

Surfacing Systemic (In)justices: A Community View





“Our battle is much more than pain and suffering. Strategic fights can make change happen that sometimes even the legal system doesn’t foresee.”

Social Protection Roundtable participant

Acknowledgements:

Thank you to the communities whose experiences are guiding this work, including those who participated in our roundtables, 1:1 conversations, and survey, as well as many others who provided advice and input.

Written by:

Patrick Williams, Adi Kuntsman, Emeka Nwankwo, and Danella Campbell

Edited by:

Leah Cowan


Illustrated and designed by:

Deanna Bains

Contents



Introduction	04
A note on methodology	06
Findings	09
Voicing, discussing, and resisting systemic harms	12
Climate Justice	13
Access to Justice	18
Policing	24
Social Protection	29
Anti-racism	34
Free Movement	39
Surfacing other priorities	44
What's next?	47
A note on sharing	50
Bibliography	51



Introduction

Systemic Justice is the first Black-led, majority Black people and people of colour (BPOC) organisation in Europe working on community-driven litigation¹ for racial, social, and economic justice. We were established to partner with and support communities in their fights for social justice, and our vision is of a society where organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) can leverage the courts through strategic litigation² and community-led campaigns against racial, social, and economic injustice. This approach to justice is fundamentally intersectional, meaning that it recognises how an individual's social or political identity and personal characteristics overlap and combine, manifesting in differential modes of discrimination and oppression. Framed through this organising principle, Systemic Justice is driven by the individuals and groups who are most exposed to structural inequalities, and who are working against systemic harms³ of injustice through local and community organisations.

Surfacing Systemic (In)justices: A Community View shares findings from an extensive Europe-wide consultation undertaken by Systemic Justice that seeks to learn from the perspectives and experiences of affected community groups and organisations, in order to inform potential litigation and other strategies for change. These consultations step into a void in the landscape which requires urgent attention. While Systemic Justice acknowledges that the use of strategic litigation is not new, it has often fallen outside of the scope and capacity of local and community organisations who are particularly susceptible to systemic injustices, such as having their freedom of movement curtailed by the increasingly hostile European border regime, or being disproportionately targeted by criminal legal systems that perpetuate harm and deny access to justice.

Systemic Justice recognises that legal partnerships are frequently characterised by exploitative, unequal relationships, in which lawyers define the parameters of legal interventions and challenges, making the ultimate decisions on legal strategy, approaches, and the terms of legal action undertaken. In order to disrupt this status quo, Systemic Justice has worked to develop an up-to-date understanding of local and community OMCs which are responding to the needs of marginalised groups and communities across Europe. Taken together, the findings in this report provide a rich and multi-layered insight into the harms of inequality and injustice across Europe.

¹ Our community-focused approach to our litigation work involves jointly developing litigation campaigns, which are devised through long-term partnerships. Our work is driven by communities' perspectives and lived experience, in order to bring about structural change on issues of racial, social, and economic justice. Together we develop strategies that tackle root causes of unjust and unequal power structures.

² Strategic litigation is a powerful tool that can be used alongside advocacy, campaigning, and policy work to help bring about systemic change. It involves bringing strategically-selected legal cases with the intended purpose of advancing systemic change beyond the circumstances of the individual case or complainant(s).

³ Systemic harms broadly describe the detrimental impact of oppressive and unequal power structures, which emerge as/result in racial, social, and economic injustice.



“The change that we want to see – is that communities and movements are able to have the realistic option of using litigation as one of their tools for change, on their own terms.”

Nani Jansen Reventlow
Founder of Systemic Justice



A note on methodology

“We have to find solutions ourselves and give them to our communities.”

- Policing Roundtable participant

Systemic Justice’s methodology foregrounds local community organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) from across the Council of Europe area working on the six interrelated areas of: climate justice, access to justice, policing, social protection, anti-racism, and free movement. Our consultations were conducted in multiple languages, engaging participants from over 30 countries. This report aims to profile the harms that OMCs are challenging and responding to, and to support the development of Systemic Justice by surfacing the urgent priorities for OMCs working on racial, social, and economic justice in Europe. Our bottom-up, community-centred research principles and values foreground the voices and narratives of those who experience and live with the violence of systemic harms. Systemic Justice works to gather information in a non-extractive manner, seeking to collaboratively develop opportunities for action and systemic change.

Systemic Justice’s intersectional approach is designed to surface the ways in which racial, social, and economic injustice are both systemic and interwoven; impacting individuals and communities in ways that are contingent on the intersections of race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexuality, language, nationality, class, disability, and age. This approach informs our responses and possible solutions. Uniquely, our analysis also avoids a common narrative which presents [technology*](#) as an element that can be separated from systems of oppression. Instead, we explore the digital and non-digital contexts of all the six themes, recognising that technology is a manifestation of the power structures that underpin all systemic injustices.

* - Yellow under-lined words are clickable, and will take you to other references to technology and digital rights throughout this document.

The approach of this work consists of the following components:

1000+

organisations, movements,
and collectives

1. **A database developed by Systemic Justice of 1000+ organisations, movements and collectives (OMCs)**

operating across Europe, who are organising and resisting injustice alongside groups and communities affected by systemic harms.

100

survey respondents

2. **A survey of nearly 100 OMCs**, made available in English, French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish, distributed online by Systemic Justice and its networks.

83

participants from
33 European countries

3. **Six community-centred online roundtables comprising 83 participants from 33 European countries**, organised around each of the six thematic areas. The roundtables were designed to bring together and encourage collaboration between OMCs, as well as to identify opportunities for strategic litigation. Using an intersectional approach, roundtable participants representing Black, Muslim, and Roma communities, migrants and refugees, sex workers, LGBTQI+ communities, undocumented people, anti-trafficking campaigners, disability campaigners, housing justice initiatives, children's rights groups, climate justice campaigners, and much more, provided community-centred insights into challenges and harms as contemporaneously experienced across Europe.

100

one-to-one
conversations

4. **One-to-one conversations with 100 individuals and representatives** who are engaged with the racial, social, and economic justice ecosystem across Europe.

Findings were thematically analysed, and in line with our community-centred approach, brought back to the roundtable participants, as well as to several European umbrella and membership organisations, for discussion and validation.

"I feel empowered by being here. It makes me feel courageous."

- Climate Justice Roundtable participant



33
countries

40+
communities
involved

6
languages



**Some of the communities
that participated:**

Black, Muslim, Roma, East & South
East Asian, Refugees, Sex workers,
Undocumented people, and LGBTQI+



**Some of the
topics discussed:**

Disability justice, deportations,
air pollution, police violence,
trans health, and artificial intelligence

Findings

Emerging themes

As outlined in the methodology, 1000+ organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) were identified for inclusion in the dataset. A primary objective of developing the dataset was to identify local and community OMCs working in close proximity to systemic injustices, in order to inform the roundtable conversations, and in turn guide the future work of Systemic Justice. To ensure a balanced geographical distribution amongst roundtable participants and a sufficient geographical representation of the harms presently experienced across the varying regions of Europe, we selected OMCs from across seven demarcated zones within the Council of Europe area.

The dataset found that only 10% of local and community OMCs were engaged in strategic work (including litigation) while others focused on policy and advocacy work. To explore the OMCs' concerns about, and interest in, using the law to challenge systemic injustice, we drew upon the responses of nearly 100 survey respondents. The survey found that OMCs' legal demands included recognition of their experiences of discrimination and oppression, and recognition of barriers to the application of protective laws at the local and systemic level. OMCs also outlined a need to address racial and ethnic disparities in criminal legal systems. They wanted to hold state institutions accountable for present and past systemic harms including colonialism and slavery, as well as to demand the implementation of existing laws.


Finally, OMCs called for the ending of legal impunity, and the abolition of oppressive social structures, prisons, detention, and unjust legislation.

The main themes emerging for support around strategic litigation are as follows:

1. There is a need for legal support, legal expertise, and lawyers.
2. There is a need for support with pre-litigation research, and research generally—both the skills to do so and actual human resources.
3. There is a need for support with financial and human resources in particular, but also more specific needs such as identifying claimants.
4. There is a need for help with developing knowledge, education, guidance, and training (for which, as several respondents note, often there are limited financial resources). Some OMCs also mentioned a need for international data (precedents) to support cases locally.
5. There is a need to know about local context before engaging in strategic litigation on issues that affect local communities.


Summary

Being in close proximity to the harms of societal inequality informs in-depth and at times visceral disclosures of injustice. The rich, detailed, and granular reflections of the racial, social, and economic problems that emerged from the survey data is therefore a result of Systemic Justice's approach to surfacing harms through centring the narratives and discourses of local communities and organisations. Local and community OMCs contend with a series of multiple and converging themes being experienced by individuals, groups, and communities who are in close proximity to systemic harms. A central finding here is that it is precisely those local and community OMCs with reduced capacity and resources who are under additional pressure to respond to the multiplicity of communities' needs. In spite of this, an overwhelming majority of organisations that responded to the survey affirmed that they would be willing to work in partnership to develop legal cases to address the systemic injustices being experienced.



“At the end of the day when we start talking about justice, we meet at the same point, because we all want justice for each other.”

Social Protection Roundtable participant





Voicing, discussing, and resisting systemic harms

“It is so refreshing to not be in a white-dominated space. Systemic Justice feels refreshing—I am curious what they will do.”

- Climate Justice Roundtable participant


The views and perspectives presented below are those of local and community organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) who participated in the roundtables and who reside in high proximity to systemic harms and structural inequality. Reflective of the roundtables’ relational collaborative design, participants expressed joy in being afforded a space within which they were able to speak their authentic truths and enjoy the opportunity to “come together” to discuss their common experiences of resisting systemic injustices. For each of the roundtables, opportunities for action are presented; these are not exhaustive lists, but should act as generative prompts for critical steps that we must take in order to effect change.

Climate Justice: linking poverty, inequality, social justice, and the climate crisis

“Those who have polluted the most are seeking to erase their history.”


- Climate Justice Roundtable participant

The Climate Justice Roundtable was attended by 12 representatives of organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) from Albania, Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Germany, Romania, Serbia, and the United Kingdom. Participants were working on a range of issues including climate, housing, racial justice, gas, pollution, and spatial justice.




Key issues

- Discourses on climate must understand the connections between the climate crisis and socioeconomic inequality, disability, and race.
- Accountability must form part of our solutions to climate injustice, including redistributive reparations to address intergenerational harms through redirecting resources to communities who are most affected by the harms of climate change and other interrelated systemic injustices.



“The air you breathe is just as important as the food you put on your table.”

Climate Justice Roundtable participant





Climate vulnerability as a systemic harm

Roundtable participants reported that discourses on climate continuously overlook the connections between the climate crisis and socioeconomic inequality, poverty, and race. Climate activism is often presented as a white, middle-class concern, from which racialised and poor communities are absent and excluded. Some participants recalled their experiences at the 2021 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP26), noting that work on climate—from activism to knowledge building—has become extractive rather than led by Black and brown people, who are largely left out of the conversation. While communities of colour are studied and analysed by white people, their inclusion as experts is rarely facilitated, and the resulting knowledge based on their lives is never shared.

Counter to this erasure and extractivism, the Climate Justice Roundtable centred the knowledge and experiences of communities who bear the brunt of the climate crisis and environmental racism. Participants' discussion of environmental racism suggests that it is a series of structural—often intentional—policies and practices that force already marginalised populations into unsafe environments. The link between climate vulnerability and systemic injustice was discussed at length: for example, it was noted that inequality manifests through material conditions such as poor housing, deprivation of resources and essential infrastructure, as well as declining environmental conditions themselves. Participants remarked that capitalism and imperialism exploit nature and deplete communities of resources, and additionally that social and environmental inequalities have been exacerbated by other emergencies including the COVID-19 pandemic.

Roma communities were identified as being particularly susceptible to the impacts of the climate crisis due to policy requirements that often force them to reside near landfills, in unhygienic conditions and environments that further increase their exposure to climate degradation, social insecurity, and health issues (Rankin, 2020; Szilvasi, 2021). In the UK, racialised communities are more likely to live in areas at high risk of heatwaves, despite the fact that these areas are emitting less carbon (Gayle, 2022). One participant observed that in mining regions in the Czech Republic—which are largely poor with high unemployment, low literacy and poor housing—residents increasingly experience respiratory issues.

The need for accountability in climate solutions

Participants at the roundtable consistently made interventions regarding the systemic racism of current climate activism. Ongoing global efforts to address the climate crisis fail to tackle environmental racism and other systemic intersecting sites of oppression, and do not hold countries and companies accountable on this crucial point. One participant noted, “the abusers are trying to delete their responsibilities”, bringing to the fore both the colonial history of climate injustice and the current racialised and class dynamics of climate pollution. Wealthy people—

often white Europeans—consume more energy and are the biggest contributors to carbon emissions. However, to date, they suffer less from the impact of the climate crisis in comparison to poor, racialised, and marginalised communities. This unequal contribution to and impact of pollution has led to calls for reparations for climate injustice, which roundtable participations suggested could provide a foundation for accountability and financial support for those most harmed by the climate crisis and its systemic intersections with racial, social, and economic injustice.

Roundtable participants noted that subsidies and climate finance are provided to the biggest polluters and wealthy, white-led organisations. As the crisis worsens, its effects intersect further with other systemic harms, however many of the current solutions will not only fail to alleviate these harms, but are likely to exacerbate them. For example, energy transitions could affect the material conditions of racialised and poor communities through job losses, higher energy prices, and the increasing “cost of living”. Equally, the increasing climate crisis places pressure on people to leave areas affected by flooding, land pollution, water pollution, and air pollution, who then face additional issues regarding freedom of movement and social protection in a new country.

Opportunities for action

1. Establish a framework for redistributive reparations, redirecting resources to communities most affected by the harms of climate change and other interrelated systemic injustices.
2. Build legal challenges to hold institutions and corporations accountable for climate abuses that disproportionately affect marginalised groups and communities.
3. Disrupt the predominance of a white Eurocentric climate activism ecosystem with an intersectional approach, including by developing key messaging which recognises the systemic climate abuses and harms endured by invisibilised and socio-economically marginalised groups.
4. Collect evidence and raise awareness of the disproportionate health and wellbeing impacts of air, water, and soil pollution for racially, socially, and economically marginalised groups and communities.
5. Further demonstrate the interconnectedness of climate change with other systemic harms, paying particular attention to racism, Islamophobia, Afrophobia and anti-Blackness, as well as anti-gypsy and anti-Roma attitudes in laws and policies, alongside state violence through policing and the border regime which restricts freedom of movement.




Access to Justice: fighting for rights, responding to systemic harms

“Justice for whom? Democracy, human rights, are not working for Roma. [...] How do we seek protection from those institutions when they are the same institutions that are failing us over and over.”

- Access to Justice Roundtable participant

The Access to Justice Roundtable was attended by 13 participants from organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) from Albania, Armenia, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Participants were working on a range of issues including human rights, disability, sex work, reproductive justice, racial justice, and justice for transgender and Roma communities.



Key issues

- Alongside advocacy work and struggles for legal recognition, OMCs' time and energy is often dedicated to immediate and pressing concerns such as access to healthcare, education, housing, and infrastructure
- OMCs are concerned with both the absence of protective laws, and protection from laws which target, penalise, and criminalise marginalised groups.



“Racism impacts our communities: they suffer so many different real human rights abuses. It’s our right to have something done about it. And we are the best people, with those experiences, to do that.”

Access to Justice Roundtable participant



Systemic injustice, legal recognition, and everyday survival

Alongside advocacy work and struggles for legal recognition, participants noted that they often had to respond to more immediate and pressing concerns affecting community members. These included identifying doctors and healthcare providers for transgender community members, or helping obtain crucial documentation such as birth certificates for migrant women of colour who were described by one respondent as a “demographic that is kept in the dark about their rights”. Similarly, Roma communities are supported by OMCs to obtain shelter, water, and electricity, as well as to access education. Everyday survival is intertwined with legal recognition, with one participant noting that, “[for] disabled people to have equal rights they need to be treated as equally as everyone else”. A participant disclosed another example of this inequality: that sex work is not recognised as a profession and, as a result, sex workers struggle to open a bank account. An urgent need for support stems from the systemic harm of being denied legal recognition; the scale and scope of these harms mean that providing daily support often occupies OMCs’ capacity, reducing energy and resources for advocating for fundamental rights and the breaking down of structural barriers to full participation.

During the roundtable, participants recognised the significant structural challenges and harms that require legal action. Participants were experienced in campaigning and advocating for the fundamental rights that are denied to various groups. An example was given of transgender sex workers from Eastern Europe and Central Asia, who struggle to access healthcare and medicines and are forced to navigate the “constantly shifting priorities” of government policies. Another participant spoke of improving the financial and social situation of Egyptian and Roma communities in Albania through the pursuit of employment support and opportunities. A respondent working with racialised migrant women acknowledged the need to provide emotional and wellbeing support and “empowerment through education” in order to “fight for their rights”. Concepts of “self-determination, self-organisation and autonomy” were presented as critical for moving toward the attainment of rights for affected members of the OMCs’ communities.

Intersectional oppression of the socially unprotected


Priorities raised by participants included securing rights for homeless people, improving mental healthcare, promoting the rights of people with disabilities, and gaining access to medicines. Also mentioned was employment support and domestic violence support alongside support for transgender sex workers; improving the financial situation of Egyptian and Roma communities and the abolition of police organisations. Participants noted a lack of acknowledgement of systemic anti-Black racism, anti-gypsyism⁴, and Islamophobia, and the ways in which these forms of oppression interact with arbitrary legal strategies that deny belonging through nationality, citizenship, and more, as well as access to a range of social goods and services, like access to housing and education.

Barriers and problems raised by roundtable participants concerned the absence of protective laws on one hand, and the absence of protection from laws on the other: for example, one participant noted the absence of “anti-discrimination and anti-hate speech laws in Armenia”. This lack of legal protection was exacerbated further by the COVID-19 pandemic, which enabled further criminalisation of marginalised communities under new policy and legal frameworks. Participants also recognised the convergence of multiple oppressions and an interconnectedness of thematic areas; for example, OMCs in this roundtable understood the need to contend with the systemic harms related to “social protection”, with 60% of OMCs engaged with both themes. The impacts of policing on racialised and marginalised communities, restrictions to freedom of movement, and limited social protection at state level were prevalent throughout the discussions. Participants remarked on the persistence of racial profiling by police; a clear sense of mistrust and disempowerment by racialised, religiously marginalised, and undocumented and migrant groups regarding approaching police and law enforcement agencies, and experiences of exclusion, racism, and violence. It was noted that a pervasive sense of being policed often characterises the everyday experiences of racially, socially, and economically marginalised groups.

“People who are directly affected tend to not enforce their rights because there is little chance of change. A lot of people don’t know where to go to get support.”

- Social Protection Roundtable participant

⁴ We note that there are conflicting views on the use of the word ‘Gypsy’ in different contexts and languages across Europe. We use this term, and the term ‘anti-gypsyism’ to reflect back the terminology offered by communities in this consultation specifically. We recognise that there isn’t one term or definition used by communities themselves—who are not homogenous. We understand that the terms ‘Gypsy’ and ‘Roma’ are often inclusive of a wide range of groups such as people who identify as Gypsies, Roma, and Travellers, as well as those who use many other terms of self and collective identification.





Opportunities for action

1. Develop community-led methodologies for documenting injustices experienced by racially, socially, and economically marginalised communities in order to affirm their claims of oppression and support the legal actions of local and community OMCs.
2. Establish legal tactics and litigation strategies that enable local and community OMCs to pursue both rights and access to justice, while resisting reliance upon the individual claim toward a 'human rights of the collective', as well as avoiding pathologising and stigmatising labels ('offender/ex-offender', undocumented, homeless, etc.).
3. Support the development of reimagined legal tactics to challenge the use of collective forms of punishment across Europe (joint enterprise, criminal conspiracy, etc), which target racially marginalised children and young people framed as 'gangs'.
4. Challenge the racist practice of segregating and/or excluding racially marginalised children and young people (specifically Roma) from education, which profoundly affects future opportunities and aspirations.
5. Challenge European government(s) over the absence of and/or non-enforcement of anti-discrimination and anti-hate speech policies and practices, and racist crimes.




Policing: eradicating police violence and institutional violence

“Our experience is basically, there is no justice...[understanding] how we can achieve justice, is why I am here.”


- Policing Roundtable participant

The Policing Roundtable was attended by 13 participants from organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) from Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Spain, and the United Kingdom. Participants were working on issues including sex workers' rights and justice, disability rights, anti-racism, and in support of Muslim, Gypsy, Roma, and Traveller communities, as well as the victims of police violence, and bereaved friends and families of people killed by police.



Key issues

- Law enforcement targets individuals and groups who are “socially unprotected”; those who live at the site of intersecting oppressions, and in particular those whose work, immigration status, or both are criminalised. There is therefore a need to build a robust counter-narrative that makes clear the inherent harms of policing.
- The encroachment of [technology](#), the growth of private security firms, the militarisation of policing, and fortifying of borders marks an onerous continuity of the harms of policing across Europe.

A cluster of three stylized flowers in the top right corner. One is white with a yellow center, and two are light pink with white centers.

“Marginalised groups have to be the main protagonist. We are done with white saviours. We need allies, and we have the tools to empower ourselves.”

Policing Roundtable participant

A cluster of two stylized flowers in the bottom left corner. One is white with a yellow center, and the other is light pink with a white center.

Making the harms of policing visible

Participants drew attention to harmful, invisibilised experiences of encountering the police and wider law enforcement agencies. Such experiences often correspond with denials of justice in the wake of harms inflicted by the police. This is particularly traumatic for bereaved family members of people killed by police, who are required to engage with protracted legal inquiries and inquests which prolong their grief and suffering without justice. As one participant said, “the government gives nothing to the families”, and that, “we want the truth recognised, [but] it is the police who investigate other policemen”. Discourses regarding the harms of policing often rely upon police monitoring figures, which conceal the full impact of state violence on racially, socially, and economically marginalised people and spaces.

The systemic violence of policing and the impunity of the police force emphasises the need for OMCs to work from an intersectional approach on this issue. The analysis of the dataset shows that the number of OMCs focusing on the harms of policing is comparatively low, representing only 8% of all OMCs identified. In the roundtable conversations, by contrast, policing was discussed extensively, including the need to extend understandings of the ways in which contemporary state policing and law enforcement is delivered and developing (see also Harris et al, 2021). This includes recognising the expansion of police into school and classroom settings, and at national and internal borders with increased use of ‘ghetto zones’ [which enact curfews and sites of exclusion, and are central to the maintenance of a ‘hostile environment’], and the consequent harms that these developments present. For one participant, the current situation is “like a ‘treasure trove’ of [police] injustices.”

Participants noted that these developments are accompanied by **tech-enabled** strategies such as facial recognition, digital fingerprinting, social media surveillance, and crossover of databases, that have served to increase and enhance racist surveillance capabilities with increasingly problematic and often unseen consequences. Across the six roundtables, policing and surveillance was discussed as extending into the digital realm where the negative impacts of artificial intelligence (AI), including algorithmic targeting and surveillance, were presented as a danger that is generally unknown and which communities are largely uninformed about.

The intersecting experiences of being policed and ‘socially unprotected’

One participant noted that people who are undocumented sometimes become engaged in irregular activities of survival, such as sex work and working as street vendors, which increases their likelihood of contact with police. As one participant disclosed, while sex work within a particular country might not be illegal, the police will still harass and criminalise undocumented migrant sex workers. The targeting of workers’ ‘undocumented status’ leads to criminalisation in an environment where workers cannot regularise their stay in the country, illustrating the cyclical nature of being policed. Irregular activities of survival were for one participant illustrative of “institutional abandonment”; where there are no social protections, then “one has to work illegally”.

For another respondent the policing of the Roma community was illustrative of racial profiling which “feeds stereotypes and constructions of Roma people”; it was noted that LGBTQI+ Roma people experience both police harassment, as well as exclusion from LGBTQI+ spaces due to the “anti-Roma structures” of European societies. In addition, the policing of transgender people across different geographical locations was raised, surfacing many varied negative experiences. Participants noted that the harassment and surveillance of Muslim communities by police has significantly undermined ‘trust’ in the police and law enforcement agencies. This in turn affects reporting and handling of hate crimes, with one participant noting: “the police do not implement or use the legislation and do not recognise hate crimes as hate crimes.” Overall, participants shared an understanding that policing and law enforcement were driven by racism, discriminatory attitudes, and negative perceptions of marginalised groups.

“There are multiple stages and the cumulative traumatic effects of the [migration] journey. Then policing at every border.”

- Policing Roundtable participant

Opportunities for action


1. Recognise the violence of policing, including surveillance, harassment, and deaths in police custody as part of institutional oppression rooted in racism, anti-gypsyism, Islamophobia, ableism, homophobia and transphobia, and more.
2. Mount a legal challenge against racial and ethnic profiling by the police, and the use of stop and search—in particular its disproportionate use against those who have been institutionally abandoned and are forced into irregular activities due to social (un)protection.
3. Challenge the racist and criminalising drivers of over-representation and disparities across European justice systems with particular attention to disproportionate incarceration of people who are racially, socially, and economically marginalised.
4. Facilitate and support campaigns to decriminalise sex work across the region, with a particular focus on resisting policing of sex workers of colour and undocumented sex workers.
5. Build understanding of and challenges against the racist use of **technology** in policing and the wider criminal legal systems across Europe.







Social Protection: the institutional violence of welfare

The Social Protection Roundtable was attended by 16 participants from organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Germany, Romania, the Netherlands, Spain, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. Participants were working on a range of issues including workers' rights, and justice for LGBTQI+ communities, marginalised communities, migrant communities, transgender communities, tenants, lesbians, survivors of domestic violence, and for Roma communities.




Key issues

- Social protection is widely denied to marginalised groups, and the systems and processes that deliver or deny social protection constitute a form of dehumanising violence.
- In particular, survivors of gender-based violence, Roma communities, LGBTQI+ communities, Muslim communities, and migrant communities broadly face the violence of unequal social protection—in many cases experiencing homelessness, poverty, and institutional discrimination.



“The current legal framework protects a system of privileges. We cannot legislate on migration without including migrants, or on issues of mental health without involving people affected. Without including the people it concerns, we cannot change the system.”

Social Protection Roundtable participant



A note on neoliberal myths of welfare

Within our dataset, 490 OMCs were working within the field of “social protection”—the largest thematic group of all. Most of the OMCs were operating in immediate proximity to systemic harms of social protection; with significant overlapping focus on access to justice (32%), anti-racism (17%), and free movement (15%), pointing to the multiplicity of systemic injustices involved in social protection. The range of issues addressed in the Social Protection Roundtable were considerable, exposing both the extent of denied access to social protection, and the dehumanising violence of social protection processes. Given the breadth of this topic, this contextualising note provides critical grounding for the Social Protection Roundtable findings.

Social protection typically includes benefit provision for “sickness and healthcare”, “old age and survivors”, “disability”, “family and children”, “unemployment”, “housing”, and “social exclusion”. Across Europe, there is considerable variation in the type and levels of social protection. These range from minimal state provision for those who are socially and economically marginalised based on the “laissez-faire” model of the new right, neoliberal free market economy, to more comprehensive social protection models that provide increased but varying degrees and standards of free healthcare, free and full-time education, a guaranteed national income, unemployment support, support for families and children, and more.

Both neoliberal and social protection models, however, are accompanied by widespread myths and stereotypes that stigmatise social protection needs, framing issues such as crises in healthcare and housing—which are in reality the result of factors such as poor governance and economic policies, geopolitical conflicts and wars—as (incorrectly) attributable to working-class and migrant communities “draining resources”. Across Europe, the extension of social provision to those seen as ‘outsiders’ is extremely limited, and barriers to access is driven by Islamophobia, anti-gypsyism, and anti-Roma and Afrophobic discourses. Recently, this violence has also been exacerbated by digitisation and automation of welfare services across Europe. In addition to furthering the [digital](#) divide for those without access to devices, internet connection, and digital literacy, digitisation of welfare has increased systemic injustices embedded in welfare provision, and concealed them, hiding behind computer systems.

Social protection and intersecting oppressions

The Social Protection Roundtable participants discussed the prevalence of gender-based violence, which is exacerbated by a denial of refuge, housing, and access to support for survivors. The compounding intersections of “race, gender, ethnicity, skin colour, and class” for survivors were also discussed extensively; for example, Roma women and girls experience violence due to the patriarchal structure of society, including the institutional racism of the police who are “supposed to protect them”. Community groups also addressed what they called “the culturalising of violence” where violence was framed by state institutions as



being inherent to the ethnic and cultural identities of survivors, rather than being caused by structural inequalities. A particular sense of social unprotection was also evident for LGBTQI+ communities who face violence as well as barriers to accessing healthcare treatments and services, or “safe zones”. Social protection was also discussed as being limited for “Muslim women of Moroccan and Turkish background” in the Netherlands, and for LGBTQI+ women. For migrants and refugees, exclusion from social protection inhibits integration into society as, “[the dominant society] automatically reject[s] us, when we want to access our rights” and the State “doesn’t pay attention to this.”


These experiences evidence the institutional violence of unequal social protection—whether it is scarcely given or denied completely. Participants noted that those who are economically, socially, and racially marginalised have to “move through the world differently” experiencing homelessness, poverty, and institutional discrimination. For example, one participant disclosed that migrants in Cyprus are required to undergo annual HIV tests upon which the continuation of their residency relies, with a positive test resulting in deportation. This demonstrates a creeping form of “biopolitical surveillance”, marking a further dimension of the “hostile environment” weaponised by the State. Furthermore, in the absence of social protection, these groups were hardest hit by the recent COVID-19 pandemic.

“We are told that we have equality, but in court we don’t. We need to make the justice system fairer for all. We have all the laws and regulations, but they don’t apply equally to everyone.”

-Social Protection Roundtable participant

Opportunities for action

1. Secure equal access to healthcare and welfare for people navigating the asylum system.
2. Hold hospitals responsible for death and mistreatment resulting from institutional racism in healthcare.
3. Bring together parents and guardians of children facing discrimination to challenge such practices and push for the promotion of anti-racism in educational institutions.
4. Challenge exclusionary and ableist support services.
5. Together with people in immigration detention and incarcerated people, campaign against law enforcement’s impunity in cases where they are challenged for specific acts or patterns of violence, which disproportionately affect marginalised groups.



Anti-racism: the legal and social fight for inclusion, safety, and justice

“Building a community that loves and cares for the place it lives in, and reaches out to others, is a priority, but often falls through the net. Building collective care is something we cannot do enough of.”


- Anti-racism Roundtable participant

The Anti-racism Roundtable was attended by 15 participants from organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) from Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greenland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom. Participants were working on a range of topics including Roma history, racial justice, anti-Islamophobia, antifascism, anti-racism, decolonialism, and justice for Roma and Sinti communities.





Key issues

- There is a need for accountability for violence perpetrated by police and other law enforcement agencies, including border enforcement, supported by independent monitoring mechanisms.
- There is a need for awareness raising on a range of injustices, including physical demonstrations; opening up spaces where people can share lived experiences; divestment in police in order to invest in local care structures; and strategic litigation in order to attain basic rights.



“Racism is not just unipolar,
it intersects in so many ways.
It is important to also eradicate that
within our communities. The goal
is to love each other more.”

Anti-racism Roundtable participant



Systemic and intersectional harms of racism

Structural, systemic, and institutional racism repeatedly arose as a central topic within each of the thematic roundtable discussions and conversations. Racial and ethnic profiling were discussed as drivers of police encounters, bringing marginalised groups and communities into contact with aspects of the criminal legal system such as incarceration, immigration detention, and deportation, as well as death in police custody. The absence of wellbeing and support services in the context of state killings and abuses was discussed as further harming individuals impacted by trauma, grief and loss who do not receive justice or any financial support. It was noted that inquests in cases of police killings and deaths in custody are biased and inadequate, and accountability for deaths caused by police is a rare occurrence. The systemic discrimination people face whether in public or private spaces, on the move or at borders (including when encountering EU external border policies which seek to push people crossing borders to other countries) results in repeated human rights violations, violence, brutality, and death. These outcomes are compounded by a combination of racism in policing, the inadequacy of systems to facilitate migration, exclusionary policies, and criminalisation.

Another systemic impact of racism discussed was hate campaigns against, and negative social perceptions of, marginalised groups. One participant outlined the need for decolonial, intersectional, and inclusive public education on marginalised communities' collective histories. For marginalised communities (for example, LGBTQI+ Roma people), an absence of understanding and awareness of Roma history contributes to a lack of self-esteem and sense of self, whilst externally perpetuating monolithic ideas of these communities. Participants noted that internally within communities, this has led to suspicion, revilement, and punishment of transgender women in particular; with less people to mediate, offer safe space and guide individuals. Participants noted a sense of fear and reluctance to take action against the police, which results in a lack of mobilisation in response to the problems being experienced.

Legal and social actions against racism

Participants made clear that dismantling systemic racism should be at the core of advocacy against policing. There is a need to mobilise public opinion on a range of injustices and issues, such as community surveillance, in order to force institutions to address discrimination. Awareness-raising can include physical demonstrations, as well as opening up spaces where people can share lived experiences, so that activists can establish incident patterns within communities. Participants noted that a communication network to collect and share evidence with families could be established, but it would require building partnerships of trust with the OMCs involved. Roundtable participants also stated that strategic litigation should be a priority in order to attain basic rights such as barrier-free access to healthcare services and vaccines for all (including migrant workers and sex workers), without penalisation or risk of deportation. From a strategic perspective, litigation at a local level as well as collective forms of litigation should be prioritised.



Participants also highlighted the need for accountability for violence perpetrated by police and other law enforcement agencies, including border enforcement. This requires the establishment of efficient and independent border monitoring and accountability mechanisms, in the face of an increasing climate of surveillance and securitisation of EU external borders. Rather than rely on current judicial practices there is also space for a Peoples' Tribunal to be established, in order to offer an environment of impartiality that can centre a meaningful commitment to justice. Participants at the roundtable noted a need to combat corruption within government, institutions, and expert fields, including those who tamper with and destroy evidence, intimidate witnesses, and influence false and biased expertise; especially within the medical field and in relation to deaths in police custody. Participants noted that governance and judicial processes should embed advocacy to combat future harmful laws (including those that limit challenge, such as the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022 in the UK), and that OMCs should encourage divestment in police in order to invest in local care structures. Participants also highlighted calls to facilitate the implementation of laws on religious freedom, non-discrimination, and against racist violence, and an urgent need to abolish detention centres.


Opportunities for action

1. Empower local and community OMCs to campaign for European governments' recognition that persistent patterns of systemic racial, social, and economic inequalities are driven by institutional racism.
2. Challenge the criteria and evidence base that informs (and legitimises) the development and implementation of 'ghetto zone' policies and other forms of geographical zonal regulation (such as curfews and exclusion zones).
3. Campaign to extend recognition of the effects of systemic racism on emotional wellbeing and mental health for racially marginalised children and young people, and legally challenge the disproportionate levels and use of school discipline, school exclusion, and expulsions from mainstream education.
4. Support growing calls for institutional funding to assist bereaved families in their pursuit of justice for victims following fatal police violence.
5. Bring racial profiling to litigation; for example, bring a lawsuit to end the practice of discrimination in the labour market or welfare system, particularly with the **use of AI**, and more broadly empirically demonstrate and legally challenge the encroachment of technologies that compound and exacerbate the material effects of institutional racism.





Free Movement: systemic harms of border enforcement, immigration and asylum laws, policies, and practice

The Free Movement Roundtable was attended by 14 participants from organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) from Croatia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Romania, Spain, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Ukraine. Participants were working on a range of topics including migration, human rights, and ending immigration detention.





Key issues

- People migrating to and seeking asylum in Europe face discrimination and prejudice based on the intersecting identities of religion, race, ethnicity, gender, and country of origin. There is also a noted disparity between experiences of non-Europeans and European nationals both in navigating the immigration and asylum system, and in accessing social protection and the right to work upon arrival.
- Lack of awareness and knowledge of the law, as well as fear of victimisation prevents people from legally challenging their treatment by immigration and asylum systems. Where successful court rulings are secured, they are unenforced.



“We need inclusion rather than integration. [...] people’s right to continue to live and thrive in their own culture, instead of having to work to be allowed into the system.”

Free Movement Roundtable participant



Fortress Europe

Participants drew attention to the years-long backlog of cases that disproportionately affects mostly non-European asylum seekers as they await decisions on their applications, which has stood in stark contrast to the recent treatment of people fleeing conflict in Ukraine, who have moved through the asylum system at a quicker pace. Participants also noted that white European migrants more broadly face less social and legal discrimination, and are supported to integrate faster into their resettlement countries. The implication for roundtable participants is that European countries have the political will and social capacity to provide better, more dignified responses and care for asylum seekers but disproportionately fail to provide this for racially marginalised people. Recent news reports also show an intentional implementation of policies that provide white European refugees with immediate social protection, and access, and right to work (Majid, 2022; Hockaday, 2022).

The asylum system is characterised by “deterrence”, and the EU has established cooperative relationships with countries such as Turkey and Libya to prevent the arrival of people into Europe (Crisp, 2020; Majid, 2022) resulting in increased exposure to harms, human rights abuses, and sometimes death for people crossing borders. One roundtable participant called for an “end of cooperation between the EU member states and Libya”, and an end to criminalisation of people on the move. Roundtable participants also suggested that governments should take immediate action on human rights violations and other harms experienced by those crossing borders; or, as a participant put it, implement “structural change to the European borders”.

Unenforced laws, lack of access, economic precarity, and dehumanisation

In considering the disparity in treatment received by asylum seekers, participants noted that identity-based discrimination and prejudice in the migration and asylum processes is a contravention of European Union and international human rights law. This stipulation in the law, they argue, is often overlooked and underused for many reasons including due to lack of awareness, fear of victimisation of whistleblowers, and lack of access to justice. However, in some cases, as one participant observed, court rulings are unenforced—i.e. “nothing happens... [court rulings don’t] change the laws of the countries itself”. People seeking asylum who are “wary of being deported”, are often distrustful of the system and, as a result, are often scared of making complaints about the asylum system out of fear of retaliation or victimisation by the state. This complicates activism, strategic litigation, and campaigning that often relies on testimony from people with lived experience.

The interconnectedness of issues relating to free movement with denials of social protection was intrinsic to many of the conversations within the roundtable. Participants stressed the



SAFE MIGRATION ROUTES

SOLIDARITY

EQUITY

importance of the “right to work”, which is often denied to people seeking asylum, forcing them to live in destitution, or to be reliant on the State (which in turn often keeps people in situations of destitution), both situations posing a barrier to settling into the country. The problems faced by people crossing borders, as well as by those seeking asylum are further compounded by poor living conditions in immigration detention centres and in accommodation provided by governments to people who are navigating the asylum system. Ireland was cited as a case study; it was noted that accommodation for people navigating the asylum system offers little privacy or dignity. Participants described this accommodation as “a prison”—one without hope or timeline for release. The open-ended nature of immigration detention negatively impacts the physical and mental health of people who are detained.

“We’re trying to create a change in society’s perception of immigration. [...] Detention centres should no longer be an option.”

- Free Movement Roundtable participant

Opportunities for action

1. Facilitate the development of a counter-narrative to reframe perceptions of migration across Europe. This includes deconstructing ahistorical and simplistic framings of ‘economic migration’ through understanding the ‘push factor’ of economic stagnation as attributable to European interference, and in addition building appreciation of the myriad interrelated drivers for the movement of people across Europe (including climate change, wars, and other crises).
2. Support a campaign for the regularisation and decriminalisation of all migrants regardless of their status across European countries, and for the setting of clear timeframes for processing asylum applications.
3. Advocate for legally agreed social provisions to respond to the social, health, and psychological needs of people who are seeking asylum across Europe.
4. Advocate for safe migration routes and passages across Europe, and create clear lines of accountability and legal challenges for human rights violations across the migratory routes to Europe.
5. Support interventions and actions by OMCs to save lives at sea (activities which are increasingly facing criminal and legal sanctions).



Surfacing other priorities

“We need assistance and we need help, but we also want to be partakers in that help.”


- Access to Justice Roundtable participant

Issue of ‘outsider’ NGOs taking up space and resources

Many roundtable participants voiced frustration at what was described as a “competition” wherein larger non-governmental organisations (NGOs) were “drowning out the voices of smaller grassroots movements who actually have impact...” and, “cutting the funding means, cutting the oxygen.” There is a sense of an “NGO rights industrial complex” which is characterised by forcing organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) to compete for resources, and the selective foregrounding and prioritising of themes or specific marginalised groups around which funding is made available. This means that local and community groups are utilised tokenistically to attract funding for larger NGOs, while resources are held back from groups and communities who urgently need them. In addition, a lack of resources also leads to overwork and unpaid labour; properly funded work enables self- and collective care, which allows organisers to maintain energy and space for longer-term political action. Local and community OMCs demand the resources and the power to respond to the harms experienced within their communities on their terms.

Firefighting and the need for resources to adopt legal tools

Community-facing OMCs are endowed with a rich understanding of harms as they are often in and of the communities they serve. At the same time, resources and capacity are required to practically enable OMCs to also respond to the political drivers of systemic injustices—resources that are particularly lacking for small, community-facing OMCs. Survey respondents noted that they didn’t use legal tools because of the “lack of time”, knowledge, and understanding which presented barriers to utilising legal tools and litigation. OMCs that would be benefiting most from legal tools thus often lack capacity to develop them due to “firefighting”: participants detailed how systemic harms drew extensively upon their limited capacity to respond to immediate problems and concerns of community members. Encouragingly, respondents from local and community-based organisations asserted that they would be interested in adopting litigation as a strategy as long as they are resourced and supported.

A cluster of three stylized flowers in the top right corner. One is white with a yellow center, and two are light pink with white centers.

“Understanding people is not just about noting how the systems oppress them, it is also understanding why they want to live in a world that is different.”

Anti-racism Roundtable participant

A cluster of two stylized flowers in the bottom left corner. One is white with a yellow center, and the other is light pink with a white center.

Building meaningful collaboration with lawyer communities

Of the nearly 100 survey respondents, 85 expressed that they would be interested in “working with an organisation to develop cases supportive of their cause”. Respondents highlighted the type of support that they would find helpful, which included advice and support in pursuing legal cases, and developing an understanding of the potential uses of the law in pursuit of the cause. It is worth noting that reference was made by some respondents to the qualities they would look for in a legal partner—with “trust”, “lawyers without bias”, and lawyers with “the same political goals” enabling them to build a “trustful relationship” being cited. Furthermore, one respondent stated that they would want lawyers with “a deep sympathy with organising” with another noting the need for “a complementary relationship” with lawyers who can “work without discrimination”. This suggests that collaboration and the centrality of relationships is critical for respondents, rather than the knowledge expertise of lawyers and legal practitioners. These findings highlight the importance and centrality of relationship building and developing an understanding of the perspective of OMCs.

Encroachment of technology and its invisible harms

One topic that deserves further exploration is the role of **technology** in systemic harms—such as the use of tech in policing and border control; the automation of welfare cruelty and surveillance of marginalised groups and communities; and, last but not least, the contribution of the tech industry to the climate crisis and the many ways in which it adds to the vulnerability of marginalised communities. In the needs assessment survey, technology was discussed in the context of systemic racism, calling for accountability for the creators of tech; and for developing alternative tech solutions and open source approaches. A need was outlined for building a community-powered and ground-up politics of digital self-defence; for supporting organisations who work against discrimination in tech and police surveillance; for abolishing AI and surveillance technologies used by police; and for holding corporations and EU governments accountable for their racist ‘counter-terrorism’ policies which utilise tech extensively.

Despite being largely understood as having universal spread and use, the impact of digital technologies and their role in exacerbating systemic injustices plays out along lines of intersecting oppressions. While the encroachment of tech often operates invisibly, its use is seldom voluntary, and is enforced and made compulsory within the precise institutional contexts that are key to systemic harms (for example, the digitising of border documents, or the use of tech by police or welfare institutions). At the same time, unequal access to communication technologies further exacerbates racial, social, and economic harms. Against the illusion of tech as always beneficial, and also against the idea that tech ‘only’ manifests existing systems of oppression, we stipulate that digital tech both reflects and exacerbates systemic injustices and harms.

What's next?

This is only the beginning of Systemic Justice's collaboration with communities to bring about the structural change that is needed in Europe when it comes to racial, social, and economic justice. Our community consultation was born from the intentionality of having our work be driven and led by communities; it was one piece of a large puzzle of figuring out where we should begin our work, faced with an endless range of injustices that all need to be urgently addressed.

Our tool for change is strategic litigation, so alongside our conversations with communities, we have been mapping existing litigation work that is already seeking to address the injustices we are exploring. Taken together, our findings have surfaced a wide range of issues of systemic injustice for racially, socially, and economically marginalised groups and communities. Our conversations with organisations, movements, and collectives (OMCs) will continue setting the direction for our work, which is driven by the priorities and objectives of these groups that are fighting for change.

Future consultations

The consultation process was crafted in order to centre communities and to encourage the application of an anti-oppression and intersectional frame to the issues being discussed. This approach informed the process of selecting participants, the design of the consultation (aimed at not only information sharing, but also fostering connection between activists across Europe), the support available to facilitate participation (such as providing interpretation and meeting other access needs), and acknowledging the work of participants by providing honoraria.

We also recognise that there are opportunities to develop and improve our approach: we see this project as a starting point to build understanding across Europe, focusing on community perspectives and foregrounding their experiences. For example, future iterations of this mapping process will address the underrepresentation of OMCs within some regions of Europe, which will involve furthering our relationships with local OMCs within these areas. Furthermore, embracing the intersectional foundations of the Systemic Justice vision also demands contending with the complex nature of systemic injustice and inequality, and the variety of ways in which people experience these harms. Understanding which marginalised groups and communities are constructed as 'outsiders' and 'undeserving', and in what ways they are constructed as such, is essential to developing strategies for change. Therefore, undertaking work in service to and alongside scholar-activists and researchers across Europe will be central to our next steps.

Surfacing focus areas: climate justice and social protection

The urgent need to address injustices, and the absence of intersectional litigation work to address them has brought us to two initial areas of focus for our work: climate justice and social protection.

While the climate crisis affects us all, marginalised communities feel its effects the most. The struggle for climate justice and for racial, social, and economic justice are therefore inherently interconnected. However, while there are great successes in climate litigation, none of the current climate work in Europe takes an explicit intersectional approach or foregrounds the disproportionate impact the climate emergency has on marginalised communities. For example, those lacking access to resilient or secure housing are the most adversely affected, as they often live in areas that are susceptible to floods and other impacts of the climate crisis. At the same time, disabled people are disproportionately affected by extreme temperatures, and people placed in polluted or toxic environments will experience illnesses that could have been avoided, and bear increased health costs as a direct consequence. Tragic cases like that of Ella Kissi-Debrah—a nine-year old girl from London who died after repeated asthma attacks due to living close to a polluting highway and who is the first person to have air pollution as cause of death on her death certificate—foreshadow what awaits us all unless we take urgent action.

Similarly, across Europe a pattern is emerging where social protection is being increasingly denied as a deliberate strategy to exclude groups and communities that are systemically discriminated against as ‘undeserving’ or ineligible for governmental assistance and support. These groups include people crossing borders and people seeking asylum, LGBTQI+ people, Roma communities, sex workers, members of religious groups, and more, who are blocked from accessing essential services and face barriers to healthcare services and labour markets. Consequently, much of the work to meet essential needs for marginalised and racialised people is carried out by OMCs, with governments denying their accountability towards welfare by focusing on individual cases, rather than looking for patterns or context. Structural efforts to challenge this approach and refocus the public debate are currently virtually absent; to help change this, we need to build litigation projects in this area together with community partners who are firmly in the driving seat.

Developing community-driven litigation projects

Our thematic consultation process and mapping research are unlikely to correlate exactly to our future litigation projects; there are many factors that weigh in the balance when considering where Systemic Justice might work with partners to develop litigation projects. This starts with the partners themselves: communities are setting the direction for our work, so instead of the “cause looking for a client” approach, we’ll start from their perspective, objectives, and preferences to explore the options. Other factors to consider will include the overall public

and political climate in (a) particular jurisdiction(s), such as the possibility of creating societal support, the potential to influence other jurisdictions, and the availability of opportunities to meaningfully engage with the press, amongst other considerations. We envisage exploring new and additional issues with partners as our work grows, mirroring our ambition that these findings are not statically fixed in time and place, but instead speak to an ongoing process which we will continue to build, refine, and refresh for years to come.

We are deeply thankful to everyone who has engaged with us at this early stage of this journey, and excited about what American civil rights activist John Lewis described as the ‘good trouble’ we are yet to make together: the necessary disruption required for meaningful change. We’ve only just begun.

Thanks to our funders:

Surfacing Systemic (In)justices: A Community View, was made possible thanks to the support of the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, Bosch Stiftung, FILE Foundation, Open Society Foundations, Lankelly Chase, Freedom Fund, and Avast Foundation. Systemic Justice has also received planning funding from Luminate and the Democracy and Media Foundation, and our Founder is supported by Ashoka.



A note on sharing

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Share Alike 4.0 International license. You can view a copy of this license [here](#). Our intention is that communities who took part, and those working on these issue areas across Europe, are able to use the findings to inform their organisational work, in whatever capacity suits them. This means that this document can be copied and redistributed in any medium or format, and that it can be remixed, transformed, and built upon, provided it is for non-commercial purposes and appropriate credit is given to Systemic Justice.

If you have any questions, please contact report@systemicjustice.ngo

Bibliography

Crisp, J. (2020) 'What is Externalization and Why is it a Threat to Refugees?' Chatham House, 14 October 2020. Available at: <https://www.chathamhouse.org/2020/10/what-externalization-and-why-it-threat-refugees> (Accessed: 21st July 2022).

Gayle, D. (2022) 'UK people of colour four times more likely to live in areas 'at higher risk from heatwaves'', The Guardian, 20 July 2022. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/jul/20/uk-people-of-colour-four-times-more-likely-to-live-in-areas-at-higher-risk-from-heatwaves?fbclid=IwAR0x0xtorVCsKGLbCgXRVR5EmUconc-NLZdVbvQJO3Z58MM7i3Edbp-c87A7> (Accessed: 20th July 2022).

Harris, S., Joseph-Salisbury, R., Williams, P. and White, L. (2021) A threat to public safety: policing, racism and the Covid-19 pandemic. London: Institute for Race Relations.

Hockaday, J. (2022) 'Only letting Ukrainian asylum seekers work 'exposes racism in UK's system'', Metro, 27 March 2022. Available at: <https://metro.co.uk/2022/03/27/only-letting-ukrainian-asylum-seekers-work-exposes-racism-in-uks-system-2-16341696/> (Accessed: 21st July 2022).

Majid, S. (2022) 'EU's generosity to Ukrainian refugees should be a model for asylum.' The New Statesman, 13 May 2022. Available at: <https://www.newstatesman.com/international-content/2022/05/eu-welcome-for-ukraine-refugees-could-be-model-for-reforming-flawed-asylum-system>
'More than 3,000 lost at sea trying to reach Europe in 2021: UN.', Aljazeera, 29 April 2022.

Rankin, J. 'Roma suffer under EU's 'environmental racism', report concludes', The Guardian, 6 April 2020. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/06/roma-suffer-under-eus-environmental-racism-report-concludes>

Szilvasi, M. (2021) 'Where Roma Rights and Environmental Justice Meet.' Open Society Foundation. Available at: <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/voices/where-roma-rights-and-environmental-justice-meet>

