

EURO-LETTER

No. 46

December 1996

The Euro-Letter is published on behalf of ILGA - The International Lesbian and Gay Association - by The Danish National Association for Gays and Lesbians in cooperation with Gay and Lesbian International Lobby. Editors: Steffen Jensen, Ken Thomassen, Peter Bryld and Lisbeth Andersen

Contact to Euro-Letter:

E-mail: steff@inet.uni-c.dk

URL: <http://www.inet.uni-c.dk/~steff>

Fax: +45 2036 7856

Tel: +45 3124 6435

Mobile: +45 2033 0840

Mail: c/o Steffen Jensen, Gl. Kongevej 31, 4.th, DK-1610 Copenhagen V, Denmark

You can receive Euro-Letter by e-mail (send a message to the above adress) and from no 30 onwards the Euro-Letters are available on the Internet at

<http://fglb.qrd.org:8080/fqrd/assocs/ilga/euroletter.html>

<http://www.qrd.org/qrd/www/orgs/ILGA/euroletter>

You can find a link to Euro-Letters at <http://www.inet.uni-c.dk/~steff>

IN THIS ISSUE

- **LAW REFORM IN AUSTRIA: PARTIAL VICTORY: BAN ON INFORMATION AND ASSOCIATION REPEALED - AGE OF CONSENT LAW UNCHANGED**
- **AUSTRIA IN FAVOR OF EU TREATY WITH HUMAN RIGHTS**
- **BACKLASH IN EU TREATY NEGOTIATIONS**
- **ILGA PRESS RELEASE**
- **PROBLEMS WITH THE PARENTAL LEAVE EU-DIRECTIVE**
- **REPORT ON ILGA'S ACTIVITIES AT THE OSCE REVIEW CONFERENCE, VIENNA, NOVEMBER 1996**
- **SPANISH SOCIALIST PARTY HAS SUBMITTED A PARTNERSHIP LAW TO SPANISH PARLIAMENT**
- **SWITZERLAND: GAY AND LESBIANS ARE SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS**
- **DUTCH SECOND CHAMBER OF PARLIAMENT AGREES ON PARTNERSHIP REGISTRATION**
- **86 COUNTRIES BAN GAY SEX**
- **SURVEY OF THE LEGAL SITUATION FOR GAYS AND LESBIANS IN EUROPE**

An update of the Survey on the Legal Situation for Gays and Lesbians in Europe and guides to the structure of the European Union, the Council of Europe and The Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe can be found on this URL:

<http://www.inet.uni-c.dk/~steff/gilil.htm>

LAW REFORM IN AUSTRIA:
**PARTIAL VICTORY BAN ON INFORMATION
AND ASSOCIATION REPEALED AGE OF
CONSENT LAW UNCHANGED**

By Kurt Krickler

On 27 November, the Lower Chamber of Austrian Parliament debated and voted on repealing the anti-lesbian and anti-gay articles in the Austrian penal code: Article 209 - higher age of consent of 18 years for male homosexual relations compared to 14 years for lesbians and heterosexuals; Article 220 - ban on positive information about homosexuality; Article 221 - ban on the founding of gay and lesbian organizations.

The most far-reaching bills were introduced by the Social Democrats, the Greens, and the Liberal Forum who proposed a total repeal of all three articles. These three parties constitute the left spectrum in Austrian politics, but do not have a majority in Parliament. The passage of these bills needed the pro-active support of at least three MPs from the conservative Christian Democratic Party or the right-wing Freedom Party of Joerg Haider or the deliberate absence of six of them in order to reduce the quorum. The government coalition partners (Social Democrats and Conservatives) were not able to agree on a joint bill. They agreed, however, to an open free vote, with MPs not bound (at least theoretically) to the party-line - a very uncommon practice in Austria. This was big step forward because the Conservatives had blocked any vote for the last ten years.

The Conservatives not only called for keeping the discriminatory higher age of consent for gay relations, but introduced their own bills calling for an intensification (!) of articles 220 and 221. At the last minute, the right-wing Freedom Party also introduced a bill proposing to fix the age of consent for gay men at 16 as a compromise, to do some cosmetic changes to article 220 but to keep it, and to repeal article 221.

After a very heated debate, the various bills were voted on each separately. The vote on repealing the higher age of consent was a draw: 91 votes for, 91 votes against, and therefore failed. Only one MP from the Conservatives and one MP of the Freedom Party dared not to follow party line and to vote for the repeal of article 209. The other proposals as mentioned above were also rejected. The existing discriminatory age of consent law for gay men will, therefore, continue to be in force in Austria.

The bill on completely abolishing article 220 got a bare majority of one vote: 90 to 89. This, however, was an accident: two MPs from the right-wing party were not in the plenary and missed the ballot.

The complete repeal of article 221 (ban on associations) passed by a large majority (128 to 52) with only the Christian Democrats opposed.

On 12 December 1996, the Upper Chamber of the Austrian Parliament passed, as expected, the Bill on some amendments to the Austrian Penal code, including the total repeal of Articles 220 and 221 (ban on pro-homosexual information and on lesbian/gay associations), which was voted, as reported, by the Lower Chamber on 27 November 1996. The reform, therefore, will come into force on 1 March 1997.

This development is at least a partial victory for Austria's lesbian and gay movement which has been fighting for this reform for 17 years. And of course, we will continue to struggle for total equality in the penal code.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank all individuals, groups, and organizations abroad who, in all these 17 years, have been supporting us in our fight against discrimination of lesbians and gay men in Austria. We also want to thank those who took part in this year's campaign which we called for last April. Your support definitely made the difference and was a great help in our struggle. Thank you all so much for your solidarity! We will also need it in the future in our fight for the repeal of Article 209!

**AUSTRIA IN FAVOR OF EU TREATY WITH
HUMAN RIGHTS**

By Kurt Krickler

On 3 December, the Austrian Parliament agreed and voted upon its guidelines for the chapter on "Fundamental Rights" in the new EU Treaty. In its statement, the Austrian Parliament urges the Federal government to work within the IGC that the prohibition of discrimination based on a series of grounds be included in the new EU treaty. The Parliament listed the same non-discrimination categories as in the Austro-Italian proposal presented in October 1996 by foreign ministers Schuessel and Dini (see Euroletter # 45) but replaced "sexual preference" by "sexual orientation". While the Schuessel-Dini initiative has a rather soft wording ("The Union shall make sure that no discrimination ... occurs"), the Austrian Parliament, however, formulated clearly: "The prohibition of discrimination ... be included in the Treaty".

BACKLASH IN EU TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

The Irish Presidency's draft framework for Treaty revision which was being discussed in October/ November contained several useful provisions from our point of view. Most notably, two revisions, one to Article F of the Treaty on European Union and another to Article 6 of the Treaty establishing the European Community contained provisions which would have represented a significant step in guaranteeing equal rights for gays and lesbians in the EU:

i) Supplement to article F:

"Within the scope of application of the Treaties on which the Union is founded and without prejudice to any special provisions contained therein, any discrimination on grounds of race, sex, national or ethnic origin, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion, social origin [...] shall be prohibited."

This is a general provision on non-discrimination, which, although of limited legal application, would be of immense symbolic significance, as it would enshrine non-discrimination against gays and lesbians as one of the common provisions fundamental to the Union.

ii) New article 6a:

"Within the scope of application of this Treaty and without prejudice to any special provisions contained therein, the Council, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Parliament, shall take the necessary measures to prohibit any discrimination on grounds of race, sex, national or ethnic origin, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion, social origin [...]."

This is the provision which would give teeth to the general provisions of Article F. Article 6 is that which forbids discrimination on grounds of nationality - extending this to other forms of discrimination would have been a major step forward, and would have given the Community the legal means to prevent discrimination in the fields of employment, free movement of people, social policy etc.etc.(although the unanimity principle could have been a problem). The wording OBLIGES the Council to adopt measures - which again would have been important.

Unfortunately, at some stage during November, the Presidency was obliged by some member states to go a good way backwards from this position. The proposal which will come to the European Council this weekend is much more limited than the October text:

NO general non-discrimination provision is now being proposed for Article F. Thus, non-discrimination is no longer a common provision with the nature of a general principle upon which the Union is founded. There is still a reference to the European

Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, but, as we know, this is not explicit on the question of sexual orientation.

As far as the EC Treaty is concerned, some significant changes have been made to the proposed new article 6a: (changes in capitals):

"Within the scope of application of this Treaty and without prejudice to any special provision contained therein, the Council, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the European Parliament, MAY TAKE THE NECESSARY MEASURES to prohibit any discrimination on grounds of sex, race, ETHNIC OR SOCIAL ORIGIN, RELIGIOUS BELIEF, HANDICAP, AGE OR SEXUAL ORIENTATION."

Within the context of the subtleties of such negotiations these changes are quite significant. A footnote, in any case, indicates that this is not a definitive list of grounds, and that the Conference will have to have a more detailed discussion on this and the precise definitions involved. The change from "shall take..." to "may take.." is important because it removes from the Council the obligation to take measures - so the Council has an excuse to do nothing if it wishes. The new order within the list is also significant, with religious belief moving up and sexual orientation down. If November's negative trend in the negotiations continues, then the next step could be the removal of "sexual orientation" from the list altogether.

On the positive side, the Italo-Austrian proposal seems still to be on the table - but it is now clear that their main concern is freedom of religion - they may, therefore, be content with the current draft.

ILGA PRESS RELEASE

The Secretaries General of the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA), Jordi Petit and Inge Wallaert, denounce and regret the fact that the European Union heads of state at their weekend meeting in Dublin did not adopt the human rights proposals for the reform of the E.U. Treaty of Maastricht that had been presented by the Irish presidency, which ends at the end of the year. These proposals would prohibit discrimination based on sex, ideology... and sexual orientation.

ILGA, a worldwide federation of more than three hundred homosexual organizations and individuals, deplores the fact that the heads of state did not pay attention to human rights during their meeting. Nevertheless, ILGA considers it a positive step that the Irish presidency had included sexual orientation in its proposals.

ILGA hopes that in the coming months of the new Dutch presidency of the E.U. that country will also support human rights concerns - including prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation - for inclusion in the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) negotiations on the Treaty revision, as has already been recommended by the European Parliament and Council.

"ILGA will continue in 1997 to campaign for the recognition of gay and lesbian rights in the European Union," declared Petit.

PROBLEMS WITH THE PARENTAL LEAVE EU-DIRECTIVE

By Mark Bell, European University Institute, Florence

On 29 March 1996, the Council of Ministers reached political agreement on the Parental Leave Directive. The Directive has an unhappy history - it was first proposed in 1983, then resubmitted by the Commission as an amended proposal in 1984, but met with deadlock in the Council of Ministers. Progress was finally facilitated through utilisation of the Agreement on Social Policy attached to the Treaty on European Union, allowing the other 14 Member States to proceed without the UK.

On 31 January 1996, the Commission published its new proposal for the Parental Leave Directive, based on an agreement reached between European employers and trades unions in November 1993. (COM (96) 26) The Directive creates two new rights for European employees: firstly, the right for men and women to take three months unpaid leave upon the birth or adoption of a child, and secondly, the right for all workers to take time off from work on the grounds of "urgent family reasons". The "urgent family reasons" are cases of "sickness or accident making the immediate presence of the worker indispensable." However, also significant was the proposal from the Commission that Article 2(3) of the Directive should state that "when Member States adopt the provisions to implement this Directive, these shall prohibit any discrimination based on race, sex, *sexual orientation*, colour, religion or nationality." (emphasis added).

Not only was the anti-discrimination provision of considerable symbolic importance, it also promised to be influential in securing a generous interpretation of the provisions of the Directive. Nowhere does the Directive actually define who qualifies as a "parent". Thus, would a lesbian be entitled to parental leave upon the birth of a child to her partner? The issue of leave for "urgent family reasons" also raises the

questions concerning the recognition of same-sex couples: would a gay man be entitled to claim the right to leave in the case of accident or illness affecting his partner and necessitating his immediate presence? Given the inclusion of the anti-discrimination provision, the answer to both these questions would surely have been 'yes'.

When the proposal came before the Council of Ministers, the Council amended the text to delete the anti-discrimination provision, and instead inserted a clause in the preamble stating "whereas the Community Charter on the Fundamental Social Rights of Workers recognises the importance of the fight against all forms of discrimination, especially based on sex, colour, race, opinions and creeds". (OJ 1996 L 145/4) Not only is that clause not binding upon the Member States, but it conspicuously excludes any reference to sexual orientation. The decision by the Council to reject the reference to sexual orientation is a significant set-back for all those campaigning for equal treatment of gay men and lesbians by the European Union, and illustrates the weak nature of the Member States' commitment to combating all forms of discrimination, as stated in the preamble of the Social Charter. Moreover, for once the decision cannot be simply blamed on British intransigence - suggesting that the obstacles to progress in this sphere of social policy extend far beyond the shores of the British Isles.

REPORT ON ILGA'S ACTIVITIES AT THE OSCE REVIEW CONFERENCE, VIENNA, NOVEMBER 1996

By Kurt Krickler

ILGA was represented by John Clark, Tom Lavell and myself. ILGA submitted a written presentation and gave two oral statements in Working Group 1c (on 5 and 8 November; see Euroletters # 45 and 46). Human Dimension Issues were discussed in the first two weeks of the meeting. As far as I am aware of, the lesbian and gay issue was only referred to in two statements of national delegations: The Statement of Ireland on behalf of the European Union on tolerance on 8 November mentioned "homosexuals" and "sexual orientation" three times. Romania dedicated a statement on 13 November solely to the issue of Article 200 (Penal Code) and gave factual information about the law reform process in Romania.

All working groups had rapporteurs who produced "official" reports which were presented to the final plenary and annexed to the plenary's minutes. The Canadian rapporteur of working group 1c included "our issue" in his report - in the section on "tolerance":

"Many delegations stressed the importance of tolerance, not only as an issue of human rights, but also as a matter of conflict prevention. Intolerance existed in all countries. A group of States noted that the problems of intolerance were not only those specified in the work programme, but also arose from discrimination on other grounds, such as gender or sexual orientation. Delegations and a large number of NGOs mentioned specific situations in participating States which they viewed as breaching OSCE commitments to tolerance and non discrimination, while other delegations raised their own problems and the programmes put in place to address these."

This inclusion in the report does, of course, not compensate for the non-mention of "our issue" in the (binding) final document of this review meeting which at the same time is the Lisbon Summit Declaration. However, it would have been totally unrealistic to expect non-discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation to be included in the Summit Declaration. This became already very clear in my first conversations with several delegations (I talked to delegates from the USA, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Spain, Ireland, Norway, Netherlands, and Sweden). Therefore, I did not invest much time and energy in lobbying the various delegations. The main reason is: Human Dimension issues have been dealt with extensively both in Copenhagen in 1990 and in Moscow in 1991 and in the Paris Charter; these issues will not be revisited in Final Documents anymore - and that's why "our issue" cannot be taken into account and added. If the issue would be addressed now in a binding document, it would be highlighted too prominently - and that would certainly not be accepted in the context of the OSCE with its consensus principle. Imagine a three pages declaration on the future security policies in Europe of which one paragraph is dedicated to homosexuality! Would be nice but is unrealistic. The format of the Lisbon Declaration, however, was focussed on European security politics. The review conference in Budapest two years ago was already going in this direction and was probably our last chance (which, unfortunately, did not materialise) to get our issue in a binding OSCE Document.

Another weak point is that the national OSCE delegations have not been lobbied beforehand. Usually, they get instructed back home before leaving for an OSCE meeting; when confronted at a busy OSCE meeting with a new specific and particular issue for the first time, delegations tend to be reluctant to take it up and contact their foreign offices in order to get new instructions. More concerted lobbying of ILGA members in the various OSCE countries before the start of any OSCE conference would be needed to make lobbying at the meetings more effective.

From this experience, I would, therefore, suggest that the ILGA working party reformulate its goals and aims towards the OSCE; we should simply forget getting non-discrimination based on sexual orientation in a binding OSCE document. ILGA should rather use the Implementation Meetings and the Review Conferences for two purposes:

- 1) lobby the delegations of countries with bad human rights records for lesbians and gays; this may turn out not to be very easy because here in Vienna, for instance, no delegation from the former Soviet republics in Asia (which I would have liked to talk with about repeal of total bans on homosexuality) attended the sessions of Working Group 1c;
- 2) highlight positive and negative developments in the OSCE in oral statements and bring forward well-documented examples and cases of human rights violations in OSCE countries; even Romania felt obliged to reply to the meeting on Article 200!

It is unclear at the moment when and where the next implementation and review meetings and summits will take place but it was obvious in Vienna that many delegations pleaded for longer intervals between them. Turkey, in any case, has offered to host the next summit in Istanbul. Denmark will take over the function of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office for the calendar year 1997, unfortunately not up until the next Summit because this function is crucial in preparing the agenda and the draft wording of the final document. But maybe Steffen/LBL nevertheless could intensify his contacts with the Danish OSCE delegation in order to promote "our issue". Poland will be Chairman-in-Office in 1998.

The OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) in Warsaw, by the way, is taking lesbian and gay issues into account in their reports. In October, 1996, ODIHR published background material for the Vienna Review Conference. In the document with the title "Respect for Civil Liberties in the OSCE Region", a sub-chapter is dedicated to "Imprisonment/Detention on the grounds of homosexuality". It reads as follows:

"There are three countries in the OSCE region, where homosexual relations are still considered a criminal offence. Most available data on related cases is dated from before September 1995, it is therefore in our previous report, so it is not included here. However, it is possible to say that at least in one of those countries people are actually imprisoned and detained on the grounds of homosexuality. In one other country, although decriminalisation of homosexual acts was rejected by the Parliament together with a draft Penal Code at the end of 1995, a Minister of Justice

decision confirming decriminalisation of homosexual acts put a stop to imprisonment. Thus, it is possible to say that the situation has improved since the previous report and there is only one country actually punishing people for a different sexual orientation."

SPANISH SOCIALIST PARTY HAS SUBMITTED A PARTNERSHIP LAW TO SPANISH PARLIAMENT

By Cesar Cleston

On The Socialist Party (PSOE) has submitted to the Spanish Parliament a draft for a partnership law which would grant pension, inheritance, fiscal and other similar benefits to heterosexual as well as to gay /lesbian partnerships. Nevertheless, the right of adoption for unmarried couples has been not included. On the other hand, at virtually at the same time, the Party in Office, the conservative MP Bernarda Barrios, member of the christian-based Popular Party (PP) has made public that the Government and her party were ready to pass such a law, though, like the socialist draft, his party stood against the right of adoption.

Since the beginning of this legislature, at the beginning of 1996, when the socialist lost office after thirteen years, and when the conservatives gained power, the Fundacion Triangulo has already held talks with virtually all the parliament groups in order to have a partnership law passed.

Hereinafter, the summary of such talks Izquierda Unida (mainly communists and socialists) ERC (catalan leftist independentists, Bloque Nacionalista Galego (galician leftist independentists) PNV (christian-democrat basque nationalists) and PSOE - socialists formerly in office, were completely in favour.

CiU (liberal and christian democrat liberal catalans) and Coalicion Canaria (Canary Islands Regionalists) said they were in favor of having such a bill passed but, since they are a part of the coalition in Parliament with the PP, the party in office, said they would not vote such a bill unconditionally if the government were to submit their own draft. They nevertheless acknowledged to representatives of the Fundacion they would be voting in favor of the socialist bill should the government not submit a bill of their own.

It should be stressed that the current government is in minority and depends on the votes of CiU and Coalicion Canaria; such votes added to those of the other parties in the opposition would be enough to have the bill passed without the party in office voting in favor.

So far, the PP -the party in office- has held talks with the Fundacion Triangulo at different levels: The

General Secretary for Social Affairs, Ms Amalia Gomez and the MP Maria J. Camilleri. They both stated the Partnership Bill was no priority to their government. However, on oct. 28, when it was clear the socialists were to submit their own bill, Ms Barrios, a PP MP said the media the Government was in favor of providing some legal solution for partnerships, whether gay or straight. Ms Barrios also said the Fundacion Triangulo the Partnership Bill would be passed within this legislature, before year 2000.

Some Spanish lesbigay groups have jeopardized the partnership bill when stating they would be dismissing any project not including adoption; this even led the socialist to consider not presenting their bill in order not to attract criticism from gay groups. Such is not the position of the Fundacion Triangulo. From our point of view, passing such a Law -also without adoptions- would be such a great step forward; The Fundacion will increase their very best efforts to have such a law passed, also trying the party in office not to vote against.

The great risk now is that parliamentary procedures take so long we might be racing against time and losing, as it already happened when the Socialist Party was in office.

SWITZERLAND: GAY AND LESBIANS ARE SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS

by Marcel Ryser, Pink Cross and HAB

The Swiss Government presented on Tuesday November 21st 1996 its proposal for a new Swiss Constitution which is to be put into force in 1998 at the earliest.

The proposal incorporates results of a public opinion poll. In the process of this poll about two dozen organisations and parties and nearly 400 citizens have requested an extension of the Anti-Discrimination Article (Article 7 of the new Constitution) in such a way as to include 'sexual orientation' together with race, religion, gender, etc.

Unfortunately the government chose to disregard that claim. Government is not prepared to recognize that g/l/b/t people are in fact being discriminated as the government's proposal for the wording of the Anti-Discrimination-Article does not mention g/l/b/t people.

In a simultaneous press release Pink Cross (the national gay organisation) and LOS (Lesbian Organisation of Switzerland) have indignantly taken note of the government's decision. They have pointed out the inconsistent attitude of the Government if its 'Eidg. Justiz- und Polizeidepartement' (Federal Ministry of

Justice and Police) merely wants to include so-called "real" discriminations in the wording of the Anti-Discrimination Article, while at the same time disapproving of - and thereby exerting discrimination against - any constitutional protection for lesbians and gay people, although it is a recognised fact that g/l/b/t people are being disadvantaged in Swiss society and force is being used against some of its members.

The government's proposal is now going to be debated by parliamentary commissions and then by Parliament in 1997.

Pink Cross and LOS will fight hard on different levels for an extension of the Anti-Discriminating Article to include sexual orientation as well.

DUTCH SECOND CHAMBER OF PARLIAMENT AGREES ON PARTNERSHIP REGISTRATION

By Michiel Odijk

Dutch lesbian and gay couples as well as straight couples will get the opportunity of legal registration of their relationship in city halls. The Second Chamber of the Dutch Parliament (the House) agreed in principle on a bill with this intent.

The Dutch registered partnership will grant the same rights to couples as matrimony, except for legal consequences towards children. Delegates from the parties represented in the coalition government of the social-democrat party (PvdA), the right-wing liberal party (VVD) and the left-wing liberal party (D66) welcomed the arrangement as an important step. This was evident during the debate in parliament on the 4th of December. "This is the first time that government acknowledges that same-sex couples and opposite-sex couples have the same rights," PvdA representative Van der Burg said. "This is a milestone."

She told that there should be no mistake that she would also strive at opening up civil marriage for gays and lesbians. Van der Stoep (VVD) and Dittich (D66) agreed completely about that. Earlier this year it became evident that there is a majority of delegates in the Second Chamber of Parliament in favour of opening up civil marriage. In April the Chamber adopted a motion by PvdA and D66 that called upon the government to abolish the legal prohibition of same-sex marriage. 81 delegates were in favour, 60 against.

Fundamental opponents of opening up civil marriage are to be found in the Christian Democrat party and the small Christian (right-wing) parties. The Christian

democrats are in favour of partnership registration, but do not think that this regulation is necessary for couples of opposite sex. Christian Democrats do not oppose to living-together, said their representative Bremmer, but they think that straight couples will either marry or stay unregistered.

The debate on opening up marriage will take place separately. The situation is now that a special commission has been appointed by the government to sort out the legal consequences, especially for adoption from foreign countries. The commission will submit its advice to the government in about half a year.

If the Second Chamber of Parliament would agree on opening up marriage, the Senate would also have to approve legal changes before they would become effective (as in every legal change). It seems that the Senate is not as progressive as the Second Chamber of Parliament is.

86 COUNTRIES BAN GAY SEX

By Rex Wockner

Eighty-six nations (or semi-independent states) ban gay-male sex and 44 of those countries also prohibit lesbian sex, according to data accumulated by the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission in San Francisco.

Gay-male sex is illegal in Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua & Barbuda, Armenia, Australia (Tasmania state only), Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei, Burma, Cameroon, Cape Verde Islands, Cayman Islands, Chile, Cook Islands, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Ghana, Guyana, India, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libya, Macedonia, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Niue, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Puerto Rico, Qatar, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa (which is also the only nation in the world with a ban on anti-gay discrimination in its constitution), Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Togo, Tokelau, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Turks and Caicos Islands, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United States of America (21 of 50 states), Uzbekistan, Western Samoa, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The states which ban gay-male sex but do not ban lesbian sex are Antigua & Barbuda, Armenia, Australia (Tasmania), Azerbaijan, Bahrain,

Bosnia-Herzegovina, Botswana, Burma, Cayman Islands, Chile, Cook Islands, Cyprus, Ecuador, Fiji, Georgia, Ghana, India, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgystan, Macedonia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Tokelau, Tonga, Turkmenistan, Turks and Caicos Islands, Tuvalu, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

In most instances, lesbian sex is permitted because sexist legislators didn't think to ban it rather than because of good will toward lesbians.

Corrections to these lists should be sent to IGLHRC, 1360 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103. Telephone: (415) 255-8680. Fax: (415) 255-8662. E-mail: iglhrc@iglhrc.org.