapn.org.uk](http://www.seapn.org.uk) and includes information on courses, good practice, specific socially excluded groups, as well as the newsletter archive.

---

## Contents List

### Did you see ...?

- *ARC Magazine* – page 2

### Coronavirus/COVID-19

- "Talking about coronavirus and poverty: a guide to framing your messages" – page 2

### Tackling social and digital exclusion – Other Agencies

- *Young people in lockdown ...* – page 4
- *The colour of money ...* – page 6

### Health & Wellbeing issues – Other Agencies

- *Health equity in England: the Marmot Review 10 years on* – page 9

### LGBTQ issues – Other Agencies

- *Annual review of the Human Rights situation of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex people in Europe and Central Asia 2020* – page 14

Abbreviations and acronyms – page 16

---

## Did you see ...?

### **ARC Magazine**

The March issue<sup>1</sup> has some items of interest, including:

- Rachael Minott (“Opening lines” column), the Inclusion and Change Manager at The National Archives, introduces herself and the priorities for her work [pp5-6]:

“What I hope to achieve in my role is to support different workers within the archive sector in making their practice more inclusive. To do this I want to speak with as many practitioners as I can to get a sense of the work already being done, the ambitions for inclusion and diversity, as well as the perceived barriers, the level of confidence around this work, and what support and guidance is wanted and needed throughout the sector.” [p5]

The April/May issue<sup>2</sup> includes:

- “Backchat” column – Kimberley Harsley talks to Sally Middleton (Community Heritage Development Manager, Gloucestershire Archives) about their work with volunteers, especially how they have broadened the range of people involved, including people seeking sanctuary. [pp9-10] As Sally says:

“I’m also pleased that we’ve broken down barriers to volunteering, especially in relation to recruiting volunteers living with mental ill health. We’re now talking about taking this a step further and recruiting mentors to support not-yet-volunteers who may simply need a helping hand to get involved.” [p10]

---

## Coronavirus/COVID-19

### **“Talking about coronavirus and poverty: a guide to framing your messages”**

JRF have just published this important and useful guide<sup>3</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup> *ARC Magazine*, no.368, Mar 2020.

<sup>2</sup> *ARC Magazine*, no.369, Apr/May 2020.

<sup>3</sup> Tamsyn Hyatt and Paul Brook. “Talking about coronavirus and poverty: a guide to framing your messages”, JRF, 5 May 2020, [https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/talking-about-coronavirus-and-poverty-guide-framing-your-messages?utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=JRF%20weekly%20round-up%20wc%204%20May%202020&utm\\_content=JRF%20weekly%20round-up%20wc%204%20May%202020+CID\\_4942b4dee65f31fdda267746662fdf13&utm\\_source=Email%20marketing%20software&utm\\_term=View%20the%20toolkit](https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/talking-about-coronavirus-and-poverty-guide-framing-your-messages?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=JRF%20weekly%20round-up%20wc%204%20May%202020&utm_content=JRF%20weekly%20round-up%20wc%204%20May%202020+CID_4942b4dee65f31fdda267746662fdf13&utm_source=Email%20marketing%20software&utm_term=View%20the%20toolkit).

“How we talk about poverty matters. And amidst the stress, uncertainty and pressure of the coronavirus pandemic, our words are more important than ever. This guide is here to help you frame your messages on coronavirus and poverty – to help your words inspire action and drive change.”

The guidance begins with setting the scene:

“The COVID-19 outbreak is having a far-reaching impact across our society. What does it mean for people already in poverty before it began? How should our Government respond? And how can we prevent more of us from being swept into poverty?”

How we answer these questions matters, in two ways:

1. For right now. We need people to act now: to make sure that those of us who are struggling to keep our heads above water aren't left to sink.
2. For the future. We need people to act after the pandemic: to make sure that everyone can access a lifeline when they need it most - one designed to pull us out of poverty and away from danger.”

A major part of the response has to be the language we use:

“This five-step guide to talking about coronavirus and poverty will help you tell stories that inspire action and drive change, with examples of messaging to try.”

After a very brief recap of ‘framing’, the guide sets out an approach via five steps.

Step 1: “Explain the growing challenges faced by people in low-paid work”:

“We can use metaphor to help people understand what’s happening: talk about **constant pressure**, to emphasise the extra risks and challenges now faced by people in poverty.” [emphasis theirs]

Step 2: “Make the case for strengthening our public services” to acknowledge:

“This moment is also showing just how much we depend on our public services. Like our NHS and social security system, where demand has surged as more and more of us are without reliable income.”

Step 3: “Call for justice, as well as compassion”:

“Appeal to people’s values of justice, as well as compassion, to make the case that we should do right by each and every person in our society.”

This then goes on to show how to avoid common traps in describing the effects of the pandemic, for example it suggests avoiding “Talking about how lockdown means we’re all in the same boat”.

Step 4: “Balance ‘we need to do this’ with ‘we can do this’”, for example:

“Our words need to do more than this. We need to show the urgency and severity of what’s happening now, without losing sight of the ability to put things right. We need to combat fatalism and inspire people to act.”

Step 5: “When the time is right, talk about redesigning our economy and support systems” – and the guide ends with an example of what we could say (and a positive note):

“When the lockdown is over, when the pandemic is over, when the emergency response is over, we know that for millions of people, poverty will not be over. Now’s the time for us to get this right – to keep looking out for each other; to keep compassion and justice at the heart of our communities; to keep strengthening the systems that support us all when times are tough. As we rebuild, we can make sure our systems are designed to work for each and every one of us.”

JRF say that the guide is going to be updated regularly – recommended.<sup>4</sup>

---

## Tackling social and digital exclusion – Other Agencies

### *Young people in lockdown ...*

This important, brief report<sup>5</sup> has just been published. It paints a grim picture:

“This report is being published at a time when the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) has predicted that the lockdown will hit young workers the hardest.

According to the IFS, young people are nearly two and a half times as likely as other employees to work in a sector which has shut down due to social distancing measures.

Alongside this, data from the Office of National Statistics shows that those under the age of 25 were already four times as likely to be unemployed as the rest of the working age population, even before the pandemic.

The impact of the current situation on mental health and wellbeing is also becoming apparent, with data from the Royal Society for Public Health showing that 70 per cent of 18 to 24-year-olds are experiencing more anxiety than usual, compared with 47 per cent of over 75s.” [p3]

---

<sup>4</sup> Source: JRF *Weekly round-up*, 7 May 2020.

<sup>5</sup> *Young people in lockdown: a report by The Prince’s Trust and YouGov, with data supported by L’Oréal Paris*. The Prince’s Trust, 2020. Available to download as a pdf from: [https://www.princes-trust.org.uk/about-the-trust/news-views/young-people-in-lockdown?utm\\_source=contentpack&utm\\_medium=social&utm\\_campaign=YPinLockdown&dm\\_i=4DH7,U9W1,273YFE,3ONMT,1](https://www.princes-trust.org.uk/about-the-trust/news-views/young-people-in-lockdown?utm_source=contentpack&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=YPinLockdown&dm_i=4DH7,U9W1,273YFE,3ONMT,1).

Key findings include:

### **Fears for future employment**

- More than a quarter of young people (29 per cent) feel their future career prospects have already been damaged by the coronavirus pandemic
- 46 per cent say that finding a job now feels 'impossible'
- Almost half (49 per cent) worry it will be harder than ever to get a job
- A third (33 per cent) feels that everything they have worked for is now 'going to waste' [p4]

### **Increased anxiety**

- Forty-three per cent of young people say their anxiety levels have increased due to the pandemic
- 32 per cent say they are 'overwhelmed' by feelings of panic and anxiety on a daily basis
- 69 per cent of young people feel like their life is 'on hold'" [p4]

### **Hope and resilience**

Despite this, "[...] some of the research findings show that young people remain hopeful and optimistic about the future.

- 52 per cent of respondents 'always' or 'often' feel optimistic, and the same percentage believes the pandemic will make their generation stronger and more resilient." [p4]

### **A new normal?**

"When looking back at how young people felt just five months ago, in research from The Prince's Trust and L'Oréal Paris, the following comparisons can be made:

- Research taken in lockdown shows how almost half (47 per cent) of young people do not feel in control of their lives
- This is a significant increase compared with similar research conducted just five months ago, supported by L'Oréal Paris, which showed that 38 per cent felt this way
- Young people not in education, employment or training (NEETs) are significantly more likely than their peers to say they don't feel in control of their lives, with 65 per cent feeling this way. This has increased significantly compared with similar Prince's Trust research supported by L'Oréal Paris five months ago, when 52 per cent of NEETs felt this way." [p5]

As Jonathan Townsend, UK Chief Executive of The Prince's Trust, concludes in the introduction:

"We know that the outlook for young people is bleak, and we know that in order to stop the effects of this pandemic from spiralling out of control, we need government, employers and charities to work in partnership. It is up

to all of us to give a lifeline to a generation of young people at this critical time.” [p3]<sup>6</sup>

---

## ***The colour of money ...***

Written before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, this important new report<sup>7</sup>:

“[...] focuses on how economic and wider social inequalities affect Black and minority ethnic (BME) people in Britain. It also considers whether and how a range of policy changes could address the issues, within a wider context of how the economy might tackle inequality more broadly.” [p3]

It starts with setting the current position into its historical context; and then moves on to looking at the demographic and economic circumstances of BME people, looking, for example, at different unemployment rates and pay levels for BME and White populations.

Section 3 is on “Analysing racial inequalities in the labour market and wider economy”, which includes, for example:

“The fact that UK-born children of ethnic minority migrant parents experience significant disadvantage in the labour market highlights some important considerations or factors for understanding racial inequalities in Britain. First, racial inequality persists in other important areas, notably education, though here the findings are even more complicated than in the labour market, with Indian and Chinese pupils doing better than White British pupils, while Black Caribbean and (especially) Gypsy, Roma and Traveller pupils doing much worse. Perhaps poverty or class are more significant factors than education in explaining why racial inequalities persist.” [p10]

and reminds us that:

“At the same time, there is evidence of discrimination in Britain, including in the labour market. For example, research has found that people with Asian or African-sounding surnames had to send in nearly twice as many curriculum vitae (CVs) just to get an interview [...] This is hardly ‘indirect’ discrimination or ‘unconscious bias’, as it involves people refusing to offer an equally qualified candidate an interview solely because of their surname.” [p10]

The report also throws up interesting – and, as yet, unanswered – questions, such as:

---

<sup>6</sup> Source: email from The Prince’s Trust, 22 May 2020.

<sup>7</sup> Omar Khan. *The colour of money: how racial inequalities obstruct a fair and resilient economy*. Runnymede, 2020. Available to download as a pdf from: <https://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/2020%20reports/The%20Colour%20of%20Money%20Report.pdf>.

“For example, nearly one in three Bangladeshi men work in catering, restaurants and related businesses as chefs and waiters. This compares to around 1 in 100 White British men working in the same professions. And while 1 in 100 White British men work in taxi, chauffeuring and related businesses, the figure for Pakistani men is around 1 in 7 [...]

Is this a ‘cultural preference’ among South Asians or other groups for particular kinds of job, is it about discrimination, or is it a mix of these and other factors – for example, the role of immigration, or of parental and family influences on job choices and outcomes? Whatever the explanation, it’s important to recognise the consequences in the current economy: the sorts of jobs where many ethnic minorities are ‘clustered’ are not only low-paid, but they also have limited prospects for progression, training and wage increases.” [p11]

The remaining sections look at how to respond to these challenges, and the report comes up with a series of recommendations:

#### Recommendation 1

Work on rethinking the economy must include migration and citizenship policy [...]

#### Recommendation 2

Reforms or changes to the economy generally should be adopted for their own sake, but also to tackle racial inequalities. They should be monitored to ensure that they do so, and additional policies should be adopted if they don’t.

#### Recommendation 3

Universal policies or systemic changes may need to be delivered in a particular way in order to reach BME groups. This could be through working with BME community groups to tailor a particular approach, or providing language translation and/or English as a second or foreign language support.

#### Recommendation 4

Those working to change economic outcomes or the wider system should use statistical tools or modelling to assess how their reforms would affect BME groups and others currently disadvantaged in the economy. To the extent that economic inequalities are driven by discrimination, and conscious or unconscious bias, general policies may be unlikely to benefit them.

#### Recommendation 5

Discrimination should be tackled directly through better enforcement of existing laws [...]

#### Recommendation 6

Racial inequalities are unlikely to be tackled without wider structural changes to the economy. Advocates of structural changes to the economy should more explicitly explain that such changes are the only way to tackle racial inequality, given the latter is structural in nature.

#### Recommendation 7

Any activities or institutions that seek to adapt the existing economic system should ensure there is space for currently unremunerated but valuable social activities, in particular those that tackle racist and sexist attitudes, for example by ensuring the sort of positive human interactions that social contact theory has found to be most effective.

#### Recommendation 8

Given the current economic starting point of racial inequality, anyone seeking to redesign the economic system needs to consider whether the political economy should be 'sufficientarian' (everyone has enough) or 'egalitarian'.

#### Recommendation 9

What gets measured guides how we respond to any issue, including (re)designing the economy. At least one measure should assess the representation of BME voices/perspectives. How every other measure may (or may not) hide racial or other structural inequalities should be also considered.

#### Recommendation 10

Racial inequalities will need to be considered in the re-envisaging and transition phases, but also if (or when) most just, inclusive economic systems are up and running. To ensure it properly accounts for existing racial and structural inequalities, systems thinking on the economy will need to develop short-, medium- and long-term strategies." [p4]

Important background report, recommended.<sup>8</sup>

---

Runnymede have also contributed to a major assessment of race in Britain, *Ethnicity, race and inequality in the UK: state of the nation*, which is currently available to download free of charge<sup>9</sup>.

Contents include:

William Shankley, Tina Hannemann and Ludi Simpson. "The demography of ethnic minorities in Britain"

William Shankley and Bridget Byrne. "Citizen rights and immigration"

William Shankley and Patrick Williams. "Minority ethnic groups, policing and the criminal justice system in Britain"

Karen Chouhan and James Nazroo. "Health inequalities"

---

<sup>8</sup> Source: email from the Runnymede Trust, 20 May 2020.

<sup>9</sup> Bridget Byrne *et al* (eds). *Ethnicity, race and inequality in the UK: state of the nation*. Policy Press, 2020. Available to download as a pdf from: <http://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/22310/9781447351269.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y>.

Claire Alexander and William Shankley. “Ethnic inequalities in the state education system in England”

Ken Clark and William Shankley. “Ethnic minorities in the labour market in Britain”

William Shankley and Nissa Finney. “Ethnic minorities and housing in Britain”

Sarita Malik and William Shankley. “Arts, media and ethnic inequalities”

Maria Sobolewska and William Shankley. “Politics and representation”

William Shankley and James Rhodes. “Racisms in contemporary Britain”

The book makes a large number of recommendations: those relating to “Arts and media” include:

“44) All creative industries need to adopt employment targets for ethnic minority people, from hiring to progression.

45) The BBC and other broadcasters need to establish more accurate targets, including for those who are employed on external production contracts, and reflecting the regional and age profile of the ethnic minority population.

46) Better and mandatory data collection and reporting on all publicly funded arts bodies to ensure diverse hiring across all roles.

47) Public funding to be withheld from arts bodies where diversity targets are not met over three years.

48) Public funding of the arts should not just focus on ensuring ‘ethnic quotas’ but focus on substantive work to tackle racism.” [p241]

---

## Health & Wellbeing issues – Other Agencies

### ***Health equity in England: the Marmot Review 10 years on***

This major reassessment report<sup>10</sup> was published in February (but has been a bit ‘hidden’ by COVID-19 – which has shown up health inequity even more sharply).

---

<sup>10</sup> Michael Marmot, Jessica Allen, Tammy Boyce, Peter Goldblatt and Joana Morrison. *Health equity in England: the Marmot Review 10 years on*. Institute of Health Equity, 2020. Available to download as a pdf from: [https://www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/upload/publications/2020/Health%20Equity%20in%20England\\_The%20Marmot%20Review%2010%20Years%20On\\_full%20report.pdf](https://www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/upload/publications/2020/Health%20Equity%20in%20England_The%20Marmot%20Review%2010%20Years%20On_full%20report.pdf).

The original Marmot Review<sup>11</sup> was published in 2010, and this report looks at progress on health and health equity:

“England is faltering. From the beginning of the 20th century, England experienced continuous improvements in life expectancy but from 2011 these improvements slowed dramatically, almost grinding to a halt. For part of the decade 2010-2020 life expectancy actually fell in the most deprived communities outside London for women and in some regions for men. For men and women everywhere the time spent in poor health is increasing.

This is shocking. In the United Kingdom, as in other countries, we are used to life expectancy and health improving year on year. It is what we have come to expect. The UK has been seen as a world leader in identifying and addressing health inequalities but something dramatic is happening. This report is concerned with England, but in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland the damage to health and wellbeing is similarly nearly unprecedented [...]

The evidence we compile in this ‘ten years on’ report, commissioned by the Health Foundation, explores what has happened since the Marmot Review of 2010. Austerity has taken its toll in all the domains set out in the Marmot Review. From rising child poverty and the closure of children’s centres, to declines in education funding, an increase in precarious work and zero hours contracts, to a housing affordability crisis and a rise in homelessness, to people with insufficient money to lead a healthy life and resorting to foodbanks in large numbers, to ignored communities with poor conditions and little reason for hope. And these outcomes, on the whole, are even worse for minority ethnic population groups and people with disabilities [...] We cannot say with certainty which of these adverse trends might be responsible for the worsening health picture in England. Some, such as the increase in child poverty, will mostly show their effects in the long term. We can say, though, that austerity has adversely affected the social determinants that impact on health in the short, medium and long term. Austerity will cast a long shadow over the lives of the children born and growing up under its effects.” [p5]

The Review is packed with valuable – and sometimes shocking – information; here are some ‘headlines’:

### **“Life expectancy since 2010**

---

<sup>11</sup> *Fair society, healthy lives: the Marmot Review – strategic review of health inequalities in England post-2010*. The Marmot Review, 2010. Available to download as a pdf from: <http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-marmot-review/fair-society-healthy-lives-full-report-pdf.pdf>. The *Executive summary* is available to download as a pdf from:

<http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/resources-reports/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-marmot-review/fair-society-healthy-lives-exec-summary-pdf.pdf>.

The original Review was assessed in *The Network Newsletter*, 105, Jan 2010, [https://www.seapn.org.uk/uploads/files/newsletter\\_ns\\_105.pdf](https://www.seapn.org.uk/uploads/files/newsletter_ns_105.pdf), pp9-11.

- Increases in life expectancy have slowed since 2010 with the slowdown greatest in more deprived areas of the country.
- The UK has seen low rates of life expectancy increases compared with most European and other high-income countries.
- Inequalities in life expectancy have increased since 2010, especially for women [...]

### **Health since 2020**

- [...] Healthy life expectancy has declined for women since 2010 and the percentage of life spent in ill health has increased for men and women.” [p13]

In the section on “Social determinants of health”:

### **Give every child the best start in life**

- “Since 2010, progress has been made in early years development, as measured by children’s readiness for school. Clear socioeconomic inequalities persist, with a graded relationship between these measures and level of deprivation.
- For low-income children, levels of good development are higher in more deprived areas than in less deprived areas.
- Rates of child poverty, a critical measure for early child development, have increased since 2010 and are now back to their pre-2010 levels with over four million children affected.
- Child poverty rates are highest for children living in workless families – in excess of 70 percent
- Funding for Sure Start and Children’s Centres, and other children’s services, has been cut significantly, particularly in more deprived areas.
- More deprived areas have lost more funding for children and youth services than less deprived areas, even as need has increased.
- There are still low rates of pay and a low level of qualification required in the childcare workforce.” [p36]

### **Enable all children, young people and adults to maximise their capabilities and have control over their lives**

- “Clear and persistent socioeconomic inequalities in educational attainment that were present in 2010 remain.
- Regionally, the North East, North West and East Midlands have the lowest levels of attainment at age 16 and London has the highest.
- Since 2010 the number of exclusions from school have significantly increased in both primary and secondary schools.
- Pupil numbers have risen while funding has decreased by eight percent per pupil, with particularly steep declines in funding for sixth form (post-16) and further education.
- Youth services have been cut since 2010 and violent youth crime has increased greatly over the period.” [p50]

## **Create fair employment and good work for all**

- “Employment rates have increased since 2010.
- There has been an increase in poor quality work, including part-time, insecure employment.
- The number of people on zero hours contracts has increased significantly since 2010.
- The incidence of stress caused by work has increased since 2010.
- Real pay is still below 2010 levels and there has been an increase in the proportion of people in poverty living in a working household.
- Automation is leading to job losses, particularly for low-paid, part-time workers and the north of England will be particularly affected“ [p58]

## **Ensure a healthy standard of living for all**

- “Wage growth has been low since 2010 and wage inequality persists.
- Rates of in-work poverty have increased.
- Incomes have risen slowly and inequalities persist.
- Wealth inequalities have increased.
- Regional inequalities in wealth have increased: London and the South of England have increased their share of national wealth compared with the North.
- The number of families with children who do not reach the minimum income standard has increased.
- Food insecurity has increased significantly.
- Social mobility in England has declined
- Tax and benefit reforms have widened income and wealth inequalities.” [p70]

The summary of recommendations includes:

### **“Recommendations for Giving Every Child the Best Start in Life:**

- Increase levels of spending on early years and as a minimum meet the OECD average and ensure allocation
- of funding is proportionately higher for more deprived areas.
- Reduce levels of child poverty to 10 percent – level with the lowest rates in Europe.
- Improve availability and quality of early years services, including Children’s Centres, in all regions of England.
- Increase pay and qualification requirements for the childcare workforce.

### **Recommendations for Enabling all Children, Young People and Adults to Maximise their Capabilities and Have Control over their Lives**

- Put equity at the heart of national decisions about education policy and funding.

- Increase attainment to match the best in Europe by reducing inequalities in attainment.
- Invest in preventative services to reduce exclusions and support schools to stop off-rolling pupils.
- Restore the per-pupil funding for secondary schools and especially sixth form, at least in line with 2010 levels and up to the level of London (excluding London weighting).

### **Recommendations for Creating Fair Employment and Good Work for All**

- Invest in good quality active labour market policies and reduce conditionalities and sanctions in benefit entitlement, particularly for those with children.
- Reduce in-work poverty by increasing the National Living Wage, achieving a minimum income for healthy living for those in work.
- Increase the number of post-school apprenticeships and support in-work training throughout the life course.
- Reduce the high levels of poor quality work and precarious employment.

### **Recommendations for Ensuring a Healthy Standard of Living for All**

- Ensure everyone has a minimum income for healthy living through increases to the National Living Wage and redesign of Universal Credit.
- Remove sanctions and reduce conditionalities in welfare payments.
- Put health equity and wellbeing at the heart of local, regional and national economic planning and strategy.
- Adopt inclusive growth and social value approaches nationally and locally to value health and wellbeing as well as, or more than, economic efficiency.
- Review the taxation and benefit system to ensure it achieves greater equity and ensure effective tax rates are not regressive.

### **Recommendations to Create Healthy and Sustainable Places and Communities**

- Invest in the development of economic, social and cultural resources in the most deprived communities
- 100 percent of new housing is carbon neutral by 2030, with an increased proportion being either affordable or in the social housing sector
- Aim for net zero carbon emissions by 2030 ensuring inequalities do not widen as a result

### **Recommendations for taking action**

- Develop a national strategy for action on the social determinants of health with the aim of reducing inequalities in health.
- Ensure proportionate universal allocation of resources and implementation of policies.
- Early intervention to prevent health inequalities.
- Develop the social determinants of health workforce.

- Engage the public.
- Develop whole systems monitoring and strengthen accountability for health inequalities” [p151]

Very important reassessment of where we are with health equity – and lots of useful information to incorporate into action plans, funding bids, etc. Recommended.

---

## LGBTQ issues – Other Agencies

### ***Annual review of the Human Rights situation of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex people in Europe and Central Asia 2020***

ILGA-Europe have just published their Rainbow Map<sup>12</sup> and annual review<sup>13</sup>.

The Rainbow Map and Index<sup>14</sup> (which are interactive) show that:

“[...] once-leading countries in Europe are falling behind in their commitments to equality for LGBTI people. Combined with the COVID-19 pandemic, which disproportionately affects the most vulnerable and is being used by some governments as an excuse to advance their agendas to curtail human rights, the Map’s findings identify a make-or-break moment for LGBTI equality in Europe.”<sup>15</sup>

Key findings include:

- “There has been no positive change in 49% of countries
- For the second year in a row, countries are moving backwards on the Rainbow Index, as existing protections are disappearing
- Trans rights are where most of the current movement in terms of LGBTI equality is happening, for better or worse.
- Other forward movement, although on a smaller scale, is in the inclusion of equality measures protecting intersex people against discrimination
- Regression is most visible where civil and political rights are eroded: LGBTI human rights defenders increasingly at risk, authorities taking active measures to undermine civil society associations, and attempts to ban public events”<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> See: <https://www.ilga-europe.org/resources/news/latest-news/rainbow-map-2020-points-make-or-break-moment-lgbti-rights-europe>.

<sup>13</sup> *Annual review of the Human Rights situation of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex people in Europe and Central Asia 2020*. ILGA-Europe, 2020. Available to download as a pdf from: <https://www.ilga-europe.org/sites/default/files/Annual%20Review%202020.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> See: <https://rainbow-europe.org/>.

<sup>15</sup> Taken from: <https://www.ilga-europe.org/resources/news/latest-news/rainbow-map-2020-points-make-or-break-moment-lgbti-rights-europe>.

<sup>16</sup> Taken from: <https://www.ilga-europe.org/resources/news/latest-news/rainbow-map-2020-points-make-or-break-moment-lgbti-rights-europe>.

The annual review is their:

“[...] ninth edition covering Europe, and our first covering the entire region of Central Asia. The publication includes events that occurred between January and December 2019. It provides a snapshot of what happened during the year, at national, regional and international levels, and it documents progress and trends regarding the human rights situation of LGBTI people.” [Introduction]

In the section, “Highlights, key developments and trends” [pp7ff], the report acknowledges that there continue to be “big wins” for LGBTI people in Europe, but also notes, in some detail, the continuing harassment and discrimination against LGBTQ+ people. These include:

- A “[...] sharp increase in online hate-speech and physical attacks on LGBTI people, many of the latter premeditated and brutal. This is a pan-European phenomenon. Brexit, for instance, and the populist narrative surrounding it, can be linked an increase in anti-LGBTI hate crimes and incidents in England and Wales from 5,807 in 2014-15, to 13,530 in 2018-19.” [p7]
- The “[...] growing presence of anti-LGBTI, anti-gender and neo-Nazi protesters in public spaces [...]” [p7]
- “LGBTI asylum seekers continue to face mistreatment by authorities, including exclusion from general society and placement in dangerous accommodation that does not take their LGBTI status into account, while there are several reports of people being denied asylum and deported back to countries where they are at severe risk.” [p8] In addition: “The situation for rainbow families in the asylum system continues to be a cause for concern. For instance, in Norway partners must be married or living together for at least two years, or have children together, to be considered for reunification, while Sweden prolonged legal measures until 2021 making family reunification more difficult. The case of a gay couple seeking asylum in Malta is highlighted, where one partner has been granted asylum while the other awaits a decision.” [p8]
- Despite a backlash against family rights in some countries, “2019 has also been a year of positive developments for rainbow families in the region, with expansion of family rights in Andorra, Austria, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Malta, Poland, Sweden, and Switzerland.” [p8]
- Issues around gender identification for trans parents
- “The issue of bodily integrity for intersex people continues to gain more prominence on the political agenda of governments and institutions. There was a major moment in February, when the European Parliament adopted a Resolution on the rights of intersex people, setting out clearly what needs to be done both on national and EU level, such as putting in place legislation that will finally ensure protection of intersex people’s bodily integrity. UN committees recommended that Austria, Belgium,

Italy, the UK and Malta pass legislation to ensure that no one is subjected to surgery or treatment without their free, informed and prior consent. The Finnish government committed to banning unnecessary and non-consensual cosmetic surgeries on intersex children.” [p8]

- Growing attention to the issue of conversion therapies
- Intersectionality: “Also internally discussed in the LGBTI movement throughout 2019, but not being picked up in reporting across the region are issues concerning intersectionality. With the exception of migrants, we are yet to see the conversation translated into political action and public policy that addresses the needs of LGBTI people on the intersections, including older people, LBT women, people living with disabilities, ethnic and racial minorities, homeless LGBTI people, and people living with HIV, among others.” [p9]
- “Important advancements continue to be made on reforming or establishing legal gender recognition procedures, even if in many countries, progress is slowing down. In 2019, reforms and consultations were ongoing in a large number of countries, including Belgium, Ireland, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Germany, North Macedonia, Finland, Norway, Spain, Switzerland and the UK (with two separate consultations in England and Scotland).” [p9]

This introductory section is then followed by the “Institutional reviews” which look at the EU, UN, Council of Europe, etc. This is followed by the Country Reviews which look in some detail at each country.

This is an important review of where LGBTQ+ rights have reached and is well worth looking at. There is also a helpful summary in an article in *PinkNews*<sup>17, 18</sup>.

---

## Abbreviations and acronyms

JRF = Joseph Rowntree Foundation

OECD = Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

---

This Newsletter was compiled by John Vincent, and all items are written by him, unless otherwise stated. Please send any comments or items for the next issue to:

John Vincent  
Wisteria Cottage  
Nadderwater  
Exeter EX4 2JQ

Tel/fax: 01392 256045  
E-mail: [john@nadder.org.uk](mailto:john@nadder.org.uk)

February 2020

---

<sup>17</sup> Patrick Kelleher. “The UK was once ranked the most LGBT-friendly nation in Europe. This year, it’s not even close”, *PinkNews*, 14 May 2020, [https://www.pinknews.co.uk/2020/05/14/rainbow-map-2020-lgbt-rights-equality-europe-uk-ilga/?utm\\_source=newsletter&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=PNnewsletter](https://www.pinknews.co.uk/2020/05/14/rainbow-map-2020-lgbt-rights-equality-europe-uk-ilga/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=PNnewsletter).

<sup>18</sup> Source: *PinkNews*, 14 May 2020.