Exporting LGBT Ideology:
The Biden Administration’s Foreign Policy Priority
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### Key Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Biden administration is devoting millions of dollars to LGBT programs through USAID and the State Department and efforts like the Global Equality Fund.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2022, 132 U.S. embassies released Pride month statements, 99 flew Pride or Progress flags, and 49 had staffers who participated in Pride parades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State Department has criticized 67 countries for allowing so-called “conversion therapy,” 48 countries for not recognizing “LGBTQI+ persons, couples, or their families,” and 154 countries for not having “legal gender recognition.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Biden administration’s ideological colonialism is a misuse of resources, harms relations with U.S. allies, and ignores existing, internationally recognized human rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

Since President Joe Biden took office in 2021, his administration has systematically elevated the importance of LGBT ideology in American foreign policy, utilizing the resources and platform of the U.S. government to promote LGBT policies abroad.

For example, the U.S. Agency for International Development funds LGBT activism, programs, and research to the tune of millions of dollars. President Biden has officially recognized LGBT-commemoration days, hired an envoy for LGBT issues, advanced LGBT ideology at the United Nations, prioritized LGBT refugees, and made Pride Month a fixture at U.S. embassies.

Meanwhile, the Biden administration’s ideological colonialism sometimes strains our relationships with other countries and diverts U.S. attention from focusing on other human rights issues.
LGBT-identifying persons are already (rightly) protected by international human rights treaties by virtue of their personhood, not their sexual orientation or gender identity. Pushing LGBT-specific policies around the world is a coercive attempt to change foreign cultures and laws from afar and displaces human rights like religious freedom.

American embassies around the world are the most prominent platform from which the Biden administration outwardly displays its prioritization of LGBT ideology. Family Research Council analyzed the websites and social media platforms of U.S. embassies around the world and found that in 2022 at least 132 U.S. embassies released Pride Month statements via social media or their website, at least 99 U.S. embassies flew Pride or Progress flags, and at least 49 embassies had staffers who participated in Pride parades. The mark of this ideological push is widespread, and the harms will be as well.
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Part 1: How Did We Get Here?

Historical Background

For approximately 70 years following World War II, the United States’ sense of national interest was largely shaped by what President Franklin D. Roosevelt called the “Four Freedoms”—the freedom of speech, the freedom of worship, the freedom from want (economic deprivation), and the freedom from fear (war). The Four Freedoms constituted something of a shorthand for our national understanding of the conditions that needed to prevail in the world for there to be a break with great conflicts and economic depression. These principles anchored the rationale for America’s involvement abroad.

These concepts provide a snapshot of how Americans thought about our national interests. This framework built by Roosevelt and, afterward, John F. Kennedy was not anathema to Ronald Reagan, a New Deal Democrat who claimed that that political party had left him, not the other way around. Richard Nixon was much more of a realist, but even he never repudiated this vision. Whatever the nuances and the criticisms we can make, the Four Freedoms give us a sense of the liberal, predominantly Christian nation we were in 1941 and the shadow that ethos cast over American foreign policy for many decades.

Things changed drastically with the Obama and Biden administrations. The foreign policy officials of these administrations have rejected that earlier liberal framework. They possess a selectively relativistic, postmodern worldview that seemingly sees past American relationships with other states as unjust and oppressive.
Shortly after assuming office in 2021, U.S. Secretary of State Antony Blinken delivered remarks about the release of the U.S. State Department’s 2020 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices. He adamantly declared regarding the Biden approach to human rights:

One of the core principles of human rights is that they are universal. All people are entitled to these rights, no matter where they’re born, what they believe, whom they love, or any other characteristic. Human rights are also co-equal; there is no hierarchy that makes some rights more important than others.

The inclusion of “whom they love, or any other characteristic” reveals that this statement is about promoting the administration’s agenda regarding sexual orientation and gender identity. Contrary to Secretary Blinken’s statement, there definitely is a hierarchy for this administration, and LGBT rights are at the pinnacle. There are policies that might rival LGBT activism for the top spot in the Biden administration’s agenda. The promotion of abortion and population control is one. Another is promoting racial “equity” both domestically and internationally. Yet, neither seems to elicit the fervor of LGBT ideology.

Amid this backdrop, the Biden administration is choosing to use the institutions and mechanisms of U.S. foreign policy to promote sexual orientation and gender identity as human rights issues. This report will describe this major shift in American foreign policy by examining the administration’s public pronouncements, key public documents, and public steps taken by its representatives, U.S. embassies, and U.S. consulates. Then, we will outline why these actions from the Biden administration are not only harmful but also unnecessary.
The Making of a New Foreign Policy Priority

The U.S. government, both its elected and non-elected components, has incorporated LGBT principles into American foreign policy during the past three administrations. White House memoranda during the Obama and Biden administrations set the goals and expanded upon them, and the Trump administration did not explicitly rescind them. Various government documents function as guideposts, casting a progressive vision for American foreign policy.

First, on December 6, 2011, President Barack Obama issued a memorandum to cabinet and agency heads entitled, “International Initiatives to Advance the Human Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Persons.” The memo began with this statement: “The struggle to end discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) persons is a global challenge, and one that is central to promoting human rights.”

Federal agencies were directed to take a series of actions to effectuate this policy: 1) combat the criminalization of LGBT status and conduct; 2) protect vulnerable LGBT refugees and asylum seekers; 3) see to it that U.S. foreign aid, assistance, and development programs “enhance their ongoing efforts to ensure regular Federal Government engagement with governments, citizens, civil society, and the private sector” to focus on the human rights of LGBT persons; 4) act swiftly with meaningful U.S. responses to human rights abuses of LGBT persons; 5) engage international organizations to fight LGBT discrimination; and 6) issue reports regarding the progress being made toward accomplishing these objectives. The presidential memorandum required all U.S. agencies working overseas “to ensure that U.S. diplomacy and foreign assistance promote and protect the human rights of LGBT persons.”

Second, in 2014, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) published a 19-page page progress and planning report describing USAID’s progressive vision for future policymaking entitled,
“LGBT Vision for Action: Promoting and Supporting the Inclusion of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Individuals.” The report opened by taking note of President Obama’s 2011 “groundbreaking” memorandum. It then boasted that USAID “has pioneered innovative ways to integrated LGBT considerations into our work....” Promoting economic development now embodies “advancing the health, safety and prosperity of the world’s most vulnerable people” because, the report states, it is “not only a matter of human rights, but is also critical to sustainable development.”6 Ignoring the inclusion of the term “sustainable,” another progressive buzzword, it is less than obvious that economic development is critically dependent on advancing this socio-political agenda. Rather, it is more likely that the important work of assisting economic development and helping various countries rise out of poverty has been co-opted by other political agendas—including LGBT policies.

Although the Trump administration did not have its own document outlining or mandating the expansion of LGBT policies around the world, the permanent foreign policy bureaucracies appear to have become committed to advancing LGBT ideology and other social justice agendas under the guise of development and human rights policy. In July 2018, USAID published “non-mandatory guidance” that explained what “inclusive development is and why it is important to USAID's work....” The 2018 guidance provided government practitioners with a handbook for “applying various USAID policies that promote inclusion of marginalized groups” and for integrating “inclusive development across the Program Cycles and operations.”7

So-called “inclusive development” is a methodology that has strayed far from the early Kennedy-Peace Corps era approach that focused on helping a nation economically with things like water and electrical infrastructure. Inclusive development involves aggressively inserting specific progressive values into aid-recipient societies while suppressing native ideas, beliefs, and concepts deemed retrogressive by Western elites working in government or for non-governmental organizations (NGOs).
Needed physical infrastructure projects, food distribution, and humanitarian responses are still part of USAID’s work, but they are increasingly interwoven with progressive political agendas.

**LGBT Policies as National Security?**

When President Joe Biden took office in 2021, his administration picked up right where the Obama administration had left off in 2017. On February 4, 2021, President Biden issued a memorandum entitled, “Advancing the Human Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and Intersex Persons Around the World.” Significantly, it was given a “national security memorandum” number—“NSM-4.” The memo was one of the first issued by the administration, and the “NSM” designation marked it as being of an even higher importance because it is a subject relevant to “national security.”

NSM-4 asserted that it “builds upon [the 2011 Obama memorandum’s] historic legacy and updates the 2011 Memorandum.” That is no exaggeration. NSM-4’s numbered sections track identically with those of the 2011 memorandum, except that the Biden document contained a “Section 8” for “General Provisions,” which consisted of various legal and administrative directives.

The spirit of NSM-4 was even more explicitly stated than it had been during the Obama administration. It could be summarized in one paragraph:

> The United States belongs at the forefront of this struggle—speaking out and standing strong for our most dearly held values. It shall be the policy of the United States to pursue an end to discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, or sex characteristics, and to lead by the power of our example in the cause of advancing the human rights of LGBTQI+ persons around the world.
The final statement is sweeping. The United States will not merely focus on ending the criminalization of certain behaviors—it also intends to “end discrimination” on the basis of “sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, or sex characteristics.” This is an unprecedented goal to exert control over the cultural perceptions and policies of foreign countries—and to push concepts that are not even found in American civil rights statutes.

**A Truly Whole-of-Government Approach**

On April 28, 2022, the U.S. State Department issued a massive document that detailed the federal government’s progress in implementing NSM-4.11 Described as a “first its kind progress report,” it demonstrated “the U.S. commitment to promoting and protecting the human rights of LGBTQI+ people around the world through our diplomacy and foreign assistance.”12 The 130-page document then presented something of a parade through the bureaucracy. All departments, agencies, and bureaus are listed in the “historic document” as it provides “detailed, transparent reporting from U.S. government agencies engaged abroad in efforts to protect and promote the human rights of LGBTQI+ persons around the world.”13

The Interagency Report is breathtaking in scope, listing all the departments, bureaus, agencies, and offices that impact American foreign policy and providing a detailed overview of how LGBT policies are being pushed throughout. Yet, it never seems to be enough:

While this report provides insights into the U.S. government’s work, it is comprehensive, not exhaustive. It is clear we must be doing more, and we will continue to strive for additional progress.14
If the United States now has a sexual orientation and gender identity-focused foreign policy, that constitutes a radical departure from earlier American foreign policies. Those sought to advance America’s national security interests while trying to also promote universally accepted human rights. As evidence of the efforts being made across his administration, President Biden promulgated Executive Order 14075, “Advancing Equality for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Intersex Individuals,” on June 15, 2022. The executive order gives a set of broad directives for advancing LGBT policies throughout the government.
Part 2: How the Biden Administration Pushes LGBT Ideology Abroad

The Biden administration is aggressively integrating LGBT ideology into every facet of foreign policy. We will describe some of the most prominent Biden administration efforts to export LGBT ideology through its foreign policy. This paper is an overview of measures taken by the administration to address LGBT policies abroad. It is not intended to be exhaustive of such efforts.

U.S. State Department

U.S. Embassies Celebrate Pride Month

In an overt display of the U.S. government’s shift in foreign policy priorities, the Biden administration authorized American embassies and consulates to fly the rainbow Pride flag on the same pole as the American flag. This was a reversal from the Trump era, when former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo prevented any other flag from being flown on the same pole as the American flag.

On June 24, 2022, the U.S. State Department held a flag-raising ceremony at its Harry S. Truman building for the “Progress flag,” which has stripes representing racial minorities and transgender-identifying individuals in addition to the rainbow colors. Deputy Secretary of State Wendy R. Sherman and Chief Diversity and Inclusion Officer Ambassador Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley gave remarks. The event was held in conjunction with glifaa, the “official LGBTQIA+ employee affinity group” for American foreign affairs agencies.

U.S. Embassies Flying Pride or Progress Flags

In 2022 alone, 99 U.S. embassies flew Pride or Progress flags.
Time and again, raising a Pride or Progress flag outside U.S. embassies has offended local leaders or citizens. On occasion, it is reasonable to conclude that raising a Pride flag was intended to be pointlessly provocative.

In June 2021 and 2022, the Pride flag was displayed at the U.S. Embassy to the Holy See, just steps from the Vatican. The Catholic Church’s teachings on marriage and human sexuality are widely known. It is unlikely that the Vatican will change its position regarding these matters of sexuality, so raising the Pride flag near the Vatican must be viewed as a hostile message.
In June 2022, the U.S. embassy in the United Arab Emirates flew the Pride flag for the first time in the culturally conservative country. The Emirati government condemned the embassy for what it saw as a show of disrespect. NGOs and churches from Caribbean countries have also pushed back against the display of Pride flags, asserting in one joint statement that flying Pride flags at embassies “represents gross disrespect and an assault upon the consciousness of our societies.” When the Pride flag was flown under the American flag at the U.S. embassy in Jamaica, protestors held signs that read “Stop cultural imperialism”; protestors also called the flag “an insult to our country.”
**U.S. Embassies Release Pride Month Statements**

Embassies also often utilize social media accounts to feature messaging relating to Pride Month. In 2022, 132 U.S. embassies released Pride Month statements via social media or their website.²⁵

At times, these displays frustrate foreign governments. For example, when the official Twitter account of the U.S. embassy in Kuwait posted an image of a Pride flag with a pro-LGBT message for Pride Month in 2022, Kuwaiti officials accused the embassy of violating international conventions that mandate diplomats “respect the laws and regulations of the receiving state.”²⁶ The Kuwaiti Foreign Ministry summoned the top U.S. diplomat and sent a memo to U.S. Chargé d'Affaires James Holtsnider that noted “the need for the embassy to respect the laws and regulations in force in the State of Kuwait and the obligation not to publish such tweets.”²⁷ Kuwaiti officials indicated that the tweets might violate the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961, which provides guidance for diplomatic interactions between countries.

**U.S. Embassies Participating in Pride Parades or Marches**

At least 49 embassies had staffers participate in Pride parades or marches in 2022.²⁸

In addition, U.S. embassies host Pride receptions, roundtable discussions, LGBT movie nights, or webinars with local LGBT activists. U.S. ambassadors have also spoken at major Pride rallies, and embassies have partnered with local LGBT activists to create videos that are shared on embassy social media. For example, on National Coming Out Day, the Deputy Chief of Mission to the U.S. embassy in Luxembourg made a video telling his own coming out story.²⁹ The U.S. embassy in India featured a video of a young transgender activist.³⁰
Thanks, #Lithuania, for #BalticPride2022 - a joyous, affirming celebration of LGBTQI+ rights & a celebration of all people — a celebration of our shared values. #HumanRights are #LGBTQI+ rights, equality for all! ❤️

We were proud to be part of it! More: bit.ly/8P2022USinLT

---

Presenting #WithPride, @TrinetraHG, a transgender activist, artist, and influencer featured in “@Forbes 30 Under 30 Asia List 2022” for her exceptional endeavors. Through powerful imagery, writing, art & other means of expression, Trinetra seeks to better queer lives. #PrideMonth
U.S. State Department Grants

In addition to the foreign assistance funds administered by USAID, the State Department and U.S. embassies also offer grants. For example, in September 2021, the U.S. embassy in Portugal gave $10,000 to fund a film festival called “Queer Lisboa,” an LGBT film festival held in Portugal that featured drag queens and depictions of incest and pedophilia. Chargé d’Affaires Kristin Kan stated she was “very happy” to support the film festival as “part of our Diversity, Equality and Inclusion efforts.” Senator Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) questioned the State Department’s Chief Diversity and Inclusion Officer, Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley, at a Senate hearing on July 26, 2022. When pressed on how promoting a drag queen film festival in Portugal would advance U.S. national interest, Abercrombie-Winstanley said she was unfamiliar with the grant and did “not know” how it served U.S. national interest.

On September 23, 2022, the U.S. State Department awarded a $20,600 grant to the Centro Ecuatoriano Norteamericano Abraham Lincoln (CENA) in Cuenca, Ecuador, to “promote diversity and inclusion” via drag theater performances and LGBT-themed media. A State Department spokesperson defended the decision to Fox News, saying, “The [CENA] program’s goal is to promote tolerance, and the arts provide new opportunities for LGBTQI+ Ecuadorians to express themselves freely and safely. Facilitators and artists in Cuenca will collaborate with a local theater company in implementing workshops, creating customized plays, and producing a documentary video; the program will conclude in June 2023.” Eventually, the grantee decided to halt the program before the funds were spent.

Secretary Blinken was asked about the Ecuadorian grant at a House hearing about the U.S. State Department budget on March 23, 2023. He described his understanding of the connection link between U.S. national interest and LGBT programs abroad:
We are engaging around the world in cultural diplomacy. We’re engaging in also making sure that we’re doing what we can to help protect the rights of marginalized groups, including notably the LGBTI+ community which in so many countries around the world is under threat, and many cases under growing threat. So, and I believe, its fundamental to our democracy to demonstrate that we are looking out for marginalized populations whatever they might be. We do the same thing with persecuted religious minorities around the world, something also of concern to me and to the Department.

On the cultural program, look, in this particular instance, the particular program you mentioned in Ecuador, that actually didn’t go forward. The grantee in this case decided to put a halt to it. You or I may not have chosen to fund this particular program. I think picking one program out of the many that we do for particular scrutiny I don’t think is an accurate reflection of what we’re doing, but in this particular case it didn’t go forward. Now, I have to tell you, maybe it’s just me, I remember a time when I think the most popular movie in the United States was Tootsie, and then a little while later it was Mrs. Doubtfire, and then we had The Birdcage—all movies that I loved. So, on one level I gotta say I’m just not sure I get what the concern is about, but I also acknowledge that again, you or I might not have chosen to fund this particular program.37

The U.S. Mission to Botswana offered a grant opportunity in 2022 titled “Beyond Decriminalization: Expanding LGBTQI+ Rights in Botswana.” The grant would provide $300,000 to “carry out a program to promote greater social acceptance of LGBTQI+ persons, including among influential religious groups and traditional groups,” in addition to other items.38 Of the projects that might qualify for the grant was programming to “[r]aise public awareness of the human rights implications of Botswana’s decriminalization of same sex relations.”39
The U.S. government also contributes to the Global Equality Fund, a leading highly funded public-private partnership led by the United States. The fund has contributions from 16 other countries and several organizations, including the Arcus Foundation, the John D. Evans Foundation, FRI: the Norwegian Organization for Sexual and Gender Diversity, the MAC AIDS Fund, Deloitte LLP, Royal Bank of Canada, Hilton, Bloomberg L.P., Marriott International, the Thomson Reuters Foundation, the Human Rights Campaign, and Out Leadership. The Global Equality Fund was first established in 2011 by the Obama administration in order to facilitate grants for civil society organizations to bolster LGBT activism in over 100 countries worldwide.

Recently, one Global Equality Fund grant competition offered an award of up to $1.5 million for “LGBTQI+ Programs” to enable LGBT communities to “(1) empower local movements and communities; (2) prevent, mitigate, and recover from violence, discrimination, stigma, and human rights abuses; (3) promote full social inclusion; or (4) address critical issues of justice.” Yet, this is just the tip of the iceberg; by 2021, the Global Equality Fund had surpassed $100 million in funding support.

**Diplomatic Interactions**

Secretary Blinken has repeatedly affirmed the importance of raising LGBT issues with diplomatic counterparts. In a first-of-its-kind briefing to LGBT reporters in June 2022, Secretary Blinken stated that he raised concerns about human rights conditions for LGBT-identifying people “invariably, in every conversation” with his Saudi counterparts. As further testimony to the administration’s commitment to these issues, on June 25, 2021, President Biden appointed Jessica Stern as the second U.S. Envoy to Advance the Human Rights of LGBTQ+ Persons. That position was first created by the Obama administration but had remained unfilled during the Trump administration. Therefore, when
President Biden filled the post, it marked a return to the diplomatic commitment that the position entails.

Secretary Blinken has also affirmed LGBT identity as being relevant and important to the role of U.S. diplomats. In 2022, Secretary Blinken hosted the 2022 Pride Reception for State Department staff in conjunction with glifaa – LGBTQI+ Pride in Foreign Affairs Agencies, the State Department and USAID’s official LGBTQI+ Employee Affinity Group. Blinken reaffirmed the State Department’s commitment to incorporating LGBT considerations into staffing policies, including allowing unmarried LGBT partners to accompany State Department staffers stationed overseas.

**Country Reports on Human Rights Practices**

Each year, the U.S. State Department releases its Country Reports on Human Rights Practices (Country Reports). These 195 Country Reports evaluate in detail the human rights record of every country in the world as perceived by the State Department. In the 2009 Country Reports, the Obama administration added a section titled “Societal Abuses, Discrimination, and Acts of Violence Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity.” At the time, its inclusion marked a radical shift in the focus of the documents.

In 2022, the Biden administration expanded this new direction taken by the Obama administration. The title of the section introduced by Obama was modified to read, “Acts of Violence, Criminalization, and Other Abuses Based on Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity or Expression, or Sex Characteristics.” The section includes new areas of assessment:

- Criminalization
- Violence against LGBTQI+ Persons
• Discrimination
• Availability of Legal Gender Recognition
• Involuntary or Coercive Medical or Psychological Practices Specifically Targeting LGBTQI+ Individuals
• Restrictions of Freedom of Expression, Association, or Peaceful Assembly

Involuntary or Coercive Medical or Psychological Practices Specifically Targeting LGBTQI+ Individuals

In 2022, 67 countries were criticized under the category of “Involuntary or Coercive Medical or Psychological Practices Specifically Targeting LGBTQI+ Individuals.”51 This category covers a range of activities, including “electric shock therapy” (see Iran)52 and talk therapy or counseling, often with religious leaders or faith-based counselors.53 For example, the Kazakhstan Country Report noted, “some families and private religious practitioners engaged in prayers and religious ceremonies intended to alter the sexual orientation or gender identities of LGBTQI+ individuals.”54 The fact that families pray for a relative who identifies as LGBT hardly seems to warrant mention in a U.S. State Department report about human rights. That the State Department considers this a human rights violation is noteworthy.

The Country Report for Finland observed that “[w]hile the law prohibits ‘conversion therapy,’” on a voluntary private basis “children in the Pentecostal Church community continued to be provided material that encourage sexual orientation ‘conversion.’”55 The U.S. State Department seemed to object to the freedom of churches to inform their congregants about their teachings on human sexuality. The State Department takes the point further in the Country Report for Poland: “The practice of so-called conversion therapy is offered on a voluntary basis by Christian-affiliated psychological centers, priests and pastors, and individual psychologists and psychotherapists. They include psychotherapy and religious practices, such as individual and group prayers and religious rituals.”56 The ability of Polish
citizens to voluntarily see a Christian counselor for talk therapy or a pastor or priest for prayer does not constitute a human rights violation. Bans on so-called “conversion therapy,” such as those the Biden administration wants to be enacted in these countries, would threaten the ability of mental health care professionals and patients from engaging in therapy consistent with their sincerely held religious beliefs and worldview.

**Relationship Recognition**

The Country Reports cite many countries because they do not “recognize LGBTQI+ persons, couples, or their families.” The 2020 Country Reports noted 48 countries that fit this description. On occasion, such non-recognition citations include the fact that the country has not recognized same-sex marriage or civil unions. For example, the report for the Central African Republic states, “the constitution defines marriage as ‘the union between one man and one woman.” The Country Report for Nicaragua stated, “the law curtailed the rights of LGBTQI+ households by defining families as necessarily headed by a man and a woman.” Similarly, the Malaysian Country Report noted that the law “does not recognize LGBTQI+ individuals, couples, or their families.”

**Legal Gender Recognition**

The Country Reports identify 154 countries as having inadequate “legal gender recognition,” which seems to include the ability of transgender-identifying persons to easily change their sex designation on official identification documentation and to easily change their name to match their gender identity. For example, the Country Report for Albania states its law does not “guarantee the individual’s right to self-determination of gender.” The Country Report for Madagascar notes that “Individuals cannot self-identify in their official documents.”
The Country Reports suggest that some countries, like Tajikistan, have too many restrictions on changing the sex listed on identity documents because it is only allowed “if a medical organization provides an authorized document.” Furthermore, Kenya was criticized because its law “did not cover or normalize gender-nonconformity or nonbinary designations associated with LGBTQI+ persons.”

**U.S. Participates in the Equal Rights Coalition (ERC)**

In 2016, the U.S. joined the Equal Rights Coalition (ERC), a coalition of 42 countries that describes itself as “a collaborative mechanism to progress LGBTI rights across the globe.” The United States remained in the coalition for the duration of the Trump administration. Under President Biden, the U.S. has signed on to multiple coalition statements. The statements focused on such topics such as the “Nexus Between Democracy and the Human Rights of LGBTI Persons,” “Aggression against Ukraine and the protection of LGBTI persons and refugees,” as well as a statement on Russia.

In 2021, Jessica Huber, Team Lead at the Department of State, Office of Global Programming, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, addressed the 2021 virtual ERC conference. Jessica Stern, Special Envoy to Advance the Human Rights of LGBTQI+ persons, spoke at the 2022 Equal Rights Coalition Conference held in Argentina.

**Prioritizing LGBT-Identifying Persons in U.S. Refugee Admission**

President Biden’s over-arching foreign policy document on LGBT issues, NSM-4, also addressed the treatment and prioritization of LGBT refugees:

> [T]he Departments of State, Justice, and Homeland Security shall ensure appropriate training is in place so that relevant Federal Government personnel and key partners can effectively identify
and respond to the particular needs of LGBTQI+ refugees and asylum seekers, including by providing to them adequate assistance and ensuring that the Federal Government takes all appropriate steps, such as potential increased use of Embassy Priority-1 referrals, to identify and expedite resettlement of highly vulnerable persons with urgent protection needs.\textsuperscript{73}

On the same day that he issued NSM-4 (February 4, 2021), President Biden also issued an executive order called “Rebuilding and Enhancing Programs to Resettle Refugees and Planning for the Impact of Climate Change on Migration.” Section 4 (j) of the order allows non-married couples to be treated as married for the purposes of the refugee system in certain circumstances. The stated purpose is so that the U.S. government can recognize “committed life partnerships” of couples who are unable to marry, “including for individuals in same-sex, interfaith, or camp-based marriages.”\textsuperscript{74}

When the debacle caused by the United States’ withdrawal from Afghanistan was unfolding, the Biden administration was vague about which refugees it was choosing to prioritize. U.S. State Department spokesperson Ned Price said the State Department will “continue to pursue all options to relocate…vulnerable Afghans.”\textsuperscript{75} Yet, organizations that were helping refugees flee Afghanistan by organizing flights out of the country, including flights with endangered religious minorities. The head of one Christian non-profit claimed that when he reached out to the State Department for help, he was told that he would have a better chance of the plane taking off if LGBT-identifying persons were on board.\textsuperscript{76}

**Gender-Neutral Option for Passports**

On April 11, 2022, the State Department added “X” as an option for U.S. citizens to denote one’s sex on their passport.\textsuperscript{77} When trying to explain what “X” on a passport signified, Secretary Blinken said, “After thoughtful consideration of the research conducted and feedback from community members,
we concluded that the definition of the X gender marker on State Department public forms will be ‘Unspecified or another gender identity’. This definition is respectful of individuals’ privacy while advancing inclusion.” The gender that one selects does not have to match the gender listed on supporting documentation like birth certificates or state ID.

U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)

Funding LGBT Programs Through USAID

Early in his administration, President Biden stated his position with respect to connecting LGBT issues with foreign policy objectives. NSM-4 instructed “agencies involved with foreign aid, assistance, and development programs” to “promote respect for the human rights of LGBTQI+ persons and combat discrimination.”

Under the Biden administration, USAID created new LGBT policies and re-instated LGBT policies developed by the Obama administration. In a speech on November 4, 2021, USAID Administrator Samantha Power outlined her vision for development policy. In it, she included a focus on “Inclusive Development” with an emphasis on reaching “marginalized groups,” including “LGBTQI people.”

In November 2021, Biden’s USAID brought on Jay Gilliam to be Senior LGBTQI+ Coordinator. In an article published on Medium, Gilliam expressed his enthusiasm to “roll up [his] sleeves” to “lead, grow, and elevate USAID’s work to advance LGBTQI+ inclusive development.” This position was first created in 2014 by the Obama administration and remained unfilled under President Trump.

In 2014, USAID released the “LGBT Vision for Action,” an 18-page guide outlining principles for advancing the LGBT agenda through its programming. Then, in 2018, USAID published an
in-depth report titled “Suggested Approaches for Integrating Inclusive Development Across the Program Cycle and in Mission Operations,” featuring policy recommendations to further make LGBT activism a priority within the Agency. Contemporary Biden administration documents still reference both the “LGBT Vision for Action” and “Suggested Approaches” report, thereby reinforcing their current relevance.

USAID’s website boasts of a public-private partnership called the Multi-Donor LGBTQI+ Global Human Rights Initiative (GHRI). GHRI is co-funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), Global Affairs Canada, and other private-sector entities. GHRI supports grant-making that benefits local “LGBTQI+-led organizations” and research regarding LGBT communities and policies. As a five-year project spanning 2019-2024, GHRI has already contributed funding to major research initiatives, including the LGBT Global Acceptance Index (which tracks stigma levels across time and geography) and the Global Barometer of Gay Rights and the Global Barometer of Transgender Rights.

USAID also funds other research, including multiple projects from the Williams Institute, an LGBT-focused public policy research institute based at the UCLA School of Law. The studies by the Williams Institute included “The Relationship Between LGBT Inclusion and Economic Development: Emerging Economies,” “The Economic Cost of LGBT Stigma and Discrimination in South Africa,” and, “Stress, Health, and Well-Being of LGBT People in Colombia: Results from a National Survey.”

USAID has also publicly indicated that its Human Rights Grants Program is being used to advance LGBT policies. These programs are available in every region in which USAID operates. At the 2021 Summit for Democracy, USAID committed to launching a new Global Development Alliance to fund LGBT-led civil society organizations.
USAID’s Education Programming

USAID’s programming also extends to education. For example, in June 2022, USAID tweeted about its new online teaching module about integrating LGBT considerations into education programming featuring an avatar named Yanira.92

On January 30, 2023, USAID published a detailed 31-page report titled “Integrating LGBTQI+ Considerations into Education Programming.” The document was developed “to support USAID’s staff working in the education sector to integrate lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex
(LGBTQI) considerations into education programming and across the Program Cycle.” Furthermore, the document “identifies some of the challenges and obstacles that LGBTQI+ individuals can face in the education sector, provides approaches that can be used to integrate LGBTQI+ considerations into the education sector....”

The January 2023 report’s suggestions for how educators are supposed to advance LGBT ideology in the classroom are extreme. It recommends training educators to use appropriate pronouns and updating forms that reference students’ parents to say parent/parent or parent/guardian instead of mother/father. The report urges the abolition of school policies that are “based on the gender binary” such as dress codes or prohibitions or “long hair or long nails for some students.”

Among the “Best Practices for LGBTQI+ Inclusion in Education” is point number nine, which calls for educators to hide sexual and gender information about children from their parents:

9. Protect students’ privacy. Ensure that education officials do not reveal a student’s sexual orientation or gender identity without the student’s permission - even to the student’s family. Students may elect to hide their sexual orientation or gender identity from family and close friends, which makes it imperative that educators respect students’ right to privacy.

The report also discusses how educators can create “safe spaces” for LGBT-identifying students and catalogs examples of USAID-funded education programs that advance LGBT ideology in schools around the world. The report presents these examples:

- In Kosovo, USAID’s Basic Education Program provided training to more than 140 school principals to be trained on “LGBTQI+ rights and inclusion” via its annual School Management and Leadership Program.
• In Honduras, a USAID-funded program called “Empleando Futuros” supported the Honduras National Institute for Professional Training, which “sensitized youth and educators on the rights of LGBTQI+ people… to enroll in formal and nonformal education services and promotes non-discrimination in employment.”

• In Jamaica, USAID helped fund a new university program to “promote respect and social tolerance, inclusive of LGBTQI+ persons.” The program also advocated for an “LGBTQI+-inclusive non-discrimination policy” at a Jamaican university.96

Interestingly, in its list of references, USAID cites a Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) resource, “Creating an LGBT-Inclusive School Climate,” which was published as a part of its “Teaching Tolerance” initiative.97 The SPLC’s Teaching Tolerance program, rebranded “Learning for Justice” in 2021, is notorious for putting sexualized content in front of children.98

USAID’s 2023 Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Policy

In 2012, President Obama released a new USAID policy on “Gender Equality and Female Empowerment.”99 President Trump’s USAID issued a new gender policy in 2020, and that was followed three years later by the Biden administration’s version released on March 27, 2023.100

The 2023 gender policy is even more extreme than President Obama’s gender policy. Obama’s policy employs the phrase “lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender” once to refer to LGBT advocates and once in a footnote.101 The 2012 policy also mentions “gender identity” eight times to represent transgenderism.102 In contrast, Biden’s 2023 policy mentions “LGBTQI+” 40 times with another seven references to either “LGBT,” “LGBTI,” or “LGBTQI+” in the endnotes.103 Clearly, the concept of “gender” had changed dramatically in 11 years.
Biden’s 2023 policy defines “gender” as follows:

Gender refers to a socially constructed set of rules, responsibilities, entitlements, and behaviors associated with being a man, a woman, or a gender-diverse individual, and the relationships between and among people according to these constructs. These social definitions and their consequences differ among and within cultures, change over time, and intersect with other factors (e.g., age, class, disability, ethnicity, race, religion, citizenship, and sexual orientation). Though these concepts are linked, the term gender is not interchangeable with the terms *women, sex, gender identity, or gender expression.*

In a sub-section titled “LGBTQI+ Individuals and Gender Equality,” the 2023 policy decries, “Regressive gender norms, gender inequalities, and associated power differentials constrain the lives of LGBTQI+ individuals.” Furthermore, the 2023 policy maligned pro-family individuals and advocates in other countries, saying, “anti-rights actors have sought to further marginalize LGBTQI+ individuals by pursuing campaigns that spread misinformation.”

This sub-section makes clear that USAID is intent on influencing and changing foreign cultures to make them adopt LGBT ideology at the societal level. It complains about cultural family and gender norms because “gender-diverse, transgender, and intersex individuals, must contend with expectations that they comply with gender binary roles.”

The Trump 2020 policy does not define gender. In doing so, and by consistently referencing “men and women,” the 2020 policy assumes a respect for the biological differences between men and women. In contrast, the Biden 2023 policy makes multiple references to “women and girls in all their diversity” at one point specifying that the term includes “those of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, plus (LGBTQI+) community.” The 2023 policy also refers to “men and boys in all their
diversity” with the same explanation that the term includes LGBT-identifying individuals. This terminology represents an explicit rejection of biological sex.

USAID’s new gender policy is expected to guide how the U.S. spends $2.6 billion dedicated toward gender equality programming in 2023.

Proposed USAID “LGBTQI+ Inclusive Development Policy”

In April 2023, USAID released the draft of an “LGBTQI+ Inclusive Development Policy” for public comment. The executive summary opens with an explicit endorsement of LGBT identity and conduct: “USAID affirms and celebrates lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex (LGBTQI+) people and all people of diverse sexual orientations, gender identities and expressions, and sex characteristics as integral parts of every society.”

The draft outlines six principles that ought to guide LGBT-inclusive programming:

1) Lean In While Continuing to Uphold the Principle of “Do Not Harm”: Safely Assume Risk
2) Leverage Community Wisdom with Humility: Take the Lead from Local LGBTQI+ Activists and Groups
3) See the Full Person: Acknowledge Intersectionality in LGBTQI+ Persons
4) Understand the Landscape: Be Aware of History, Stakeholders, and What Has Worked
5) Be a True Ally: Support Sustainable, Resilient LGBTQI+ Movements
6) Recognize that No One Size Fits All: Target, Tailor, and Differentiate LGBTQI+ Programs

The third principle outlined in the draft concerns intersectionality. These standards imply that even when targeting LGBT-identifying individuals for aid programming, there is a hierarchy of oppression...
that should inform such programming. The draft states, “For example, gender-conforming, cisgender
LGBQ individuals with socioeconomic privileges, while still stigmatized, may also live a very different
reality than gender-nonconforming, intersex, and/or transgender individuals.” In the draft policy,
there also seems to be a desire to affect the political makeup of foreign parliamentary systems. The draft
notes, “Around the world, there is a far greater proportion of openly gay and bisexual men serving in
parliaments than ‘out’ lesbians, bisexual cisgender women, and transgender women.”

The draft policy requires:

- That USAID follow “Do No Harm” principles and practices, USAID’s Risk Appetite
  Statement, and USAID’s guidance for safety/security sensitive and trauma-informed
  stakeholder consultations with members of marginalized groups when engaging LGBT
  individuals and groups.
- Reporting on the impact and progress of USAID’s LGBT programs and the Agency’s plan for
  “LGBTQI+ inclusive development.”
- That each USAID Mission and Washington-based Operating Unit identify at least one staff
  member to serve as an “LGBTQI+ Focal Point” to focus on LGBT issues.

In addition, the draft policy recommends:

- That USAID integrate LGBT priorities “across its policies, strategies, programming, and
  guidance documents, and in other learning and knowledge platforms.”
- “Elevating and supporting the collection of disaggregated data to tailor programmatic
  approaches” as a “short-, mid-, and long-term goal” for USAID programs and policies.
- Include LGBT considerations in routine Gender Analyses and Inclusive Development
  Analyses.
• Develop sectoral guidance documents for the “Inclusive Development Hub LGBTQI+ Portfolio” for integrating LGBT considerations in programming.

• That the “Inclusive Development Hub LGBTQI+ Portfolio” regularly update LGBT trainings to be available for staff, including “potential courses on marginalized populations within the LGBTQI+ community.”

• That all staff must complete USAID’s “LGBTQI+ 101: LGBTQI+ Inclusion in USAID’s Workplace” training, which was introduced for USAID supervisors and managers in 2022.114

The White House

Official U.S. Recognition of LGBT-Oriented International Days

The “International Transgender Day of Visibility” is a transgender commemoration day observed annually on March 31. It appears that the United States was the first government to recognize it when President Biden issued Presidential Proclamation 10164 to that effect on March 31, 2021. According to President Biden, the day “recognizes the generations of struggle, activism, and courage that have brought our country closer to full equality for transgender and gender non-binary people in the United States and around the world.”115

A year later, on March 30, 2022, President Biden issued Presidential Proclamation 10355. Biden’s statement began by telling transgender-identifying persons, “my entire Administration see you for who you are—made in the image of God and deserving of dignity, respect, and support.” He continued by recognizing “the resilience, strength, and joy of transgender, nonbinary, and gender nonconforming people.”116 Secretary Blinken issued a supporting press statement the following day. Secretary Blinken’s statement declared, “We call on governments and other partners around the globe to join us in fighting for a world in which everyone can live safely and openly as themselves. We will not waver in our
commitment to upholding the human rights of transgender, nonbinary, and gender non-conforming persons worldwide.”

In 2021, the Biden administration was the first U.S. administration to commemorate the International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia, and Transphobia (IDAHOBIT) on May 17 by issuing statements from President Biden and Secretary Blinken. President Biden’s 2021 statement concluded with his commitment to “continue to engage with allies and partners to advance the human rights of LGBTQI+ people here at home and in all corners of the world.” Secretary Blinken’s 2021 statement articulated the administration’s goal to achieve an “inclusive society where no one lives in fear because of who they are or whom they love.”

President Biden’s 2022 statement touted his administration’s work “standing up for LGBTQI+ human rights at the United Nations.” Secretary Blinken’s 2022 statement dramatically declared:

"Homophobia, biphobia, interphobia, and transphobia are deeply entrenched in societies across the world, including here in the United States. Countless persons are at extreme risk for being themselves. We remain committed to ending this intolerance."

Once again, in 2023, both President Biden and Secretary Blinken released IDAHOBIT statements. President Biden used the occasion to boast about his administration’s work expanding LGBT policies across the globe, including its work to “prevent the use of so-called ‘conversion therapy’ in the United States and around the world.” Secretary Blinken’s statement also emphasized opposition to “conversion therapy.” He stated, “As we mark this year’s IDAHOBIT, the United States reaffirms our commitment to exposing the harm conversion therapy practices cause to LGBTQI+ persons.”
Honored Transgender Activist on International Women’s Day

On March 6, 2023, First Lady Jill Biden and Secretary Blinken hosted the annual International Women of Courage (IWOC) Awards ceremony at the White House. They awarded 11 individuals with the “International Women of Courage” award, one of whom was Alba Rueda, Argentina’s current Special Envoy for Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Alba was born a biological male and identifies as a transgender woman. The bio released by the State Department stated:

Her activism led her to fight for the Marriage Equality Act, the Gender Identity Act, and the Diana Sacayán and Lohana Berkins Act on the Promotion of Access to Formal Employment by Cross-Dresser, Transsexual and Transgender Persons. Her hope is to establish an LGBTQI+ foreign policy agenda and mainstream it into the various negotiation fora, including into multilateral fora and bilateral relations as well as represent the Global South.124

Blinken handed Rueda the award while exchanging a kiss on the cheek.125

Action Plan to Combat So-Called “Conversion Therapy” Practices Globally

President Biden’s Executive Order 14075 entitled “Advancing Equality for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Intersex Individuals” instructed the secretary of State, together with the secretary of the Treasury, the secretary of Health and Human Services, and the administrator of USAID, to create a plan to end “conversion therapy” around the world.126 On May 17, 2023, the State Department released a fact sheet titled “Summary of Interagency Action Plan to Combat So-Called ‘Conversion Therapy’ Practices Globally in accordance with E.O. 14075.”127 Without ever defining the
term “so-called “conversion therapy” practices (or “CTPs”), the interagency action plan nevertheless makes 17 statements regarding what the administration aims to do to combat “conversion therapy.” These include “engage with partner governments to encourage them to stop sponsoring, funding, and/or otherwise supporting CTP” and “emphasize the importance of ensuring broad access to evidence-based SOGIESC affirming care.” Bans on so-called “conversion therapy” would act as a counseling ban to restrict mental health care professionals and patients from engaging in therapy consistent with their sincerely held religious beliefs or professional opinions.\(^{128}\)

**Using the United Nations to Promote LGBT Ideology**

On September 21, 2021, President Biden delivered his remarks before the 76th session of the United Nations General Assembly. In his speech, President Biden highlighted LGBT issues, saying, “We all must defend the rights of LGBTQI individuals so they can live and love openly without fear, whether it’s Chechnya or Cameroon or anywhere.”\(^ {129}\) A year later, on September 21, 2022, he delivered his second address to the United Nations General Assembly and again emphasized the importance of expanding pro-LGBT policies:

> The future will be won by those countries that unleash the full potential of their populations, where women and girls can exercise equal rights, including basic reproductive rights, and contribute fully to building stronger economies and more resilient societies; where religious and ethnic minorities can live their lives without harassment and contribute to the fabric of their communities; where the LGBTQ+ community individuals live and love freely without being targeted with violence; where citizens can question and criticize their leaders without fear of reprisal.\(^ {130}\)
The U.S. Mission to the United Nations in March 2023, with co-sponsors from the Permanent Missions of several other countries (mainly from the West), and the LGBTI Core Group hosted an informal meeting of members of the United Nations Security Council called “Integrating the Human Rights of LGBTI persons into the Council’s Mandate for Maintaining International Peace and Security.” The purpose of the meeting was to “identify steps the Security Council can take to better incorporate the human rights of LGBTI persons in carrying out its mandate to maintain international peace and security.” Security Council members and UN Member States were asked to propose ways that the Security Council and other UN organs, bodies, and agencies can advance “LGBTI rights in situations of conflict, incorporate LGBTI perspectives in peacekeeping/peacebuilding, and establish mechanisms to protect members of the LGBTI community and create more resilient societies.”
Part 3: Why Biden’s LGBT Push in Foreign Policy Is Harmful and Unnecessary

The Biden administration is upfront about its effort to infuse LGBT priorities into every facet of its domestic and foreign policy. In general, the Biden administration resumed the pro-LGBT policies set in motion by the Obama administration. However, the Biden administration proceeded to move more aggressively in this direction, accelerating the pace at which radical LGBT policies are being pushed around the world. Its focus is clear: U.S. foreign policy under President Biden’s leadership will advance LGBT ideology, even when this course of action is contrary to U.S. national interests as traditionally understood.

Misuse of Resources

The U.S. government provides more foreign development aid than any country in the world. This generosity often makes the United States a powerful force for good. However, when our assistance is coercively directed toward progressive programs intended to change the culture of a foreign country, then such generosity becomes a different thing altogether. Such leveraging of aid to recipient countries, which often hold to more traditional or conservative social values, fails to honor the benevolence of American taxpayers who do not want to promote ideologies contrary to their values.

Aside from the direct harms of promoting an ideology at odds with biology and that rejects the natural complementarity of two sexes, Biden’s international LGBT expansionism has opportunity costs. Many worthwhile policies, such as international religious freedom, are not being pursued rigorously because that manpower is being used to advance this agenda. Advocating for an ever-expanding list of “rights” invented by progressive activists also reduces the U.S. government’s ability to advocate for fundamental and universally recognized human rights. It is not acceptable to use the full force of U.S. foreign policy
to advance ideas, policies, or values that are neither in the U.S. national interest nor reflect longstanding American values.

**Harming U.S. Relations with Allies**

This Biden administration agenda is alienating much of the world from the United States and the American people. Many countries believe these efforts to change their domestic laws to be condescending while having a toxic impact on their cultures and populations. Grace Melton, a policy expert on social issues at the international level, writes that the U.S. government’s LGBT expansionism “perpetuates the notion that Americans see other cultures as morally inferior, and that we use our aid to ‘improve’ their cultures.”

Examples of this American imperiousness about imposing LGBT values abound. In 2022, a Latin American ambassador to the United States told one of the authors of this report that although the country has many economic and security needs, the U.S. government offered to fund programs designed to advance a progressive social agenda rather than focus on the needs of the ambassador’s country.

The U.S. government has no reason to interfere in the marriage laws or policies governing sexual behavior in other countries. They are often determined by foundational beliefs, culture, and tradition. For the most powerful country in the world to pressure less secure and more needy countries across the developing world to adopt progressive social policies reeks of ideological colonialism.

Flying Pride flags outside an embassy can be an inherently incendiary political statement. Diplomats can raise human rights issues to protect the human rights of all people—including those who consider themselves part of the LGBT community—without public, Western-style virtue signaling. Raising a
Pride flag implies that the laws and customs of a given country are backward and that more progressive Western values should be adopted there. For many foreign governments and citizens, Pride observances at embassies represent an unwanted source of foreign activism on their home soil.\textsuperscript{137}

Other forms of LGBT activism by U.S. officials are more directly coercive. American foreign assistance is sometimes used as leverage by the Biden administration to pressure a country to adopt more LGBT policies. In April 2023, the U.S. President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) Country Coordinator for Uganda, Mary Borgman, sent a letter to the PEPFAR Uganda Country Operational Plan 2023 to postpone a major meeting after the Ugandan parliament passed a bill restricting homosexual conduct.\textsuperscript{138} According to Ugandan news outlets, U.S. officials threatened to withhold funds used to treat 1.4 million Ugandans living with HIV/Aids. That would include withholding $400 million annually that goes toward life-saving anti-retroviral drugs.\textsuperscript{139} The fact that some foreign government is enacting legislation that the Biden administration does not approve of does not justify withholding life-saving medical treatment and drugs to sick patients.

Maintaining positive relations with developing countries around the world is of particular strategic importance at present. As part of China’s massive Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), the Chinese government does not coerce the countries in which it is investing to adopt LGBT policies or other radical social agendas.\textsuperscript{140} The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) commits heinous human rights abuses against people within China’s borders and is similarly disinterested in the rights of citizens of other countries.\textsuperscript{141} The BRI ensnares countries into a debt spiral that the United States does not want to see its friends and allies fall into. When less developed countries are given a choice between developing stronger ties with China or the United States, the Biden administration’s LGBT agenda could be an important factor affecting a country’s decision to ally itself more closely with either China or the United States.
All Individuals Are Already Protected Under International Human Rights Law

Proponents of the fusion of LGBT advocacy and foreign policy will say that this approach is necessary in order to protect vulnerable LGBT minorities around the world from human rights abuses. However, human rights are already recognized for all people in foundational documents like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and treaties like the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the Convention Against Torture (CAT).

The UDHR and ICCPR protect every individual from arbitrary arrest, torture, and extrajudicial killing by the state. Everyone is and should be protected under these laws based on their human dignity. As expressed in the UDHR, humans possess reason and conscience, and those qualities bestow “human dignity.” Sexual orientation and gender identity are not analogous characteristics.142

Of course, we certainly do not want to see LGBT-identifying people (or anyone) endure the human rights abuses that typically rise to the level of the U.S. government’s attention with respect to “extrajudicial killings, torture, or other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.”143 That list is found in the Global Magnitsky Act, an American human rights protection statute. The Act allows the U.S. government to impose targeted sanctions against foreign individuals who commit these human rights abuses, regardless of the sexual orientation or gender identity of the victims. In fact, Global Magnitsky sanctions have been successfully used against foreign persons specifically for committing human rights abuses against LGBT-identifying persons.144
Conclusion

At the outset of this report, we made the observation that American foreign policy had dramatically shifted away from its post-World War II moorings. It was a policy that pursued American national interests and saw the world through the lens of liberalism (e.g., the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 that Eleanor Roosevelt promoted). This focus was also readily seen as the United States waged a worldwide ideological struggle with Soviet communism during the Cold War.

The commitment to that postwar, liberal vision for American foreign policy was definitely on the wane in the Obama administration. The Trump administration represented an intermission in the trend, and Secretary Mike Pompeo’s dedication to pursuing religious freedom for persecuted peoples harkened back to a more traditional vision for American action.

The Biden administration’s aggressive expansion of gender ideology in foreign policy moves it well beyond those initial steps the Obama administration took in this direction. As we have noted, torture, murder, and persecution are rightly condemned under existing international and American law, and no person should be subjected to them. Protecting against grave violations of these broad human rights abuses is not what the Biden administration seems focused on. Yet, the Biden administration presses on to advance its radical policies globally, to the detriment of our alliances and without respect for the cultures or traditions of foreign societies. Until a new chief executive can be elected, it falls to members of Congress to act to minimize the damage to American interests posed by President Biden’s ideological colonialism.

Arielle Del Turco, M.A., is Director of the Center for Religious Liberty at Family Research Council.
Chris Gacek, J.D., Ph.D., is Senior Fellow for Regulatory Affairs at Family Research Council.
Appendix A: Significant Biden LGBT Foreign Policy Documents

The Biden administration’s concerted efforts to elevate LGBT policies are obvious when one looks at the administration’s own documents. Below is a list of some of the most prominent.


Appendix B: USAID’s Significant Definitional Sentence and Footnote on “LGBTQI+”

The term “LGBT” appears to now be obsolete, as the acronym currently used by the Biden administration is “LGBTQI+.” The earlier term was rather straightforward, but what does “LGBTQI+” mean? What is its scope?

In May 2023, USAID posted a draft document for public comment entitled “USAID LGBTQI+ Inclusive Development Policy.” The first sentence of the executive summary, along with an attendant footnote, seemed particularly important for providing some definitional clarity. Whether that text will be included in the final version of the document remains to be seen, but its inclusion in the draft indicates how President Biden’s USAID sees these terms working together and the U.S. government’s position regarding them.

The draft document stated:

USAID affirms and celebrates lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex (LGBTQI+) people and all people of diverse sexual orientations, gender identities and expressions, and sex characteristics as integral parts of every society.

An essential footnote describes what the “+” in “LGBTQI+” means:

The “+” in LGBTQI+ represents additional sexual orientations, gender identities, gender expressions, and sex characteristics (SOGIESC) that do not fit within the “LGBTQI” identity labels. Sometimes variations on this acronym (e.g., LGB, LGBT) are used depending on the
subpopulations being referred to. Regardless of the acronym used, USAID’s intention is to be inclusive of the full diversity of all genders, sexualities, gender expressions, and variations in sex characteristics. USAID recognizes that all LGBTQI+ individuals have diverse SOGIESC, but not all individuals with diverse SOGIESC necessarily identify as LGBTQI+. This document uses both LGBTQI+ and SOGIESC to address the various ways communities inside and outside the United States refer to these communities.¹⁴⁷

As far as we can tell, there is no boundary to the sexual identities and behaviors that USAID is willing to affirm and celebrate in the name of the U.S. government. If there is a limiting principle, we cannot discern what it is.

What is “SOGIESC”? It is an expanded and modified version of “SOGI,” a term that has only begun to be used widely in the past five years. “SOGI” stands for “Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity.” In USAID’s footnote, “SOGIESC” is said to be a comprehensive and inclusive term that expands “LGBTQI+” by including “additional sexual orientations, gender identities, gender expressions, and sex characteristics.”¹⁴⁸ SOGIESC is a term of recent vintage—in the past five years. USAID’s use of the term is on the cutting edge in gender ideology analysis.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to trace the etymology of SOGIESC. However, it appears that the concepts started to be combined in the Yogyakarta Principles (2007),¹⁴⁹ and by the time the Yogyakarta Principles Plus 10 (2017) were enunciated, the various ideas of sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics were explicitly linked together.¹⁵⁰ We found only one law journal that discusses this conceptual evolution.¹⁵¹

All that said, the Yogyakarta Principles are not law.¹⁵² Piero A. Tozzi described the legal status of the Principles as follows:
The “Yogyakarta Principles,” or “Principles,” is a statement concerning the “application of international human rights law in relation to sexual orientation and gender identity” adopted by representatives from various non-governmental organizations and United Nations treaty monitoring committee members following a November 2006 conference held in Yogyakarta, Indonesia.\(^{153}\)

Tozzi describes the Principles as an “attempt by activists to present an aspirational, radical social policy as binding norms.” The Principles merit closer scrutiny for that reason, not because they have the force of law.\(^{154}\)

Tozzi describes in some detail why the Principles are only “aspirational” and without the effect of recognized human rights law:

The Principles have been touted as establishing a “universal guide to human rights which affirm binding international legal standards with which all States must comply.” Notwithstanding such ambitions, the Principles reflect only the views of a narrow group of self-identified “experts” and are not binding in international law: The Principles have not been negotiated nor agreed to by member states of the United Nations—indeed, not a single UN human rights treaty mentions sexual orientation and repeated attempts to pass resolutions promoting broad homosexual rights has been repeatedly rejected by UN member states.\(^{155}\)

Thus, USAID’s statement and footnote in their draft document appear to tie the U.S. government to the recognition of seemingly limitless permutations of genders, sexual identities, sexual expressions, and sexual characteristics.
President Roosevelt described his vision of “Four Freedoms” in his 1941 State of the Union Address delivered on January 6, 1941. This address is often referred to as the “Four Freedoms Speech.” See Franklin D. Roosevelt, “Annual Message to Congress on the State of the Union,” The American Presidency Project, January 6, 1941, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/annual-message-congress-the-state-the-union.

Throughout this report, the term “LGBT” is used as shorthand for “LGBTQI+” or any other set of acronyms used to describe multiple sexual orientations and gender identities.


Note that the U.S. government will act to defend and promote a radical new sexual ethic—not merely protect the persons who behave in a certain manner.


10 Ibid.


14 Ibid, 2.


19 These included U.S. embassies in: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, The Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bermuda, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Curacao, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, the Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kosovo, Laos, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, San Marino, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, American Institute in Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, the United Kingdom, Uruguay, and Vietnam.


25 These included U.S. embassies in: Albania, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, The Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bermuda, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei, Bulgaria, Burma, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Curacao, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, the Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kosovo, Kuwait, the Kyrgyz Republic, Laos, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palestinian Territories, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Rwanda, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Korea, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, American Institute in Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Vietnam, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.
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