



OUT IN OFFICE

LGBT Legislators and LGBT Rights Around the World

Andrew Reynolds





Photo Credit: The front cover photo was taken in Madison, Wisconsin, on February 22, 2011 by drwMrk. flickr.com

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to research assistance at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill provided by Alissandra Stoyan, Elizabeth Menninga, Ali Yanus, Alison Evarts, Mary Koenig, Allison Garren, Olivia Burchett, and Desiree Smith. Comments and advice were gratefully received from Layna Mosley, George Walker, John Sweet, Arnold Fleischmann, Gary Mucciaroni, Holning Lau, and Stephen Gent.

Graphic design by UNC Marketing and Design with thanks to Megan M. Johnson and Chelsea Woerner.

Monica Byrne did a wonderful job of editing the text.

Andrew Reynolds

Andrew Reynolds is an Associate Professor of Political Science at UNC Chapel Hill and the Chair of Global Studies. He received his M.A. from the University of Cape Town and his Ph.D. from the University of California, San Diego. His research and teaching focus on democratization, constitutional design and electoral politics. He is particularly interested in the presence and impact of minorities and marginalized communities. He has worked for the United Nations, the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), the UK Department for International Development, the US State Department, the National Democratic Institute, the International Republican Institute, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the International Foundation for Election Systems. He has also served as a consultant on issues of electoral and constitutional design for Afghanistan, Angola, Burma, Egypt, Fiji, Guyana, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon,

Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Netherlands, Netherlands Antilles, Northern Ireland, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Yemen, and Zimbabwe. He has received research awards from the U.S. Institute of Peace, the National Science Foundation, the US Agency for International Development, and the Ford Foundation. Among his books are *Designing Democracy in a Dangerous World* (Oxford, 2011), *The Architecture of Democracy: Constitutional Design, Conflict Management, and Democracy* (Oxford, 2002), *Electoral Systems and Democratization in Southern Africa* (Oxford, 1999), *Election 99 South Africa: From Mandela to Mbeki* (St. Martin's, 1999), and *Elections and Conflict Management in Africa* (USIP, 1998), co-edited with T. Sisk. His forthcoming book *Modest Harvest: Legacies and Limits of the Arab Spring* (co-authored with Jason Brownlee [UT Austin] and Tarek Masoud [Harvard]) will be published by Oxford. In 2012 he embarked on a two year research project to study the impact of LGBT national parliamentarians on public policy around the world. His articles have appeared in journals including the *American Political Science Review*, *World Politics*, *Democratization*, *Politics and Society*, *Electoral Studies*, *Journal of Democracy*, *The Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, and *Political Science Quarterly*. He has published opinion pieces in the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Chicago Tribune*, *Christian Science Monitor*, and *San Diego Union Tribune*. His work has been translated into French, Spanish, Arabic, Serbo-Croat, Albanian, Burmese, Thai, and Portuguese.

Published 2013 by the LGBT Representation and Rights Initiative at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Second Edition November 2013.

Table of Contents

| | |
|----|--|
| 4 | Executive Summary |
| 6 | The Importance of Representation |
| 7 | Descriptive Representation and Policy Making |
| 8 | Out LGBT Elected Officials |
| 10 | Upper House Members, Cabinet Ministers and Local Officials |
| 11 | Table: LGBT Cabinet Ministers |
| 14 | Explaining LGBT Candidate Success |
| 16 | The Evolution of Equality in Law and Sexual Orientation |
| 23 | Transgender Representation and Rights |
| 25 | Conclusion |
| 29 | LGBT Members of National Legislatures |

Executive Summary

Major Finding

Even when present in small numbers, LGBT legislators have a direct and significant effect on the enactment of pro-LGBT legislation. Their presence reinforces a climate of transformation of values. Individual legislators can nurture familiarity and acceptance from their straight colleagues, who, by and large, become more supportive of gay rights when they know someone who is gay. Out LGBT MPs are symbols of progress which reinforce new norms of (voting) behavior. Last, LGBT MPs can be legislative entrepreneurs, advocating, setting agendas and building alliances with straight legislators to put equality issues on agendas and marshal majorities in favor.

We investigate the link between the presence of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) members of parliament (MPs) around the world and the enactment of laws that ensure equity and protection for LGBT persons.

We ask three major questions:


- 1 *How many openly LGBT legislators serve or have served in national legislatures?*
 - 2 *What factors determine their success from nation to nation?*
 - 3 *What is the relationship between the presence of these legislators and the enactment of laws that promote equal rights for LGBT people?*
-

190 openly lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender legislators have been elected to serve in national office in 30 countries since 1976: As of November 2013 there were 113 Members of Parliament in 25 countries: 86 gay men, 22 lesbians, four bisexual, and one transgender MP. There were 95 lower house members and 18 upper house members.

In our study 96 countries (those with and without LGBT MPs) were scored on the progressiveness of their LGBT legislation on a scale from -2 (the most homophobic) to 6 (the closest to equality). Globally, in 2003 the average score was 0.47, in 2008 it had risen to 0.98, and by 2011 it was 1.18. There is a clear relationship between LGBT MPs' presence and progressive law. The 27 countries who have experienced at least one LGBT MP averaged 3.6 in 2011, while the 69 nations with no LGBT MPs averaged 0.3.

1976 - 2013

LGBT MPs



179 MPs



28 Senators/Lords

207 Total

Prime Ministers



3 Total

Cabinet Ministers



28 Total

A country that has elected an LGBT MP is fourteen times more likely to have marriage equality or civil union/registered partner laws.

No country in our dataset declined in its overall LGBT legal rights between 2003 and 2011; 48 nations improved, while the other 48 stayed the same.

The likelihood of a candidate being open about their LGBT identity, when running for office, has increased dramatically over time. Up until 1999, only 48% were out when first elected (the rest came out while in office); after 1999, 93% were out when elected.

Most progress has been made in the form of laws that ban discrimination in employment and services, and the least progress in laws that define and punish hate crimes.

A country's dominant religion showed no demonstrable effect as a factor influencing the likely election of openly LGBT MPs.

The majority of openly LGBT MPs have been members of left wing or post-materialist political parties. However, a surprisingly large and growing number of MPs come from conservative and right wing parties.

In terms of electoral systems, LGBT MPs are now almost as likely to be elected in single member districts as they are in party list (proportional systems).

The findings in this policy paper are based on research outlined in greater detail in Andrew Reynolds. "Representation and Rights: The Impact of LGBT Legislators in Comparative Perspective," *American Political Science Review*, Vol 107, No.2 (May 2013).



Top: Baron Alli United Kingdom
Bottom: Kyrsten Sinema USA

The Importance of Representation

The presence of women and ethnic minorities in national parliaments is an indicator of strength of democracy. In 2012, the Inter Parliamentary Union identified 7,443 female members of national lower houses (20% of the total). Such descriptive (sometimes called 'passive' or 'symbolic') representation does not necessarily imply that women vote together or vote to protect the specific interests of their sex. However, it does mean that their faces and voices are present in a lawmaking body, and, therefore, present in decision-makers' minds. Other research, including one of the largest surveys to date of over a thousand ethnic minority MPs, shows that their presence in national legislatures has a similar effect.

However, there is very little research on the existence and influence of openly LGBT MPs across nations. As the study of the role of LGBT politicians enters the mainstream of academic and public policy research, and we seek to facilitate the creation of inclusive legislatures, this research becomes crucial. Furthermore, politicians around the world are increasingly using 'gay issues' as a wedge issue in election campaigns. Homophobia is a potent weapon for candidates

from Zimbabwe to Malaysia to the United States. As such issues dominate national campaigns, the need to represent the community at risk becomes more urgent. This study is important not only for its parallels with other cases of descriptive representation, but also because the data enhance our understanding of how openly LGBT candidates can succeed.

Descriptive Representation and Substantive Policy Making

Based on research on the representation of women and ethnic minorities, we presumed that the presence of LGBT legislators in a national assembly would enable the passage of laws that protect LGBT equality. However, while women and ethnic minority legislators may need a critical mass of legislators to be influential, LGBT legislators do not. Fewer LGBT MPs may have an equal or greater impact than their female or minority colleagues because, to varying degrees, LGBT people around the world have been driven underground for most of modern history; therefore, LGBT people are usually fully integrated in society, but invisible. There is strong evidence to suggest that, in general, heterosexuals become more supportive of LGBT rights when they realize they know someone who is LGBT. Globally, there are billions of people who do not realize that they know someone who is LGBT, whether it is a family member, friend, or colleague at work. Their mere visibility makes more of an impact.

However, there remains a debate over whether descriptive representation leads to substantive (or active) representation, in which a group's interests are protected by the presence of their own community in elected office. Some believe that engineering a highly inclusive legislature, made up of all of the significant majority and minority groups in society, is key to good governance and democratic stability. But others caution that simple inclusion in elective office may only lead to superficial symbolic rewards.

How might descriptive representation lead to substantive representation when the number of LGBT legislators is so small? A fuller answer to that question requires an in-depth analysis of the case histories of individual LGBT MPs, and the second stage of this project will survey the LGBT MPs identified in the first stage. But present evidence suggests that, when LGBT MPs act as advocates for LGBT issues such as the adoption of domestic partner benefits, they must almost always build alliances with heterosexual allies due to their low numbers.


Of course, other factors contribute to the passage of LGBT-friendly legislation. In countries where acceptance of homosexuality is high, and a majority of the electorate supports same-sex marriage and adoption rights (e.g., Sweden, Netherlands, Iceland, and Denmark), advocating equal rights for LGBTs wins votes for any political party. Other research notes the impact of



Top: Jani Toivola Finland
Bottom: Penny Wong Australia



Top: Jóhanna Sigurðardóttir Iceland
Bottom: Coos Huijsen Netherlands



transnational human rights advocacy groups. Diffusion of new 'human rights norms' then occurs through networks of governmental actors, judges, legislators, and bureaucrats. If openly LGBT politicians are part of these networks, they may aid in the diffusion of such laws.

In this paper, we test the hypothesis that the more openly LGBT MPs there are in parliament, the more progressive a nation's legislation will be when it comes to issues of LGBT rights. To test this hypothesis, we first examine the specific relationship between LGBT MPs and policy regarding marriage/civil unions. We then examine the impact of LGBT MPs on broader policy, measured through a cumulative score of national law as it relates to six LGBT issues. We include control measures for: (i) social attitudes (a society's tolerance of homosexuality as measured by the World Values Survey and Pew Global Attitudes Survey), (ii) level of democracy (as measured by POLITY IV on a 21-point scale ranging from -10 [hereditary monarchy] to +10 [consolidated democracy]), (iii) development (the annual United Nations Human Development Index), (iv) European Union membership (Yes or No by year), (v) government type (left, center, or right), and (vi) electoral system (Plurality-Majority, Semi Proportional Representation, or Proportional Representation).

Out LGBT Elected Officials

We analyzed the legislatures of nation states between 1976 and 2013 to collect the number of LGBT MPs. Such data have not been systematically gathered or presented before; as such, two issues of data collection arose: (i) How does one identify openly LGBT MPs?, and (ii) What legislation indicates LGBT equality?

To address the first question, we employed a simple rule of thumb when gathering data. MPs were counted only if they had publicly stated or acknowledged that they are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. They may have stated this through the media, campaign literature, biographies, or personal web sites. Some MPs may have acknowledged their sexual orientation after being outed, but nevertheless, they made a clear statement at some point. If a politician denied that s/he is LGBT, s/he was not included. Our data sources included country experts and experts in the LGBT field, politicians' personal websites, and media reports. Of course, this method undercounts the actual number of LGBT MPs, but this research is focused explicitly on openly LGBT MPs.

We use the data from six time points: 1983, 1988, 1998, 2003, 2008, and 2011. We identify

a total of 179 LGBT MPs elected to the national assemblies/lower houses of 27 countries. As of November 2013, among the countries we surveyed, there were 95 MPs holding office in 20 countries (73 gay men, 17 lesbians, four bisexual and one transgender MP). The largest number was 24 in the British House of Commons.

Though the number of openly LGBT MPs has increased substantially over the last forty years, the total numbers remain small. The growth in the numbers of gay men versus lesbians in elected office has kept pace over time, with approximately three gay male MPs for every lesbian MP. The first openly LGBT MP in modern history is a matter of debate; for example, the British MP Tom Driberg was known to be gay without ever publicly stating so. Marilyn Waring was elected as an MP in New Zealand in 1975, then was outed by a newspaper in 1976, and on the advice of her party leader, refused to comment. Maureen Colquhoun was a British MP between 1974-1979, coming out as a lesbian in 1977. Coos Huijsen was elected to the Dutch parliament in 1972 and again between 1976-1977, but did not come out until 1977. We record six gay and lesbian MPs in 1983, eight in 1988, 36 in 1998, 60 in 2003, 80 in 2008, 101 in 2011, and 107 in April 2013.


The LGBT MPs are also overwhelmingly of the majority ethnic group within their nation state. In the dataset there are only six ethnic minority LGBT MPs – Jani Petteri Toivola (Finland) is of Kenyan and

Finnish descent, Charles Chauvel (New Zealand) is of Tahitian ancestry, and Louisa Wall and Georgina Beyer (also of New Zealand) are Maori, while the two South African MPs are both white South Africans of European ancestry.


Forty-one of the MPs were not out at the time of their first election to parliament but came out during their time in office, and the other 129 were out when first elected. The incidence of candidates declaring LGBT identity while running for office increased over time. Up until 1999, only 48% were out when first elected, but after 1999, 93% were out when elected.

The vast majority of LGBT MPs have been elected in the established democracies of Western Europe, North America, and Australasia (91% in 2013). However, at the beginning of 2013, there were three Central/Eastern European LGBT MPs, two African, two Latin American, one Middle Eastern, and one Asian. The nations that had LGBT MPs before, but had none in 2013, were Austria, Hungary, and Portugal.

Growth of LGBT MPs



LGBT MPs in Office



LGBT Senate/ Upper House Members

| Name | Years in Office | Party Affiliation |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|
| AUSTRALIA | | |
| ✓ Bob Brown | 1996–2012 | Green |
| ✓ Brian Andrew Greig | 1999–2005 | Dem. |
| ✓ Penny Wong | 2002– | Labor |
| ✓ Louise Pratt | 2008– | Labor |
| ✓ Dean Smith | 2012–2013 | Liberal |
| ARGENTINA | | |
| ★ Osvaldo López | 2011– | Fresh Encounter |
| CANADA | | |
| ★ Laurier LaPierre | 2001–2004 | Liberal |
| ★ Nancy Ruth | 2005– | Con. |
| CZECH REPUBLIC | | |
| ✓ Vaclav Fischer | 1999–2002 | Ind. |
| GERMANY | | |
| ★ Klaus Wowereit | 2001–2002 | Social Dem. |
| IRELAND | | |
| ✓ David Norris | 1987– | Ind. |
| ★ Katherine Zappone | 2011– | Ind. |
| ITALY | | |
| ★ Emilio Colombo | 2003–2013 | UDC |
| NETHERLANDS | | |
| ✓ Gerard Schouw | 2003–2010 | D66 |
| SPAIN | | |
| ✓ Jerónimo Saavedra Acevedo | 1996–2003 | PSOE |
| SWITZERLAND | | |
| ✓ Claude Janiak | 2007– | Social Dem. |
| UK | | |
| ● 3rd Baron Montagu of Beaulieu | 1945– | Con. |
| ● 2nd Viscount Maugham | 1958–1981 | Ind. |
| ★ Baron Alli | 1998– | Labour |
| ★ Baron Browne of Madingley | 2001– | Ind. |
| ★ Baron Smith of Finsbury | 2005– | Labour |
| ★ Rt. Hon Lord Justice Etherton | 2008– | Judiciary |
| ★ Baroness Stedman-Scott | 2010– | Con. |
| ★ Baron Black of Brentwood | 2010– | Con. |
| ★ Baron Gold of Westcliffe-on-Sea | 2010– | Con. |
| ★ Baron Glendonbrook of Bowdon | 2011– | Con. |
| ★ Baron Collins of Highbury | 2011– | Labour |
| USA | | |
| ✓ Tammy Baldwin | 2010– | Dem. |
| ★ Appointed ✓ Elected ✓ Indirectly Elected ● Inherited | | |

Upper House Members, Cabinet Ministers and Local Officials

There have been 28 Senators/Lords elected or appointed to the upper parliamentary chambers of twelve countries, 21 gay men, one bisexual man and six women. Most nations had LGBT MPs in their lower houses before they had Senators or Lords but David Norris was an Irish Senator for 25 years before two out gay men were elected to the Irish Dail. Osvaldo López was elected to the Argentinean Senate in 2011 while no LGBT candidate has ever been elected to the Argentine lower house. Eleven of the upper house members were elected (thus bringing the total number of out LGBT MPs elected to national office to 190 as of 2013) while the rest were appointed.

There have been 28 LGBT cabinet ministers in the governments of 18 countries since 1995 (23 men and 5 women). An additional two ministers came out after leaving office. Two countries have had out cabinet ministers without ever having had LGBT members of parliament, Ecuador and the Czech Republic. Outside of the three Prime Ministers, there has been one Foreign Minister

(Germany) and five Economics/Finance ministers (Australia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway and the UK). The only place where a top legal job has been occupied by a gay man is in New Zealand. LGB politicians when appointed to cabinet posts are more likely to oversee Environmental (5) or Culture (4) portfolios. Outside of Ecuador and the Czech Republic it took an average of 16 years after the first LGBT MP was elected to parliament before an LGBT politician was appointed to a cabinet level position.


These trends are confirmed at the sub-national level, where, if anything, the growth in LGBT elected officials has been more impressive. The U.S.-based Gay and Lesbian Victory Institute identified 764 appointed and elected officials worldwide in August 2008, at all levels of government (http://www.glli.org/out_officials), the vast majority at the local level. In the United States, there were approximately 20 openly LGBT individuals in elected office in 1987, 52 in 1991, 146 in 1998, and 180 in 2000. By 2003, the Victory Fund noted that 218 of the roughly 511,000 Americans in elective office were openly LGBT—less than 0.05%. Three served in Congress, 47 in state legislatures, and the rest in local government. By 2008, the total number of LGBT officeholders in the US had tripled to 602, including 79 state legislators and 28 mayors.

LGBT Cabinet Ministers

| | | | |
|----------------|--|--|---|
| AUSTRALIA | Penny Wong | 2007–2013 2010–2013 | Climate Change Finance and Deregulation |
| BELGIUM | Elio di Rupo | 2011– | Prime Minister |
| CANADA | Scott Brison | 2004–2006 | Public Works |
| CZECH REPUBLIC | Gustáv Slamečka | 2009–2010 | Transport |
| DENMARK | Uffe Elbæk | 2011–2012 | Culture |
| ECUADOR | Carina Mafla | 2012– | Public Health |
| FINLAND | Pekka Haavisto | 1995–1999 | Environment |
| FRANCE | Roger Karoutchi Frederic Mitterrand | 2009 2009–2011 | Parliamentary Relations Culture |
| GERMANY | Guido Westerwelle | 2009– | Foreign Minister |
| HUNGARY | Gábor Szetey | 2006–2008 | Human Resources |
| ICELAND | Jóhanna Sigurðardóttir | 2007–2009 2009– | Social Affairs Prime Minister |
| ITALY | Alfonso Pecoraro Scanio | 2000–2001 2006–2008 | Agriculture Environment |
| NETHERLANDS | Joop Wijn Gerda Verberg Jans Kees de Jager | 2006 2007– 2010– | Economic Affairs Agriculture, Nature & Food Finance |
| NEW ZEALAND | Chris Carter Maryan Street Chris Finlayson | 2004–2005 2005–2007 2007–2008 2007–2008 2008– 2008– | Housing Building Education Housing Attorney General Arts and Culture |
| NORWAY | Per-Kristian Foss | 2001–2005 2002 | Finance Acting PM |
| SWEDEN | Tobias Billström Andreas Carlgren | 2006– 2006– | Migration Environment |
| SWITZERLAND | Claude Janiak | 2004–2005 | President |
| UK | Chris Smith Peter Mandelson Nick Brown Ben Bradshaw David Laws | 1997–2001 1998–1999 1999–2001 2008–2009 1998–2001 2009–2010 2010 | Culture Trade & Industry Northern Ireland Business Agriculture Culture, Media & Sport Chief Secretary to Treasury |


| Country | # | First |
|----------------|----|-------|
| Argentina | 1 | 2011 |
| Australia | 5 | 1996 |
| Austria | 1 | 1999 |
| Belgium | 3 | 2003 |
| Brazil | 2 | 2006 |
| Canada | 13 | 1988 |
| Czech Republic | 1 | 1999 |
| Denmark | 7 | 1977 |
| Finland | 4 | 1987 |
| France | 2 | 1998 |
| Germany | 21 | 1985 |
| Hungary | 1 | 1990 |
| Iceland | 1 | 1987 |
| Ireland | 5 | 2011 |
| Israel | 2 | 2002 |
| Italy | 9 | 1983 |

LGBT Members of Parliament
1977–2013




| Country | # | First |
|--------------|----|-------|
| Lithuania | 1 | 2008 |
| Luxembourg | 1 | 1999 |
| Mexico | 3 | 1997 |
| Nepal | 1 | 2008 |
| Netherlands | 21 | 1981 |
| New Zealand | 10 | 1984 |
| Norway | 9 | 1977 |
| Poland | 2 | 2011 |
| Portugal | 1 | 2010 |
| Spain | 1 | 2000 |
| South Africa | 2 | 1999 |
| Sweden | 16 | 1991 |
| Switzerland | 4 | 1995 |
| UK | 44 | 1977 |
| USA | 13 | 1983 |

Political Ideology and LGBT MPs



Electoral Systems and LGBT MPs



Explaining LGBT Candidate Success

If the presence of openly LGBT officeholders does advance progressive law, it is useful to ask: what factors facilitate and hinder the election of LGBT candidates? Explaining electoral success helps us to better understand what drives the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation.

One might consider party ideology a strong factor; historically, left parties were more likely to have ideologies rooted in the protection and promotion of marginalized communities. On the other hand, we know that electoral systems can often mold the access that minorities have to elected office. Previous studies have found significant links between the proportionality and district magnitude of the electoral system and the probability of ethnic minority and female success. Thus, the electoral system in use should also affect the success of candidates from a geographically dispersed community like LGBTs. Finally, one might hypothesize that the level of democracy—with established democracies more likely built on civil rights, with higher levels of social tolerance and open LGBT activism—

influences LGBT candidate success.

The data partially confirm these hypotheses, but also leave significant space for the legislators as individuals. The majority of openly LGBT MPs have been members of left or post-materialist parties. In early 2013, 59 of the 111 LGBT MPs were members of Social Democratic, Socialist, Communist, or Green parties. Proportionately, Green parties have elected more LGBT MPs than other political movements over the last forty years. However, a surprisingly large and growing number of MPs come from conservative parties. In 2013, there were 24 Conservative/Right MPs, almost as many as the cohort of centrist/liberal MPs, demonstrating the most rapid growth among any political ideology. The burgeoning number of LGBT Conservative MPs rests in part on Prime Minister David Cameron's decision to promote a number of out candidates in the 2010 British General Election.

Certainly, left or socially liberal parties are more likely to have ideologies sympathetic to LGBT inclusion, and as the total number of LGBT MPs grows, we might expect a higher proportion of them to come from left or liberal parties. However, voter hostility and party leadership reticence still preclude mainstream parties from backing substantive numbers of openly LGBT candidates.

Political history would suggest that electoral systems matter greatly to the chances of openly

LGBT candidates being elected. Of all electoral systems, list proportional representation (List PR) systems are the most inclusive of women and minority candidates, as they tend to give political parties a means of bypassing some of the prejudices of the electorate by putting minority candidates on their lists.

The expectation that LGBT members are clearly more likely to be elected from list proportional representation systems than from majoritarian systems is confounded by the data. The number of gay MPs elected under single member district systems has tracked closely the number elected by list PR. In 2013 there were only 11 fewer first past the post gay MPs than list PR MPs. It is true that if one aggregates all PR systems – List, Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) and the Single Transferable Vote (STV) – then more LGBT MPs are elected by PR methods but the theory that ‘hiding’ on a list of candidates is the only way for openly gay candidates to be elected is not borne out by the data.

Apart from Nepal, all the countries where LGBT MPs have been elected were democracies, but the correlation between the percentage of LGBT MPs and the POLITY score for democracy is never high (.18 in 1998, .29 in 2003, .28 in 2008 and .29 in 2011). Most of the 27 cases are long-established democracies; the exceptions are South Africa, Mexico, Brazil, and Lithuania where democratic regimes may be too young to be


considered consolidated. However, having openly LGBT MPs is not inevitable in a progressive and democratic polity. Most striking are the cases of Andorra, Colombia and Spain, which have high scores on the LGBT law scale but have never had openly LGBT MPs in their national assemblies. It is unsurprising that LGBT MPs are found more often in countries where public opinion tolerates homosexuality, but in Brazil, Mexico, Lithuania, Poland, and South Africa, for example, there exist LGBT MPs even where most voters categorize homosexuality as unjustifiable.




Top: Barney Frank USA
Bottom: Libby Davies Canada

LGBT Laws 2003-2012

Positive Indicators



Negative Indicators



The Evolution of Equality in Law and Sexual Orientation

To establish the relationship between the presence of LGBT legislators and progressive law in each nation, we ask the following questions:

- Are same-sex acts between consenting adults legal? (Yes 0, No -1)
- Are same-sex couples allowed to marry? (Yes 1, No 0)
- Are same-sex couples allowed to enter civil unions/partnerships? (Yes 1, No 0)
- Can same-sex couples and LGBT individuals adopt children? (Yes 1, No 0)
- Are there national/federal laws against discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation? (Yes 1, No 0)
- Is homophobia a distinct category of hate crime law? (Yes 1, No 0)
- Does the nation state ban LGB people from military service? (Yes 1, No -1, silent 0)



Laws that speak specifically to the rights of the transgender community are shown on page 24.

For each case, we generate an index, with values ranging from -2 to 6. Higher values indicate greater equality. We code 96 countries for which data were available, 27 that have or have had open LGBTs MPs and 69 that have not. The highest equality law scores in 2011 were in Sweden and the Netherlands (which received a maximum score), with Belgium, Canada, Iceland, Norway, South Africa, and Spain close behind. The most homophobic legal constructs—where there are no LGBT rights and homosexuality is illegal—exist in Algeria, Bangladesh, Egypt, Lebanon, Malaysia, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Uzbekistan, Zambia and Zimbabwe, although de facto practice in the treatment of LGBT persons varies across these cases.

The numbers demonstrate both the advances LGBT rights have made around the world and the continuing chasm between the rights of heterosexual and LGBT people. In 2003 the average score of all cases was 0.47, in 2008 it had risen to 0.98, and by 2011 it was 1.18. The largest increases between 2003 and 2011 occurred in Andorra, Argentina, Brazil, Serbia, and Uruguay. In our dataset no country declined in its overall LGBT legal rights between 2003 and 2011, but 48 nations improved, while the other 48 stayed the same.

Most progress has come in laws that ban discrimination in employment and services. In

LGB Legal Equality
2012





Top: Volker Beck Germany
Bottom: Jean Wyllys Brazil

2003, only 22 of the 96 cases had such provisions on the books, but by 2011 that number had more than doubled to 47. In 2003 same-sex couples were only allowed to adopt children in five cases, and by 2011, it was 17. There was less dramatic progress in hate crime law: 15 cases in 2003, 20 in 2011. Last, in 2003, 27 cases allowed LGBT citizens into their military forces while 24 cases banned them from serving. Eight years later, 36 cases explicitly said yes to LGBT soldiers while 21 still maintained a ban.

In 2003, only two nations had recognized same-sex marriage (Belgium and the Netherlands), but by the end of 2011, ten nations offered same-sex marriage. As of 2011, civil unions or registered partnerships were much more common, available (to some degree) in an additional 19 countries. One must stress that legal protection of LGBT rights do not guarantee in any way that homophobia, hate, and discrimination aimed against LGBT people are wiped out in a society. South Africa most vividly illustrates this truism, with strong constitutional protections of a social order that continues to be deeply homophobic in many regards. Nevertheless, legal and constitutional provisions pushing towards equality are significant advances for LGBT rights both substantially and symbolically.

There is a clear relationship between LGBT MPs' presence and progressive law. The 27 countries with at least one LGBT MP average 3.6 in 2011, while the 69 nations with no LGBT MPs

average 0.3. On average, nations with LGBT MPs have significant equality clauses in their laws while those nations without have virtually no LGBT rights.

But does a nation implement progressive laws when their parliament includes a handful of dynamic and persuasive openly LGBT MPs, or are we more likely to see openly LGBT MPs in a polity that has already demonstrated its commitment to equality through progressive laws promoted and passed by straight legislators? This question is partially addressed by an analysis of nations offering same sex marriage.

Of the ten countries with same-sex marriage on the books as of 2012, eight had openly LGBT MPs in their chambers at the time the law was passed. Those eight had first elected an LGBT MP 14 years prior to the legislative change. In the case of civil union or registered partnership laws, eleven of the 18 cases had openly LGBT MPs when their laws were passed, or had an LGBT MP previously; an average of 12 years passed between the first openly LGBT MP and the law.

These patterns are replicated in the full spectrum of countries that have had openly LGBT MPs. Nineteen of the nations with openly LGBT MPs (before the passage of the law) passed same-sex marriage or civil union/partnership laws (70%) while only nine of the 69 countries without LGBT MPs (13%) passed such laws. In reality, the latter figure is even smaller, because among the

remaining 97 member states of the United Nations that are not in the dataset, none have elected LGBT MPs to their parliaments or have LGBT marriage/civil union laws. Thus the true figure is 5% (9/167). Overall a country that has elected an LGBT MP is fourteen times more likely to have marriage equality or civil union/registered partner laws.

While there is a correlation between LGBT MPs and law, it is also the case that a country is more likely to have some type of marriage or partnership recognition if the government is ideologically left of center, with or without openly LGBT MPs. Full marriage equality is more likely with a combination of left leaning governments and openly LGBT MPs in parliament. Also, the countries with the most progressive LGBT rights have had some level of LGBT representation for the longest time, and continue to do so today.

Our statistics show that the relationship between openly LGBT MPs and the passage of progressive laws is statistically significant even when one controls for other plausible explanations. The results also demonstrate that a society's view of homosexuality has strong and consistent effects on legal equality. However, the effects of democracy and EU membership are inconsistent. Democracy is a small but significant factor in 2003, but not in 2008 or 2011; this result is due to the diffusion of some LGBT rights to middle ranking democracies, and the fact that many full democracies continue to have limited

equality at the national level. EU membership is correlated with higher law scores in 2003, but not in 2008 or 2011, suggesting that the power of EU membership to influence domestic law came at a time of growth and accession a decade ago. While we would expect left ideology to lead to marriage equality in general, our measure of government ideology is not significant in these models. The electoral system is significant in 2008 and 2011.

It is plausible that religion would impact the degree of equality under law above and beyond social values, but the models using religion (cases categorized by the dominant or plurality national religion: Protestant, Christian, Eastern Orthodox, Islam, or other [Buddhist, Hindu, Shinto, Animist]) showed no demonstrable effect. Tolerance and organized religion have a complex relationship. While most organized religious institutions are negative towards homosexuality, some religions are more overtly discriminatory than others. Indeed, even within Protestantism, one finds widely divergent degrees of support for LGBT equality. American evangelicals often lead anti-LGBT movements, but Quakers, and some denominations of Anglicans and Baptists, have strongly affirmed LGBT rights in the U.S. In 2008, the Lutheran Church of Sweden announced its full support for same-sex marriage. Catholics are deeply split, but collectively constitute the most progressive Christians in the U.S. on the issue of LGBT rights, while Spain, Portugal and Argentina



Top: Jan Logie New Zealand
Bottom: Mike Waters South Africa



Top: John Lyons Ireland
Bottom: Nitzan Horowitz Israel

all have same-sex marriage despite their strong Catholic orientations. Furthermore, a simple 'dominant' religion model fits poorly with the many heterogeneous nation states that do not have a majority religion. Religious intensity or religiosity maybe a better indicator, but this factor is difficult to operationalize across such a large dataset.

It is important to note that the statistics do not show whether the presence of LGBT MPs and progressive laws causes or precedes the other, only that they are correlated with each other. The most plausible explanation drawn from all the evidence is that LGBT MPs and social attitudes form a virtuous cycle of mutual reinforcement. This theory is corroborated by the fact that, once LGBT MPs are elected to office and subsequently run for re-election, they are overwhelmingly successful, regardless of whether they were initially elected as out candidates or came out (or were outed) while in office.

The evidence for this is most clear for those LGBT MPs who are elected as individual candidates in single member districts. Fifty-seven MPs in my dataset were elected from single member districts in either First Past the Post, Two Round Systems, or from the single member mandates in mixed electoral systems (Canada, France, Germany, New Zealand, USA and the United Kingdom). Twenty-nine were out when elected, 28 were not out but came out during their time in office. Of the 28

MPs who came out during their term of office, 19 were re-elected after coming out and 13 of the 19 actually increased their majorities. The average majority of winning candidates in elections immediately after coming out was 21 percent. This is almost double the winning margin of first time MPs. The margin of election victory in first time races won by out candidates was 12 percent, and by not out candidates 14 percent. Only three MPs lost their seats after coming out (and Mario Silva held his Canadian riding once before losing in 2011). Four others retired or resigned before standing for re-election and as of 2012 three others wait to present themselves to the electorate now that they are out. This compares to re-election rates of those MPs who were out when first elected. Fourteen of those 29 MPs were re-elected, 13 have not yet had the opportunity to present themselves to the electorate again, one chose to not stand again, and one lost his seat (Rob Oliphant who was swept away by the anti-Canadian Liberal party tide of 2011). Incumbency advantage is certainly the underlying cause of the strong re-election rates but the fact that incumbency still works for LGB MPs who come out while in office suggests that familiarity breeds respect and tolerance rather than contempt.

If openly LGBT MPs do change public policy, what is the mechanism of change? LGBT legislators have an effect on two levels. First, as educator-advocates, they influence colleagues who

promote and draft laws; second, in their visibility, they influence the views of the electorate writ large and its perception of LGBT people. When an LGBT legislator becomes a person with a name, talents and foibles, aging parents and young children, hobbies, sporting obsessions and opinions about the latest TV show, it becomes more difficult for their parliamentary colleagues to overtly discriminate against (or fail to protect) them through legislation.

Harvey Milk extrapolated on the importance of openly LGBT candidates running, and winning office, in his “Hope” speech of 1978; an excerpt runs on the back cover of this report.

Examples of this phenomenon abound. The Victory Fund notes that when cabinet minister Gabor Szetey came out in 2007 in Hungary, the event prompted a widespread evaluation of attitudes toward LGBT individuals within the government, including the passage of a law allowing registered civil unions for same-sex couples. The German Green Party MP Volker Beck has held various high level positions in the Bundestag since 1994, and his campaign for equal rights led him to be known as the ‘father of the German registered partnership act’ of 2001. LGBT marriage passed unanimously in the Icelandic legislature in 2010, and on the day the law went into effect, Prime Minister Jóhanna Sigurðardóttir had her registered partnership legally changed to a marriage.

The effect of individual advocacy is perhaps no more profound and surprising than in Nepal. Sunil Babu Pant was elected to the Nepali Constitutional Assembly in 2008 and immediately embarked on a campaign to educate his colleagues on what he calls a ‘third gender,’ or lesbian, gay, and transgendered people. In that deeply socially conservative country, the Supreme Court ruled that sexual minorities had the same rights as other citizens. The Portuguese Prime Minister, José Sócrates, made LGBT marriage part of his re-election platform in 2009, citing the impact of a childhood friend who was LGBT and how moved he was by the movie Milk. Socrates’ legislation was passed and came into effect in June 2010. Even more surprising was the support for LGBT rights expressed by the Prime Minister of Albania, Sali Berisha, in 2009. It is not clear exactly why Berisha took such a bold move in the socially conservative Balkan state, but in the face of threats to his popularity, he has maintained his defense of equal rights over the last three years.

In the U.S., LGBT allies such as Dick Cheney, Jon Huntsman, and Wade Kach have cited family and personal relationships as motivations for their support of marriage equality. These narratives are supported by research that found “people who know LGBs are much more likely to support gay rights” even after controlling for demographic, political and religious variables, and that “the effect holds for every issue, in every year, for every



Top: Boris van der Ham Netherlands
Bottom: Ulrike Lunacek Austria



Top: Baron Smith of Finsbury United Kingdom

Bottom: Elio Di Rupo Belgium

type of relationship, and for every demographic, religious and political subgroup” (Lewis 2011). In June 2012, for the first time, an absolute majority of Americans supported same-sex marriage, 54% for and 42% against. At the same time, 60% of Americans said they had a close friend or family member who was LGBT (in 2010 the figure had been 49%).

Jonathan Gottschall broadens the benefits of straight-LGBT familiarity to fictional characters, noting, “when we are absorbed in fiction, we form judgments about the characters exactly as we do with real people, and extend those judgments to the generalizations we make about groups. When straight viewers watch likable gay characters on shows like *Will and Grace*, *Modern Family*, *Glee*, and *Six Feet Under* they come to root for them, to empathize with them—and this seems to shape their attitudes toward homosexuality in the real-world. Studies indicate that watching television with gay friendly themes lessens viewer prejudice, with stronger effects for more prejudiced viewers” (Gottschall 2012).

Transgender Representation and Rights

While there are clear connections between the rights of transgender people and lesbians, gays and bisexuals the two communities are distinct. The experiences of marginalization and discrimination have been parallel tracks but the political mobilization of transgender groups has lagged behind the advocacy of LGB rights. As noted earlier, only three out transgender politicians have been elected to national office: Georgina Beyer in New Zealand (1999–2007), Vladimir Luxuria in Italy (2006–2008) and Anna Grodzka in Poland (2011–).

We have measured the legal rights afforded to transgender people through an analysis of ten variables which, while similar to the variables we have used to measure LGB rights, are distinctive in their focus on transgender issues. For each nation state in 2012 we have asked; on the positive side (Yes 1, No 0): 1) can you legally change your name, 2) can you legally change your gender, 3) is gender identity included in hate crime law, 4) is gender identity part of anti-discrimination law, 5) can you claim asylum on the basis of gender identity persecution, 6) is respect for trans-identity upheld in the constitution, 7) is gender reassignment

surgery funded by the state? On the negative side (Yes -1, No 0): 8) is transgender identity criminalized, 9) is there active prosecution of transgender people, 10) is there state-sponsored discrimination? Performance in these ten areas gives each country a score ranging between -3 and 7.


The country which most respected the legal rights of transgender individuals in 2012 was New Zealand (perhaps unsurprising considering Georgina Beyer's ground breaking election in 1999). Close behind New Zealand was the United Kingdom. The most regressive nations were Burma, Libya, Namibia, Nigeria, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Solomon Islands, Syria and Tanzania; where legal state sponsored discrimination was reinforced by active prosecution.

Does the presence of lesbian, gay or bisexual MPs affect the likelihood of progressive transgender laws being passed? The correlation between our summary indicator of LGB legal rights and transgender legal rights is high: 0.71. Thus, the fact that out LGB MPs are a significant predictor of equality laws for lesbian and gay individuals, and the close relationship between equality laws for LGB and transgender individuals implies that yes, out LGB MPs do enhance the legal climate for transgender people.



Top: Vladimir Luxuria Italy
Bottom: Pekka Haavisto Finland

Transgender Law
2012



Conclusion

Marginalized communities often seek political representation as a means of protection, advancement, and integration. Whether they achieve representation is contingent on the group's size, geographical concentration, social status, and capacity to make alliances with other interest groups. LGBT people share political interests but are fragmented geographically, ethnically, and often ideologically; this fragmentation represents a hurdle to winning elective office, alongside the other hurdles of legal and communal discrimination.

This paper offers strong evidence that the presence of openly lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender MPs in national legislatures encourages the adoption of LGBT friendly legislation, and that their numbers do not have to be high to effect this change. Indeed, the mere existence of politicians who are open about their LGBT orientation has a significant impact on electoral and identity politics. These findings echo previous research on the impact of women and ethnic minorities in office, but the direct relationship between LGBT MPs and changed public policy is more compelling than for any other marginalized group. Openly LGBT legislators act as mold-breakers and trailblazers, giving symbolic hope to younger generations and slowly lessening


the shock of difference in the legislative chamber.

The research shows that the opportunities for success vary considerably across nations and across time, but the impact of out MPs appears to be consistent regardless of context. It is sobering to note that when Jóhanna Sigurðardóttir was chosen as Prime Minister of Iceland in 2009, the focus on Sigurðardóttir's sexual orientation was a curiosity largely promoted by the international media and not the Icelanders themselves.

Why do MPs come out while in office? Of the 41 MPs who have come out while in office a number were outed in controversial circumstances, for example Barney Frank (1987) and Steve Gunderson (1994) in the United States and Michael Brown (1994) in the UK, but the vast majority came out voluntarily. The benefits of coming out are clustered along four lines. First, representatives feel relief at not having to live a lie and hide any longer which centers them personally. They feel more at peace with themselves and their convictions and thus are happier and more confident. Second, voters appreciate personal honesty even if they may have issues with homosexuality. Third, some parties see sexual orientation diversity as a component part of their desire to be seen as inclusive and modern. This leads to LGB candidates being sought out and promoted by a central party hierarchy (e.g., the UK Conservative Party). Last, as public opinion moves towards supporting equality issues, having an out

Out vs. Not Out When First Elected?

LGBT MPs Globally





Top: Guido Westerwelle Germany
Bottom: Charles Chauvel New Zealand

LGBT candidate is less of an electoral burden than it once was.

Public acceptance of LGBT people is a predictor of progressive law. At first blush this finding is unsurprising. But it does indicate that politicians and governments have been responding to public opinion, and it suggests that, if the general public becomes more supportive of sexual orientation equality, then governments may respond with broader laws accepting same-sex marriage, adoption and legal protections.

This paper indicates that making even small gains in winning elective office pays large dividends in social and legal progress. Therefore, groups that support openly LGBT candidates, regardless of political affiliation, will contribute to eventual equity when it comes to sexual orientation and civil rights. Pouring time and money into electing even a single senator, representative, or state official may be worth the ultimate progress toward breaking down stereotypes and easing the passage of non-discriminatory law.

Globally, the trajectory is clear. More and more openly LGBT candidates are winning office. Legal equality, across a variety of domains, is gathering momentum. Up until 2009 there had never been an openly LGBT Prime Minister or President elected to office; in 2013, there are two currently holding office. Twenty years ago, there had never been an openly LGBT cabinet minister; since then there have been at least 28. Ultimately, most political

leaders are rational actors who wish to maximize their power and influence. If voters (both straight and LGBT) warm to issues of sexual orientation equality, then championing such issues will become a strategic advantage for politicians and parties.

Future research should examine more closely why it might be that LGBT representation does not necessarily need a critical mass to effect policy change. We also need to better understand the driving characteristics of politicians who are openly LGBT. The second phase of this project will move beyond the quantitative data to interview LGBT MPs around the world, to gauge the interaction between their sexual orientation, policy advocacy, and role as representatives. Just as in the case of women MPs, we would expect most openly LGBT MPs to act as role models for other LGBT politicians. If the dynamics of female representation are mirrored, we predict that the first small wave of openly LGBT MPs will be followed by a larger wave of MPs who experience reduced hurdles to office. Nevertheless, the mere fact of a politician's sexual orientation does not guarantee that s/he will view LGBT rights as a central, or even peripheral, part of their mission as a representative. Some openly LGBT MPs argue that their sexual orientation is a private matter irrelevant to their political views. However, our research implies that regardless of their political views, LGBT legislators change the discourse around LGBT rights by their presence alone.

Further Reading

Blasius, Mark. *We Are Everywhere: A Historical Sourcebook of Gay and Lesbian Politics*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Bratton, Kathleen A. "Critical Mass Theory Revisited: The Behavior and Success of Token Women in State Legislatures." *Politics and Gender* 1(1): 97-125, 2005.

Campbell, David and Christina Wolbrecht. "See Jane Run: Women Politicians as Role Models for Adolescents," *Journal of Politics* 68(2): 233-247, 2006.

Cook, Timothy E. "The Empirical Study of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Politics: Assessing the First Wave of Research." *American Political Science Review* 93(3): 679-692, 1999.

Dececco, John and Kenneth S. Yeager. *Trailblazers: Profiles of America's Gay and Lesbian Elected Officials*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Egan, Patrick J., and Kenneth Sherrill. "Marriage and the Shifting Priorities of a New Generation of Lesbians and Gays." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 38:229-32, 2005.

Endean, Steve. *Bringing Lesbian and Gay Rights into the Mainstream: Twenty Years of Progress*. New York: Harrington Park Press, 2006.

Golebiowska, Ewa. "Political Implications of Group Stereotypes: Campaign Experiences of Openly Gay Political Candidates." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 32(3): 590-607, 2002.

Gottschall, Jonathan. *The Storytelling Animal: How Stories make us Human*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2012.

Haider-Markel, Donald P. "Representation and Backlash: The Positive and Negative Influence of Descriptive Representation," *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, XXXII, February, 2007.

Haider-Markel, Donald P. *Out and Running: Gay and Lesbian Candidates, Elections and Policy Representation*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2010.

Haider-Markel, Donald P., Mark R. Joslyn and Chad J. Kniss. "Minority Group Interests and Political Representation: Gay Elected Officials in the Policy Process," *Journal of Politics* 62(2), 2000.

Hirsch, Harry N. (ed). *The Future of Gay Rights in America*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Kollman, Kelly. "Same Sex Unions: The Globalization of an Idea." *International Studies Quarterly*. 51: 329-357, 2007.

Lax, Jeffrey R. and Justin H. Phillips. "Gay Rights in the States: Public Opinion and Policy Responsiveness." *American Political Science Review* 103: 367-86, 2009.

Lewis, Gregory B. "Black-White Differences in Attitudes Toward Homosexuality and Gay Rights." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67: 59-78, 2003.

Lewis, Gregory B. "The Friends and Family Plan: Contact with Gays and Support for Gay Rights." *The Policy Studies Journal* 39:217-238, 2011.



Top: Bettina Herlitzius Germany
Bottom: Fredrick Federley Sweden



Top: Anette Trettebergstuen Norway
Bottom: Stephen Gilbert United Kingdom

Lewis, Gregory B. and David W. Pitts. "Representation of Lesbians and Gay Men in Federal, State and Local Bureaucracies." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21,1:159, 2011.

McThomas, Mary and Robert J. Buchanan. "President Obama and Gay Rights: The 2008 and 2012 Presidential Elections," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 45: 442-448, 2012.

Mucciaroni, Gary. *Same Sex, Different Politics: Success and Failure in the Struggles Over Gay Rights*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2008.

Rayside, David. *On the Fringe: Gays & Lesbians in Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Reynolds Andrew, Ben Reilly and Andrew Ellis. *The New International IDEA Handbook of Election System Design*. Stockholm: International IDEA, 2007.

Shilts, Randy. *The Mayor of Castro Street: The Life and Times of Harvey Milk*. St. Martin's Press, 1982.

Wheen, Francis. *Tom Driberg: His Life and Indiscretions*. Chatto and Windus, London, 1990.

Wolbrecht, Christina and David Campbell. "Leading Example: Female Members of Parliament as Political Role Models," *American Journal of Political Science* 51(4): 921-939, 2007.

LGBT Members of National Legislatures 1976–2013

| Country | Name | Years in Office | Party Affiliation |
|---------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| AUSTRIA | ● Ulrike Lunacek | ★ 1999–2009 | Green Party |
| BELGIUM | ● Jean-Jacques Flahaux | ★ 2007–2010 | Reform Movement |
| | ● Xavier Baeselen | ★ 2008– | Reform Movement |
| | ● Elio Di Rupo | ☆ 1987–1989 | Socialist Party |
| | | 2003–2005 | Socialist Party |
| | | 2010– | Socialist Party |
| BRAZIL | ● Clodovil Hernandez | ★ 2007–2009 | Christian Labor Party |
| | ● Jean Wyllys | ★ 2011– | Socialism and Freedom |
| CANADA | ● Suend Robinson | ☆ 1979–2004 | New Democratic Party |
| | ● Réal Ménard | ☆ 1993–2009 | Bloc Québécois |
| | ● Libby Davies | ☆ 1997– | New Democratic Party |
| | ● Scott Brison | ☆ 1997– | Liberal Party |
| | ● Bill Siksay | ★ 2004–2011 | New Democratic Party |
| | ● Mario Silva | ☆ 2004–2011 | Liberal Party |
| | ● Raymond Gravel | ★ 2006–2008 | Bloc Québécois |
| | ● Rob Oliphant | ★ 2008–2011 | Liberal Party |
| | ● Randall Garrison | ★ 2011– | New Democratic Party |
| | ● Danny Morin | ★ 2011– | New Democratic Party |
| | ● Philip Toone | ★ 2011– | New Democratic Party |
| DENMARK | ● Yvonne Herlou Andersen | ☆ 1977–1979 | Centre Party |
| | | 1981–1984 | Centre Party |
| | | 1987–1988 | Centre Party |
| | | 1998–2001 | Centre Party |
| | ● Torben Lund | ☆ 1981–1998 | Social Democrats |
| | ● Louise Freuert | ★ 2001–2007 | People's Party |
| | ● Simon Emil Ammitzbøll | ★ 2005– | Liberal Party |
| | ● Mogens Jensen | ★ 2007– | Social Democrats |
| | ● Flemming Møller Mortensen | ★ 2007– | Social Democrats |
| | ● Uffe Elbæk | ★ 2011– | Social Liberal |
| FINLAND | ● Oras Tynkkynen | ★ 2004– | Green Party |
| | ● Pekka Haavisto | ★ 1987–1995 | Green Party |
| | | 2007– | Green Party |
| | ● Jani Petteri Toivola | ★ 2011– | Green Party |
| | ● Silvia Modig | ★ 2011– | Left Party |

● Lesbian

● Gay

● Bisexual

● Transgender

★ Out when first elected

☆ Not Out when first elected

| | | | |
|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| FRANCE | ● André Labarrère | ☆ 1967–1968 | Socialist |
| | | 1973–2001 | Socialist |
| | ● Franck Riester | ☆ 2007– | UMP |
| GERMANY | ● Jutta Oesterle-Schwerin | ★ 1987–1990 | Green Party |
| | ● Herbert Rusche | ★ 1985–1987 | Green Party |
| | ● Volker Beck | ★ 1994– | Green Party |
| | ● Birgitt Bender | ★ 2002–2013 | Green Party |
| | ● Jorg van Essen | ★ 1990–2013 | Free Democrats |
| | ● Guido Westerwelle | ☆ 1996–2013 | Free Democrats |
| | ● Kai Gehring | ★ 2005– | Green Party |
| | ● Gerhard Schick | ★ 2005– | Green Party |
| | ● Lutz Heilmann | ★ 2005–2009 | PDS |
| | ● Patrick Meinhardt | ★ 2005–2013 | Free Democrats |
| | ● Jan Mücke | ★ 2005–2013 | Free Democrats |
| | ● Pascal Körber | ★ 2009–2013 | Free Democrats |
| | ● Anja Hajduk | ★ 2002–2008 | Green Party |
| | | 2013– | |
| | ● Bettina Herlitzius | ★ 2007–2013 | Green Party |
| | ● Sabine Jünger | ★ 1998–2002 | PDS |
| | ● Johannes Kahrs | ★ 1998– | Social Democrats |
| | ● Michael Kauch | ★ 2003– | Free Democrats |
| | ● Stefan Kaufmann | ★ 2009– | Christian Democrats |
| | ● Ulle Schauws | ★ 2013– | Green Party |
| ICELAND | ● Jóhanna Sigurðardóttir | ☆ 1978–2013 | Social Democrats |
| HUNGARY | ● Klára Ungár | ★ 1990–1998 | Liberal Party |
| IRELAND | ● Dominic Hannigan | ★ 2011– | Labour Party |
| | ● John Lyons | ★ 2011– | Labour Party |
| | ● Jerry Buttimer | ☆ 2011– | Fine Gael |
| ISRAEL | ● Uzi Even | ★ 2002–2003 | Meretz |
| | ● Nitzan Horowitz | ★ 2009– | Meretz |
| ITALY | ● Alfonso Pecoraro Scanio | ☆ 1992–2013 | Green Party |
| | ● Paola Concia | ★ 2008– | Democrats |
| | ● Vladimir Luxuria | ★ 2006–2008 | Communists |
| | ● Nichi Vendola | ★ 1992–2006 | Left Party |
| | ● Daniele Capezzone | ★ 2006–2008 | Italian Radicals |
| | ● Franco Gillini | ★ 2001–2007 | Left Democrats |
| | ● Titti de Simone | ★ 2001–2013 | Social Democrats |
| | ● Angelo Pezzana | ★ 1979 | Italian Radicals |
| LITHUANIA | ● Rokas Žilinskas | ☆ 2008– | NRP/Homeland |

| | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| LUXEMBOURG | ● Xavier Bettel | ★ 1999–2011 | Democratic Party |
| MEXICO | ● Patria Jimenez | ★ 1997–2000 | PRD |
| | ● David Sanchez Camacho | ★ 2006–2009 | PRD |
| | ● Enoé Uranga | ★ 2009– | PRD |
| NEPAL | ● Sunil Babu Pant | ★ 2008–2012 | Communist Party Nepal-U |
| NETHERLANDS | ● Coos Huijsen | ☆ 1972 | CHU |
| | | 1976–1977 | CHU |
| | ● Peter Lankhorst | ★ 1981–1994 | PPR |
| | ● Jan Franssen | ★ 1982–1994 | VVD |
| | ● Evelien Eshuis | ★ 1982–1986 | CPN |
| | ● Clemens Cornielje | ★ 1994–2005 | VVD |
| | ● Boris Dittrich | ★ 1994–2006 | D66 |
| | ● Anne Lize van der Stoep | ★ 1994–1998 | VVD |
| | ● Peter Rehwinkel | ★ 1995–2002 | PvdA |
| | ● Boris van der Ham | ★ 2002–2012 | D66 |
| | ● Wim van der Camp | ★ 1986–2009 | CDA |
| | ● Ger Koopmans | ★ 2002–2012 | CDA |
| | ● Gerda Verburg | ★ 1998–2007 | CDA |
| | | 2010–2011 | CDA |
| | ● Mark Harbers | ★ 2009– | VVD |
| | ● Henk Krol | ★ 2012– | 50 Plus |
| | ● Vera Bergkamp | ★ 2012– | D66 |
| | ● Henk Nijboer | ★ 2012– | PvdA |
| | ● Hanke Bruins-Slot | ★ 2010– | CDA |
| | ● Manon Fokke | ★ 2012– | PvdA |
| | ● Gerard Schouw | ★ 2011– | D66 |
| | ● Astrid Ossenburg | ★ 2012– | PvdA |
| NEW ZEALAND | ● Tim Barnett | ★ 1996–2008 | Labour Party |
| | ● Chris Carter | ★ 1993–2011 | Labour Party |
| | ● Charles Chauvel | ★ 2006–2013 | Labour Party |
| | ● Georgina Beyer | ★ 1999–2007 | Labour Party |
| | ● Chris Finlayson | ★ 2005– | National Party |
| | ● Louisa Wall | ★ 2008 | Labour Party |
| | | 2011– | Labour Party |
| | ● Grant Robertson | ★ 2008– | Labour Party |
| | ● Kevin Hague | ★ 2008– | Green Party |
| | ● Jan Logie | ★ 2011– | Green Party |
| | ● Maryan Street | ★ 2005– | Labour Party |
| NORWAY | ● Wenche Lowzow | ★ 1977–1985 | Conservative Party |

| | | | |
|--------------|---|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anders Hornslien Bent Hoie Andre Kuakkestad Siri Hall Arnoy Per Kristian Foss Anette Trettebergstuen Andre Dahl Ole Henrik Grønn | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★ 1993–2001 ★ 2001– ★ 2001–2005 ★ 2001–2005 ★ 1981– ★ 2005– ★ 2005–2013 ☆ 2005–2009 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour Party Conservative Party Conservative Party Socialist Left Conservative Party Labour Party Conservative Party Christian Democratic |
| POLAND | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robert Biedron Anna Grodzka | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★ 2011– ★ 2011– | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Palikot Palikot |
| PORTUGAL | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Miguel Vale de Almeida | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★ 2009–2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socialist |
| SOUTH AFRICA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ian Ollis Mike Waters | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★ 2009– ★ 1999– | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Democratic Alliance Democratic Alliance |
| SWEDEN | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kent Carlsson Andreas Carlgren Tobias Billström Elisabeht Markstrom Tasso Stafilidis Martin Andreasson Ulf Holm Borje Vestlund Fredrick Federley Olof Lavesson Tomas Tobe Marianne Berg Josefin Brink Hans Linde Hans Ekstrom Jonas Gunnarsson | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☆ 1991–1993 ☆ 1994–1998 ★ 1995– ☆ 1995–2010 ★ 1998–2006 ★ 2002–2006 ★ 2002– ★ 2002– ★ 2006– ★ 2006– ★ 2006– ★ 2006– ★ 2006– ★ 2006– ★ 2006– ★ 2010– ★ 2011– | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social Democrat Center Party Moderate Social Democrat Left Party Liberal Party Green Party Social Democrat Center Party Moderate Moderate Left Party Left Party Left Party Left Party Social Democrats Social Democrats |
| SWITZERLAND | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doris Stump Marianne Huguenin Claude Janiak | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★ 2003–2011 ★ 2003–2007 ★ 1999–2007 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social Democrats Labor Party Social Democrats |
| UK | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maureen Colquhoun Matthew Parris Michael Brown Chris Smith Clive Betts David Borrow Ben Bradshaw | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☆ 1974–1979 ☆ 1979–1986 ☆ 1983–1997 ☆ 1983–2005 ☆ 1992– ☆ 1997–2010– ★ 1997– | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour Party Conservative Party Conservative Party Labour Party Labour Party Labour Party Labour Party |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Nick Brown ● Chris Bryant ● Angela Eagle ● Nick Herbert ● Simon Hughes ● Gordon Marsden ● Mark Oaten ● Adam Price ● Alan Duncan ● Stephen Williams ● Gregory Barker ● Nigel Evans ● Crispin Blunt ● Margot James ● Iain Stewart ● Nick Boles ● Mike Freer ● Stuart Andrew ● Conor Burns ● Eric Ollerenshaw ● Stephen Twigg | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★ 1983– ★ 2001– ☆ 1992– ★ 2005– ☆ 1983– ☆ 1997– ☆ 1997–2010 ★ 2001–2010 ☆ 1992– ★ 2005– ☆ 2001– ☆ 1992– ☆ 1997– ★ 2010– ★ 2010– ★ 2010– ★ 2010– ★ 2010– ★ 2010– ★ 2010– ★ 1997–2005 2010– ★ 2010– ☆ 2001– ☆ 1992–2004 ★ 2001–2011 ★ 2012– | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour Party Labour Party Labour Party Conservative Party Liberal Democrat Labour Party Liberal Democrat Plaid Cymru Conservative Party Liberal Democrat Conservative Party Conservative Party Conservative Party Conservative Party Conservative Party Conservative Party Conservative Party Conservative Party Conservative Party Conservative Party Labour Party Labour Party Liberal Democrat Liberal Democrat Labour Party Labour Party |
| USA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gerry Studds ● Steve Gunderson ● Barney Frank ● Jim Kolbe ● Tammy Baldwin ● Jared Polis ● David Cicilline ● Sean Patrick Maloney ● Kyrsten Sinema ● Mark Pocan ● Mark Takano ● Michael Michaud | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☆ 1972–1987 ☆ 1980–1997 ☆ 1982–2012 ☆ 1984–2007 ★ 1998–2012 ★ 2008– ★ 2010– ★ 2012– ★ 2012– ★ 2012– ★ 2012– ☆ 2003– | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Democratic Party Republican Party Democratic Party Republican Party Democratic Party Democratic Party Democratic Party Democratic Party Democratic Party Democratic Party Democratic Party Democratic Party |

LGBT Representation and Rights

The UNC LGBT Representation and Rights initiative at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is the first academic program in the United States focused exclusively on the link between the representation of lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgender people and the legal and political rights afforded to those groups.

The mission is threefold:

- 1** Conduct and encourage research on the relationship between the presence and representation of LGBT individuals and equality.
- 2** Nurture, connect and inspire a cohort of scholars focused on questions of sexual orientation, representation and rights in North Carolina and beyond.
- 3** Pay testimony to, and build on the Carolina tradition of pursuing engaged research, bringing the highest level of scholarship to bear on the question of how to protect and enhance equality, democracy and the civil rights of all Americans.

The initiative will:

- Gather data to generate knowledge and evidence to support advocacy and generate understanding. Specifically, data on the representation of LGBT officials in national parliaments, multi-national assemblies, governments, and as mayors of cities. We are compiling a comprehensive compendium of national laws as they relate to the rights of LGB and Trans communities.
- Bring domestic and international speakers to UNC's campus.
- Hold academic workshops leading to a series of policy papers.
- Focus on areas beyond that of politics; i.e., the representation of LGBT individuals in Sports, the Media, Education, Business, the Judiciary, Music, Religion, Health Care, etc.

We will disseminate knowledge to a wider audience, through:

- Academic journal articles
- Newspaper opinion-editorials
- A policy paper series addressing a variety of issues and themes
- The publication of books on LGBT representation and rights
- Public talks and lectures

The initiative has a North Carolina, national and global focus. As such it is housed in the Curriculum for Global Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences at UNC Chapel Hill.

For the full MP and legal data described in this paper, along with information on the activities of the UNC LGBT Representation and Rights Initiative, please go to:
<http://global.unc.edu/globalstudies/lgbt-representation-and-rights-research-initiative>



UNC
GLOBAL



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Data: While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the data presented here, it is possible that we have overlooked individual Out LGBT MPs serving in national legislature or executive office. If you have suggestions for our data base please send them to ali.lgbtrightsrep.unc@gmail.com



“Like every other group, we must be judged by our leaders and by those who are themselves gay, those who are visible. For invisible, we remain in limbo – a myth, a person with no parents, no brothers, no sisters, no friends who are straight, no important positions in employment....A gay person in office can set a tone, can command respect not only from the larger community, but from the young people in our own community who need both examples and hope.”

Harvey Milk (1978)