

De-Funding Our Lives

Queers for Economic Justice
presents

**DEFUNDING OUR LIVES:
the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Community and the Privatization of Social Security
and the Federal Tax Cuts**

Highlights from presentations presented at the DEFUNDING OUR LIVES community forum that was held on Wednesday, April 6, 2005.

Featuring comments from:

Collette Carter

Administrative Coordinator, *Audre Lorde Project*

Michelle Eichorn

Director, the Neutral Zone

Amber Hollibaugh

Senior Strategist, *National Gay & Lesbian Task Force*
Board of Directors, *Queers for Economic Justice*

Abbie Illenberger,

Assistant Political Director, *UNITE!*

David Kallick

Senior Fellow, *Fiscal Policy Institute*

The DEFUNDING OUR LIVES event was organized by
Queers for Economic Justice

and was co-sponsored by
the Audre Lorde Project / the Empire State Pride Agenda / the LGBT Community Center / the
National Gay and Lesbian Task Force / Services and Advocacy for GLBT Elders (SAGE).

It was held Wednesday, April 6, 2006
at the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Community Center
208 W. 13th Street, New York City
and was moderated by Miriam Yeung,
Director, Public Policy & Governmental Relations, LGBT Community Center

De-Funding Our Lives

David Dysseggaard Kallick

Senior Fellow, *Fiscal Policy Institute*

I want to start by talking a little bit about how Social Security works. I'd like to explain it because the way the Bush administration is talking about it they're trying to give the impression that it's something other than what it really is. It's not a system where you put in money, like into your IRA, and it's there for you when you retire. It's a social insurance program. The money you put in today goes directly into the mail to your parents and grandparents who receive Social Security today. The program is financed by a special tax—it's part of the FICA tax that gets taken out of your paycheck every two weeks. We pay for the generation that's retired now, and we assume that the next generation will pay for us when we retire. It's a social contract.

That's the basic system. It was modified in 1983, when there politicians recognized that there was a population boom after World War II that's going to retire in the next ten to twenty years. This challenge is how to have an increased number of retirees without an equally increased workforce. Of course, you can't be certain about the predictions: there could be a bigger workforce through increased immigration, another baby boom...any number of factors. But we have to make our predictions based on the information we already have. And the politicians in 1983 rightly decided that we should assume a temporary change in the proportion of workers to retirees. So they made an adjustment. Through a very modest increase in the FICA tax, they intentionally built up a surplus.

So now, in addition to our basic system where you have us paying for our parents and grandparents, you also have a little extra, put aside for our own retirement. It's a very sensible system. Where does the money get put? It's in US treasury bonds--possibly the most secure investment in the world. This, by the way, is what some conservatives are calling a "worthless IOU." OK, so the government has this surplus, and it's real—as long as you believe, as I do, and as the bond market does—that the government will not default on its bonds. Eventually, starting around, 2017-2018, baby boomers will start to retire, and we'll need to draw from that surplus to give full benefits to all the people who will be retiring. And of course, over time, the surplus will start to be eaten away. The projection is that in around 2041 the surplus will be gone.

So does that mean Social Security will be bankrupt? This is what the Bush administration wants you to think. No, the system will not be bankrupt—we're just talking about the surplus. The country will still be collecting money from those who are working. Even in 2041, we'll still be able to meet 75% of the benefits without even changing a thing. That's still below what we need, because we've been promised 100% of our benefits, not 75%. So it's a serious issue, but let's keep it in perspective: we're not talking about bankruptcy. One obvious possibility would be to do what was done in 1983, which was to put some more money into the system. This is actually what the Clinton administration was proposing to do with the government's budget surplus. (You remember the budget surplus?). But even without touching the government's general funds, you could increase the Social Security tax a little bit—a very small amount would be enough to cover it.

Or, better still, you could roll back the Bush Administration's tax cuts to the superrich. Over the course of 75 years, we will need over 3.7 trillion dollars. This is about 1/5 the size of Bush's tax cuts (if they're made permanent, which it looks like they may be). Or, it's about 1/22 the size of the prescription drug benefit, the very limited drug benefit that the president has put into the budget now. It is about the equivalent to the tax cuts to just the top 1% of the income owners. So this is a very manageable gap to meet if we think about the normal kinds of solutions that we could have.

De-Funding Our Lives

Those are the kinds of solutions I think make sense. What, though, is the president proposing? Well, the president, strangely, seems to be projecting a crisis that isn't really there, and then proposing a solution that has nothing to do with the crisis. Have we heard this one before? The "crisis" is the bankruptcy of Social Security. The "solution" is privatization. Privatization is a risky and controversial idea. But even its supporters have been forced to admit that it would have zero impact on the "crisis" the president is talking about.

Conservatives like the idea of privatization for all kinds of other reasons: it will be a boon to stock brokers; it will make more people stock owners; but, most fundamentally, it undermines a basic role of government in securing people's future and instead makes them dependent on the whims of the market. But even the most die-hard conservative can't explain how privatization would help the "crisis."

Let me add, by the way, that while the president has admitted privatization will not solve the problem, under any likely scenario, privatization would have a very negative impact. Creating private accounts would increase the debt by a large amount. Because, the problem is, the shift is not just from a public system to a private system. It's a shift from a pay-for-your-parents system to a keep-it-yourself system. When you divert a portion of today's paycheck from your parents' and grandparents' mailbox, who's going to make up for the missing portion of the check? The president says the government will. Where will the money come from? Increased borrowing.

Social Security is a very well conceived social program. It's efficient. It's been around for a very long time. In any kind of normal definition of conservative, you'd have to think conservatives would say, *ok, let's just leave it the way it is, it's working fine, it's been working for decades, don't give us some risky new social experiment.* Social Security is also the most effective anti-poverty program we've ever had. In the 1930-'40s, older people were the most poor demographic; now, they are the least poor group of people. In over 70 years, there has never had a month when Social Security didn't pay its check – it is incredibly efficient in the way it works.

If the president wants to change Social Security, to take money out of the system to start some sort of individual, on-your-own market accounts, the obvious questions are:

- Who's going to pay for it?
- What will happen to some of the benefits that aren't just for you (like disability insurance, or survivor benefits)?
- What's going to happen to people who make bad investment decisions?
- What, even, if you're doing pretty well, but the market takes a bad turn when you need it?
- And, most of all, what will happen to the regular, reliable, guaranteed Social Security benefit when you start to siphon away money and support from Social Security into a market-oriented system of individual accounts?

3 PULL-OUT QUOTES FOR DAVID'S SECTION:

"The president, strangely, projects some crisis that isn't really there, and then proposes a solution that has nothing to do with the crisis. Under the best circumstances that we can project, the privatization of Social Security would have a zero impact. But under any likely scenario, it would have a very negative effect – it would increase the debt and that would increase the deficit."

De-Funding Our Lives

“Over the course of 75 years, Social Security will need over 3.7 trillion dollars. This is about the equivalent to the tax cuts to just the top 1% of the income owners. This is a very manageable gap to meet if we think about the normal solutions we could have.”

“Social Security is the most effective anti-poverty program we’ve ever had. In the 1930-40’s, older people were the most poor demographic; now, they are the least poor group of people. And there has never had a month when it didn’t pay it’s check.”

De-Funding Our Lives

Abbie Illenberger,
Assistant Political Director, *Unite!*

Many younger people my age don't really understand Social Security, but we should remember that the number of people who receive it is astounding. One in six people in this country receive Social Security benefits in some way, either through their families, or other services. And, 1/3 of those people are under 65. So they are children who are receiving survivor benefits because one of their parents is deceased or, they are spouses of folks who are deceased, or they are disabled workers. And 30% of all of us who are under the age of 65 are going to be disabled before we're 65. And for millions of Americans, the ability to purchase a disability insurance or a life insurance that would be the equivalent of what Social Security could give, is just out of our reach. And, for more and more of us who are often in changing jobs, and who are in the non-traditional sector, we don't have any disability insurance or life insurance through our jobs.

But Social Security would pay a 20 year old who received survivor insurance about 420,000 dollars – which is equivalent to a 420,000 dollar life insurance policy. I have a pretty good, unionized job, with really good benefits, and my life insurance is you know not even 1/5 of that. And it is unrealistic for me to expect that I could ever provide that for myself. So I think it's important for us to think about the amount of benefits that are provided by Social Security, and to recognize that this is one of the most successful, well-thought out plans created by our country. Which I think is one of the reasons why it's under attack by the Right.

And now Bush wants us to take 1/3 out of our taxes and put it into our own private accounts. In order to do that, 1/3 of the money that pays my grandfather's checks is going to disappear, and we would have to replace that money somehow, but the only thing that the Pres and his advisors have said is that we could borrow it. We've already got a billion dollars annual deficit, but just to set up this plan we'd have to borrow 2-3 trillion dollars, *trillion dollars*, to fix the fake crisis.

But there is no real crisis, and actually, it wouldn't even fix it, and actually it would give us 2-3 trillion dollars in new deficit, and over the first 20 years it would increase to at least 5 trillion. That's really great, I'm going to have no benefits and I'm going to have 5 trillion dollars in new deficit – I really like this program.

So, *why?* Why do this? And, the first clue is to look at who's going to get to manage these accounts. It's very key to look at Wall Street. If you look at the next 75 years (the way the President does) Wall Street would make at least 1 trillion dollars in fees. It would be the largest windfall in Wall Street history – there no other way for them to make that much money in 75 years. We're talking about trillions of dollars being transferred from us, the people who live and work in the U.S., to Wall Street and the ruling class. This would be the greatest transfer of wealth that we've seen in the history of this country. This is bigger than the days of the robber barons, when people took what was most valuable at the time (which was natural resources) and just stole it for themselves. This is similar to that.

And this is tied to the tax cuts for the wealthy. This is tied to the programs that are going to be cut, and benefits that will be cut, and organizations being shut down – all because of lost funding. But to me, this is about actually even much bigger than that. It's the overall restructuring of our country. We've been talking about structural adjustment in terms of the developing world, 3rd world countries – well, this is structural adjustment happening here. And it's been happening already – welfare reform in 1996 was an example. This is the next big piece. This is the administration, and the ruling class in this country opening a new front in terms of structural adjustment, and it's all about privatization.

De-Funding Our Lives

And the one of the main goals of privatization are to maximize profit-making opportunities, but not for us, but for businesses and the ruling class. The other goal is to minimize the social role of government. And I say the social role because, if you want to simplify it, there's the social role of government and there is also the military role of government – the role of actually controlling people. So you either provide services and benefits and you provide for people's needs development and growth, or you try to control them because you're not providing for them, and they're organizing against you. So privatization is actually the process of removing the provision of benefits from the role of government. And this is where we're headed and that's the direction of the program

I do think that we can stop this fight, a lot of it is about educating people both about how the program works, but also about what the Bush proposal is and that it the biggest heist we've seen. I think it's interesting to see the alliances being formed by this. You see old people and students coming together on this issue, a lot of communities of color are getting involved in this fight. We can use this to reengage people around issues affecting our economy. We have to start connecting it to other fights – it's important that this be connected to the war in Iraq and the fight for universal benefits of all kinds, etc. And if we fight this fight this way, we'll set ourselves up well for the fight that will continue.

3 PULL-OUT QUOTES FOR ABBEY'S SECTION

“More and more of us don't have any disability insurance or life insurance though our jobs.”

“Why? Why do this? And, the first clue is to look at who's going to get to manage these accounts. It's very key to look at Wall Street. If you look at the next 75 years (the way the President does) Wall Street would make at least 1 trillion dollars in fees. It would be the largest windfall in Wall Street history. We're talking about trillions of dollars being transferred from us, the people who live and work in the U.S., to Wall Street and the ruling class. This would be the greatest transfer of wealth that we've seen in the history of this country.”

“And this is tied to the tax cuts for the wealthy. This is tied to the programs that are going to be cut, and benefits that will be cut, and organizations being shut down – all because of lost funding.”

De-Funding Our Lives

Amber Hollibaugh

Senior Strategist, *the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force*
Board of Directors, *Queers for Economic Justice*

Why Social Security is an LGBT Issue

Often we don't discuss these kinds of issues in identity based politics, so what happens then is that we're left out of something that profoundly impacts us because it somehow doesn't fit into a very narrowly defined LGBT political agenda. Currently, it often looks like the LGBT agenda is simply about gay marriage and nothing else, as though you could trade one for the other or dealing with one will take care of the other. That is why it is so important that this discussion happen and that the work of groups like the Task Force includes critical LGBT issues such as the preservation of Social Security. It is really important to frame this by saying that if we begin to talk in a more radical way about America, and our place in America, including who we are as LGBT people (but not as though there's only one single thing we bring to the table or struggle with), then the question of something like Social Security crosses many lines and is more clearly understood as a "gay" or LGBT issue. While it's clear why it is an urgent question for those of us that are older or really old, for the Bush administration it is a faux crisis to cover another agenda that they have which will profoundly devastate this country. It is an agenda to take apart all the safety nets created in the New Deal. So for many of us the irony is that instead of being able to work on expanding and adapting what now exists to include us and others that were invisible during that earlier historical time, we have to fight today just to hang on to what is here now. So for us as the LGBT community to not step up and find our voices as if this is not our issue, not a queer issue, is a dangerous thing and a foolhardy thing.

The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force absolutely irrevocably condemns privatization. What we're seeing about the second term of the Bush agenda is a strategy that his people have of creating one apparent crisis in order to move another, more hidden agenda into place. Social Security as an issue represents just one more place where that strategy of a manufactured crisis (that doesn't represent the reality of what we do need to be paying attention to) is projected as though its survival is eminent. This is enormous hype, and what it does is cover the truth that this fight is not about improving Social Security. None of this kind of move to the Right has ever been about improving the lives of those who would be most affected, in fact if this happens, if Bush wins this battle to privatize Social Security, it would have exactly the opposite effect.

Social Security is the single most solid and progressive program that contradicts the reality of age in this country – and that reality is that age makes you poor and that if you are already poor it makes you poorer. Social Security was created to address this problem. When it started it came out of the depression, it came out of a much more progressive time in America. It was framed as a question saying, "if we are a culture that is based on work, and if you have to have a job in order to survive, well then, who does *not* have a job, and therefore who will be completely without resource and *not* able to survive?". Who is that? Old people, who physically cannot any longer get an income from working because they are too old to be able to hold a job, people whose families are disabled because the bread winner is killed or disabled, and disabled people themselves – these are the people for which Social Security was created. We need to frame it that way because it named something that is no longer discussed in this culture – about who are vulnerable constituencies and communities, including old people.

Social Security is the primary source of income for elderly people in America, and it is the only source for 1/3 of our people. It's the only thing people have, so if you mess with it, you mess with our ability

De-Funding Our Lives

to be protected as workers and to be protected as old people. And it is important to remember that the majority of LGBT people make up our numbers in the working class and working poor of this country. We are members of communities of color, of women, of working people and those are exactly the communities that rely on Social Security benefits the most heavily. We often earn less because we are queer and come from backgrounds that have few privileges in the workplace like benefits, pension plans and golden parachutes. If something happens to decrease our Social Security benefits as old people, we are vulnerable and have no other back up. It is really important that we understand this.

In addition, there are other specific ways that LGBT people will be particularly impacted if this plan is implemented. Queer people are four more times more likely to not have children to call in times of need. And children -- the biological family and formally recognized heterosexual married partners, are how this country transfers the work of aging so that the country doesn't have to pay for it, it gets done by a spouse or a relative, unpaid. And the fact is that LGBT people are more than 2 ½ times more likely than straight people to age alone, which means that if we don't have that income we're destitute – which also means we are much more likely to rely on social security to sustain our ability to survive as we get old and live as old LGBT people.

So it's very important to see that we are a particularly vulnerable community of people because of who we are and it becomes particularly important for us to join other groups and come to the table with a lot of other people who are furious about privatization. It is important to say that we have a stake here – that it matters. It matters to us, it matter to our older generations and the people who are going to be next which will be the Stonewall generation, my generation. And it profoundly affects young queer people, as we hope they have an aging future. So that in every way and in every generational moment it is completely a queer issue, it is completely a queer issue. And it is completely bigger than a queer issue at the same time.

We also need to take it on completely because it is an opportunity to create partnerships and have a voice in coalitions in which we're often not even thought of being included in. Even if they would be willing to invite us, they don't know that we would even care. So I think there is an enormously progressive coalition that is coming together to fight the right, which God knows we have a stake in doing ourselves, but, more importantly, is coming together to create a set of partnerships that can act as an active and pro-active buffer that offers resistance to the kinds of politics that Bush is going to try to get away with because he does not have to worry about being reelected. We need to see this as the beginning of a fight that will continue for quite awhile. Medicaid is coming up next, and loosing that fight would be devastating for all of us who are HIV+ or have AIDS and/or are LGBT, poor and without any other kind of healthcare. So it matters that we insist on being there in these battles because of the multiple ways that this and the above issue impact us. This is a queer issue as well as a social justice issue and we need to insist on being there to make a difference in the way that this unfolds and how that it gets answered.

TWO PULL-OUT QUOTES FOR AMBER'S SECTION

“Social Security is the primary source of income for elderly people in America, and it is the only source for 1/3 of our people. It's the only thing people have, so if you mess with it, you mess with our ability to be protected as workers and to be protected as old people.”

De-Funding Our Lives

“Queer people are four more times more likely to not have children to call in times of need. And LGBT people are more than 2 ½ times more likely than straight people to age alone. We are much more likely to rely on social security to sustain.”

De-Funding Our Lives

Michelle Eichorn

Director, *the Neutral Zone*

I'm actually going to talk specifically about tax cuts, and very specifically about LGBT people.; The first thing I'd like to do is frame the way that we talk about tax cuts. I mean even the name that we call it, I don't want to call it tax cuts, I want to call it tax evasion because I see it as tax evasion. So you know we live in a country where Republicans have framed the tax debate to look like it's about good hard working people are forced to pay tax so that lazy welfare queens can sit at home and have lots of kids and all of these horrible things that they say that just aren't true. And so the tax cuts have been able to slide through and even potentially become permanent, because of a lot of the ways the debate has been framed.

So I'd like to quote John Lakehoff in his book Don't Think of the Elephant. In his book he says that really the way we need to start framing the debate is that, as people living in this country, taxes are basically what we pay you use the infrastructure. So, you sit at a red light, you use the light, you use the school systems, and this is what we pay for it. If you think of it in that way, we're all doing ourselves a favor by paying taxes. And most of the tax cuts are going to upper class people and corporations who really don't want to pay their share to maintain the infrastructure, and I consider that a crime.

Let's look at what this tax evasion is going to do. According to The Fiscal Policy Institute, vulnerable New Yorkers will lose up 4.4 billion in federal funding under the house budget plan, and under this particular plan 458 billion dollars in SSI benefits would be cut, 402 million dollars in food stamps would potentially be cut, 350 million dollars in TANF welfare would be cut. And as a person who runs a drop-in center for queer youth, I am particularly concerned about the cuts that are proposed for spending on HIV treatment and housing. When this country talks about the tax cuts, we're neglecting to talk about people with HIV. And we're not talking about low-income people who aren't going to have any place to stay, because not only is Section 8 being frozen, but they want to completely cut all this other money. So, under the budget, treatment for HIV funding would be cut by 550 million dollars over the 2006-2010 period and by 190 million or 10% in 2010 alone. Under this administration, Section 8's going to be cut so not only are new people not going to receive it, but people currently getting it are not going to be able to access it any more.

And a lot of times it's not framed as a queer issue because there's this general misconception that queer people are rich people, who are all fighting for marriage – you know, that we're all doing well. This does not take into consideration all of the queer people who are on welfare, queer people who are low-income. And young queer people are dying in the streets every single day. I went to a lobby day today, and you know, we're talking about 40% of homeless youth are LGBT identified. And, a lot of these young people are infected with HIV. It's really a life and death issue that people are not looking at, if a young person is homeless and goes to a 30 days shelter and they move to a transitional living program, that's only 18 months. If there are no vouchers, what'll happen? You can't live in the transitional living program forever, they're going to say "you have to pack your bags and go", they'll end up back on the street. Then you're being exposed to survival sex to live, you're being exposed to HIV. So then you're infected with HIV and you can't get your medicine because they just cut the program. You know so all around, these are huge issues for the queer community, particularly those that are neediest amongst us. And our next steps are organize, we have to do something about this. It's really our responsibility to do so.

De-Funding Our Lives

TWO PULL-OUT QUOTES FOR MICHELLE'S SECTION:

“Treatment for HIV funding will be cut by 550 million dollars over the 2006-2010 period and by 190 million or 10% in 2010 alone. Under this administration, Section 8’s going to be cut so not only are new people not going to receive it, but people currently getting it are not going to be able to access it any more. “

“A lot of times it’s not framed as a queer issue because there’s this general misconception that queer people are rich people, who are all fighting for marriage. This does not take into consideration all of the queer people who are on welfare, queer people who are low-income. And young queer people are dying in the streets every single day.”

De-Funding Our Lives

Collette Carter

Administrative Coordinator, *the Audre Lorde Project*

The overall picture that I'd like to provide is that this is all about the de-prioritization of human life. I actually think that the Audre Lorde Project laid it out very well in 2001 when we did a letter, which was opposing the war on terrorism. This war is going to be an extended kind of non-identified way to kind of take resources and money away, and de-prioritize human life. We said that this war would create cuts in human services and cuts in HIV funding. It would create more joblessness, it would create a more militarized community and zone. They exposed that this war was going to be a profit war. So I think the most important thing to try to recognize at these fronts is that privatization and tax cuts, the marriage of the two, is not a new fight. It is something that folks have been fighting on many fronts, and where ever there's a fight LGBTST people are there. Let's just be honest. So it's about local issues like fighting the privatization of housing that's going on the Lower East Side, (where there are subsidized apartments are being held, empty, because that contract is about to expire and they're going to go for market rate apartments), and it is nationally run projects, and internationally run projects.

Because if you look at the language that they are using, especially around privatization, it really mirrors the language they use at the IMF World Bank on the structural adjustment programs when they go to the global south and convince these countries to pay off their global debt – as if we aren't sucking down money like a milk horse. They then encourage these countries to completely slash public services as a way to divert funds to pay off their debt, they also convince these countries to enter into a trade market that their economy can't sustain. This then gives other countries, like ours, a foot hold into that country to start importing our products there. So what you see is a huge cycle that encourages privatization. And this is on multiple fronts. This is about privatization of schools, privatization of waste management, our electricity, our utilities, privatization of prisons. And also the privatization of many of our services, like what's going on now with the fight against privatization of social security.

And it happens in the day-to-day normalized things that we have now accepted – like when you look at the bill of how much it costs to buy a toilet seat on capital hill. Toilet seats shouldn't cost \$50-\$500 – they cost \$7, I've been to Home Depot. Or pens don't cost \$200. But this is what they are spending the money on, or, these are the people that they're giving our money to. And these businesses getting our money are run by people that the politicians know – family members, employers they used to work for, places they are connected to.

So it's really become about people who are in economic power coming together and using that power, through militarized zones and propaganda to enforce social power. The idea that privatization could be more accountable to a public base is completely laughable. That's not to say that the government is completely accountable to the people, but at least they set up an artifice – you go to vote. It may be hard to hold your public officials accountable but they set up some kind of system, as opposed to a company that has no investment, accountability in any shape form or fashion is not needed – they are only there for profit. They are there to make money, and that is just a fact and we should acknowledge that.

We also have to remember that what is happening is an artificial crisis that has been manufactured. This administration has promoted this idea of scarcity so that privatization can come in and look like the savior. Like “here's this big problem, we won't be able to do it, lets get some body else to help us”. But in reality, because these companies and institutions are not accountable, that's actually a bigger way to kind of sell off portions of what are our social benefits and our lives.

De-Funding Our Lives

This is an example of how economics and militarization are actually linked. There is a profit side to every decision that is made and there is an agenda behind every decision that is made. Because it's about where you decide to spend money. If you don't give it to schools, if you don't give it to public programs, if you're not giving it to subsidized housing, and instead you're paying for more police locally, or to occupy other countries. Or you're paying to be a member of the World Bank and you're convincing the global south that "you need to export, you need to start selling us basically bits of your country so that you can cut your public services". So really it's just a mirror from an international front on a level here. It is all connected.

THREE PULL-OUT QUOTES FOR COLLETE'S SECTION:

"If you look at the language that they are using, it really mirrors the language they use at the IMF World Bank on the structural adjustment programs when they go to the global south and convince these countries to completely slash public services as a way to divert funds to pay off their global debt."

"It's about privatization of school, privatization of waste management, our electricity, our utilities, privatization of prisons..."

"Because it's about where you decide to spend money. If you don't give it to schools, if you don't give it to public programs, if you're not giving it to subsidized housing, and instead you're paying for more police locally, or to occupy other countries."

De-Funding Our Lives

MISSION STATEMENT

Queers for Economic Justice is a progressive non-profit organization committed to promoting economic justice in a context of sexual and gender liberation.

Our goal is to challenge and change the systems that create poverty and economic injustice in our communities, and to promote an economic system that embraces sexual and gender diversity. We are committed to the principle that access to social and economic resources is a fundamental right, and we work to create social and economic equity through grassroots organizing, public education, advocacy and research.

We do this work because although poor queers have always been a part of both the gay rights and economic justice movements, they have been, and continue to be, largely invisible in both movements. This work will always be informed by the lived experiences and expressed needs of queer people in poverty.

CONTACT US

Queers for Economic Justice

16 W. 32nd Street #10H

New York, NY 10001

(212) 564-3608

www.QueersforEconomicJustice.org