

LGBTQI RIGHTS IN HUNGARY

A joint submission by the Hungarian LGBT Alliance, Transvanilla Transgender Association, Háttér Society, Budapest Pride, and Labrisz Lesbian Association

Hungary, UPR 2nd cycle, September 2015



1. This parallel report is aimed at assisting the Human Rights Council with Hungary's second UPR by providing information about the state of **LGBTQI rights** in the country since Hungary's last review in 2011.
2. Submitting organizations. The **Hungarian LGBT Alliance** is an umbrella organization bringing together LGBTQI organizations in Hungary. **Transvanilla Transgender Association**, the only registered trans rights organization in Hungary, has been representing the rights of trans people since 2011. **Háttér Society** is the oldest LGBTQI organization, providing key services such as legal support and a helpline. **Budapest Pride** works on increasing the visibility of LGBTQI people by organizing awareness-raising events, such as film festivals and the Pride March. **Labrisz Lesbian Association** works to draw public attention to the discrimination against sexual minority women, and eliminate prejudice and stereotypes against them.

Implementation of recommendations

3. In the previous UPR cycle, Hungary received 5 recommendations specifically addressing sexual orientation or gender identity, and 24 general recommendations relevant for LGBTQI persons as well. It is positive that following the first UPR cycle, the Human Rights Working Group (an interministerial working group to monitor and promote the human rights situation in Hungary) was set up with a clear mandate to follow-up on the recommendations received as part of the UPR process. A **Human Rights Roundtable** consisting of NGOs was also set up as a consultative body for the Working Group for more intense dialogue with civil society (Rec. 94.33, 94.37). The Roundtable has a thematic working group on LGBTQI rights, a remarkable development as this is the first formalized consultative forum with LGBTQI NGOs in Hungary. The quality of the work in the various thematic working groups varies greatly, but the LGBTQI working group is one of the most active ones. As part of its work in the thematic working group, the Hungarian LGBT Alliance prepared a **document identifying concrete measures to be taken** to implement the UPR recommendations. The document was discussed at a meeting of the working group, but no information on its follow-up was provided. Based on information publicly available, **of the 56 concrete measures suggested, some progress has been made on 7, but none has been fully implemented.**
4. Concerning the recommendations directly targeting issues of sexual orientation and gender identity, two recommendations called on strengthening efforts on transphobic and homophobic hate crimes (Rec. 94.13, 94.53). The 2013 amendment of the **Criminal Code to explicitly include sexual orientation and gender identity** in its hate speech and hate crime provisions is welcome, and so is more intense dialogue between law enforcement agencies (especially the police) and LGBTQI NGOs. However, several issues concerning LGBTQI-phobic hate crimes are still not addressed, for a discussion see paras 14-16.
5. Another recommendation called on the Government to ensure the **cardinal laws do not contain provisions that discriminate** against – among others – LGBTQI people (Rec. 94.12). Sadly, this recommendation was **not implemented**: a cardinal law on the protection of families clearly discriminating same-sex couples was adopted in 2011, and when the Constitutional Court found it unconstitutional in 2012, rather than respecting the Court's decision the Fundamental Law was amended in 2013 to avoid future judicial review. For more details see paras 38-44. This adds one more discriminatory provision to the Fundamental Law that has already been criticized for this by a UPR recommendation (Rec. 95.14).
6. Two recommendations (Rec. 94.30, 94.52) called on the government to **combat discrimination based on sexual orientation and/ or gender identity**. Unfortunately, **no progress** has been made in this regard, there are still no state-sponsored campaigns or comprehensive efforts to address prejudices and discrimination against LGBTQI people, and

transphobic and homophobic speech by public figures is on the rise. For more details see paras 8, 22-23.

Right to equality and non-discrimination [Art. 2. UDHR, Art. 26 ICCPR, Art. 14. ECHR, Art.1 of the Protocol no.12, CEDAW/C/GC/28, Yogyakarta Principles, 2]

7. A new Constitution (Fundamental Law) entered into force in April 2011. Even though the list of protected characteristics was extended in comparison to the previous Constitution, **sexual orientation and gender identity are not explicitly included** in the prohibition of discrimination (Article XV:2). The government argued that ‘other status’ already covers these grounds. Further hierarchy between minority groups was created when the Fourth Amendment of the Law introduced **new opportunities to tackle hate speech**, but **limited this to national, ethnic, racial or religious groups** – this time with a closed list leaving LGBTQI people without any effective tools against homophobic and transphobic hate speech.
8. Incitement to hatred against sexual and gender minorities is on the rise: in recent years not only extreme right wing politicians, but also **leading government officials made prejudiced statements** against this group. Special advisor to Prime Minister Orbán, Imre Kerényi called for “stopping the faggot lobby”, Mayor of Budapest István Tarlós talked about homosexuality as “unnatural and repulsive”, Vice Prime Minister Zsolt Semjén called homosexuality “a deviance” and “an aberration”. No government officials distanced themselves from these statements.
9. These statements are particularly harmful, as LGBTQI people are one of the **most discriminated social groups** in Hungary. 65% of Hungarians would not welcome a ‘homosexual’ person as their close friend, 46% as their neighbor, 37% as their colleague (ELTE 2011). 61% of the population still considers **homosexuality a sickness** (MTA-EBH 2012). According to a 2012 poll by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights 45% of the Hungarian LGBTQI respondents have personally felt discriminated against or harassed on the grounds of sexual orientation in the last 12 months, and 46% of trans respondent on grounds of trans status.
10. Yet, there are **no government sponsored campaigns or concentrated efforts** to tackle discrimination. Unlike most other minority groups (Roma, gender, disability, youth), there is no strategy or action plan on LGBTQI equality. Besides LGBTQI NGOs, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) also called for the **adoption of an action plan** to promote tolerance towards LGBTQI persons and to combat homophobia and transphobia.

Recommendation 1: Adopt a comprehensive strategy and action plan covering all spheres of life to tackle discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

Recommendation 2: Strengthen its efforts in fighting homophobic and transphobic hate speech by amending relevant provisions of the Fundamental Law and the Civil Code, and by condemning such statements, especially if made by public officials.

The Right to Privacy [Art. 8. ECHR, Art. 16. ICCPR, Art. 1, 2, 3, 15. CEDAW, Yogyakarta Principles, 3, 6]

11. According to the current practice **transgender persons** are able to have their legal gender recognized (only male or female) by means of a non-legislated administrative procedure for

change of first name and legal gender at the same time. The practice is **not supported by any legislation** and has never been officially published, changes to it are not communicated. There is **no possibility to appeal** and the procedure can take up to six months. Change of legal gender for minors is not supported by authorities.

12. Gender identity or change of gender is **not mentioned as special personal data** in the Data Protection Act. It might be considered covered by health status, but with the Government's commitment to depathologization, change of gender/gender identity may no longer be protected by data protection legislation.
13. Since January 2014 **health data is automatically shared with all healthcare providers (1997/XLVII)**, making HIV-status, information on the use of trans specific health care, and data before transitioning also available. While there is an option to ban the sharing of data, **patients are not** informed about it, and the ban concerns sharing all data, there is no option to limit access to certain categories of data only. Patients are not informed when someone checks their data.

Recommendation 3: Develop a quick, transparent and accessible procedure based on self-determination for legal gender recognition.

Recommendation 4: Ensure through legislation or by interpretation of the law, that data on previous change of gender and gender identity is covered under data protection law.

Recommendation 5: Create opportunities for protecting sensitive health data and publish the procedure to ban data sharing in an easy-to-understand non-ambiguous language.

Right to life, liberty and security of the person [Art 3. UDHR, Article 6, 9 ICCPR, Art. 1-4, 6, General Recommendation #19 CEDAW, Yogyakarta Principles, 4, 5]

14. **Homophobic and transphobic hate crimes are widespread** in Hungary: a 2012 EU FRA survey found that 28% of Hungarian LGBTQI respondents had been physically/sexually attacked or threatened with violence in the past 5 years, in 59% of the cases due to their sexual orientation or gender identity. A survey by Háttér and IS-HAS in 2010 found similar results: 15% of LGBTQI respondents (and 26% of trans respondents) have been subjected to violence based on their sexual orientation or gender identity. Only **13% of respondents reported the attack** to the authorities.
15. Recent years brought some positive developments concerning state responses to hate crimes, and LGBTQI-phobic hate crimes in particular. The new Criminal Code (2013) **explicitly includes sexual orientation and gender identity in its hate speech and hate crimes provisions** (Art. 332 and 216, respectively). A **network of hate crime investigators** was set up at the police increasing dialogue between the police and LGBTQI NGOs, including **training sessions** conducted by these NGOs.
16. In practice, law enforcement agencies often continue to **disregard the hate motivation** treating hate crimes as regular crimes resulting in less efficient investigation and lower sanctions. **Data collection** on homophobic/transphobic hate crimes is not adequate: recording them is optional, while for those motivated by nationality, ethnicity, race, religion it is mandatory. There are **no measures to encourage reporting** or prevention. ECRI recommended that the National Crime Prevention Strategy be revised to better combat crime motivated by racial and homo/transphobic violence.

Recommendation 6: Adopt guidelines for law enforcement agencies on their response to hate crimes; integrate those guidelines in training police officers, prosecutors, judges.

Recommendation 7: Take comprehensive measures to prevent hate crimes and encourage victims to report the incidents.

Right to employment [Art 6. ICESCR, Art. 11, 13, 16 [1], [h] CEDAW, Yogyakarta Principles, 12]

17. According to a 2010 LGBT study (*The situation of LGBT people in Hungary, 2010*, Háttér Society), **13% of LGBTQI persons have suffered from discrimination** at their workplace: being subject to **gossip** (81%), a **homophobic or transphobic work environment** (72%), or **harassment and humiliation** (41%). One-third of those discriminated against were **rejected** when applying for work (31%) or **fired** (32%).
18. **Trans people** are twice as likely to report experiencing discrimination at work than non-trans gays and lesbians (29% vs. 15%). They are also more likely to have experienced **long-term unemployment** in the past 5 years (46% vs. 27%).
19. Act CXXV of 2003 on Equal Treatment and the Promotion of Equal Opportunities and the Labor Code sanction discrimination in employment. However, **reporting discrimination remains alarmingly low**, roughly 15%. It would be essential that more emphasis is placed on **prevention** as well as the dissemination of **good practices** with regards to creating diverse work environments.
20. Although employers can put in place so-called **equal opportunity plans**, only the public sector and state bodies are obliged to do so. State support for employers to do this (e.g. funding) is lacking. Accordingly, only 21% among those discriminated said that their employers had a **non-discrimination policy**.

Recommendation 8: Extend the requirement to adopt equal opportunity plans to all public and private employers and issue guidelines on their content with specific reference to the needs of LGBTQI employees.

Recommendation 9: Develop programs improving the employability of trans persons to prevent long-term unemployment including trainings and financial incentives to employ them.

Recommendation 10: Introduce financial incentives for employers to provide diversity trainings for their employees specifically including LGBTQI issues.

Right to freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly [Art. 20. UDHR, Art. 21. ICCPR, Art. 10 and 11. ECHR, Yogyakarta Principles, 20]

21. In 2011-2012 the Budapest Police **refused to grant a permit** to the Budapest Pride March. Budapest Pride had to challenge this decision at the Municipal Court twice. The Court said the Police was unlawfully restricting the right to assembly and ordered them to permit and secure the March. A separate court case also found the 2012 police decision direct discrimination and harassment based on sexual orientation, and the police was ordered to apologize. In 2011-2014 however, participants of the March were **attacked** by extremist counter-protesters on numerous occasions. Despite ample police force being present, they failed to effectively protect these people, particularly when people were gathering for before the March and after it

was concluded. On the other hand police uses barriers and fences to hermetically separate the March from the city. This has resulted in denying people the possibility to join the March after the start. By separating the March entirely from the community, police effectively prevents that the Pride March contributes to increased visibility for LGBTQI people, thus undermining the effective realization of the right to peaceful assembly.

22. Members of the extreme right party Jobbik have repeatedly made public statements **threatening LGBTQI people** with banning the March. In July 2014 [Gábor Vona](#), head of Jobbik and in July 2013 [Ádám Mirkóczy](#), Jobbik Spokesperson said the March [will be banned](#) if Jobbik is in power. In April 2012 Mirkóczy [submitted a proposal](#) to amend the Fundamental Law to ban the March and said the “promotion of sexual deviance” should be punished with jail term. In July 2015 Dóra Dúró, Jobbik MP and Chair of the Parliamentary Committee on Culture [called](#) the March a “deviant event”.
23. The government has not condemned any of these statements. On the contrary, FIDESZ representatives and the Budapest mayor have also made similar **negative remarks**. In June 2015 Budapest mayor István Tarlós [called](#) the March and LGBTQI people “repulsive”. He was also an open opponent of the 2012 EuroGames event, saying it was [“alien to his beliefs”](#) in a letter to Klaus Wowereit, Berlin mayor.
24. In 2014 three LGBTQI NGOs, Háttér Society, Labrisz Lesbian Association and Budapest Pride, and other human rights NGOs were subject to a **state-organized investigation** by Hungary’s Government Control Agency (KEHI). The investigation aimed at examining whether the NGOs lawfully spent funding from the Norwegian Government and followed previous stigmatizing remarks by State officials, including by PM Viktor Orbán, labeling human rights NGOs receiving funding from abroad as “foreign agents”. NGOs working with minorities, incl. women and LGBTQI, were overrepresented in the process. The agency had no right under Hungarian law to launch such proceedings and provided no information to the NGOs about its grounds, the NGOs’ rights or avenues for appeal, the process and potential consequences.
25. NGOs had to submit extensive documentation about their spending on extremely tight (3-8 day) deadlines, making it barely possible for them to do their usual tasks. They were told to provide lists of volunteers and participants at events – both sensitive data that the authority had no legal basis to gather. Other NGOs were raided at their offices or staff’s homes. None of the NGOs have received documentation of the process and its findings. To date, they have not been officially informed about the results, but heard about them on the news. The news included stigmatizing statements about them, never been properly backed up by evidence or withdrawn by the authority.
26. In July 2014, Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights [sent a public](#) letter to the Minister of the PM’s Office, urging authorities to refrain from such investigations and **stigmatizing NGOs** and to ensure an enabling environment for them.

Recommendation 11: Ensure that LGBTQI people and their representative organizations are not restricted in their right to peaceful assembly and that their safety is secured at demonstrations and public events. Ensure that the right to peaceful assembly is secured by proportional police presence that does not undermine the visibility of LGBTQI people.

Recommendation 12: Refrain from stigmatizing and negative statements about LGBTQI persons/events and publicly condemn any such remarks made by State and party officials.

Recommendation 13: Ensure an enabling environment for LGBTQI NGOs in Hungary by avoiding stigmatizing statements and unlawful audits against them.

Right to education [Art. 26 UDHR, Art. 13 ICESCR, Art. 10 CEDAW, Yogyakarta Principles, 16]

27. According to the 2010 LGBT study, **every fifth LGBTQI person has experienced discrimination** in educational institutions, mostly in high school (83%). This included **gossip and lies** (83%), **bullying/harassment** by peers (67%) or **teachers** (29%). Twenty-three percent of those discriminated were **physically abused**.
28. **Trans students** are **routinely harassed** because of their gender expression or their documents not matching up with their physical presentation. There is little to **no flexibility** by school administrators when it comes to trans students using their preferred names or bathrooms that match their gender identity.
29. There is currently **no obligation for educational institutions to put in place policies against bullying** - particularly worrisome as in 59% of the cases teachers did nothing to combat homophobic/transphobic incidents and in 17% they supported the bullies.
30. The **school curriculum** lacks **LGBTQI topics** that could be fostering an inclusive school environment and boosting the self-esteem of LGBTQI students. Two-thirds of respondents said that **LGBTQI topics were completely missing** from school curricula. Only 2% of schools discussed transsexuality in details.
31. There has also been a rise in **homophobic and transphobic materials in books** that schools can choose to use. For instance a 2013 Religion textbook stated that homosexuality is a “serious, deadly sin” (Fülöpné Erdő Mária, *Élet a Hitben*, p. 79). Religious freedom is routinely cited as an excuse for such contents.

Recommendation 14: Amend the law on the National Basic Curriculum and the Framework Curricula to include information on sexual orientation/gender identity.

Recommendation 15: Ensure that all textbooks and other educational materials authorized for use in public education cover sexual orientation and gender identity in an objective manner, and promote tolerance and respect for LGBTQI persons.

Recommendation 16: Issue a model policy of non-discrimination and anti-bullying for educational institutions with reference to sexual orientation/gender identity and expression.

Recommendation 17: Integrate issues of homophobic and transphobic bullying into anti-violence and safe school programs.

Right to health [Art. 25. UDHR, Art. 12(1) ICESCR, CESCR’s General Comment #14, 20, Art. 12, 11[f] General Rec. #19, #24 CEDAW, Yogyakarta Principles, 17, 18]

32. The respondents of the 2010 LGBT survey reported a relatively low occurrence of discrimination in health care settings (7%), which may be due to the fact that **very few people come out to their doctors**. Respondents who said they were out to their doctors were **three times as likely to report being mistreated** (3% vs. 12%).
33. The most common forms of discrimination included that **medical staff asked inappropriate questions** (55%), **blamed the respondent for an illness** (34%) or started to pay **more attention to hygiene** (e.g. using gloves) (34%). **Only 6%** of those reported facing discrimination **reported the incident** and only 13% of these cases resulted in the perpetrator being held accountable.

34. According to a **trans specific study** (TransCare, 2014, Transvanilla Transgender Association) **26% of the respondents felt discriminated in health care facilities or during medical examinations** because of their gender identity or expression and only 6% of those have reported the incidents. In none of the cases has the perpetrator been held accountable.
35. **Diagnosis of transsexualism and change of legal gender is mandatory for trans specific health care** (gender affirmation surgeries and hormone therapy) despite a supportive statement of mental depathologization made by the Health Professional Colleges Psychiatric and Psychotherapeutic Sections (Egészségügyi Szakmai Kollégium Pszichiátriai és pszichoterápiás Tagozat). There are **no national clinical guidelines for trans specific health care** which results in lack of proper care and lack of experts. Health insurance covers only 10% of the costs of gender affirmative surgeries. The **lack of specialized surgeons** in the public health care system is also a huge obstacle. (ECRI)
36. It is legally required to certify and register births in 30 days as either male or female. **Medical treatments including surgery on intersex children are very common** but there is no data available on those. There is **no official general medical protocol** regarding the treatment of intersex children.
37. When it came to mental health, 42% of LGBTQI respondents said they had considered suicide (2010 LGBT Survey) and 30% of them reported having attempting suicide. Reported **suicide attempts were twice as high among respondents who said they had experienced homophobic or transphobic discrimination** and three times as high among those who said they had experienced homophobic or transphobic violence. 53% of trans respondents said they had considered suicide (TransCare 2014) and 44% of them reported having attempting suicide.

Recommendation 18: Introduce sensitizing training for doctors and other medical staff on discrimination against and the specific health needs and concerns of LGBTQI persons as part of basic and in-service training.

Recommendation 19: Create clinical guidelines on treatment for trans persons and ensure that costs of gender affirmation procedures are reimbursed by public health insurance.

Recommendation 20: Stop unnecessary medical treatment and surgery of intersex people without their consent and improve law and policy to facilitate the legal recognition of intersex individuals on official documents, respecting their right to self-determination.

Recommendation 21: Include LGBTQI persons, and LGBTQI youth in particular, as a specific target group in suicide prevention programs.

Right to family [Art. 17. ICCPR, Yogyakarta Principles, 24]

38. Cohabitation among same-sex couples has been recognized since 1996 and since 2009 same-sex couples can enter into **registered partnership** granting them most rights and duties that come with marriage. Notable exceptions include the right to take the partner's name, access to assisted reproduction technologies, joint and second parent adoption. Differences between marriage and registered partnership are **solely based on the gender of partners**, have no reasonable justification, and thus amount to **discrimination based on sexual orientation**.
39. A cardinal law, the Act on the Protection of Families was adopted in December 2012 that contained **several discriminatory provisions against same-sex couples and their**

children. First, the law contained a definition of family – to be used consistently throughout the Hungarian legal system – that defined “family” solely with reference to marriage and parent-child relationship (Art. 7), and secondly limiting inheritance rights of non-married couples (Art. 8). The Commissioner for Fundamental Rights claimed both provisions to be discriminatory based on sexual orientation, and turned to the Constitutional Court. In December 2013, the Court found both provisions to be unconstitutional. However, rather than respecting the decision of the Court, the **Parliament adopted an amendment to the Fundamental Law** containing the same definition of family found to be too restrictive, thus avoiding any future judicial review.

40. While the adoption of the Family Protection Act (Act CCXI of 2011) did not affect the institution of registered partnership introduced in 2009 (Act XXIX of 2009), changes to the Civil Code created a lot of confusion around the institution leading to legal uncertainty. The new Civil Code adopted in 2013 removed **all references to registered partnership** making large segments of the population believe the institution was abolished, or the rights of registered partners restricted. The Commissioner for Fundamental Rights submitted a petition to the Constitutional Court claiming the changes to be discriminatory. The case is pending.
41. The new Civil Code adopted in 2013 also **removed the possibility for cohabiting partners to adopt their partner’s child** (second parent adoption). This option was introduced in the new Civil Code adopted in 2009, but it never entered into force as the new Government that took office in 2010 revoked the previous legislation, and prepared their own version removing these provisions disregarding the opinion of the Hungarian National Committee for UNICEF submitted during the debate.
42. Legislation on **assisted reproduction technologies is openly discriminatory**: while it is possible for married couples, different-sex cohabiting couples and single women to access such services, lesbian couples (whether in registered partnership or cohabiting) are excluded.
43. The lack of recognition for same-sex parents creates **legal and practical problems** for the growing number of children living with same-sex parents: they cannot inherit from their non-biological parent without a will, and if there is a will their inheritance tax is significantly higher; in case the parents’ relationship deteriorates they are not entitled to receive child maintenance from their non-biological parents; and the non-biological parent cannot make even urgent medical decisions on their behalf. De jure discrimination against same-sex parents also **makes discriminatory behavior socially acceptable**. In 2013 a 13 boy’s admission to a school was rejected after the school found out he was raised by a lesbian couple. The Equal Treatment Authority found the decision discriminatory and fined the school. The Hungarian LGBT Alliance suggested to the Ministry of Human Resources to come up with measures to prevent such incidents, but their submission was **left unanswered**. The Committee on the Rights of the Child specifically called on the Government to take steps against discrimination faced by children raised by same-sex parents.
44. The person applying for legal gender recognition has to be unmarried, this entails **mandatory divorce** if the person is already married or is in a registered partnership. This was also noted as a problem in the report of the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (pp. 33-34).

Recommendation 22: Remove discriminatory differences between registered partnership and marriage, and provide legal recognition to same-sex parenting.

Recommendation 23: Take measures to prevent discrimination against same-sex couples and their children in the fields of education, healthcare and access to social benefits.

Recommendation 24: Remove discriminatory legislative restrictions for lesbian couples in accessing assisted reproduction technologies.

Recommendation 25: Remove the requirement to be single as prerequisite for legal gender recognition.

Right to asylum [Art. 1, 3, 1951 Geneva Convention, UNHCR Guidelines no. 9 (2012), Yogyakarta Principles, 23]

45. The 2007/LXXX. law on asylum fails to mention **gender identity and expression** as grounds for persecution. The most recent draft of amendments to the law includes these – NGOs hope they will remain in the text.
46. **Information materials and the website** of the Office of Immigration and Nationality (BÁH) fail to mention that sexual orientation, gender identity and expression as recognized grounds of persecution.
47. **Asylum procedures** are often insensitive to the situation of LGBTQI asylum seekers and disregard UNHCR Guidelines no. 9. (2012), resulting in degrading questions by case workers and in some cases psychological tests (*Fleeing Homophobia*, 2011, Jansen & Spijkerboer, pp. 34, 49, 59).
48. LGBTQI asylum seekers routinely face verbal and even physical **homophobic and transphobic abuse** by others living in the camp, guards and staff.
49. If LGBTQI asylum seekers are **not safe in camps** and have to live elsewhere, they become ineligible for any services. This increases their vulnerability and makes them dependent on their own limited financial resources or the voluntary support of NGOs.

Recommendation 26: Ensure that law 2007/LXXX. explicitly states gender identity and expression as grounds of persecution.

Recommendation 27: Explicitly include sexual orientation, gender identity and expression in information materials as grounds for persecution that LGBTQI asylum seekers can base their claims on.

Recommendation 28: Ensure that asylum procedures are conducted in line with UNHCR Guideline no. 9 and consider the special situation and needs of LGBTQI claimants.

Recommendation 29: Ensure that LGBTQI asylum seekers are safe in the camps and if necessary, provide alternative housing, medical, and social services for them elsewhere.

Contact:

Dodo Karsay, board member, Hungarian LGBT Alliance
karsay.dodo@lmbtszovetseg.hu