**Report of the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity to the 77th General Assembly on peace, security, sexual orientation and gender identity**

Evidence submitted by [Protection Approaches](https://protectionapproaches.org/)

1. **About**
2. Protection Approaches works to transform how identity-based violence is understood and so transform how it is prevented. From Newham in East London to Bangui in the Central African Republic, we work with local communities, civil society organisations, policymakers, governments, academics and multilateral institutions to develop strategies that predict, prevent and protect people from identity-based violence. Protection Approaches convenes the UK Atrocity Prevention Working Group: a group of 25 NGOs based in the UK who collaborate on atrocity prevention policy and advocacy. PA has trained and advised state representatives, parliamentarians, and law enforcement from Romania to Central African Republic to the United States, including on what national and local atrocity prevention strategies can look like. PA works closely with central UK government and missions. Protection Approaches is a registered charity in England and Wales, charity number 1171433. For more information, please see [www.protectionapproaches.org](http://www.protectionapproaches.org).
3. Contact information: Dr Kate Ferguson, Co-Executive Director and Head of Research and Policy: [kate.ferguson@protectionapproaches.org](mailto:kate.ferguson@protectionapproaches.org)
4. **SOGI communities and mass violence**
5. The persecution of LGBTQI+ people is an indicator of a dangerous politics: when we leave out anti-LGBTQI+ politics from our understandings of risk and prevention of atrocity crimes and armed conflict, we not only compound the insecurities people face on the basis of their (presumed) identity but establish a dangerous precedent where homophobic and transphobic violence is not deemed worthy of attention. Efforts to look at the intersections of WPS, R2P, and atrocity prevention have tended to work through a cis-heteronormative understanding of gender, which has left those who fall outside the parameters of cis-heteronormative gender and sexuality consistently and unendingly insecure. As Jamie Hagen has written “those vulnerable to insecurity and violence because of their sexual orientation or gender identity remain largely neglected by the international peace and security community”. Actors involved in the prevention of atrocity crimes – States, multilateral and regional organisations, civil society – need to challenge their queer blind-spots. This means recognising the specific forms of mass violence LGBTQI+ experience when their identities are weaponised and targeted, that LGBTQI+ people are often the canary in the coal mine when it comes to the perpetration of atrocity crimes, and that measures of crisis response, humanitarian need, civilian protection and atrocity prevention must be designed to meet the varied and specific needs of and be inclusive of the leadership of LGBTQI+ people.
6. In our submission to the report on violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity to the 77th General Assembly on peace, security, sexual orientation and gender identity we focus on how States in particular, but also multilateral organisations and civil society, have failed to include LGBTQI+[[1]](#footnote-1) communities in the practice of and approach to mass atrocity prevention. This submission, while including certain situations of violence in States as illustrative examples, is not in response to a particular armed conflict. While we focus on the specific agendas of atrocity prevention, the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), and their related fields, we believe parts of our evidence and analysis apply beyond these spheres and across peace and security more broadly. It responds primarily to question 10 and aims to “enrich the understanding of the overall relationship between SOGI, peace and security.” This submission draws from Protection Approaches’ work, in [collaboration](https://protectionapproaches.org/news/f/press-release-stonewall-protection-approaches-launch-project) with Stonewall and the University of Manchester, on queering atrocity prevention.[[2]](#footnote-2)
7. In our submission, our focus is on mass violence and its prevention, including associated human rights violations including but not limited to the rights to life, freedom from torture, family life, and freedom of association. Mass atrocities occur during war and so-called times of peace.[[3]](#footnote-3) Far from being a consequence of armed conflict, atrocity crimes are a major cause of violence escalation and instability in and of themselves. The pathology of mass atrocities is distinct from the pathology of conflict[[4]](#footnote-4), and it is this distinction that requires additional analysis and resourcing to properly identify, understand, and interrupt the risks of mass violence – both preceded by, during, after and distinct from armed conflict – faced by LGBTQI+ communities. Mass atrocities are on the rise inside and outside of conflict settings. Protection Approaches has long argued that the forces behind identity-based violence – inequality, social fracture, democratic backsliding, resource scarcity, climate change, misinformation, and the internationalisation of malign networks – are moving in the wrong direction. As these trajectories of concern continue, our work has sought to raise the alarm that discrimination and persecution, including widespread and systematic targeting, will become increasingly more frequent.
8. The history of modern atrocity crimes shows that the persecution of LGBTQI+ people and queer communities commonly foreshadows the persecution of other groups.[[5]](#footnote-5) Just as the reassertion of patriarchal, heteronormative values and legislation indicates a constriction of the rights, freedoms and safety of a society, such shifts commonly come before wider acts of violence.[[6]](#footnote-6) From Nazi Germany to genocide in Darfur to the breakup of former Yugoslavia, the imposition of ‘moral’ codes that directly assault sexual and gender identities and freedoms came before widespread state-led physical violence and atrocity crimes.[[7]](#footnote-7) More recently, we have seen LGBTQI+ people become targets for violence, abuse, and extra-judicial executions in Afghanistan under new Taliban rule. Russia’s geopolitical encounter with Europe over the last decade has also included a stark sexualised and gendered component in which Russia positions itself as a morally superior civilisation in both domestic and foreign policy against a European bloc in need of rescuing from its path of civilisational decay. In light of the so-called “gay purges” in Chechnya and Russia’s invasion of Ukraine and intelligence reports of rumoured lists that include LGBTQ+ individuals, activists, organisations, and allies to be targeted upon successful Russian takeover, the urgency to consider the distinct vulnerabilities and risks of LGBTQI+ communities in situations of mass violence and human rights violations has a new and important resonance.[[8]](#footnote-8)
9. While predicting mass violence remains a persistent challenge to the practice of atrocity prevention the sector recognises the importance of identifying and responding to warning signs. The sector’s primary and to many most practical tools are the analytical frameworks and check lists of risk factors used by States, United Nations, civil society and many other actors to monitor, understand and identify opportunities for prevention in situations (at risk) of mass violence. None of the formal international frameworks of atrocity risks reviewed as part of this study include violence against LBGTQI+ groups as an indicator of atrocity crimes towards such groups or in general. This means that those who rely upon these frameworks or use them as starting points for making assessments, designing programmes, or developing their own understanding of atrocity risks, are starting from a position of gaps that could readily be closed. The example of Russia is particularly illustrative of the material consequences of these exclusions. The Chechen ‘gay purges’ - likely meeting the threshold of Crimes against Humanity – and the utilisation of homophobia and transphobia as part of the justification of the invasion of Ukraine were preceded by indications of risks such as the anti-LGBTQI+ legislation from mid-2013, commonly known as the ‘gay propaganda law’ prohibiting the promotion of so-called ‘non-traditional’ sexualities and gender expression to minors, and the subsequent increase in violence towards LGBTQI+ communities, especially LGBTQI+ youth. These developments however were not recorded in atrocity risk frameworks and failed to register both specific anti-LGBTQI+ and wider whole of society architectures of violence.[[9]](#footnote-9)
10. The inclusion of LGBTQI+ communities must not be reduced to a checkbox exercise, rather the indicators of risk must be co-created with the communities experiencing these risks – LGBTQI+ communities themselves. The UK fund that supported the production of Protection Approaches’ research was a rare and welcome window that sought out “gender-transformative, inclusive and equitable peacebuilding projects that also consider sexual orientation and gender identity minorities”.[[10]](#footnote-10) This direct support of work done jointly by LGBTQI+ and atrocity prevention organisations is unfortunately a rare occurrence but a light-lift low-cost endeavour many States should replicate. While states, philanthropic donors and grantmaking organisations continue to become more interested in intersectional approaches to reducing conflict, the wider challenge in the peace and security funding space – where ‘firefighting' so far outstrips attention on prevention – is ensuring that large humanitarian agencies do not remain the primary recipients, crowding out organisations – including LGBTQI+ led organisations – that are for a variety of reasons able to be more nimble, progressive, and nuanced. While we highlight in this paragraph the UK as an example of best practice, we do underscore that the responsibility to protect communities must be upheld consistently by all States. We are concerned about the recent developments in the UK as trans people are excluded from proposed bans on the torture practice of conversion therapy, and that in response to civil society pressure put on the UK-hosted [Safe To Be Me](https://www.gov.uk/government/topical-events/safe-to-be-me-a-global-equality-conference) conference regarding this decision, the UK decided to cancel a rare global opportunity to further LGBTQI+ rights rather than ensure the protection of trans individuals under the conversion therapy ban.
11. **Lacunae in international legal and governance frameworks**
12. The invisibility of LGBTQI+ communities in atrocity prevention architecture normalises, and not only institutionalises assumptions of the cis-heterosexuality of communities facing and experiencing violence, but renders implausible and invisible the fact that atrocity crimes against people on the basis of non-heteronormative sexuality and non-cisgender identities occur across the world. Widespread and systematic violent targeting of LGBTQI+ people can often look different to the widespread and systematic violent targeting of ethnic, religious and racial groups that traditionally dominate the atrocity prevention agenda, but may still meet the conceptual and legal thresholds of crimes against humanity.
13. The Genocide Convention and most definitions of the crime of genocide do not include LGBTQI+ communities as possible victims. As shown by Nellans, this misses the intrinsic connections between heteronormativity – systems which normalise, legitimise and prioritise heterosexuality as the natural or preferred sexual orientation – and genocide. She connects nationalism and homophobia as “queers are depicted as traitors to the nationalist cause” that prevent the reproduction and pollute the purity of a people.[[11]](#footnote-11) Other researchers show how common understandings of genocidal sexual violence are premised on a logic of heteronormativity to the exclusion of gender and sexual minorities.[[12]](#footnote-12)
14. LGBTQI+ communities are protected by the Rome Statute. As Lisa Davis and Jamie Todd-Gerr set out “as with all forms of persecution, accountability for gender persecution requires establishment of the underlying discrimination. Targeting women, men, girls, boys, LGBTQI+, non-binary and gender non-conforming persons on gender grounds is a crime against humanity”.[[13]](#footnote-13) However, this has not been reflected in the either the language used to describe widespread and systematic violations against LGBTQI+ communities or in recognising LGBTQI+ communities as groups that can be vulnerable to identity-based atrocity crimes. The ongoing drafting of a new convention on Crimes against Humanity offers opportunities for closing gaps in the international legal framework. The removal of archaic definitions of gender – secured in part by contributions from Special Procedures including the Independent Expert and civil society submissions[[14]](#footnote-14) – allows for the inclusion of gender in a manner enabling the wider recognition of gender-based violence inclusive of LGBTQI+ communities. We urge States to support and uphold the gender component of the draft convention currently at the 6th committee.
15. To understand the LGBTQI+ blindspots in multilateral atrocity prevention governance, our research examined the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). Each year states gather at the UN General Assembly for an annual dialogue on R2P, and the statements given there are a useful resource for ‘temperature checking’ the positions, activities, and areas of concern that states hold on R2P and its implementation. These meetings “have helped to forge a shared understanding of R2P,” all be it a largely inflexible one, whereby a large number of states flesh out their official understandings of R2P.[[15]](#footnote-15) As such, the annual dialogues are a useful site for assessing how states understand the relationships between R2P and identity-based violence. There were no references to LGBTQI+ people or the component identities of gay, lesbian, homosexual, bisexual, or transgender until 2019.[[16]](#footnote-16) In 2019 Costa Rica’s statement and Uruguay’s statement both included references to enhanced domestic legal protections for LGBTQI+ people.[[17]](#footnote-17) There was also a reference in Russia’s statement in 2019, however it served to dismiss protections of LGBTQI+ people saying that Ukraine “needs real democratization, and not just colourful gay parades in the central squares of Kyiv”.[[18]](#footnote-18) This shows that while some states move towards understanding the relevance of R2P to identity categories such as women and refugees, there is still very limited understanding evident in statements on the relevance of LGBTQI+ identities to R2P protection.
16. The limited understanding and persisting exclusion of LGBTQI+ communities is compounded by how LGBTQI+ issues at the United Nations remain siloed, and as a result disjointed from Security Council topics like R2P, under the Human Rights Council and its Special Procedures.[[19]](#footnote-19) Greater inclusion of LGBTQI+ people in annual statements on the responsibility to protect – their risks, resilience, and resistance – would help to integrate these currently siloed areas of work. The UN Joint Office for the Prevention of Genocide and the Responsibility to Protect could lead by example in explicitly acknowledging that LGBTQI+ people are part of the’ 'who’ R2P – and thus its mandate – covers. The UN Secretary writes a report on the responsibility to protect each year, none of which in the past have mentioned LGBTQI+ people or their rights, sanctioning in effect the sector’s blindness. And so, despite increasing risks to LGBTQI+ communities around the globe, engagement with LGBTQI+ risks, vulnerabilities and expertise in atrocity prevention and R2P practice, research and policy have remained limited. If he does not so already, we encourage the Independent Expert to liaise and collaborate with the Joint Office to work towards the inclusion of LGBTQI+ communities in atrocity prevention and R2P UN initiatives.
17. UN actors that have engaged more than others with LGBTQI+ programming include the UNDP, OHCHR, and UNHCR but progress is slow. UNHCR has had guidance on handling asylum claims on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity since 2008.[[20]](#footnote-20) Implementation of these guidelines, however, is lacking. UN Women has more engagement with gender and sexual diversity than its predecessor UNIFEM, however “many LGBTI activists still find it difficult to work with UN Women, describing it as one of the more conservative agencies”.[[21]](#footnote-21) The WPS agenda, which exists both inside and outside the UN, has been critiqued for its “continued silence about homophobic and transphobic violence targeting lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer individuals in conflict-related environments”.[[22]](#footnote-22)
18. Alongside LGBTQI+ blindspots in international law and governance, these blindspots also persist in the humanitarian responses to atrocity crimes and armed conflict (as well as to disasters, which are and will become more common due to the already locked-in consequences of climate change). Research by governments, agencies and academics are finding that humanitarian response systems continue to exclude LGBTQI+ people even where they are at heightened risk.[[23]](#footnote-23) Recent studies have found that “sexual minorities are at greater risk of war crimes, including conflict-based issues of forced displacement, migration, and social cleansing, in addition to the psychological and physical trauma that accompanies persecution and violence”.[[24]](#footnote-24) During humanitarian crises, such as the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, gender diverse people were excluded from systems designed to provide aid and compensation. In fact, a 2018 survey of the 10 largest humanitarian response plans found no inclusion of LGBTQI+ people or their specific needs during humanitarian crises.[[25]](#footnote-25)
19. To adequately account for and prevent mass atrocities and conflict escalations, multilateral organisations, States, civil society and all actors involved in the prevention of mass violence and armed conflict must take heed of situations such as those unfolding in Russia as a precipitant to much larger conflicts and situations of violence, such as in Chechnya and Ukraine; we must look to the patterns of violent discrimination in Egypt, acknowledge specific risks in Afghanistan, commit to including the needs of LGBTQI+ communities in our prevention efforts in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Sudan. This requires concerted efforts to and investments in how to better monitor the specific risks and indicators of LGBTQI+ vulnerability to identity-based atrocity crimes. Our research does not suggest that all mass atrocities begin against a backdrop of LGBTQI+ persecution, but such violence does tend to be a precursor to violence escalation and deeper, faster democratic backsliding. Queer people face significant and unique insecurities during conflicts and atrocities – it is time that these communities are accounted for in conflict and atrocity frameworks.

**We ask States to consider:**

* developing, adopting and implementing an inclusive, intersectional national strategy of atrocity prevention
* investing in cross-cutting agenda development that brings together WPS, R2P, civilian protection, humanitarian response, atrocity prevention, and the rights of LGBTQI+ people in domestic and international policy
* moving towards the depoliticisation of sex, acknowledging that sexual desire and gender identities/expressions are as varied as the individuals who hold them
* delivering interventions supporting the protection and inclusion of LGBTQI+ communities within the General Assembly – including the annual R2P debates, the Human Rights Council, and through recommendations given through the Universal Periodic Review
* inviting the Independent Expert on sexual orientation and gender identity to make a country visit
* ensuring high-level ministerial attendance, including ministers whose portfolio includes atrocity prevention and R2P focal points, to attend international LGBTQI+ conferences
* funding R2P focal points to ensure they have the capacity to both queer and devolve R2P

**We ask the UN Joint Office for the prevention of genocide and the responsibility to protect to consider:**

* explicitly acknowledging that LGBTQI+ people are part of the ‘who’ that the mandate of the joint office, and the principle of the responsibility to protect, covers
* opening up the framework of analysis to include indicators relating to sex and gender, and issue guidance on the importance of co-creation for specifical contexts, populations and at risk groups
* including LGBTQI+ communities and the risks they face in the activities of the joint office, both by reaching in to CSOs and in the risk assessments they undertake
* pushing for accountability for systematic targeting of LGBTQI+ people through the ICC or draw lessons from human rights courts

**We ask civil society organisations that work towards the prevention of mass atrocity crimes and in the wider peace and security fields to consider:**

* using their platforms to publicly commit to look to their blind spots and encourage a sector-wide conversation about how we can ensure our tools and practices are fit for the purpose of contributing to the protection of LGBTQI+ people from atrocity crimes
* ensuring proactive and inclusive internal policies protect the rights and recognising the needs of their LGBTQI+ staff
* including LGBTQI+ people in early warning research, both as researchers and as communities that face additional risks
* the risks for LGBTQI+ people in specific contexts when developing analysis, in their advocacy, and in programme design

**We ask Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity to consider:**

* to comment within his report on the explicit needs of LGBTQI+ inclusion in atrocity prevention programming, commitments and strategies, as well as and alongside such inclusion on armed conflict prevention
* to liaise with the UN Joint Office on how to collaborate on ensuring LGBTQI+ communities are explicitly included under the office’s mandate
* to continue the welcomed collaboration with civil society to enhance the inclusion of LGBTQI+ communities across prevention sectors

**Annex A**

Jess Gifkins, Dean Cooper-Cunningham, Kate Ferguson, Detmer Kremer, Farida Mostafa, “Queering atrocity prevention,” *Protection Approaches*, 31 March 2022 (attached to submission email).

1. In this evidence submission, while we acknowledge the recent turn in UN and other policymaking circles to the term SOGIE, we have opted to use the terms LGBTQI+ and queer to refer to those whose sexual orientation and/or gender identity falls outside cis-hetero norms. We acknowledge that no acronym (e.g., LGBTQI+) can account for the diversity of sexual orientation and gender identity/expression, but use the identity-based LGBTQI+ acronym because it is often, on account of being (read as) L/G/B/T/Q/I/+, that individuals are subject to violence and atrocity crimes. Our submission and the accompanying report are about violence and atrocity crimes motivated by (presumed) identity, and while we acknowledge that sexual desire ought not to be elevated to an identity in its own right*,* all kinds of so-called ‘deviant’ sexualitiesoften function as an identity category that perpetrators assign to those targeted. Hence, we have chosen LGBTQI+ in our analysis. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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