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The first confirmed case of Covid-19 in Turkey was announced on 11 March 2020 by the Ministry of Health. On the same day, Director-General of World Health Organisation Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus announced that we were facing a global pandemic. In fact, news about the Covid-19 virus had circulated in Turkish media since the beginning of 2020. News storied covered information on people affected by Covid-19. Authorities and experts interpreting these news stories declared that the virus hit older persons the hardest. Older persons started to receive cautions from all quarters based on a so-called protective attitude towards them. Although these cautions were initially expressed in a low tone, they had in due course turned into violence against all people who were described as older persons based on their physical appearance and who were seen outside their houses. At this very time, the Ministry of Interior issued a circular on 21 March 2020, announcing a curfew for people aged 65 and over. The curfew took effect for an indefinite period and without any
supervision or defined limits. The public authorities in Turkey adopted discriminatory practices against older persons. The Office of Presidency issued orders consecutively to obstruct the older persons from travelling within and between city limits. Local governments removed benches at public squares to prevent older persons from using in the cities. Security forces started to intervene when they saw older persons in public spaces. A metropolitan municipality announced the launch of a “Hotline to Report Older Persons”. Older persons have been transformed from being people in danger to dangerous people. The isolation process and the great lockdown have started, compounded by violence, negligence, and rights violations against older persons.

Senex: Association for Aging Studies was the first civil society organisation to react against the great lockdown. The Association issued a public statement on 23 March 2020. The statement pointed out that the great lockdown would propagate discriminatory attitudes and behaviours against older persons. It also emphasized the fact that obstructing older persons from leaving their houses would not contribute to a solution to mitigate the effects of the virus since older persons lived in one in every five households in Turkey. On the contrary, this oversimplified measure based merely on chronological age to protect a certain social segment would lead to loss of rights. Recalling in the statement that the rights arising from international conventions cannot be suspended, Senex Association underlined the fact that restrictions in cases of emergencies should be temporary,
limited and supervised. Indeed, there has been a significant upsurge in discriminatory attitudes and behaviours against older persons since the curfew was imposed. Senex kept the public informed, urging everyone to be heedful of any types of attitudes, behaviours and practices that might undermine the social dialogue and solidarity among generations, calling them not to keep quiet in the face of any forms of discrimination against older persons. In its statement against the great lockdown, Senex: Association for Aging Studies shared its belief that our society could weather these difficult times under the threat of the pandemic if all segments of society, including children, young people, adults and older persons, stood in solidarity.

As members of Senex: Association for Aging Studies, we conducted a human rights monitoring study to identify the rights violations and discriminatory practices against older persons during the Covid-19 pandemic. In doing so, we aimed to establish findings that would strengthen the hand of all affected people, particularly the rights defenders, in their quest to claim their rights in the face of the great lockdown. Based on this study, we offered our evidence-based recommendations to urge central governments, local governments and all parties who have responsibility and power in the public sphere to take effective actions against the ongoing loss of rights and wide-spreading discriminatory practices. It was also our hope to raise awareness of ageism and enhance social dialogue among civil initiatives working in the field of human rights in Turkey.
We had support from several people and institutions while conducting the study. Etkiniz provided funding for the study. I am grateful to Adem Arkadaş-Thibert, Ebru Hanbay, Ayça Haykir, Gülçe Başkaya and Melis Topçu for their unstinting support. I would like to thank our research team members, Doğukan Durmuş Çobanoğlu, Gizem Polat, Gül Şahinkaya, Mine Çapkur, Nil Meral and Tuğçe Keleş, for their dedicated and selfless work in the data collection process. İşil Demir Çarkacı read the text numerous times to complete any lacking details on my part. İşil Demirakın and Yagmur Zeybek provided a thorough translation. My fellow colleague Jason K. Holdsworth read the text from cover to cover and offered his assessments to support me in strengthening the findings and the conclusions thereof in the study. I owe a debt of gratitude to Jason.

The field of ageing studies is so rich that it offers many diverse opportunities for learning. It has provided us with new information and knowledge, offering us a learning experience once again. I hope our findings will provide a meaningful contribution to older persons and ageing persons in their fight against discrimination. I also hope this study, aimed at combatting ageism, will herald other studies in the field.

Özgür Arun
Older persons worldwide face rights violations and discrimination during the Covid-19 pandemic. Structural defects in areas such as health, caregiving, social security, education, justice, housing and nutrition exacerbate the impact of rights violations and discriminations experienced during the Covid-19 pandemic. The protective approach towards older persons adopted as a social policy, coupled with the understanding that ageing is a problem in a cultural context, fail to produce functional and reactive solutions to the social, economic and environmental impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic. Indeed, developing countries like Turkey are not ageing per se but ageing without becoming wealthy! On the one hand, there is a need for resources for development; on the other hand, it is necessary to improve the welfare and share it fairly. Nonetheless, Turkey has been facing challenges in the last 15 years to improve social welfare and distribute it equitably. However, Turkey is not ready to face issues brought on by societal ageing. Consequently, the difficulties Turkey encounters as ageing and impoverishing society create deep ruptures in human rights.

The global negligence of the human rights of older persons is striking. There are not any international conventions on the rights of older persons. Demographic transformation at the global level creates unprecedented changes and impacts in
social life. Rapidly ageing societies need mechanisms, principles and agreements to protect and promote human rights of older persons. Indeed, the lack of legal regulations impedes an effective fight against violence, negligence, abuse and discrimination. The fact that rights-based services are not effectively provided reinforces inequalities.

What has been the response of central governments and local governments to the Covid-19 global outbreak? How has civil society reacted to what older persons have gone through during the pandemic? Where do we stand today on the rights of older women and older men?

This study examines the types of discriminatory practices faced by older persons in Turkey during the Covid-19 global pandemic. A 6-month media monitoring, from January 2020 to June 2020, was launched to determine the rights violations and discriminatory practices against older persons in Turkey during the Covid-19 outbreak. News coverage covering rights violations and discriminatory practices in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic and older age have been analysed. Data analysis identified the content, discourse and discriminatory expressions in news coverage of older persons and revealed how these have changed during the process. Consequently, it has become possible to comprehend both the discriminatory discourse of the media and the types of rights violations experienced during the Covid-19 outbreak.

The discriminatory language of the media also determines the interpersonal behaviour patterns in the social structure. Reproduction and circula-

Demographic transformation at the global level creates unprecedented changes and impacts in social life.
Types of negative prejudice have been reinforced, particularly in Turkey, as a result of the indefinite curfew imposed on older persons as a measure against Covid 19. Types of negative prejudice have been reinforced, particularly in Turkey, as a result of the indefinite curfew imposed on older persons as a measure against Covid 19. Older persons have been branded as being uneducated, obtuse, disobedient, disrespectful to rules, risky, a threat to security and, last but not least, opponents to the state. News reports in the media create oppositions such as younger persons versus older persons, citizens versus older persons, and society versus older persons who have alienated and marginalized older persons. This process triggered a transformation of discriminatory attitudes towards older people into behaviours.

The media monitoring done during the Covid 19 pandemic revealed that the most widespread discriminatory practices and rights violations can be identified under the five main headings below:

- Denial of freedom of movement
- Denial of the right to justice
- Denial of the right to work
- Denial of civil rights
- Denial of the right to health and care

Consequently, the findings reveal the steps taken by the government and local governments against the rights violations experienced by older persons. In this regard, it is quite striking that such older persons have their rights denied, including their right
to health and care, right to transport, access to justice, right to work and civil rights. The arguments developed in Turkey to protect older persons against the pandemic have turned into practices and behaviours that marginalize, alienate and isolate older persons.

**Purpose**

Ageism is a common form of discrimination similar to sexism and racism. Current research shows that ageism has become even more widespread in Turkey in the last decade. Discriminatory attitudes towards older persons are observed to have turned into behaviours during the Covid-19 pandemic. This study uses media monitoring to analyse rights violations and discriminatory practices against older persons during the Covid-19 pandemic.

The change of discourse in news media reporting on ageism is evaluated based on the research findings. Data analysis identified the content, discourse and discriminatory language in news coverage on older persons, revealing how these have changed during the pandemic. Consequently, both the discriminatory discourse of the media and the types of rights violations experienced during the Covid-19 outbreak have been rendered visible. The research showed that the media discourse has fed the violations during the pandemic, providing a justification and a robust background. The violations in turn impacted the discourse of broadcasting.

**Importance of the Study**

Considering that there has not been any media monitoring on older persons in Turkey so far, the...
research findings provide an essential source of data for policy developers and implementers and civil society organisations working in the field. There are articles, research findings and postgraduate studies (dissertations) on ageism. Nevertheless, civil society organisations’ lack of monitoring reports makes it more difficult to monitor how rights violations occur in times of crisis, particularly during the coronavirus pandemic. Yet, monitoring of rights violations is critical in that it is an activity for the furtherance of public interest.

We believe that monitoring of rights violations and discrimination against older persons will raise awareness in the field of human rights and advocacy. Monitoring reports would enable new collaborations among civil society initiatives actively working in the field and support rights defenders to get better equipped to combat ageism.

**Beneficiaries of the Study**

This study stands to contribute to the work of particularly civil society organisations, lawmakers and law enforcement officers, local governments and professional groups working in the field, offering valuable insight to young researchers in the academy and, in a wider context, to those working on ageism. The study would raise awareness among younger people, adults and older people. Moreover, it may serve as an exemplary study done in Turkey that would contribute to monitoring reports at the international level.

**Vulnerable Groups and Gender Equality**

Rights violations experienced by older persons during the Covid 19 pandemic have an adverse
impact on many aspects of life, inflicting irre-
mediable wounds. Rights violations suffered by
older women, in particular, can be even more
compelling due to their longstanding isolation
from the public space. Deprivations endured
by older women of education, employment
and income have become part of their identity
in their life cycle, further isolating them from
the public space. It is thus obvious that rights
violations during the coronavirus pandem-
ic have a more devastating impact on older
women in poverty. Indeed, we observe that
the discourse used in the media for older women in the
context of gender is quite discriminatory. This discriminatory
discourse, coupled with the protective attitude towards older
women, has caused them to become even more locked in
their homes, leaving them subject to violence.

Key Recommendations
Older persons have the same equal rights as other
segments of society. Older persons should be protected
as much as all other social segments during the pandemic
in accordance with the principle of equality.

Basic needs should be met without delay, fairly and in a
non-discriminatory way during the Covid-19 outbreak.

All bans, restrictions and obstacles imposed on the grounds
of chronological age should be removed. Chronological
age should not be used as a discriminatory criterion that
defines the needs, expectations and requirements of health
and care.
Central and local governments are obliged to protect the rights of older persons and provide the necessary conditions for older persons to live a life of dignity and age gracefully with dignity. Measures should be taken to protect all older persons at risk from abuses, such as negligence and harassment, including people ageing alone, older people living alone, older women who are alone, older persons with disabilities, older persons under institutional care, dementia / Alzheimer’s patients as well as their relatives who provide caregiving, older persons excluded from social life, older persons living on the street and older persons who have no access to digital services.

Family members who provide caregiving should be empowered and bestowed with health and social rights. Local governments, central government and civil society should cooperate in providing the health and social care support needed by older persons who live away from their families or lack the support of a family. Such support should be planned in a way so as not to create new inequalities or reproduce discrimination on the grounds of age, gender, class, faith, place of residence, political preferences, and similar factors.

Quality information should be accessible. Older persons who do not own information and communication technologies (ICT) nor aptitude for using such technology or who have cognitive difficulties should be provided access to quality information in a transparent way.
Mechanisms should be created to enable older persons to convey their opinions publicly. There should be a guarantee of the right of older persons to express their opinions about decisions taken on their behalf in the public sphere.

Local governments should prepare emergency measure plans against epidemics, disasters and crises, including the Covid-19 pandemic. Emergency action plans should be reviewed from the perspective of a rights-based service approach.

Legal regulations should be in place at the national level to effectively combat ageism. Evidence based contribution by national and local civil society organisations in Turkey working on ageing and older persons would make it easier to identify what types of legal regulations are required. In addition, a step forward would be to contact the United Nations Open-Ended Working Group on Ageing and get their support and recommendations.

TUBITAK and national funding institutions should have “Ageing Studies” added to their research support strategies to promote research on older persons and the ageing perception of ageing people. Research on ageing should definitely be included in the Official Statistics Program (OSP) of the Turkish Statistical Institute.

It would be pertinent to establish a Turkish National Ageing Institute that would follow legal regulations, establish national and international collaborations, support research in required fields, oversee development and implementation of evidence-based policies, and provide guidance and coordination among institutions.
Introduction

This is not a first. It has been 40 years since the international community first began to discuss ageing. United Nations First World Assembly on Ageing was held 40 years ago. UN member states gathered in Vienna in 1982 and launched an “International Plan of Action”, formulating their plans on ageing and older age in the context of employment, income, safety, health, accommodation, education, and social welfare (UN, 1982).

The world was ageing at an incredible rate. By the end of the twentieth century, one in ten people was an older person, and the projections indicated that one in five people in the world would be an older person by the middle of the new century. The number of older persons was projected to go up from 600 million to 2 billion. Moreover, the ageing process was projected to occur faster in developing countries. The countries that needed resources the most for development were those with rapidly ageing societies. Their biggest challenge in the next century would be rapid ageing without gaining wealth.

Global developments following the first assembly compelled the UN to hold a second meeting. Twenty years after the first Plan of Action, “the Second World Assembly on Ageing” was held in Madrid, which resulted in a design named Madrid International Plan of Action (UN, 2002). Madrid International Plan of Action tried to explain to, even convince, governments and societies that older persons would substantially contribute to social life. The Second Assembly put forward a revised plan of action that is in line
with the social, cultural, economic, and demographic realities of the new century. The plan of action aimed at offering practical tools to policy developers for steps to take during the demographic transformation. Ageing has provided a basis for public policies. It has been a fundamental aspect of social, economic, and human development. The plan of action had two significant points: development in human rights and strengthening inter-generational solidarity.

Eighteen years have passed since the adoption of the Madrid International Plan of Action by member states. Given that the Plan recommended development based on human rights and strengthening of intergenerational solidarity, the inequalities experienced during the Covid-19 pandemic reveal the extent to which these targets, set 20 years ago under two headings, have been achieved. It is impossible to say that headway has been made towards the targets.

Despite the fact that the UN has laid down the basic principles on ageing, it reveals that older persons’ human rights are globally neglected. The UN put forward 18 principles for older persons (UN, 1991). This set of principles and suggestions recall the first assembly meeting in Vienna, emphasizing the remarkable diversity of the living conditions of older persons both among societies and among individuals in a given society.

The General Assembly encouraged governments to incorporate these principles in their national programmes as soon as possible and without delay. Older persons:

- should have access to food, water, health and care services and educational programmes;
should be able to live in environments that are safe and adaptable; should be able to remain integrated in the society and share their experience with younger generations; should be able to live in dignity and security and be free of violence, negligence, exploitation and physical or mental abuse; should not be discriminated against on the grounds of age, gender, ethnicity, disability or any other grounds and should be treated equally; should be able to enjoy all rights defined as human rights.

Despite all these assemblies, recommendations and principles, grave violations of the rights of older persons have demonstrated the need to find ways to claim their rights in the international community. International mechanisms were set up to this end. One of such international mechanisms is the UN Open-ended Working Group on Ageing established in 2010.

The Open-ended Working Group on Ageing aims at fulfilling key tasks, including outlining the main international framework on the human rights of older persons, identifying problems of practice and offering solutions. Since 2013, the UN, not limiting itself with the Working Group, has been monitoring internationally the conditions surrounding the rights of older persons in the member states via the Independent Expert on the Enjoyment of All Human Rights by Older Persons. More recently, in 2018, a group of international experts convened in Vienna and adopted a declaration on the rights of older persons. While the Declaration acknowledged and supported international mechanisms on the rights of older persons, it nevertheless pointed out the existing violation
As early as mid-2020, the UN Secretary General launched the independent expert report on the impact of Covid-19 on the rights of older persons. The report covers how the Covid-19 pandemic stokes up ageism against older persons and deepens structural inequalities, underlining how and in which conditions the human rights of older persons are violated. In addition to all these mechanisms and initiatives, international human rights law, particularly the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that guarantee the rights of older persons and other segments of society. In fact, the exclusion of older persons in the implementation of international covenants would amount to a violation of the prohibition of discrimination. Nonetheless, there are still not any international conventions on the rights of older persons.

Despite all the steps taken in the last 40 years to promote the rights of older persons, including the mechanisms, comprehensive international conventions and initiatives, it is compelling that the human rights of older persons are globally neglected. This global negligence causes older persons to be even more oppressed, particularly in times of crisis, leaving them vulnerable to discrimination and violation of their rights. This is due to the lack of domestic and global mechanisms and a legal framework that would ensure an effective combat against existing violations.

What has been the response of central governments and local governments to the Covid-19 global outbreak? How has civil society reacted to
This study examines the types of discriminatory practices faced by older persons in Turkey during the Covid-19 global pandemic. In doing so, the study attempts to initiate an understanding of how the internationally accepted 40-year-old pledges offered by participating governments to the public as a fundamental right are fulfilled. Furthermore, the study examines the steps taken by Turkish central governments and local governments in response to the rights violations suffered by older persons, with an aim to also demonstrate the civil society response. In short, the study explores the impacts of ageism on everyday life in times of crisis such as a global pandemic. Discussions generated by this study will help us understand how the Turkish central governments have responded to the pledges made twice in the last 40 years in international plans of action developed globally to ensure development based on human rights and the strengthening of intergenerational solidarity. We hope that this monitoring study will support civil society initiatives in their evidence-based work to advocate more resolutely for older persons who demand their rights.

1 https://social.un.org/ageing-working-group/
3 http://www.ageing.at/site/pub_html/sites/default/files/ICHRoP%20Conference%20Declaration%20Final_0.pdf
5 Documents, information and instruments regarding the conventions and mechanisms on human rights are available at this address: https://insanhaklarizleme.org
Population Ageing and Challenges Facing Turkey
Turkey is one of the most rapidly ageing countries in the world. Average life expectancy of 35 years at the time of the foundation of the Republic exceeded 78 years by 2020 (TURKSTAT, 2020). The population of older persons in Turkey surged from 3.5% a century ago to 10% today. By 2040, Turkey will see the number of older persons exceeding the number of children for the first time in its history. By the end of the century, one in four people in society will be an older person. This remarkable transformation will have impacts that will radically transform the social, economic and environmental development. These impacts are likely to cause problems. Especially due to the fact that Turkey is ageing rapidly but without getting wealthy.

Recent macro data show striking findings that Turkey is ageing while getting poorer (Arun, 2020a). However, societal ageing would cease to be a problem for Turkey insofar as it could become an inclusive society. That is because inclusiveness is a way for older women and older men to be able to effectively contribute to the society, they are living in. The UN World Summit for Social Development held in Copenhagen a quarter of a century ago defined an inclusive society as “a society for all”, in which every individual, each with rights and responsibilities, has an active role to play (UN 1996). It is based on an ideal society upholding fundamental freedoms and human rights, ensuring social justice and diversity in faith and culture, meeting the needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged segments, and guaranteeing the rule of law and democratic participation. Inclusive society is also an all-embracing, resilient, and tolerant society which is well-equipped with social policies developed to reduce and eliminate inequalities. An inclusive society pledged to overcome inequalities based on gender, class, ethnicity, generation, and geography. However, it was stressed that all institutions in society had to adopt an inclusive and egalitarian approach in providing services. Social, economic, and environmental development had to be in a sustainable balance.
The ideal of an inclusive society will be possible to achieve when we arrive at a human-rights based understanding that underpins all efforts. Governments, local governments, or central governments, at every level must assume responsibility to embrace such an understanding. Governments have an obligation to both transform existing institutions and establish new ones to fulfil the needs and expectations of ageing women and men. There is a need for a creative and reasonable development model since the needs and expectations of older women and older men are very different from each other. Older women are more at risk of poverty. They shoulder more responsibilities in society. Yet, there is less inclusiveness towards older women in almost every aspect of social life. In such conditions and given the projected ageing dynamics in the future, it is no doubt imperative to mainstream human rights and gender.

Stigmatisation and discrimination are perpetuated in both aged and ageing societies. Ageism is as widespread as sexism and racism. Older persons face more injustice, exclusion and stigma. Current studies indicate that ageism in Turkey stands at 4% (Arun, 2020a). However, with respect to older persons, the ratio of those who suffer injustice on grounds of age reaches 8% (Arun, 2020c). According to a current longitudinal study (Arun, 2020b), while the level of ageism against older persons was 4% in 2013, it went up to 7% in 2016 and 11% in 2020. Discriminatory attitudes and practices against older persons persist, steadily increasing and becoming in an upward trend.

The most critical risk facing Turkey today and in the future is ageing without gaining wealth. Poverty observed in two age groups is at a very striking level. The number of children and older persons at risk of poverty is on a rapid rise. Children working in seasonal, mobile and temporary jobs, young people in flexible employment, women out of employment, people with disabilities, minorities and migrants are all in the same boat as far as rapid ageing is concerned. Main challenges facing Turkey are ensuring a sustainable and well-balanced development for all segments of society, gaining wealth without damaging the natural environment and sharing the welfare equitably.
Concepts:
International Standards on the Rights of Older Persons and Ageism
Discrimination refers to violation of human rights, restriction of freedoms in political, social, cultural or any other domain and all forms of segregation, exclusion or snub. International conventions prohibit all forms of discrimination. In this time of widespread discrimination, it is all the more necessary than ever to have an international convention of the rights of older persons. Still, there is not an international convention adopted by the UN on the rights of older persons. Member states are obligated to protect the human rights of older persons as much as those of all other age groups and prevent discrimination, negligence, abuse and violence against older persons. Madrid Plan of Action underscores older persons’ right to work, right to education, right to access health services, and right to participation in social life and all decision-making mechanisms. (UN, 2002). Although the Universal Declaration of Human Rights refers to different social categories under the heading of “other”, there is not a distinct and specific reference to older persons.

The International Labour Organisation (ILO), in its Older Workers Recommendation no. 162, refers to inclusiveness in the context of discrimination on grounds of age. The underlying argument of the ILO recommendation is that “age cannot be a reason for termination of employment”.

International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (article 7) refers to age. Articles of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities with respect to access to justice (article 13), right to protection (article 16), right to health (article 25/b) and right to an adequate standard of living (article 28/2/b) and the article of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women on the right to social security (article 11.1/e) make references to older age and older persons; nonetheless there is still not a specific convention on the right of older persons.

Older women and older men do not constitute a homogenous social group. Experience of ageing varies considerably for women and men. Ageing refers to an experience that diversifies on the basis of age groups. Older age is as natural a part of the life cycle as childhood, youth or adulthood. Old age has as much diversity as childhood, youth and adulthood. Yet, prejudice and fear about old age,
the ageing process and older persons are quite widespread in society. Fear or anxiety of ageing and harbouring stereotypes about older persons are indicators of ageism. Behavioural patterns based on the assumption that older persons are all alike encourage the spread of ageism. Practices and discourse based on a portrayal of older persons as tired, exhausted, indigent or sick people on the brink of death exacerbate ageism. There are three key dimensions of ageism: discriminatory behaviours, prejudice and negligence against older persons. Butler (1969) was the first scientist who noticed that older persons were neglected, excluded and humiliated on grounds of age (Arun, 2020b). He defined discriminatory treatment of older persons as ageism. Like sexism and racism, ageism is one of the most widespread forms of discrimination in the world. It is quite insidious. It is a form of discrimination that damages intergenerational solidarity and destroys one’s self-esteem and confidence.

This report considers ageism covering all types of neglect and abuse of older persons on grounds of age. Systematic exclusion of older persons, and prejudice and all forms of discriminatory practices based on chronological age against older persons are addressed within the scope of ageism.

Photo: Selim Aksan, Archive of the Senex: Association for Aging Studies

7 International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
8 Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
9 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
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Method
A 6-month media monitoring, from January 2020 to June 2020, was conducted to determine the rights violations and discriminatory practices against older persons in Turkey during the Covid-19 outbreak. Top 6 national newspapers by circulation were selected for the media monitoring. These are, in alphabetical order, Birgün, Cumhuriyet, Hürriyet, Milliyet, Sabah and Yeni Şafak. Internet publication of these newspapers were scanned daily searching for key words older person, older age and ageing. Results of the media scan were recorded for each newspaper. News reports collected during the monitoring were read one by one and irrelevant reports were left out.

News reports that cover rights violations suffered by older persons and discriminatory practices in the context of Covid-19 and old age were recorded in the database. Variables were developed to analyse the news reports recorded in the database. Variables were reviewed after the analysis of the news reports. New variables were added to the database to comprehend the discourse used in news reporting.

Variables are used to analyse the content of the news collected as a result of the monitoring process and reveal their discourse. Content analysis offers an understanding of how the content of the news changes as the pandemic evolves. A discourse analysis on the other hand aims at understanding the subtext, the target of the discourse, and which words are used to develop the discourse and discriminatory attitudes. In doing so, it becomes possible to go beyond merely reporting sample cases to comprehending the basis, quality and attitude of the content and the discourse of the monitoring period.

Top 6 national newspapers by circulation were selected for the media monitoring. These are, in alphabetical order, Birgün, Cumhuriyet, Hürriyet, Milliyet, Sabah and Yeni Şafak.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>The media subject to monitoring</td>
<td>Birgün, Cumhuriyet, Hürriyet, Milliyet, Sabah and Yeni Şafak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of publication</td>
<td>Variable used to identify the type of publication for categorizing purposes.</td>
<td>i. news report, ii. opinion column, iii. comment, iv. interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date of publication</td>
<td>Days between the months of January and June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headline</td>
<td>Headline of publication</td>
<td>Not categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word count</td>
<td>Word count of publication</td>
<td>Not categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main theme of the publication</td>
<td>Classification of the main theme of publication.</td>
<td>Main themes are recorded as open-ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key words</td>
<td>Key words in publications are coded as is. Maximum of 6 key words are included.</td>
<td>Key words spotted in publications are collected under variables as open-ended words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Coded to determine the discourse of publication.</td>
<td>Attitudes are collected under three categories, positive, negative and neutral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Venue, institution, social segment and person(s) targeted in the publication.</td>
<td>Recorded as open-ended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>Used to determine the discourse produced in publication</td>
<td>Recorded as open-ended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition</td>
<td>Used to understand the opposition created in the discourse of publication.</td>
<td>Opposition reveals which discourse creates discrimination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Variables and categories
Ageism and Rights Violations Against Older Persons During the Covid-19 Pandemic
1. How did discrimination start during the Covid-19 Global Pandemic

When the world realized that the Covid-19 virus caused a global pandemic, the number of cases first from China and South Korea, and then from Italy was shared in the media. The data provided a breakdown by age groups of people who were most affected by the pandemic and lost their lives. Based on these data, experts stated that older persons constituted the most at risk group. They pointed out that most fatalities were observed among people aged 80 and over. According to experts, preliminary information released by China, South Korea and then by Italy validated these observations. In fact, they found that the high death rates in Italy were due to the fact that Italy was the oldest European country\(^\text{10}\).

A statement\(^\text{11}\) by South Korea at the outset of the pandemic shared the number of patients younger than 30 years old, stressing that there have been no fatalities in this age group. The same statement underlined that deaths were more frequently observed among people aged 80 and over. Similarly, articles in the international press often reported that people aged 80 and over were the hardest hit by the pandemic.

Age groups were compared in all available data. The number of deaths by age group was especially underlined. Then, experts who interpreted such data persistently expressed that older persons should not go out to the street, markets, bazaars, shopping centres, hospitals or similar locations. Similarly in Turkey, there were discussions about older persons being in the risk group, issuing them directives about what they should do or not do\(^\text{12}\). Fear and anxiety about the pandemic were directed at older persons. So much so that people who were considered to be in danger have themselves turned into dangerous people.

---

\(^{10}\) One of such articles is available at [https://www.businessinsider.com/coronavirus-death-rates-by-age-south-korea](https://www.businessinsider.com/coronavirus-death-rates-by-age-south-korea)


\(^{12}\) Please click on this link to see an article about these discussions [https://birikimdergisi.com/guncel/9982/gencler-yetiskinler-ve-yaslilar-bir-de-ozgurlukleler#_ftn1](https://birikimdergisi.com/guncel/9982/gencler-yetiskinler-ve-yaslilar-bir-de-ozgurlukleler#_ftn1)
There has already been a considerable number of media news reports covering older persons prior to the bans and lockdown measures. These news reports were important in the sense that they revealed the discriminatory practices of local governments. One of the first discriminatory practices against older persons was the denial of their right to the city. Denizli Metropolitan Municipality had the benches in the city square disassembled due to the fact that “the virus led to deaths among older persons and many older persons sat on the benches in crowded areas, which might increase the spread of the virus”. Birgün Daily reports that Denizli Metropolitan Municipality, in an attempt to prevent older persons from getting together, had the benches disassembled as older persons dismissed the warnings. The news report says that “citizens in the neighbourhood” were also supportive of this practice. The news report was based on an opposition, placing “Citizens in the neighbourhood” versus “older persons”; and this particular piece of news was covered with a similar discrimination by other newspapers.
Indeed, it was especially around that period of time that people were gripped by fear of being an older person and a public discussion was initiated and held repeatedly maintaining that older persons should be locked in their homes. Cumhuriyet Daily reported on 21 March 2020 that benches in the city square were disassembled and removed by Sivas Metropolitan Municipality even before the stay-at-home orders were imposed. The Municipality stated that the justification for removing the benches was “...to make older persons stay at home and reduce the risk of virus transmission for the sake of public health”. The news headline in Cumhuriyet Daily creates an opposition between “citizens in risk groups” and “everyone”, underlining that older persons’ attempt to seek their rights was “shocking to everyone”. Indeed, other newspapers also developed a discriminatory discourse against older persons who claimed their rights.

“Denial of right to the city”, a rights violation, has not been limited to the removal of benches in city squares. Local governments have started to prevent older persons from using public transport.
Konya Metropolitan Municipality led the way to obstruct the right of older persons to transport. Free public transport provided to older persons was cancelled right before the curfew was announced. Metropolitan Municipalities of Ankara, Antalya, Istanbul and Malatya followed suit. These practices also obstructed the urban mobility of older persons.

Removing benches at the city square and banning intracity transport aim at preventing older persons from enjoying their right (of access) to the city. The right to the city is a fundamental right that allows people to express themselves and their authentic identities in public space. Central or local governments cannot deny the right to the city except in cases of emergency. Yet, in Turkey, cities have started to turn into prisons for older persons due to the bans based on advanced chronological age.
These discriminatory practices introduced right before the implementation of curfews have served as a justification to lock older persons in their homes, because “despite” all measures, older persons were still seen on the streets, city squares and parks and they continued to go out to hospitals, markets, banks or other public spaces to fulfil their needs. Older persons seen on the street were cautioned to go back home. This was the backdrop of the bans on older persons branded as “dangerous people”. These discussions led to a circular issued by the Ministry of Interior on 21 March 2020 which banned people aged 65 and over from going out. Older persons were shut in indefinitely due to the ban, without any supervision or limits.

A statement by the civil society referred to potential rights violations due to the curfew imposed indefinitely, without any supervision or limit. Senex: Association for Ageing Studies, in a statement made immediately after the announcement of the curfew, cautioned against the spread of discriminatory attitudes and behaviours following the blanket ban to prevent older persons leaving their homes. The statement recalled that suspension of rights in cases of emergency should be temporary, limited and supervised. The statement noted that bans based on chronological age would turn into rights violations, urging people not to keep quiet in the face of discrimination against older persons. However, initiatives, except for Senex: Association for Ageing Studies, working on human rights and the rights of older persons failed to express any opinions during that period on the curfew decision for older persons. Old age and ageing have not been on the radar of civil society organisations; it was apparently not a domain in which they developed an understanding or thought about. Otherwise, how could a lack of an effective support or a statement by civil society in the face of rights violations and discrimination be explained?

Senex: Association for Ageing Studies, working on human rights and the rights of older persons failed to express any opinions during that period on the curfew decision for older persons.
2. Ageism and Rights Violations Against Older Persons After the Lockdowns

Following the circular of 21 March 2020 by the Ministry of Interior banning older people from leaving their homes, discriminatory attitudes towards older persons were observably evolved into behaviours. Evolution of ageism from attitude to an individual level violence made hatred of older persons visible.

Curfew has turned older people in danger into dangerous people; because “despite” the bans, they still went outdoors and were seen in the city.

News Report 4: Cumhuriyet Daily, 22 March 2020

According to a news report by Cumhuriyet Daily on 22 March 2020, law enforcement forces checked the age of a person reported to be sitting on a bench, who happened to be 69 years of age. The news report stated that law enforcement officers ran identity checks on older persons, gave them warnings and sent them back home. These nationwide practices criminalized older persons.

---

The news reports stressing that older persons posed a danger as they “defied the bans”, or “did not comply with the bans” led to a stigmatisation of older persons as “headstrong older citizens”. Hürriyet Daily news report of 22 March 2020 also stressed that older persons went out on the street “in defiance of the ban” and law enforcement officers had to give them a warning. These warnings were not limited to verbal notices, fines were also imposed on older persons. According to a news report by Hürriyet Daily on 22 March 2020, a 75 year old person who was “kept anonymous” was fined 392 TL for going out on the street to buy some bread. Older persons who encountered law enforcement officers and attempted to claim their rights in the face of discriminatory practices against them were defined as “interesting” in the news.
News Report 6: Milliyet Daily, 31 March 2020

Milliyet Daily reported on 31 March 2020 that an older couple driving home in their personal vehicle were stopped by law enforcement officers who ran an identity check, “determined that they were old” and gave them a warning. Older couple’s attempt to defend themselves against discriminatory practices were reported as “an interesting defence from a 76-year-old travelling by car”. The person in his own defence explained that he complied with the bans and avoided going out or going to the parks, while the news report defined his explanation as an “interesting defence”.

The news reports stressing that older persons posed a danger as they “defied the bans”, or “did not comply with the bans” led to a stigmatisation of older persons as “headstrong older citizens”.
News Report 7: Sabah Daily, 24 March 2020

All these news reports underlined the fact that older persons were dangerous. Breaking news by Sabah Daily was showing the moments older persons were “captured” by the police, with the headline “No Way! One is 70 and the other is 74 years old....” Older persons were stigmatised as “those against the state” because they claimed their rights in their encounters with law enforcement officers, expressing themselves and challenging the discrimination against them. So much so that Sabah Daily ran a headline “Grandpa on the street argues with the police!”, sharing personal information of the older person and portraying him as “a trouble-maker for law enforcement and officers”.

Portraying people stigmatised for their age as criminals reinforces the negative adjectives in social perception associated with the image of an older person. When older persons are criminalised, discriminatory practices and behaviours become legitimate. Because older persons are perceived as people who pose a threat to security and disrupt the public order, they therefore should be punished.

Breaking news: They could not care less about coronavirus! 2 seniors caught drinking alcohol at a recreation spot

“No Way! One is 70, the other is 74 years old!... See how the two old-timers were caught!

It is shocking the lengths some older persons would go to in defiance of the curfew measure against coronavirus. According to the breaking news from Tosya district of Kastamounu province, two pals over 65 were seen drinking alcohol at a recreation spot. The police issued them a warning and imposed a fine of 3150 TL
While at the outset of the global pandemic, data repeatedly stressed that older persons were in danger, according to these pieces of news they have now turned into dangerous people. The stigma of being dangerous attached to older persons is an important phase of how hatred of older persons has stirred up and how violence against older persons has been legitimised. Combatting, both publicly and individually, older persons rather than the pandemic itself shows the course of transformation of ageism into violence against older persons in Turkey.

In this context, when this stance was initially adopted against older persons, discriminatory practices and violence emerged from two fronts. First, discriminatory public practices prevented older persons from using the city, by banning them from enjoying the city surroundings and any features their city had to offer. Obstructions sometimes took place in most striking forms, including adopting a hostile architectural approach to transforming the urban features of the city itself.

News Report 8: Sabah Daily, 30 March 2020
Edirne was home to one of the most striking cases of hostile architecture. Benches in the city square were encircled with wire fences to prevent older persons from sitting down. Employees of Edirne Municipality (Deputy Mayor according to the news report) were warning older persons, wire fences were used to enclose the benches with a notice stating “Stay at home Edirne. Do not go out, do not push your luck!” In a similar case, Denizli Metropolitan Municipality removed the benches in the city square to prevent older persons from enjoying the city square. The news report by Yeni Şafak Daily also justified the hostile architecture by stating “benches were removed when older persons defied the rules”. Indeed, according to a news report by Sabah Daily, similar attempts were also made in Sivas: “Benches in Sivas were removed because of citizens over 65”. Practices introduced to “protect” older persons from the pandemic morphed into public bans “against” older persons. These practices went beyond bans to a redesign of the city by adopting hostile architecture, obstructing older persons’ use of the city.
The stigma attached to older persons as people who pose a threat to security, disrupt public order and thereby require punishment was soon compounded by an intervention from another front. This intervention was one the most discriminatory practices against older persons during the period of quarantine and lockdown. It has become one of the most striking indicators of how older persons are seen as a threat.

News Report 10: Yeni Şafak Daily, March 19, 2020

The stigma attached to older persons as people who pose a threat to security, disrupt public order and thereby require punishment was soon compounded by an intervention from another front. This intervention was one the most discriminatory practices against older persons during the period of quarantine and lockdown. It has become one of the most striking indicators of how older persons are seen as a threat.

News Report 11: Sabah Daily, 21 March 2020

When seniors acted recklessly regarding coronavirus, benches were removed: People are sitting here insensibly

When an overcrowded group of citizens sitting together on benches dismissed the coronavirus-related warnings, municipal teams had to resort to removing the benches. Citizens in the neighbourhood approved of this measure, saying “This is a good practice because apparently these friends are not well aware of the situation. We have to keep a distance from each other but still people are insensibly sitting here.”
On 21 March 2020, Nevşehir Metropolitan Municipality posted on social media that a “Hotline to Report Elderly” initiative was launched. They called people to report older persons by posting a tweet “If you see people over 65 on the street, call this number”. In addition to the publicly displayed discrimination against older persons, a perception was also built that suggested combating older persons individually. Indeed, life for older persons got even harder because of the numerous reports on them. Discriminatory attitudes against older persons turned into behaviours; and older persons faced both public and individual interventions. The call to report older people, who have been criminalised, led the way to reinforce ageism with hatred of older persons.

Life for older persons got even harder because of the numerous reports on them. Discriminatory attitudes against older persons turned into behaviours; and older persons faced both public and individual interventions.

A news report again by Sabah Daily on 24 June 2020 stated that the police searched for and detained an older man downtown upon a report by his fellow passengers in the minibus he took earlier that day. The older man detained by the police was forced to take a coronavirus test, which turned out to be negative. The news report commented that “the older man found in downtown caused a short panic”. Older persons who were considered in danger only a few weeks earlier were thus being relabeled as dangerous people.

As public measures criminalised older persons, boundaries were also set on how to react to older persons. The news report stating that “citizens” had to resort to take their own measures against older persons actually dropped hints about how “citizens” would turn to violence against older persons in the future. News reports based on the opposition between “citizens who had to take measures” and “dangerous older persons” set the first examples of hatred of and violence against older persons. According to Hürriyet Daily news, “the people” reacted to older
persons, throwing water at them so that “older persons would not sit on the benches”. Sabah Daily also covered a similar story, reporting that water was thrown at older persons to stop them from sitting on the bench. The Daily portrayed this act of violence against older persons as a “bittersweet warning”.

News Report 14: Hürriyet Daily, 22 March 2020

They were sitting on a bench. They were absolutely appalled at what came next!
As police checks are getting more stringent following the nationwide lockdown order for people aged 65 and over, a mobile phone video recording prior to the start of lockdown in Isparta shows water being thrown from above at two older citizens sitting on a bench.

News Report 15: Sabah Daily, 22 March 2020

Breaking news: They threw water at older people sitting on a bench to give them a coronavirus warning!
This is what they did to warn older men sitting on a bench
They did not know what hit them!
One of the cases that most sparked off reaction during the course of the pandemic was when an older person, who was later found out to be a person with a disability, was stopped on the street and forced to wear a mask and then had cologne poured down on his head. According to a news report by Yeni Şafak Daily, “young people” stopped the older man and treated him badly while at the same time recording the incident in which they commented, “over here, we found a virus”. All cases covered by such news reporting effectively stigmatised and marginalised older persons and inflicted violence against them.

The pandemic does not only pose a health threat to older persons. In addition to the existing health risks, discrimination, isolation and exacerbating poverty exert irreversible impacts on the lives of older persons. Indefinite lockdowns and restrictions imposed on older persons during the Covid-19 pandemic have led
them to lose their rights. No one in society can be left behind or abandoned to poverty. Older persons, just like other segments of society, have fundamental rights. Therefore, emergency measures should be implemented in compliance with human rights and human dignity. Maintaining physical distance from each other during the pandemic is an inevitable measure; nevertheless, alienation, negligence and ignorance should not be an option. Social support and reasonable and creative solutions to isolation should continue to be provided by central and local governments as part of their responsibilities. Fundamental rights and freedoms including health, education, transport, housing, protection from poverty, work and freedom to express oneself should be fully upheld and comprehensively provided. Rights and freedoms should not be suspended for long periods of time and without any supervision due to a security concern. Older persons should not be ignored or seen as indigent, useless, weak or dispensable people who can be left behind.

Still, pandemic related bans pose a threat to older persons in terms of their inalienable rights including rights to health, safety, work and education. Discriminatory practices strip older persons of their dignity. Discriminatory practices, violence, abuse and violations against older persons demonstrate how ageism is deeply rooted in Turkey.

A few years before the Covid outbreak, research on ageing was conducted nationwide in Turkey. This particular research, titled Elderliness Envisagement and Practices in Turkey (YADA Foundation, 2019) was a first of its kind in the field of ageing studies in Turkey. This is because the research did not limit the interviews only to those aged 65 and over, but also covered social segments that were going through the ageing process. Life-course perspective provided the main theoretical approach adopted in this research. Due to this quality, the research is considered the first ageing study of Turkey. The research, one of the most up-to-date and comprehensive works on ageism in Turkey, was the only available research that allowed us to discover the level of ageism in Turkey. In this research, respondents were asked whether they “experienced any bad treatment on grounds of age”.
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The findings show that in 2018, 4.3% of people experienced discrimination on grounds of age in Turkey. Research results based on age groups were even more stunning. While ageism stood at 1.6% among adults (35-44 age group), it rose to 6.5% among people aged 65 and over. These figures help us understand the extent of ageism in Turkey prior to the outbreak of Covid-19.

Elderliness Envisagement and Practices in Turkey was a cross-sectional study. It provided a basic level of information about a specific subject matter in a definitive time period. Cross-sectional research is quite valuable in this regard because findings can paint a picture of the current situation in a cross section of time series and demonstrate the extent of problems.

There are other types of research conducted by scientists. They are classified as longitudinal research. Longitudinal research, as opposed to cross-sectional research, focus on the
process. They not only establish the current situation, but also enable us to understand how the current situation has changed in due course. Since longitudinal studies are repeated at regular intervals, they offer an understanding of changes and transformation. However, the fact that they are repeated at regular intervals make such research a challenge to carry out. A researcher working on a longitudinal study should have both a vision of the future and access to necessities such as an available budget and human resources. Of course, the researcher should also have patience as information is obtained more quickly in cross sectional research; whereas it may take years even decades to produce information in longitudinal research. This process of information production changes the quality of information as well. Longitudinal research provides richer information and findings.

Since longitudinal studies are repeated at regular intervals, they offer an understanding of changes and transformation. However, the fact that they are repeated at regular intervals make such research a challenge to carry out.

**Figure 2:** Multiple Discrimination Against Older Persons

*Source:* Antalya Ageing Study, 2020 (Arun, 2020b)
To date, there is a single longitudinal study in the field of ageing studies in Turkey. Antalya Ageing Study (AAS) produces information on the different dimensions of the lives of people in the ageing process. AAS is Turkey's first and only longitudinal research launched in 2013 and repeated every three years. The third period of AAS was conducted in 2020. AAS directed a series of questions to respondents with respect to discrimination. The study enquired into whether the respondents had been discriminated against on grounds of age, gender, ethnicity, faith or political opinion. Consequently, AAS made it possible to analyse over the years individual or concurrent cases of discrimination as well as multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination. Current findings show that 4% of older respondents of AAS reported that they have been treated with prejudice or unfairly on grounds of age, 5% on grounds of ethnicity and 8% on grounds of faith. The two more common forms of discrimination experienced by older persons are on grounds of age and political opinion. While 16% state that they have been discriminated against on grounds of political opinion, 11% think that they have been discriminated against on grounds of age (Arun, 2020b). Findings show that ageism is on a rapid rise since 2013. While ageism was at 4% in 2013, the year when AAS was launched, it rose to 7% in 2016 and 11% in 2020. In this regard, the study gives indications that ageism has been rapidly increasing over the years. Moreover, it is the poorest older persons who are most affected by ageism. Similar to gender, class is also a factor that determines how discrimination occurs. Ageism soars to 18% among unprivileged classes that are the most deprived of income and education. Older persons in poverty and, among them specifically, older persons with a disability and widowed older women are the main segments that experience ageism in the most
destructive way. Why is that? Why do older persons in poverty experience ageism more than others?

There is a widespread notion in Turkey that older persons have, for centuries, long been protected and respected as part of Turkish culture. Nevertheless, our research show that older persons have never been held in high esteem in any period of the history (Arun, 2018). Archetypes for older age give us information about the social appearance of older persons and the social perceptions on age. According to this information, older persons have been portrayed for centuries as people in poverty, who have suffered biological losses, with wrinkled skin, white and sparse hair and with no teeth. This social image is the source of fear of older age in modern times. However, affluent older persons are a far cry from these descriptions. Affluent older persons have been well respected in almost all periods throughout time. Older persons affluent in income and education are also those who hold a high status in life...this is why they are not portrayed by their older age. The word “older” is not used as a descriptive attribute to describe them. It is the people in poverty, indigent and desperate people, who are classified and indicated as older persons. Disease, disability and death are basic features accompanying these qualities. These social images associated with older persons, old age and ageing are one of the main reasons that people in modern times recoil at the sound of the word “older”.

Social representation of older age are also an indicator of why older persons in poverty are more subject to ageism. When older persons can no longer produce wealth and become deprived of education and income – the very social tools to help them defend themselves – they face more exclusion and stigma, thus turning into persons to be despised and feared.
Take a look at the older persons who have been criminalised, stigmatised and badly treated during the Covid-19 pandemic in Turkey. They all have a main characteristic in common: poverty. It is the older persons in poverty who are covered by the media and portrayed by their older age identity. It is the older persons in poverty who have been most affected by ageism during the Covid-19 pandemic. Older persons have their rights to the city and transport denied; they face hostile behaviours and hatred and have water thrown at them; they are chased, ensnared and caught by law enforcement officers. “Citizens” bothered by older persons report them; older persons create panic in the city. They are stopped by force on the street and forced into putting on masks and branded as “viruses”.

Media discourse has rather played a defining role in Turkey in the process of transforming older persons from being persons considered to be in danger to dangerous persons. Building on the longstanding negative social image of older persons, they have been transformed into despised and feared people who need to be isolated during the Covid-19 pandemic.
Production and Circulation of Ageist Discourse
Part 5 presents statistical analysis of publications compiled from media monitoring work aimed at understanding how discriminatory discourse against older persons is produced and circulated during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Publications in question have been examined using both content analysis and discourse analysis. Analysis outcomes have established the content of these publications during the pandemic, revealing how content has changed and discourse has transformed in the course of the pandemic. Variables used in the analysis below exhibit quantitative data from the text of the publications, while at the same time making it possible to understand discriminatory attitudes, subtext of the publications, target(s) of the discourse and how discourse is constructed, and which deliberate word choices are made in the discourse. Therefore, this study goes beyond reporting sample cases in the media during the Covid-19 pandemic and can facilitate comprehension of the publications during the monitoring period with respect to the basis of their content and discourse, their quality and purveying attitudes.

In this context, 197 publications were identified in connection with rights violations and discriminatory practices against older persons as a result of the media monitoring covering the first six months of 2020 (January-June). Cumhuriyet Daily has published the largest number of news items during the Covid-19 pandemic. A quarter of the publications identified during the media monitoring were published by Cumhuriyet Daily, which is followed respectively by Hürriyet Daily and Yeni Şafak Daily. The rate of the news items published in these two newspapers is 17%. Birgün Daily and Milliyet Daily come next with 16% each. Sabah Daily has published the least number of items during the monitoring period. Only 9% of the publications is by Sabah Daily. All publications are in the form of news reporting. There has not been any publication found in the form of an opinion column, interview or critique that notes, points out or considers the rights violations against older persons or ageism.
**Graphic 1:** Distribution of Publications Covering Older Persons during the Covid-19 Pandemic.
An examination of the monthly distribution of the news reports that are selected based on the intersection of keywords “older persons and Covid-19” shows the impacts of global and domestic developments on news.

On 31 December 2019, the World Health Organisation made the first public announcement of an unknown new virus. In this announcement, WHO reported on a case of pneumonia of an unknown cause. Ten days later, on 10 January 2020, WHO announced that it was drawing up guidelines on the said case. The guideline referred to a diagnosis-treatment process of the novel coronavirus. On 13 January 2020, the first case out of China was reported. Consequently, a WHO team visited Wuhan, China on 21 January 2020. On 11 February 2022, WHO officially named the disease caused by this new virus “Covid-19”. A month later, on 11 March 2020, the Director General of WHO declared the Covid-19 outbreak a global pandemic. After the declaration of Covid-19 virus as a global pandemic, several countries introduced restrictions.

**Graphic 2:** Distribution by Month of Coverage on Older Persons during Covid-19 Pandemic
WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020

Good afternoon.

In the past week, the number of cases of COVID-19 outside China has increased 15-fold, and the number of affected countries has tripled. There are now more than 18,000 cases in 144 countries, and 4,018 people have lost their lives.

Thousands more are fighting for their lives in hospitals.

In the days and weeks ahead, we expect to see the number of cases, the number of deaths, and the number of affected countries climb even higher.

WHO has been assessing this outbreak around the clock and we are deeply concerned both by the alarming levels of spread and severity, and by the alarming levels of inaction.

We have therefore made the assessment that COVID-19 can be characterized as a pandemic.

Pandemic is not a word to use lightly or carelessly. It is a word that, if used, can cause unreasonable fear, or unjustified acceptance that the thing is over, leading to unnecessary suffering and death.

Describing the situation as a pandemic does not change WHO’s assessment of the threat posed by this virus. It doesn’t change what WHO is doing, and it doesn’t change what countries should do.

We have never before seen a pandemic spread so rapidly across the globe. This is the first pandemic caused by a coronavirus.

And we have never before seen a pandemic that can be controlled, at the same time.

WHO has been in full response mode since we were notified of the first cases.

And we have called every day for countries to take urgent and aggressive action.

We have rung the alarm bell loud and clear.

As I said on Monday, just looking at the number of cases and the number of countries affected does not tell the full story.

Of the 18,000 cases reported globally in 144 countries, more than 90 percent of cases are in just four countries, and two of those – China and the Republic of Korea – have significantly declining epidemics.

81 countries have not reported any cases, and 27 countries have reported 10 cases or less.

We are now seeing this loudly enough, or clearly enough, or often enough: all countries can still change the course of this pandemic.

Countries detect, test, trace, isolate, and mobilize their people in the response, those with a handful of cases can prevent those cases becoming clusters, and those clusters becoming community transmission.

Every one of these countries with community transmission or large clusters can turn the tide on this virus.

Several countries have demonstrated that the virus can be suppressed and controlled.

The challenge for many countries who are now dealing with large clusters or community transmission is not whether they can do the same – it’s whether they will.

Some countries are struggling with a lack of capacity.

Some countries are struggling with a lack of resources.

Some countries are struggling with a lack of resolve.

We are grateful for the measures being taken in Iran, Italy and the Republic of Korea to stem the virus and curb their epidemics.

We know that these measures are taking a heavy toll on societies and economies, just as they did in China.

All countries must strike a fine balance between protecting health, minimizing economic and social disruption, and respecting human rights.

WHO’s mandate is a public health. But we are working with many partners across all sectors to mitigate the social and economic consequences of this pandemic.

This is not just a public health crisis, it’s a crisis that will touch every sector – so every sector and every individual must be involved in the fight.

I have asked the beginning that countries must take a whole-of-government, whole-of-society approach, not around a comprehensive strategy to prevent infections, save lives and minimize impact.

Let me summarize it in four key areas.

First: prepare and be ready.

Second: detect, protect, and treat.

Third: reduce transmission.

Fourth: innovate and learn.

I want to tell all countries that we are calling on you to activate and scale up your emergency response mechanisms;

Communicate with your people about the risks and how they can protect themselves – this is everybody’s business;

Find, isolate, test and treat every case and trace every contact;

Ready your hospitals;

Protect and train your health workers;

And let’s all look out for each other, because we need each other;

And;

There’s been too much attention on one word.

Let me give you some other words that matter much more, and that are much more actionable.

Prevention.

Preparedness.

Public health.

Political leadership.

And most of all, people.

We’re in this together. To do the right things with care and protect the citizens of the world. It’s possible.

I thank you.
Turkey closed its borders to countries with high incidence of Covid-19 before the first case of the disease was reported in Turkey on 11 March 2020. Initial measures were introduced, and nationwide campaigns were held about the use of masks and hygiene rules.

The pandemic entered Turkey’s agenda in January 2020. Initial news items that directly linked Covid-19 with older persons were published in February. News reports generally provided information from Asia. These news reports presented a distribution of Covid-19 cases by age groups, underlining that people aged 80 and over were the hardest hit by the pandemic. Given the date of the WHO declaration of the pandemic and the date of the first case of Covid-19 in Turkey, it may be expected that the coverage about Covid-19 virus and older persons would have escalated in March. In fact, 72% of all news items that we have identified in relation to Covid-19 and older persons were published in March. Another reason for the escalation was the nationwide bans imposed on older persons on 21 March 2020. The coverage that soared in March 2020 declined to 20% in April, further going down as low as 5% in May and June.

Graphic 3: Word Count of Coverage on Older Persons during the Covid-19 Pandemic
197 pieces of news reports published between January and June of 2020 had a minimum word count of 32 and a maximum of 2626. The average word count per news report was 305. The majority of the news reports had a word count of 200. When calculated in terms of months, the average word count per news report was 300 in March, the month of the largest number of news reports, 278 in April, 450 in May and 350 in June. Although there is not a statistically significant change observed in the word count of the news reports during the process, the content produced by newspapers has observably differentiated in quantitative terms. News reports by Birgün Daily have an average of 473 words. In this regard, Birgün Daily has issued the longest news reports. The average wordcount per news report is 339 for Cumhuriyet Daily; 275 for Hürriyet Daily, 268 for Yeni Şafak, 226 for Sabah Daily and 188 for Milliyet Daily respectively. In terms of the average word count per news report, Birgün Daily and Cumhuriyet Daily rank above the average and the rest fall below the average. Moreover, word count is not a sufficient criterion to assess the quality of the news report. The length of a news article is not considered as a factor that directly determines the discourse of the news. The main themes, the target and the attitude of the actor should also be examined.
Main themes of the media news reports in the first 6 months of the pandemic have been studied. Main themes have been reclassified under six headings. The main themes that constructed the discourse of the news reports were as follows:

**65+:** The key word 65+ was frequently included in the content of the news. During the Covid-19 pandemic, news reports provided information about older persons and assessments of the situation. Age stood out as a topic of reported information and assessments. Information, developments and data based on chronological age were shared. Consequently, 65+ made up the main theme of 3% of all news reports.

**Transport:** All news items under this heading were related to the denial of the right to transport. Metropolitan municipalities started to discontinue free transport passes given to older persons. Elimination of free transport passes started immediately after the curfew was imposed in metropolitan cities such as Konya, Istanbul, Ankara, Antalya and Izmir and many other cities followed suit through June. Information provided in the news reports was important as it pointed out how the right to transport was taken away. Although many news reports covered similar information following the curfew, all news coverage provided details on the denial of older persons’ right to transport.
Consequently, 3% of all news reports were related to transport.

**Number of cases:** The main common feature of the news reports collected under this theme was that they provided information on the number of Covid-19 cases. After the first case of Covid-19 was reported in Turkey, the news covered the total number of cases, but the numbers based on age group were not made public at the time. Contrary to the news coming in from abroad, which provided the number of cases per age group, Turkey only reported the total number of cases to the public. Nevertheless, after covering the total number of cases, the news reports began to include a comment in the discourse that older persons were more at risk. Therefore, rather than reporting the number of cases, the news items that fall under the theme of “number of cases” focused more on comments and assessments concerning older persons. News reports that fall under this theme made up 4% of all news coverage.

**Sanctions:** Some of the news reports covered fines imposed on older persons for defying the bans. These news reports focused on sanctions imposed following the announcement of the curfew. Older persons who were reported for allegedly defying the lockdown were intervened by law enforcement officers and fined. News coverage used visuals that posited older persons against law enforcement officers, using photographs taken when older persons “caught by the police” were given a fine. The main theme that stood out in all these types of news was punishment and the amount of the fine. Consequently, the main theme of sanctions made up 6% of all news coverage.

**Covid-19 measures:** Some of the news reports covered measures taken against Covid-19. The news reports under this main theme spanned over the six-month monitoring period. News coverage on
Covid-19 related measures were available before and after the curfew was imposed. The measures included regulations on entrances to and exits from places such as bazaars, markets, shopping centres and restaurants; rules were set for institutions like retirement homes and nursing homes. The main content in these news reports were limited to the measures against the spread of the Covid-19 pandemic. Consequently, the main theme of Covid-19 measures made up 13% of all news coverage.

Curfew: A notable part of the news consisted of reflections on lockdown. People aged 65 and over nationwide in Turkey were banned from leaving home by a Ministry of Interior circular on 21 March 2020. News reports compiled under this main theme of “curfew” consisted of news coverage published after a stay-at-home order was issued for older persons. These news reports listed measures taken by the police against older persons who had allegedly “defied the ban”, “resisted” or “reacted against” the curfew measure or “ran away from officers”. For example, the news report titled “Police stop an older man who insists on going to the bank” (Sabah Daily, 7 May 2020) is exemplary of this type of news report. The news coverage is indicative of how older persons have been criminalised as a result of the practices put in place following the curfew order. So much so that photos of older persons who were “cautioned”, “caught” or “detained” by law enforcement officers were used as visuals in the news reports. These practices led to the stigmatisation of older persons as “dangerous people” who break laws. However, there were also news reports under this main theme that humiliated and discredited older persons. Indeed, news reports with headlines “We cannot keep grandpas at home: They go out in defiance of the ban” (Yeni Şafak Daily, 22 March 2020) or “75 year-old grandma caught on camera while climbing the wall like a spider disobeying the coronavirus restriction” (Sabah Daily, 23 April 2020) clearly belittle older persons in their references
to them. Furthermore, the fact that the photos shown in the news reports were not related to the content and that older persons seen in the photos were circled in red solidify the perception that they are dangerous. Consequently, the main theme of curfew made up 32% of all news coverage.

**Rights violation, abuse, negligence, violence:** A rather significant part of news contains content based on rights violations, abuse, negligence and violence. The bans imposed on older persons were followed by practices, violations and interventions by local governments and law enforcement forces which led to loss of rights, constituting the main item on the news. Moreover, cases of violence, abuse and neglect against older persons defined the main theme of the news. These news reports stressed that discriminatory practices by local governments against older persons which led to rights violations were appropriate and right; one example is the headline “Citizens Ignore Coronavirus, Municipality Turns to Last Resort!” (Hürriyet Daily, 19 March 2020). Such news reports presented the hostile architecture used to redesign city squares and landscape to prevent older persons from using the features of the city as a rational and right decision. The news compiled under this main theme show that the bad treatment and violence inflicted on older persons are legitimised. For example, when people throw water at older persons sitting on a bench, it is presented as “a bittersweet caution” or “a warning” (Sabah Daily, 22 March 2020), noting that older persons “did not know what hit them” (Yeni Şafak Daily, 22 March 2020). The main content in these news reports legitimised exclusion and discrimination of older persons and the violence inflicted on them, while also trivialising violence and negligence. In other words, discrimination was instrumental in order to both justify and legitimate the violation and the violence. The main argument of the news that falls under this theme was based on alienating older persons and finding them in the wrong. Older persons were stigmatised as dangerous people who posed a threat (to national security) and opposed the state. Accordingly, the text of the news circulated the idea that it was appropriate to introduce discriminatory practices, measures that lead to loss of rights, and indefinite, limitless and unsupervised bans. A significant part of all news, as high as 40%, was based on the main theme of rights violations, abuse, negligence and violence.
Main themes help us understand the basis of arguments in the content of the news coverage. Moreover, another point of interest for study in the context of spread of discriminatory practices and behaviours against older persons is the intended audience of the news reports under these main themes. Knowing the target audience of the discourse in the news would help us understand how the discourse is circulated. The target audience of most of the news coverage on older persons during Covid-19 pandemic (97%) appears to be the public. The discourse of the coverage is circulated to a public that is positioned to exclude older persons. Only 3% of all coverage directly addresses older persons. The circulation of the discourse requires that the public and older persons be two separate sets of the targeted audience. This tendency contributes to trivialisation of both discriminatory practices and behaviours.

The process of transforming older persons from people in danger to dangerous people required a public that would uphold the main arguments of the news. A wide and homogeneous public is quite functional to captivate a common target audience in order to form and spread opinions and transform them to leading opinions. Therefore, all news coverage,
including reports that dictate what older persons should do or not do, addressed to a public that was built without older persons. Similarly, news reports covering measures to protect older persons again addressed to the same public, a broad-based public without older persons...

This so-called public was not only instrumental in disseminating and circulating the discourse but also quite effective in silencing the objections made by older persons to bans imposed on them, as well as alienating and marginalising them in their efforts to claim their rights. Indeed, while reporting older persons who defend themselves and object to unfair treatment, a notable part of the news ran headlines such as “A shocking defence!” “Interesting reaction!” “Interesting scenes!” “Interesting dialogue” “Appalling behaviour” “Stupefying incident!”, all of which marginalised older persons’ attempts to claim their rights, making it impossible to seek a remedy for their rights taken from them. In fact, the news reports created the impression that the shocking defences or appalling behaviours by older persons were directed at the public. The discourse of the news was developed based on the narrative that actions taken by older persons were against the public.

**Graphic 6: Attitude of Discourse in the News Coverage on Older Persons During Covid-19 Pandemic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDE OF DISCOURSE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>%12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>%4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>%85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitude of discourse while presenting arguments in news coverage is a critical variable in understanding the discrimination against older persons. Of all news coverage, 4% had a positively constructed discourse. These news items reported the conditions older persons found themselves in and the loss of rights they experienced without using a discriminatory discourse or key words. These publications were limited to an average of 442 words. News headlines such as “[Pandemic] triggered discrimination on grounds of age” (Birgün Daily, 25 March, 2020), “Bad treatment and discrimination against older persons have escalated” (Cumhuriyet Daily, 30 June 2020), “Human beings are cruel and ignorant: We are all responsible for what is happening, older persons are even more confused than we are” (Yeni Şafak, 24 March 2020) stood out with their positive discourse about older age. Some coverage had neutral attitudes towards older persons, older age and ageism. These seemingly impartial news items usually reported information on Covid-19 cases, or the measures taken against it. These pieces of news were also the longest ones as they explained the measures or the figures. Such news reports with a neutral discourse consisted of an average of 550 words. The objective quality of the content, rather than the attitude of the actor in the news report, was the main factor that rendered the language of the news neutral. Since the content did not enable the actor to display an attitude, the discourse also developed neutrally. On the other hand, the news reports that displayed negative attitudes towards older persons and older age were relatively short. Such news reports with a negative attitude toward older persons and older age had an average word count of 260, which placed them in the category of the shortest news. These were news reports which circulated the discriminatory discourse albeit being short.

Of all news coverage we collected during the media monitoring, 85% had a discriminatory discourse against older age and older persons. These publications, which fed into the fear of older age, criminalised older persons and painted a negative image of older persons, used similar key words. “Old uncle/old aunt”, “grandma” and
“grandpa” were frequently used words to describe older persons by forming a kinship. This so-called intimate relation built as if there was a blood tie with older persons is a hierarchical positioning. It is an attempt at disregarding the status of older persons by stripping them off their individuality and forming a power relation by removing the distance. This intimacy also constructs a patriarchal relation. Reprimanding and shaming older persons for how they act and reporting the news in code by emphasizing the term “despite the bans” have formed the main construct of the exclusionary discourse.

Stigmatisation of older persons, portraying them as a threat (to security) and thus criminalising them, make it clear how marginalised social positions were constructed during the Covid-19 pandemic and what tools were used to do so. Indeed, in the first months of the outbreak the main contradistinction made in the discriminatory discourse was between “older persons and others” and “older persons and young people”. In due course the discriminatory discourse turned the contradistinction into “risky/dangerous people and others”. It was the older persons who were coded as risky/dangerous.

**Graphic 7:** Top 10 Words Used in the Media to Describe Older Persons During the Covid-19 Pandemic
Top ten words used in the news coverage about ageing, older age and older persons during the Covid-19 pandemic are available above. These words show us how, and with what tools, a discourse is constructed, resulting in discriminatory behaviours and practices. **Virus** is the most frequently used word. It usually refers to the virus named as Covid-19. WHO coined the term “Covid-19” in the early days of the outbreak when it was declared a pandemic, then the virus was also given different names such as “coronavirus”, “koronavirüs” or “Kovid19”. It is noteworthy that this word was also used to refer to older persons at a time when deeply discriminatory discourse about older persons were emerging. The fact that people saying “we caught the virus” in reference to older persons was reported as news can be seen as a case in point that the discriminatory discourse was indeed reflected in the public.

The next two frequently used words are **65+** and **ban**. The 65-age threshold regularly used in scientific studies to define older persons refers to a segment defined by chronological age. Many institutions, both international and in Turkey, classify and define older persons by the chronological age of 65 and over. Although this age threshold is used in scientific studies and policy documents to define a period or a social segment, it is actually an arbitrary and random definition. It is a convenient term for researchers and policy practitioners to present findings, information and observations in an organized format.
Media coverage during the Covid-19 pandemic has frequently used chronological age threshold to define older persons. This classification firstly came into view by foreign data on the pandemic, and later used in the legal document that declared a curfew. Then it was used in the media discourse as a chronological age threshold to define older persons. It is noteworthy that people sometimes use the term 65+ because they shy away from saying older person. Nonetheless, any term that disguises older age and ageing paves the way to ageism. Therefore, circulating the term 65+, an alternative to the term older person, as an avoidance reflex is indicative of ageism.

Another common term used in association with 65+ is the word “ban”. This couple of words, 65+ and ban, are accompanied by grandma/grandpa and dangerous/risky and police. When they all come together, they yield clues about how older persons have transformed from people in danger to dangerous people in the public perception. When the next words mask, stay at home and chronic diseases are also thrown into the bargain, a bigger picture of the parts of the discourse that alienate and isolate older persons become more clear. Denial of the right to public transport, the most controversial discriminatory practice, has also often been covered in the media. In fact, public transport is another word frequently used to refer to older persons.

It is noteworthy that people sometimes use the term 65+ because they shy away from saying older person. Nonetheless, any term that disguises older age and ageing paves the way to ageism.
Discriminatory Practices Against Older Persons During the Covid-19 Pandemic
Transformation of ageism to discriminatory attitudes and practices during the Covid-19 pandemic was an unexpected development for most people. Yet, ageism in Turkey has been escalating rapidly and consistently over the years. Thus, it was not unexpected that attitudes evolved into behaviours during Covid-19. Indeed, in times of crisis, a discriminatory attitude can quickly and inevitably turn into behaviour. Systematic discriminatory practices have been observably and publicly in place in Turkey during the Covid-19 pandemic. These practices have led to rights violations against older persons. Most widespread discriminatory practices and violations can be grouped under 5 main headings;  

1. **Denial of freedom of movement**  
   Legal framework;  
   - Universal Declaration of Human Rights  
   - European Convention on Human Rights  
   - International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights  

2. **Denial of the right to access justice**  
   Legal framework;  
   - Universal Declaration of Human Rights  
   - European Convention on Human Rights  
   - International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights  

3. **Denial of the right to work**  
   Legal framework;  
   - Universal Declaration of Human Rights  
   - European Social Charter  
   - International Labour Organisation Conventions no. 111, 122, 162  
   - International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights  

4. **Denial of Civil Rights**  
   Legal framework;  
   - European Convention on Human Rights  
   - European Social Charter  
   - International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights  

5. **Denial of the Right to Health and Care**  
   Legal framework;  
   - Universal Declaration of Human Rights  
   - European Social Charter  
   - International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights  

---

15 Turkish translation of relevant legal instruments are available at: [www.insanhaklariizleme.org](http://www.insanhaklariizleme.org)
Merely a few hours after the declaration of the curfew, local governments in Turkey announced that they had revoked free passes given to older persons for intracity public transport; and airline companies stated that older passengers would not be permitted on flights. These developments have led to a nationwide denial of older persons’ right to freedom of movement.

In a news report shortly after the declaration of the curfew, Cumhuriyet Daily shared a statement by THY Press Room. The statement called on older persons to stay at home, announcing that they would not be permitted as passengers on flights. However, freedom to travel is a right that cannot be denied unless there is a case of emergency or a temporary situation. Still, the right of older persons to travel have been denied nationwide and indefinitely after the lockdown and bans were imposed on older persons during the pandemic.
Immediately prior to the curfew imposed on older persons in Turkey, a large number of metropolitan municipalities announced that they had cancelled free intercity transport, an entitlement given to older persons. Metropolitan municipalities of İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Antalya and Konya were the first local governments announcing this decision. News coverage by Cumhuriyet Daily and Yenı Şafak Daily, dated 20 and 21 March 2020 respectively, reported that Malatya and Çorum provinces also introduced restrictions to public transport of older persons. Local governments asserted that these decisions were to protect older persons with the justification that they used public transport very frequently. In fact, frequent use of public transport by city dwellers is actually a desired outcome since public transport is an inexpensive, safe, relatively clean and a common mode of intracity transport and mobility, as part of the right to the city.

**News Report 19:** Cumhuriyet Daily, 21 March 2020

**Son dakika haberler: Ankara'da "corona virüs" öne... 65 yaş üstüne ücretsiz ulaşım durduruldu**

**Statement by Ankara and İzmir Municipalities: Free transport pass is revoked for people aged 65 and over**

Metropolitan Municipalities of Ankara and İzmir announced that, as a part of measures against coronavirus, they decided to temporarily revoke free pass entitlement given to citizens aged 65 and over for all modes of public transport.
Bans on intracity transport have been further expanded in the months following the curfew. Some older persons were complaining that the bus drivers did not stop to pick them up at the bus stops, while others who wanted to get on the bus faced intervention. The news report by Sabah Daily displays the treatment given to an older woman and how her right to travel is denied. According to the news story, the police were called because the bus driver wanted the older woman off the bus, and when the police officers arrived, they forced her to get off the bus.

Rights violations, which have become a frequent occurrence after the curfew, have shown how devastating stigmatization of older persons can be. Millet Daily reports on 29 March 2020 that an older person who wanted to get on a public bus to go home was not allowed on the bus. The news report underscored that “bus drivers did not let the 64-year-old man on the bus”. Stereotypes are as effective in the spread of ageism as prejudices. As is the case in point in this news story,
having white hair and a wrinkled complexion would be a good enough reason for people to face unfair treatment and exclusion.

Given the discriminatory transport practices, it is obvious that older persons’ right to travel is denied. Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Article 2 of Protocol 4 of the European Convention of Human Rights refer to the freedom of movement. Nonetheless, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights also states that freedom of movement can be restricted in cases of emergency. Still, the legal basis of these restrictions should be stated, restrictions should be based on legal norms and not contradict other obligations of human rights. Prohibitions and restrictions should be time-bound and subject to supervision. If rights are restricted for some reason, information must absolutely be provided on remedies and mechanisms to claim rights. Otherwise, preventing a person from leaving a certain place for an indefinite period of time could be considered as depriving that person of freedom by restricting social communication and interaction. Indeed, both intercity and intracity transport have been banned disproportionately, indefinitely and without supervision on grounds of chronologic age during the Covid-19 pandemic in Turkey. Restrictions imposed on grounds of chronologic age show that prohibition of discrimination is violated.
Denial of the Right to Justice

Another right violation that immediately became discernible after an indefinite and unlimited curfew was imposed on older persons was the restriction on access to justice. Access to justice is a fundamental right guaranteed by the constitution and referred to in international conventions. Access to justice means, inter alia, ensuring that justice is done, in the shortest time period and at minimum cost, to those who claim their rights. Moreover, it is a basic rule that judicial procedure and rules be fair and the right to a fair trial be not denied. In addition to these two universal rules, the option to apply to judicial bodies cannot be denied either. However, the measures, restrictions and practices, implemented in the context of bans with the claim that the aim is to protect older persons, have all shown that access to justice has been violated in all its aspects.

People aged over 65 not allowed in the Palace of Justice

Following an announcement by the Ministry of Interior imposing a curfew on people aged 65 and over and those with chronic diseases, as part of the measures taken against Covid-19, identity checks were carried out at Istanbul Palace of Justice on older citizens. Those who were aged over 65 were not allowed to enter the Palace of Justice. Further, a new practice was introduced where judges-prosecutors and citizens alike, have their temperatures taken every time they enter into the Palace.

News Report 23: Milliyet Daily, 23 March 2020

Older persons were prevented from entering into the court houses immediately after the curfew was imposed. A news story by Milliyet Daily on 23
March 2020 reports that identity checks are carried out on older persons and those aged over 65 are not allowed to enter into the courthouse. This practice, above all else, constitutes a denial of the right to apply to judicial bodies. Nevertheless, it is perfectly clear that older persons, like everyone else, cannot, without exception, be denied the right to recognition before law. News reports on the impediment of older persons’ access to legal mechanisms are rather unnerving as they also show that principles of a democratic state administration are violated during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Articles 3, 6, 13 and 14 of the European Convention of Human Rights, articles 2 and 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, articles 2 and 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights explicitly refer to access to justice. Right to access to justice does not simply focus on results, it also emphasizes the process. Everyone has the right to be notified as early as possible of the quality and reason of the accusation levelled at him/her, to have the means to prepare his/her case, to have a trial that is held within a reasonable time period and to be heard by an independent and impartial court. Furthermore, everyone whose rights and freedoms are violated have the right to an effective remedy. In fact, international instruments mentioned above set out the requirement that these rights and freedoms be provided without discrimination. Freedom to claim one’s rights cannot be denied on grounds of belief, sex, race, colour, political or any other opinion, social origin, wealth, etc., neither can it be denied on ground of chronological age. Still, during the Covid-19 pandemic, people have had their access to justice and judicial mechanisms denied on ground of chronological age.

3. Denial of the right to work

Right to work is a social right. It is one of the prioritized and fundamental guarantees and pledges in a social state. Indeed, a social state should provide the legal conditions for all citizens to enjoy the right to work. This does not simply mean that people would have a job. Right
to a dignified and decent work should be ensured. Occupational conditions including social security, occupational health, protection, guarantees and leave entitlements should be legally guaranteed. Citizens should equally enjoy all guarantees related to the right to work. As stated in both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (articles 23 & 24) and the European Social Charter, everyone’s right to work and right to free choice of employment should effectively be protected. Yet, older persons have had their right to work denied as a result of the bans imposed on them during the Covid-19 pandemic.


Analyses made in a news report by Cumhuriyet Daily on 31 March 2020 indicated that a significant part of older persons (65.5%) are employed in the agriculture sector. For older women, the percentage was around 72. The news story reported that security officers did not give a work permit to an older farmer, adding that older producers were compelled to either ask for support from their family members or hire workers to maintain their agricultural activities.

Agriculture boggled down with "age 65"...Gendarmerie does not permit farmers to work

The Gendarmerie did not permit a farmer aged over 65 to go to his farm in Izmir. An 80-year-old farmer in Adana asked his son to step up to keep the production going
Sabah Daily reported on 26 March 2020 that during a traffic control, the police took action on a shuttle service driver when he turned out to be over 65 years of age. According to the news story, the police prevented the service driver from working based on his age and gave him a fine.

Articles 23 and 24 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, International Labour Organisation Conventions numbered 111, 122 and 162, article 6 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and article 23 of the European Social Charter explicitly set forth the framework on the right to work. General Comment no. 6 of the Committee that monitors the implementation of International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights defines the obligations of the administration to take measures to prevent discrimination on ground of age in employment and occupation (Alkan Olsson, 2019). Article 6 of the Directive of the Council of European Union refers to protective and inclusive regulations concerning employment of older persons (Council of Ministers of the EU, 2000). Consequently, right to work is essential to realise other human rights fully and completely. Right to work is an integral part of human dignity. Right to work is an inalienable right for older persons as well the right to effectively participate in public, social and cultural life and live a good life. However, older persons’ right to work has observably also been violated during the Covid-19 pandemic.
Denial of Civil Rights

Human Rights and Equality Institution of Turkey\(^6\) (HREI) states that civil rights are important and valuable as they prevent people from being subjected to arbitrary practices in the legal and political system. As HREI points out, deprivation of liberty cannot be tolerated, neither can being left in extreme poverty be acceptable. “Therefore, it is extremely crucial to defend social and economic rights”\(^7\). Civil rights provide for a person to participate to social life in its entirety. For example, to own property, come into inheritance, start a family, get engaged and married, etc.

**Denial of Civil Rights**

**Wedding cancelled due to 65 age ban**

The wedding of Sait Dursun (69) and Canan Çoban (45) who have been living together for 21 years in Manavgat, Antalya scheduled to take place on 30 March fell through due to the curfew imposed on people aged 65 and over. The couple called on the authorities for help. News Report 26: Cumhuriyet Daily, 5 April 2020

According to a news report by Cumhuriyet Daily on 5 April 2020, a couple who applied to the municipality to have an

---

\(^{16}\) Human Rights and Equality Institution of Turkey

\(^{17}\) Civil rights provide a person to participate to social life in its entirety.
official marriage ceremony was reminded of the curfew imposed by the Ministry of Interior and told that “they could not have the ceremony because of their age”. The couple was told that they could get married “after the virus faded away”.

In fact, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which Turkey ratified in 2003 by a Cabinet decision,\(^\text{18}\) states that people cannot be denied the right to enter into marriage with their free will. Article 23 of the Covenant explicitly states, “The right of men and women of marriageable age to marry and to found a family shall be recognized”. In addition, article 12 of the European Convention of Human Rights states that men and women of marriageable age have the right to marry and to found a family. Article 16 of the European Social Charter obligates the States to ensure the necessary conditions for the full development of the family. International conventions undertake to promote the economic, legal and social protection of family life by such means as social benefits, fiscal arrangements, provision of family housing, benefits for the newly married, and other appropriate means.

Notwithstanding the rights guaranteed by international conventions, older persons’ enjoyment of their civil rights has also been denied during the Covid-19 pandemic. Denial of civil rights was an obvious violation. As also indicated by institutions in charge with human rights in Turkey, denial of civil rights can neither be tolerated nor accepted.

\(^{16}\) www.tihek.gov.tr
\(^{17}\) https://www.tihek.gov.tr/insan-haklari-3/
\(^{18}\) Cabinet decision is available at: https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2003/06/20030618.htm#3
To be healthy and to access health and care services is a fundamental human right. No one can be denied the right to access information on health and to benefit from health institutions. Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone has the right to access medical care and necessary social services for the health and well-being of himself and of his family. The European Social Charter (article 11) provides for appropriate measures be taken to ensure the effective exercise of the right to protection of health.

Health is not merely an absence of disease. It refers to a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being. Thus, it is a fundamental human right to access well-defined health and care services. Both the code of medical ethics and international conventions outline and protect the right to an inclusive health as well as patients’ rights. Fundamental and inalienable rights in this context are autonomy over medical decisions, right to information, informed consent, access to medical records and confidentiality, privacy, right to care and treatment. Nevertheless, older persons have had their right to access health institutions denied and those who needed medical treatment have had their patients’ rights violated. As a matter of fact, these violations are the biggest obstacle facing a person’s state of physical, mental and social well-being.

Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone has the right to access medical care and necessary social services for the health and well-being of himself and of his family.
Cümhuriyet Daily, in its news story of 19 April 2020, reported that older persons who needed ongoing treatment outside the hospital were not allowed back in the nursing home. According to the news report, older residents of the nursing home contracted Covid-19 and received treatment in the hospital, where after a while they were referred back to the nursing home to continue their treatment outside the hospital due to the hospital’s “high occupancy rate”. The news report underscores the fact that the nursing home did not let its residents back in until their tests were negative. The news report however added that the older persons in question, aged 82 and 84 respectively, faced homelessness as they had no place to go.
Another news report on the denial of the right to health services was published by Milliyet Daily on 3 April 2020. According to the news story, a 75-year-old man who wanted to get on a minibus to go to the hospital was not allowed on the minibus by its driver and had to go on foot to the hospital. Security forces intervened and gave a warning to the 75-year-old man and took him back home.

In times of crises related to public health, as is the case with the Covid-19 pandemic, all decisions such as imposing lockdowns or quarantines including curfews, denial of social calls or restrictions on travelling should be regulated in a way that they do not lead to loss of rights. Nevertheless, older persons’ right to health and care services have been denied during the Covid-19 pandemic as a result of restrictions and bans imposed on grounds of chronological age. Measures taken to protect
No one, including older persons, can be left behind. No one’s right to health services can be restricted; nor can anyone be excluded from social protection. Public health should be lawful and not lead to discrimination. Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and article 11 of the European Social Charter and article 12 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights state that everyone has the right to health without discrimination. No one, including older persons, can be left behind. No one’s right to health services can be restricted; nor can anyone be excluded from social protection. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights explicitly lays out the framework of access to health services: health facilities and services should be available, de facto and de jure, for everyone without discrimination. The European Social Charter also underlines that enjoyment of all defined rights, including the right to health, cannot be discriminated against for any reason. It prohibits all forms of discrimination in access to health and care services. In addition to international conventions, the World Medical Association Declaration of Lisbon refers to the right of everyone to receive adequate medical treatment without discrimination (World Medical Association, 1981). However, quarantine and lockdown measures adopted to protect the health of older persons during the Covid-19 pandemic have led to the violation of the right of older persons to health and care services.
The monitoring carried out during the Covid-19 pandemic shows that the media discourse has fed into the violations during the pandemic, providing a justification and a solid foundation in the spread of ageism. Older persons who seek to claim their rights in the face of violations are being discredited. In this context, the discriminatory language of the media shapes people’s behavioural patterns in the social structure. Reproduction and circulation of discriminatory discourse feed into the collective representation of older persons: stereotypes such as sick, indigent, close-minded, conservative and introvert trigger other prejudices due to the lockdown in the context of Covid-19 pandemic. Older persons are defined as uneducated, obtuse, disobedient, risky and a threat to security and branded as people opposed to the state. Collective representation of older persons is reinforced by hierarchically structured relations. Older persons are alienated by relationally placing them in positions of opposition such as “younger versus older”, “citizens versus older person” and marginalising their collective representation, thereby precipitating transformation of discriminatory attitudes against older persons into behaviours. Discriminatory language of the news separates older persons from social life, first figuratively in the collective mind’s eye, then it does so literally.

The quantitative size of the media reports covering cases of older men in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic is astounding. Since older women are more likely to face isolation in private spaces in Turkey, their stories are arguably not covered as much by the news. Nevertheless, rights violations and discrimination faced by older women are as widespread as those faced by older men. The fact that media professionals do not find older women critical enough to cover in the news does not alleviate the devastating impact of rights violations and discrimination endured by older women. Indeed, a monitoring study by Senex (Senex monitor-
ing, 2021) found that older women were at the receiving end in half of the cases of violence, negligence, abuse, rights violations and discrimination against older persons in Turkey. Two key factors are noticeable in cases of negligence and discrimination against older persons. One is gender and the other is class. Inequalities that occur at the intersection of gender and class can be clearly observed in cases of rights violations and discrimination. Older persons in poverty, older persons with disability, widowed women in poverty, dementia/Alzheimer's patients and their older caregivers are among groups that are most affected by discrimination.

The cases covered by the news media reveal the social spheres where rights violations take place. In this context, it is rather striking that older persons have their rights violated including right to health and care, right to transport, right to access to justice, right to work and civil rights. In Turkey, arguments based on protection of older persons from the pandemic have morphed into practices and behaviours that marginalise, alienate and isolate older persons. The fight is not against the pandemic or the spread of the virus but against older persons. The fight is not against diseases and poverty that exacerbate inequalities but against ageing. Older persons and ageing are branded as risky and dangerous; accordingly, the discourse of the news creates the perception that the fight is against older persons and ageing. Nevertheless, older persons have the same rights as everyone else. Bans, restrictions, quarantines, and lockdown imposed on grounds of chronological age are in violations of the rights of older persons. All these practices and the accompanying behaviours are a blatant display of ageism. In fact, in parallel with Covid-19 pandemic, ageism in Turkey is systematically reproduced at the political level as well.

All stereotypes and prejudices associated with age and accompanying unfair practices are forms of ageism. Much like sexism and racism, ageism is one the most
widespread forms of discrimination in our age. It is arguably the devious form of discrimination. It can be monitored at the micro, meso or macro level; it can also turn in upon itself. It can be observed in behaviours, negatively or positively. In either case, it means that the rights of older persons are violated.

In light of the rights violations and discriminatory practices facing older persons during the Covid-19 pandemic, it is a foregone conclusion that ageism need be combatted. The need is enhanced by the expectation that adults, young people and children of our time will live a longer time as older persons than their parents and grandparents. Young people will spend a larger proportion of their lives as older persons than they have as young people and likewise, children will spend more time as older persons than they have as children. Indeed, dynamics of societal ageing indicate that Turkey is one of the most rapidly ageing countries in the world. Life expectancy at birth is swiftly increasing in an ageing Turkey. Combating all forms of discrimination, including ageism, is a must for people to live a dignified life free from discrimination in their older age.

An effective combat against ageism requires three critical structural steps. First, Turkey will need legal regulations in place to combat ageism. Cooperation with civil society needs to be expanded to remove ambiguities with an aim at implementing legal regulations. Evidence-based contributions by national and local civil society organisations working on ageing, older age and older persons in Turkey would facilitate the identification of required legal regulations. Furthermore, establishing contact with the United Nations Open-ended Working Group on Ageing and receiving their support and recommendations would be a step in the right direction. Recognition in practice of rights arising out of international conventions in the context of the protection of older persons would foster intergenerational solidarity. In this context, providing support to all generations with active ageing pol-
icies will render social, economic and environmental development sustainable in the near future in Turkey, which is ageing without gaining wealth.

Second step should be the launch of a monitoring and evaluation process. An initial undertaking of such a monitoring and evaluation process could be to support research on older persons and the ageing perception of people who are ageing. TUBITAK and national funding institutions should have “Ageing Studies” added to their strategies on research support. A second worthwhile undertaking under this heading could be to launch a national and longitudinal ageing study. Research on ageing should definitely be included in the Official Statistics Program (OSP) of Turkish Statistical Institute. OSP aims at producing up-to-date, reliable, timely, transparent and impartial data on domains required at the national level\textsuperscript{19}. This legally established framework should be adopted, and a longitudinal ageing study at the national level should be included in the national data program in the new term following 2021. Consequently, this would not only encourage the academy, civil society and private sector in their future research on ageing, older age and older persons, but also provide inputs for policy makers, practitioners and those who do the monitoring based on data collected at the national level. It is important to produce up-to-date, reliable and transparent data on ageing, older age and older persons. Because the absence of quality data in a given domain means that human rights violations are unchecked and free to take place in that very domain.

A third step would be to establish a Turkish National Ageing Institute. An autonomous institute should be set up that would follow legal regulations, establish national and international collaborations, support research in required fields, oversee development and implementation of evidence-based policies, and provide guidance and coordination among institutions. This is a necessary and inevitable step for Turkey that is rapidly ageing without gaining wealth.

These prioritised steps would provide a functional mechanism to identify and prevent violations against older persons at the national and regional level and alleviate ageism.

\textsuperscript{19} \url{http://www.resmiistatistik.gov.tr/detail/resmi-istatistik-programi-nedir/}
Covid-19 Diary: What has happened, What have people gone through?
A 6-month long media monitoring was carried out between January 2020 and June 2020 for the research ‘Rights Violations and Discriminatory Practices Against Older Persons During the Covid-19 Pandemic’. It is necessary to be well-apprised of international developments with respect to Covid-19 right before and after the media monitoring period in order to view the research in context. In order to meet this need of knowledge, please find below a diary of what happened globally in the first six months of the pandemic, starting from the day the virus was defined.
Case of pneumonia of unknown etiology is reported to WHO China Country Office

A 6-month long media monitoring was carried out between January 2020 and June 2020 for the research ‘Rights Violations and Discriminatory Practices Against Older Persons During the Covid-19 Pandemic’. It is necessary to be well-apprised of international developments with respect to Covid-19 right before and after the media monitoring period in order to view the research in context. In order to meet this need of knowledge, please find below a diary of what happened globally in the first six months of the pandemic, starting from the day the virus was defined.

WHO reported case of pneumonia of unknown cause in China

WHO published its risk assessment and recommendations. National authorities released a report on the cluster of pneumonia cases in Wuhan including the condition of the patients and the public reaction.

WHO issued its first guidance on the novel coronavirus

Based on experience with other coronaviruses such as SARS and MERS, WHO issued a guidance to help countries check their capacity to detect and respond to the novel coronavirus. The guidance offers information to help identify main gaps, assess risks and plan for response and control actions.

First case of coronavirus outside of China is confirmed

Authorities confirmed a case of novel coronavirus in Thailand. Cases of novel coronavirus were expected to break out outside of China. This event makes it clear why WHO called on other countries to actively monitor and get prepared for cases of novel coronavirus.
WHO conducts a field visit to Wuhan City in China

The delegation observed and discussed active surveillance processes, temperature screening at Wuhan Tianhe airport, laboratory facilities, infection prevention and control measures at Zhongnan hospital and its associated fever clinics, and the deployment of a test kit to detect the virus.

The delegation further discussed ongoing efforts to communicate with the general public and China’s plan to expand the case definition of novel coronavirus to build a clearer picture of the spectrum of severity of the virus.

At the conclusion of the visit, the Chinese Government has released the primers and probes used in the test kit for the detection of the virus in other countries. Chinese experts also shared with the delegation a range of protocols that will be used in developing international guidelines, including case definitions, clinical management protocols, and infection control.

Public Health Emergency of International Concern is declared

WHO Director General Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus declared 2019-nCoV outbreak as a Public Health Emergency of International Concern following the second meeting of the Emergency Committee convened under the International Health Regulations.

Thus, all countries should be prepared for containment, including active surveillance, early detection, isolation and case management, contact tracing and prevention of onward spread of 2019-nCoV infection, and share full data with WHO.

Acknowledging that cases have been reported in five WHO regions in the space of a month, the Committee noted that early detection of cases, isolation and treatment, contact tracing and social distancing measures -depending on the level of risk- could work to prevent the onward spread of the virus.

Novel coronavirus is officially named as COVID-19

Under agreed guidelines, it is required that the name of a disease not refer to a geographical location, an animal, an individual or group of people. It also needs to be pronounceable and related to the disease. Having a name for the disease helps prevent the use of other names that can be inaccurate or stigmatizing.
Do your part to stop stigma and combat COVID-19

WHO Director General has repeatedly called for “solidarity, not stigma” to address COVID-19. WHO has worked with UNICEF and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies on a guide to prevent and address the social stigma associated with the disease.

It is vital to fight stigma. Because it can drive people to hide the illness, not seek health care immediately and discourage them from adopting healthy behaviours. This guide includes some tips and messages, as well as dos and don’ts on language when talking about COVID-19.

"There's no choice but to act now"

Speaking at the COVID-19 media briefing, the Director-General emphasized that the virus is capable of community transmission but can be contained with the right measures.

Mental health and COVID-19

WHO provided guidance to help people manage fear, stigma and discrimination during the COVID-19 outbreak.

In the #AskWHO film below, expert Aiysha Malik answers public questions about mental health and preventing stress during the outbreak.
WHO characterizes COVID-19 as a pandemic

Speaking at the COVID-19 media briefing, the WHO Director-General said:

"WHO has been assessing this outbreak around the clock and we are deeply concerned both by the alarming levels of spread and severity, and by the alarming levels of inaction.

We have therefore made the assessment that COVID-19 can be characterized as a pandemic.

Pandemic is not a word to use lightly or carelessly. It is a word that, if misused, can cause unreasonable fear, or unjustified acceptance that the fight is over, leading to unnecessary suffering and death.

Describing the situation as a pandemic does not change WHO’s assessment of the threat posed by this virus. It doesn’t change what WHO is doing, and it doesn’t change what countries should do.

We have never before seen a pandemic sparked by a coronavirus. This is the first pandemic caused by a coronavirus.

And we have never before seen a pandemic that can be controlled, at the same time."

"You cannot fight a fire blindfolded."

Countries must test every suspected case of COVID-19. If they test positive, they should be isolated and people who they have been in close contact with up to 2 days before they developed symptoms should be found and if these people show symptoms of COVID-19, they should be tested too.

WHO also advises that all confirmed cases, even mild cases, should be isolated in health facilities, to prevent transmission and provide adequate care.

But we recognize that many countries have already exceeded their capacity to care for mild cases in dedicated health facilities. In that situation, countries should prioritize older patients and those with underlying conditions.

Europe has become the epicenter of the pandemic

Europe now has more reported cases and fatalities than the rest of the world. Apart from China, Europe today has more reported cases and deaths than the rest of the world.
Youth are “not invincible.”

Speaking at the COVID-19 media briefing, WHO Director General said:

“Although older people are the hardest hit, younger people are not spared. Data from many countries clearly show that people under 50 make up a significant proportion of patients requiring hospitalization.

Today, I have a message for young people: you are not invincible. This virus could put you in hospital for weeks, or even kill you.

Even if you don’t get sick, the choices you make about where you go could be the difference between life and death for someone else.

I’m grateful that so many young people are spreading the word and not the virus.”
With support from WHO, “Covering COVID-19 Course” for Journalist Begins

Created and curated by science journalist and writer Maryn McKenna, the course covers the recent history of COVID-19 pandemic, past warnings that could have prevented or can help address the outbreak, excellent journalism covering the pandemic and insights of scientific experts.

The course is provided by Knight Center for Journalism in the Americas, Texas University, Austin in collaboration with WHO and UNESCO and with support from Knight Foundation and UNDP.

UN statement on COVID-19 and the need for action on mental health

Some countries report rising cases of depression and anxiety due to COVID-19 pandemic. A study in Ethiopia in April 2020 reported a 3 fold increase in the prevalence rate of depression symptoms compared to estimates from Ethiopia before the outbreak.

Frontline health workers, women, children, teenagers, older persons and people with mental health problems are all at risk. Increase in alcohol consumption is another cause for concern for mental health experts.

Upsurge in the number of people who need mental health or psycho-social support has risen further due to the disruption of mental health services in several countries.

Strictly speaking, it is imperative that people living with mental health problems continue to access treatment. Many countries have changed their approaches and support which showed signs of success.

Support should continue to be provided especially to the most vulnerable people to strengthen social cohesion and reduce loneliness.

WHO marks the six month anniversary of the COVID-19 pandemic

An up-to-date and detailed timeline of WHO response to the pandemic is published on our website. So the public can have a look at what happened in the past six months in relation to the response. The timeline illustrates the range of WHO’s work to stop transmission and save lives.
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The first confirmed case of Covid-19 in Turkey was announced on 11 March 2020 by the Ministry of Health. On the same day World Health Organisation announced that we were facing a global pandemic. Authorities and experts declared that the virus hit older persons the hardest. Older persons started to receive cautions from all quarters based on a so-called protective attitude towards them. In Turkey, the Ministry of Interior issued a circular on 21 March 2020, announcing a curfew for people aged 65 and over. The curfew took effect for an indefinite period and without any supervision or defined limits. The public authorities in Turkey adopted discriminatory practices against older persons. The Office of Presidency issued orders consecutively to obstruct the older persons from travelling within and between city limits. Local governments removed benches at public squares to prevent older persons from using in the cities. Security forces started to intervene when they saw older persons in public spaces. A metropolitan municipality announced the launch of a “Hotline to Report Older Persons”. Older persons have been transformed from being people in danger to dangerous people. The isolation process and the great lockdown have started, compounded by violence, negligence, and rights violations against older persons.

As members of Senex: Association for Aging Studies, we conducted a human rights monitoring study to identify the rights violations and discriminatory practices against older persons during the Covid-19 pandemic. In doing so, we aimed to establish findings that would strengthen the hand of all affected people, particularly the rights defenders, in their quest to claim their rights in the face of the great lockdown. Based on this study, we offer our evidence-based recommendations to urge central governments, local governments and all parties who have responsibility and power in the public sphere to take effective actions against the ongoing loss of rights and wide-spreading discriminatory practices. It was also our hope this study, aimed at combating ageism, will herald other studies in the field.