

## Twitter Thread by [Polly Mackenzie](#)

[Polly Mackenzie](#)

[@pollymackenzie](#)



**Here's the thing about equality intersectionality.**

**A serious effort to reduce socio-economic inequality (that did nothing on race or gender) would inevitably have disproportionate benefits to BAME communities and women.**

**Because they are more likely to be poor. (1/?)**

So Liz Truss's starting point is not off the wall.

\*Sometimes\* efforts to increase BAME inclusion or female diversity end up helping only those who were privileged already. The same woman who sits on 8 boards. The privately educated middle class child of a lawyer who gets onto a special internship to improve diversity in the law.

If you want to seriously address racial and gender disparities you need to also tackle poverty and sociology economic inequality. You have to be intersectional.

Because the middle classes - including BAME people and women in them - are good at protecting their privilege.

But the same is true if you start - as Liz Truss does - on the other side of the equation.

As I said: reduce inequality and women and BAME people will disproportionately benefit.

BUT

Many people are trapped in poverty or excluded from opportunity for reasons that are, specifically, to do with their race or gender.

So if you want to complete the job on socio-economic opportunity you'll need to tackle racism and misogyny on the way.

No-one - on either side - should be turning this into a culture war. Those who care primarily about routes out of poverty need to consider race and gender (and disability). Those who care primarily about racism or misogyny need to consider poverty.

I do believe that much injustice is experienced as racism or misogyny when its roots are primarily class prejudice and socio-economic inequality. We \*have\* got too distracted by identity politics and lost the focus on the basics of tackling poverty and opportunity for all.

But you can't say "their system doesn't work" without proposing a substantive alternative. And until you recognise that racism and misogyny play a big part in socio economic injustice then I will not take you seriously when you say you want to fix it.

Also, if you thought socio-economic inequality was the most important thing why did you (the Conservatives) insist we never enact the "socio economic equality duty" in the equality act?

Also (again) thank God disability isn't in the crossfires of the culture war. But half ish of people in poverty have a disabled person in their family. So disability should be front and centre of a socio economic inequality / opportunity strategy. I hope it's in the speech

Final also: I haven't mentioned LGBT+ protections in the equality act. There's much less of a correlation between poverty and LGBT+ identity. But that's a reminder that being poor isn't the only way that discrimination can harm your life.

That's why we have - and need - protections against discrimination that go beyond tackling poverty. Poverty matters. It may even matter most. But discrimination hurts no matter who you are and how much money you have.