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Welcome & Overview
Project Charge

To understand the LGBT movement and its future directions through the lens of organizations advancing policy and social change through advocacy and organizing.

Polling Question
What category best describes your organization?

Results
- LGBT org; advocacy/organizing/legal: 24%
- LGBT org; service delivery: 13%
- Non-LGBT; advocacy/organizing/legal: 16%
- Non-LGBT; service delivery: 16%
- Foundation/Grantmaking: 5%
- Consulting: 4%
- Other: 22%
Movement Building Framework

- Vision
- Mobilized Base
- Advocacy Infrastructure
- Leadership
- Strategic Alliances
- Diversity
- Connectivity

Organizational Level <-> Movement Level

Research Framework

Methodology

Gigi Barsoum
@gigibarsoum
@BldingMovement #BMPlive #LGBTcrossroads
Survey

Fielded on May 14, 2012 and closed on June 4, 2012

Sent to 62 organizations recommended by Wellspring Advisors

58% completion rate (n=36)
• 69% started the survey (n=43)

Methodology

Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT Movement</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT organizations</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and movement leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations and</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affinity groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LGBT Allies</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement building</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks and capacity building</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foundations and affinity groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology
Findings: Respondents’ Organizational Profile

- Region
- Issues
- Constituency
- Alliances
- Budget

Regional Distribution

- Northeast (n=15)
- Mid-Atlantic/DC (n=10)
- West (n=8)
- Midwest (n=2)
- South (n=7)
Findings: Respondents’ Organizational Profile

Issue Areas

Civil Rights/Anti-Discrimination
Marriage Equality
Racial Justice
Economic Justice
Anti-Violence/Bullying
Health
HIV/AIDS

Findings: Respondents’ Organizational Profile

Issue Areas by Geographic Reach

Marriage
Civil Rights
Racial Justice
Economic Justice
Anti-Violence/Bullying
Health
HIV/AIDS

Findings: Respondents’ Organizational Profile
Findings: Respondents’ Organizational Profile
Coalition Partners by Geographic Reach

Findings: Respondents' Organizational Profile

Organizational Budget

Findings: Respondents' Organizational Profile
Polling Question
What do you think is the top factor for accelerating progress of the LGBT movement?

Results
- Cultivate leaders and leadership: 17%
- Develop broadly shared vision: 31%
- Partner with other movements: 7%
- Base-building; community organizing: 2%
- Expand organizational reach in U.S.: 5%
- Enhance advocacy capacity of orgs: 2%

Findings: Respondents’ Analyses of the LGBT Movement

We’re at a moment that the tide is turning from being on the defensive and fighting back attacks to moving proactive work forward.
—State LGBT Advocate

Barbara Masters
@mastery

@BldingMovement #BMPlive #LGBTcrossroads
Findings: Respondents’ Analyses of the LGBT Movement

Movement Building Framework

- Vision
- Mobilized Base
- Advocacy Infrastructure
- Leadership
- Strategic Alliances
- Diversity
- Connectivity

Factors to Accelerate Progress

Legend:
- Leadership
- Vision
- Partnering with other movements
- Community organizing
- Presence throughout US
- Advocacy Capacity
- Communications

Findings: Respondents’ Analyses of the LGBT Movement
## Findings: Respondents’ Analyses of the LGBT Movement

### Current Vision
- rights
- non-discrimination
- policy
- public
- equality
- marriage
- legal

### Desired Vision
- diversity
- social
- intersectional
- justice
- equality
- hearts
- minds
- inclusive
- people

### Mobilized Base
- Limited investment in base building and not well-connected to state and national LGBT organizations
- LGBT Movement has potential to draw from a tremendous base
Advocacy Infrastructure

Strong anchors, particularly at the national level

Major gaps in statewide capacity in the middle of the country and in the south

Findings: Respondents’ Analyses of the LGBT Movement

Advocacy Infrastructure

Self-Assessment of Advocacy Capacity

- Base building/organizing
- Communications
- Public education
- Legislative advocacy
- Coalition building with LGBT groups
- Coalition building with non-LGBT groups

Very Strong
Moderately Strong
Somewhat limited
Limited

Findings: Respondents’ Analyses of the LGBT Movement
Leadership

Politically connected and savvy national leadership

Multiplicity of movement / organizational leaders may be a strength, but may also be a limitation

Findings: Respondents’ Analyses of the LGBT Movement

Strategic Alliances

Many state and local LGBT organizations are building or are interested in building alliances with other issues/movement

Little time or support to enable the development of alliances

Findings: Respondents’ Analyses of the LGBT Movement
Diversity

Diversity of the LGBT community is one of the movement’s biggest assets, BUT this asset has not been fully leveraged by the movement.

Need to put opportunities in place at all levels need to put in place to attract and sustain leaders of color.

We recognize that LGBT people of color are folks who are left in the gap. The LGBT movement doesn’t address racial justice and the racial justice movement doesn’t necessarily address LGBT issues. Neither movement has a safe space where they (LGBT POC) can bring their whole selves.

— Interviewee

Findings: Respondents’ Analyses of the LGBT Movement
Connectivity

Few structures or mechanisms to connect organizations across the movement

Movement fragmented by issues, geography and type of advocacy

Findings: Respondents’ Analyses of the LGBT Movement

Recommendations

Frances Kunreuther
@fkunreuther

@BldingMovement  #BMPlive  #LGBTcrossroads
Recommendations

1. Expand the Vision
2. Strengthen the Infrastructure
3. Facilitate Connectivity

1: Expand the Vision
Recommendations

Vision: Create More Opportunities to Vision Together

Vision: Both/And Approach

“It gets back to both/and rather than either/or. We need movement building and campaign organizing… Without movement building we are not building long term political power.”

- LGBT Advocate
2: Strengthen the Infrastructure

Infrastructure: Promote Diversity

Image: www.southernlife.blogspot.org
Infrastructure: Enhance Advocacy Capacity

Infrastructure: Build Capacity in the “Fly Over States”
3: Facilitate Connectivity

“Movements need real grassroots engagement to take hold. They can’t be engineered. But you can seed relationships, capacities and sparks for bring forth movements.”

- Interviewee

Connectivity: Local, State, National
Recommendations

Connectivity: Alliance Building

Future Directions

- Hear from service providers and others working on a broader array of LGBT issues
- Document collaboration among LGBT and other movements and deepen understanding of how to foster long-term alliances
- Investigate long-standing obstacles
Polling Question
Given the range of recommendations, which one do you think should be the highest priority?

Results

- Expanding the current vision: 38%
- Strengthening the Infrastructure: 24%
- Connecting within the LGBT Movement: 38%

Learning from the Report

Urvashi Vaid
@urvashivaid
@BldingMovement #BMPlive #LGBTcrossroads
Additional context and framing to evaluate the movement’s situation

Consider a case study: What would it take to implement these recommendations in the U.S. South?

Arguments Against LGBT People

- Crime
  - Against Nature
  - Sex criminalized
  - Lawrence v. Texas 2003

- Sickness
  - Mentally Ill
  - Transgender stigmatized
  - APA-1974
  - APA-2012 (Trans)

- Sin
  - Abomination
  - Unnatural
  - Ongoing

- Immorality
  - Wrong
  - Perverted
  - NORC: 43.5%/Always Wrong
Movement Today

- Legal strategy dominant – big wins: Roemer; Lawrence; Goodridge; Perry, Windsor
- Cases determine policy agendas – what’s winnable legally gets pursued politically; marriage and military focus
- Politics all about insider money ball, and reaching out to moderate republicans to win at state level
- National Organizations larger than ever and narrow
- Funders dictate agenda
- Direct action weak and single issue focused
- Split between racial justice, POC/trans focused advocates and others
- No focus on women’s rights
- No economic policy focus

Learning from the Report

Critical Question: Is the Focus Lived Equality or Legal Equality?

Lived Equality Argument – Freedom will come through:
- Seeking change in the lived experience of all LGBT people
- Access to jobs, housing/ending homelessness, health care, education, services and support
- Addressing the Criminalization/Over Policing, and other racially biased systems that disproportionately affect POC
- Addressing poverty
- Addressing gender conformity and gender binary
- Progressive leadership

Legal Equality Argument – Freedom will come through:
- Nondiscrimination laws
- Marriage and family protection
- Anti-Bullying
- Anti-violence/hate crime
- Inclusion in military and corporate institutions
- Ending legal exclusion
- Cultural visibility

Learning from the Report
**Williams Institute (June 2013 report):**

- Almost 25% of kids living with a male same-sex couple and 19.2% of children living with a female same-sex couple are in poverty.
- 14.1% of lesbian couples and 7.7% of gay male couples receive food stamps. Also, 2.2% of women in same-sex couples and 1.2% of men in same sex couples receive government cash assistance.

**National Survey of Family Growth (2002):**
- 13% of gay men in poverty
- 24% of lesbians in poverty

**NCTE/NGLTF Trans Survey (2009):**
- Transgender persons report twice the rate of unemployment as national average; Trans POC 4x rate

**LIVED EXPERIENCE: Poverty**

---

**Movement Theory of Change**

(mainstream movement differs from grassroots and progressive wings)

1. **Legal and Policy Change**
   - Will affect all people equally
   - Allow access to opportunity
   - Be sufficient

2. **Cultural and Societal attitude change will follow**
   - Generational change inevitable
   - Religious opposition eroding

3. **LGBT people will be “free”**
   - To form family, work, live
Underlying Assumptions: What Produces Homophobia and Transphobia

- Law/State Policy
- Societal/Tradition-Rel. Culture
- Individual/Family
- IGNORES: Race
- IGNORES: Eco. Inequality
- IGNORES: Gender

Learning from the Report

LGBT movement’s view of the state and role of government over time

- Apparatus of the State
- Gov’t should Affirm Our Lives (Belonging) ’90s+
- Gov’t Out of Our Lives (Privacy) ’50s-’80s
- Gov’t should Save Our Lives (Accountability) ’80s+
- Fair Share from Gov’t (Access) ’70s+

Learning from the Report
Southern Case Study
applying the recommendations of the report

- Broaden the Vision
- Extend Base Building
- Deepen Alliances

Status of Key Rights in South

State constitution
- bans same-sex marriage (Bright red)
- bans same-sex marriage and some or all other kinds of same-sex unions (Maroon)

Employment discrimination Laws
- Grey = no laws
- Purple = SOGI all employment
- Pink = SOGI in state emp.
- Blue = SO only

Housing Discrimination Laws
- Grey = no laws
- Purple = SOGI
- Blue = SO only

Labor, Immigrant Rights

Turquoise = “right to work” laws (prohibit union agreements)

Rasmussen Poll – September 2011: “Half of American Adults (48%) think labor unions have outlasted their usefulness, but there’s a sharp difference of opinion between Republicans and Democrats on the question.”

Anti-immigrant laws: ACLU fighting 5 copycat laws to Arizona’s SB1070- allows police to determine immigrant status of detainees


HIV Epicenter

Abortion Laws - 1

Parental Consent Laws

- Dark Blue: Both parents must consent
- Medium Blue: One parent must consent
- Purple: One parent must be informed before
- Pink: No notification required
- Grey: Laws exist but are enjoined

Mandatory Waiting period laws

- Yellow: No waiting period
- Blue: Waiting period < 24 hours
- Maroon: Waiting period > 24 hours
- Grey: Laws enjoined


Learning from the Report

Abortion Laws - 2

MANDATORY ULTRASOUND PRIOR TO ABORTION

- Bright Red: Mandatory. Must display image.
- Dark Maroon: Mandatory. Must offer to display image.
- Light Red: Mandatory. Law temporarily unenforceable.
- Yellow: Not mandatory. Must offer ultrasound.
- Light green: Not mandatory. If ultrasound is performed, must offer to display image.
- Grey: Not mandatory.


Learning from the Report
Voter Disenfranchisement

Percent of African Americans Disenfranchised*

* Due to Felony Convictions  
Map Source: The Sentencing Project

Unemployment Rate - April 2013

Source: Economic Policy Institute

Learning from the Report
Learning from the Report

**What would it take?**

**Base Building:**
- Values vs. identities
- Traditional affinities through which bases are built are not helpful for LGBT issue
- Scaling a base is impossible without investment in politics

**Broader Vision:**
- Are funders and activists willing to take on so-called “non-LGBT” issues?
- Include economic justice?
- Include women’s rights?

**Alliances:**
- Curious that reported so many alliances — local and isolated or continuous
- Faith communities
- Linking capacities and infrastructure, not just rhetoric

---

**Snapshot of Elements of LGBT capacity in South**

**Organizations**
- Statewide LGBT orgs small
- Largest budget in FL ($909K) and NC ($933K)
- Less than $25K (AL, MS, OK, WV, TN)
- 135 Community Centers Globally – not sure how many in US Southern states

**Elected Officials**
- 120 openly LGBT elected and appointed officials listed on Victory Fund online database from Southern states
- AL: 1; AR: 2; FL: 33; GA: 16; KY: 5; LA: 2; MD: 28; NC: 9; OK: 5; SC: 2; TN: 3; VA: 11; WV: 3

**Population**
- Williams Institute Overall: 3.8% self-identify as LGB; .2% T; 8.2% report having sex with same-gender person; 11% report having feelings of attraction
- No data found on LGBT in South

Source: Guidestar database; Equality Federation State of States 2011; Victory Fund; Williams Institute

Learning from the Report
Municipalities in South – HRC ratings

In 2012, HRC began an annual ranking of municipalities called the Municipal Equality Index (MEI). They rated a city on a 0-100 scale based on the city’s policies, laws and services to LGBT people. 137 cities were ranked against 47 criteria.

- **Alabama**: Montgomery – 0
- **Arkansas**: Little Rock – 17
- **Florida**: Ft. Lauderdale – 62; Miami – 72; Tallahassee – 46
- **Georgia**: Atlanta – 82; Decatur – 27
- **Kentucky**: Louisville – 40
- **Louisiana**: Baton Rouge – 2; New Orleans – 79
- **Maryland**: Annapolis – 66; Baltimore – 88
- **Mississippi**: Jackson – 8
- **North Carolina**: Charlotte – 39; Durham – 37; Raleigh – 43
- **Oklahoma**: Oklahoma City – 26; Tulsa – 41
- **South Carolina**: Columbia – 40
- **Texas**: Austin – 90; Dallas – 76; El Paso – 49; Houston – 52; San Antonio – 48
- **Virginia**: Alexandria – 68; Richmond – 15; Virginia Beach – 17
- **West Virginia**: Charleston – 62


What Infrastructure is Needed to advance in the South?

- State-based versus regional
- LGBT rights focused or intersectional
- Funded by LGBT donors or progressives
- Political capacity means c3+PACs

Learning from the Report
Questions Remain about shared or divergent Goals, Strategy, and availability of Funding

Control and Funding

FOUNDATIONS: 2011 Funding = $128M*

LGBT Foundation Funding
- National 37%
- Local 23%
- State 13%
- International 27%

Giving to LGBT
- .26% of all Foundation giving to LGBT in 2011
- 10 largest LGBT funders gave 64% of all giving
- 40 Largest LGBT nonprofits had $182.3M in revenues in 2011*
- 36% Individual donors; 20% Foundations; 17% In-Kind; 12% Fundraising events; 4% corporate*
- 40 Orgs reported a total of 260,531 donors: 12,969 donors who contributed $1,000-$24,999; and 279 donors who contributed $25,000 or more*

** Sources: Funders for LGBT Issues; Movement Advancement Project*

Learning from the Report
Funders for LGBT Issues – 2011 Report

Learning from the Report

Many same-sex couples receive public assistance

Receipt of public assistance

Concluding Question

- How do you move a movement to change?

Question & Answer

Rebecca Fox
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Barbara Masters
@masterspolicy
@BldngMovement #BMPlive #LGBTcrossroads

Question & Answer

Urvashi Vaid
@urvashivaid
@BldngMovement #BMPlive #LGBTcrossroads
“Movement building is absolutely crucial to the longevity and ultimate success of the LGBT community. Nearsighted policy outcomes can only take us so far and must be in concert with more longer term projects that seed broad social acceptance.”

- Interviewee

Closing Survey will pop up at the end of the webinar