

RAINBOW GHOSTING

An initiative by **LLYC**



PRIDE

LEFT

ON READ,

When responsible voices
leave the conversation,
hate starts typing...

PINNED MESSAGE

IS OUR WILLINGNESS TO RESPOND CHANGING?

For years, June, **Pride Month**, amplified a shared idea: **diversity, inclusion, and respect** were part of the world we were building. Companies, leaders, and society added their voices, **turning Pride into a public signal of belonging.**

That idea is **still alive.** What is **changing** is the **strength of its echo.**

The causes are many, and the pace varies from country to country. But the **pattern repeats: the support system that once propelled this conversation is turning down the volume.**

The LGBTIQ+ community **continues to raise its voice, create, contribute, and claim its place.**

Pride keeps typing...

But **more and more often, its messages are being left on read.**

And when a **conversation receives fewer replies, the story begins to change...**

Concepts such as **vulnerability, fear, and struggle** begin to crowd out **autonomy, ambition, work, and the future.** **Artificial intelligence already reflects this fracture:** when presented with everyday situations, it tends to **associate the LGBTIQ+ community with fragility,** while more frequently linking **agency and success** to **cisnet identities.**

Of course, **it does not do this by choice.** It is **learning from the stories we make available to it.** And when **diversity-related information recedes,** the machine can **keep the LGBTIQ+ community visible while representing it within an increasingly limited horizon.**

This is **Rainbow Ghosting:** an investigation into **the retreat of public support for diversity** and how this **quiet shift is shaping the representations produced by one of the tools that will most define our future: AI.**

We analyze this transformation to provide **data, context, and judgment** that can help identify how this **loss of intensity affects identities today,** while anticipating that **algorithms may ultimately encode exclusion into the future.**

Leaving a **message on read** does not mean the conversation **is over.** It means that what we **stop telling today** will shape the **story the future encounters.**

That is why we have chosen to keep the conversation open and continue *responding...*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER 1

The Response Becomes Intermittent

CHAPTER 2

The Voices Responding Less Often

CHAPTER 3

Hate Is *Typing*...

CHAPTER 4

When Belonging Becomes More Fragile

CHAPTER 5

The Machine Is *Typing* Too...

CHAPTER 6

Responding Again



INTRODUCTION



For a long time, Pride served as an unmistakable signal of visibility, rights, and belonging for the LGBTIQ+ community. It was a way to participate in public life and a reminder that freedom requires not only laws, but also stories, role models, and collective responses. For society at large, it also represented **a space of social cohesion, a symbol of progress, and a safe space in which demonstrating a commitment to coexistence** reflected an ethical consensus that seemed firmly established.

But consensus fractures when it is not defended. In earlier editions of our research, we argued that institutional support and communication around inclusion were only an essential starting point. Today, **we are witnessing a broader social retreat in which even those minimums are being contested.** Coverage of diversity is declining sharply and becoming concentrated almost exclusively in June, Pride Month. At the same time, institutional and corporate commitments related to DEI are being scaled back, reframed, or made less visible. Many companies once rushed to climb aboard the Pride float. Today, just as many appear eager to step off.

This retreat reflects a tectonic global shift: **rising social division and the breakdown of shared agreements about how we live together.** For organizations, yielding to this climate represents a strategic risk. Years of analyzing these dynamics have shown us that real leadership is proven precisely in moments like these. A brand earns authority with its customers and society by holding its course and staying true to its values when the surrounding context pushes in the opposite direction.

Coverage of diversity is declining sharply
and becoming concentrated almost
exclusively in June, pride month.

As some inclusive signals lose continuity, hostile **narratives occupy the space they leave behind and learn new ways to circulate**. Exclusion now appears on multiple fronts, disguised as opposition to an ideological agenda and shielded by humor, morality, supposed common sense, or bitter political debate. What was once recognized as explicit violence now moves through normalized forms that appear defensible and are far harder to isolate.

This struggle is also moving into the systems that increasingly mediate how we explore and represent the world. Artificial intelligence models organize references, rank possibilities, and return interpretive frames. When asked equivalent questions, **some models tend to associate LGBTIQ+ people with respect, fear, acceptance, or rejection, while cisnet profiles are consistently linked more often to autonomy, work, self-improvement, planning, and the future**.

The risk is twofold. First, that the community becomes invisible. Second, that it remains **visible only within an increasingly narrow frame**: closer to vulnerability than fulfillment, more closely associated with resilience than ambition, and represented more through a label than through the complexity of a full life.

Using Pride as a timely lens, **this report examines a deeper shift**: what happens when equality, diversity, and respect for the LGBTIQ+ community **stop receiving sustained, genuinely committed responses over time**; which narratives occupy the space left open; which identities become battlegrounds in a cultural conflict; and how AI can reproduce, amplify, or harden those biases.

Leaving the defense of inclusion on read
does not silence polarization.
it raises a far more important question:
who do we want writing the future?

There is no single cause or linear relationship between reduced visibility, hostility, and material setbacks on one side, and algorithmic bias on the other. These dimensions belong to the same cultural ecosystem, one in which **absences also communicate, narratives also train the machine, and the responses we choose not to give are ultimately written by others**.

Leaving the defense of inclusion on read does not silence polarization. It raises a far more important question: **who do we want writing the future?**

METHODOLOGY

The **conversations shaping the future are increasingly mediated by technology**. Examining its social impact is therefore essential to understanding how **representation, belonging, and the frameworks through which we interpret reality are being constructed today**.

From that standpoint, this report focuses on a **chain reaction** we consider significant: the **retreat of institutional conversations removes positive, inclusive reference points**, leaving a vacuum that hostile narratives can **occupy with little resistance**. When artificial intelligence is trained on this unbalanced digital ecosystem, it absorbs and automates those biases, **returning a representation of the LGBTIQ+ community anchored in vulnerability and stigma**.

To assess the true scale of this dual phenomenon, we designed a study structured around two areas of analysis:

1. AUDIT OF THE SOCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ECOSYSTEM

To measure the **decline in conversation and the rise in hostility**, the study conducted an extensive **analysis of media and social platforms** across **12 countries**: the United States, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Spain, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Portugal, and the Dominican Republic. The analysis examined:

- **Declining visibility**: We analyzed **15,122,069** news stories related to DEI and the LGBTIQ+ community published between **2021 and 2026**. In parallel, to evaluate the loss of cultural curiosity, we monitored **eight global search terms on Google Trends** over the past five years, including terms such as gender fluid, trans, and queer.
- **Growing hostility**: Through social listening dating back to 2018, we collected **201,998,304 posts on X** and identified more than 4.6 million violent messages.
- **Natural Language Processing (NLP)**: Focusing this layer of analysis on 2023, the period in which polarization became most firmly established, we applied advanced techniques including stemming, lemmatization, and bag-of-words models to conduct a semantic analysis of **8,383,662 messages in three languages** (English, Spanish and Portuguese). This allowed us to isolate 17 territories of hostile discourse, including pathologization, ridicule, dehumanization, and anti-rights narratives.

2. AUDIT OF GENERATIVE ALGORITHMIC BIAS

To understand how artificial intelligence processes and reproduces this polarized environment, we evaluated the textual and visual behavior of leading large language models (LLMs):

- **Text analysis, the agency gap:** Using ChatGPT 5.1, we tested **90 questions** about major life concerns, grouped into nine thematic areas. We compared how the model responded to five **profiles based on different sexual orientations and gender identities**, four LGBTIQ+ and one cisnet, systematically testing both male and female perspectives. Through NLP, this enabled us to identify **34 semantic territories** and assess how AI distributes concepts such as fear, depression, and autonomy depending on the user's profile.
- **Visual analysis, representational marginalization:** Using **Gemini's gemini-2.5-flash-image** model, we analyzed **627 AI-generated images**. Of these, 100 were generated without context to audit baseline bias in the representation of specific profiles. The remaining 527 were generated under emotionally charged narrative conditions, such as "How do I deal with fear in environments where I am in the minority?" or "What should I do if I no longer want to live?" We evaluated iterations across 10 different gender identities and sexual orientations to assess visual stigmatization.



CHAPTER 1


THE RESPONSE BECOMES INTERMITTENT.

WHEN INCLUSION BECOMES SEASONAL...

Every June, the conversation seems to flare with the same intensity as ever: streets fill with rainbows, logos change color, and institutions publish their statements. Yet a **seasonal spike in conversation is not always evidence of a healthy ecosystem**. Sometimes, it exposes the fragility of the ground beneath us during the rest of the year.

The LGBTIQ+ community **does not disappear** when the month ends. The fight for rights, space, and representation takes place every day. Only a few years ago, we examined how CEOs' **commitment to diversity was sustained, public, and seen as an unquestioned standard of leadership** (LLYC, 2022) ¹. Today, amid global polarization, reputational pressure, and so-called anti-woke *fatigue*, that ecosystem is pulling away from the microphone.

This is not the end of visibility, but it is a loss of frequency and continuity. The data confirms this shift in the cycle. In **2023, twice as many news stories about DEI were published as in 2025**, and as many as six times more than in 2026 to date. Across all countries analyzed, the five-year trend shows a steady decline: **2.5% per quarter since 2021**, accelerating to nearly **10% per quarter over the past three years**.



The first sign of ghosting is that the surrounding environment begins to respond less.

Media coverage is losing continuity: Change in the volume of DEI-related news stories over the past five years.

¹ LLYC. (2022). Companies and LGBTQ+ diversity in digital conversation <https://llyc.global/en/ideas/companies-and-lgbtq-diversity-in-online-conversation/>



These figures refer to the broader DEI universe, not exclusively to content about the LGBTIQ+ community. Even so, they reveal the **weakening of a broader information framework in which sexual and gender diversity has held a meaningful place** and which, especially during Pride, helped sustain conversations about recognition, equality, and belonging.

REPRESENTATION AS A SOURCE OF TRUST...

The decline in coverage does not mean diversity has lost all space, but it **widens the distance between media outlets and diverse audiences seeking to see themselves reflected with greater accuracy, continuity, and complexity.**

For many years, some LGBTIQ+ audiences have felt that **newspapers, magazines, radio, and print books represented their experiences less closely than digital environments did.** That distance does not necessarily reflect a rejection of traditional formats. It is more often a response to the quality, authenticity, and breadth of the stories those formats offer.

Consumer data points to a positive correlation between **authentic representation of the LGBTIQ+ community and measures such as affinity with content.** When audiences can recognize themselves without stereotypes or **simplification, they develop a more favorable relationship with the media and organizations producing that content** (Nielsen, 2022).²

Cultural relevance and positive audience impact do not follow separate paths. **Bringing in real voices, expanding the range of stories, and reflecting society more faithfully also strengthens the ability to generate identification, trust, and connection.**

Two traditional industries illustrate how that relationship can help renew relevance.

Publishing: Digital phenomena such as **BookTok** have demonstrated the ability of online communities to move cultural conversation toward printed books. Demand for **stories with diverse representation has brought new audiences to bookstores, publishers, authors, and genres that remained outside mainstream visibility for years.**

² Nielsen. (2022, June). A new chapter in inclusivity: How LGBTIQ+ audiences are reviving traditional media. <https://www.nielsen.com/insights/2022/a-new-chapter-in-inclusivity-how-lgbtq-audiences-are-reviving-traditional-media/>

Far from abandoning physical formats, younger audiences are helping revitalize them when they find stories that reflect their identities, interests, and experiences. Diversity is **part of a broader transformation in what people expect to read and whom they expect to find within those stories.**

When the industry expands the range of voices it publishes, it also expands its ability to connect with new reading communities, spark conversation, and regain cultural relevance.

Newspapers and magazines: The same dynamic can be seen in publications in Mexico and Brazil that have featured trans creators, artists, and public figures such as **Victoria Volkova** and **Linn da Quebrada** on their covers. These examples show how traditional media can reconnect with contemporary culture by bringing **historically absent figures into their storytelling with depth and editorial judgment.**


The value depends on the treatment, the context, and the outlet's ability to ensure that this presence is not reduced to an exception, a symbol, or a controversy. When **representation is authentic, a cover becomes a signal of cultural relevance.** It shows that the publication understands who is part of society, which conversations are transforming it, and which stories need room to be told. This is editorial courage.

Diverse audiences do not always abandon traditional formats. **Sometimes, they simply stop finding themselves in them.**

Rainbow Ghosting can create that disconnect too. When certain voices are confined to isolated moments, media outlets **narrow the space available for those experiences and drift away from communities that are still looking for stories in which they can recognize themselves.**

More authentic representation can strengthen identification, trust, affinity, and willingness to engage with the content that accompanies people's lives. Not because diversity should become a commercial formula, but because the ability to **interpret society accurately remains one of the primary sources of relevance for any media outlet, brand, or organization.**

Better representation means expanding who can **see themselves inside a story.** In doing so, it also **expands that story's ability to connect, endure, and create value.**



A GLOBAL VACUUM: THE LOSS OF CONTEXT KNOWS NO BORDERS...

When a subject appears less often in the media, reports, institutions, and public content, it loses both **volume** and **context**. There are fewer opportunities to add nuance, surface reference points, and challenge the interpretations other actors build around it. Put another way:

What is named less is explained less.

What is explained less is understood less.

And what is understood less is more vulnerable to being defined by others.

This decline is not unfolding with the same intensity in every market analyzed. In 2025, for example, **Argentina recorded 63%** fewer DEI-related publications than in 2023; **the United States, 55%** fewer; and **Spain, 48%** fewer.

The loss of signal is not unfolding in the same way across every market, but it points to the same symptom: **public conversation about diversity and inclusion is no longer responding with the same frequency.**

ARGENTINA	-63%	The steepest decline occurs in an environment where diversity has become a political and institutional battleground.
UNITED STATES	-55%	Reflects a retreat shaped by corporate anxiety, quiet reassessments of DEI budgets, and fear of reputational boycotts.
SPAIN	-48%	The most revealing figure: even in countries with strong institutional protections and active support for diversity, public conversation has fallen by nearly half.

The three markets represent **very different political and institutional contexts**. Yet all of them show significant declines in DEI coverage.

Spain is particularly revealing. Even in a **country where diversity retains stronger institutional backing and formal protection**, news coverage has **fallen by nearly 50%**. This suggests the phenomenon cannot be explained solely by the decisions of one government, a specific law, or an electoral cycle.



We are looking at a **broader trend, one capable of crossing societies with different regulatory frameworks, political traditions, and levels of protection.** The retreat is also reaching public attention and the cultural centrality that diversity occupies within society.

The phenomenon also appears in other layers. On social media, the analysis identifies declines in LGBTIQ+ conversation in markets including **Brazil, Chile, Panama, and Portugal.** In Portugal, average monthly conversation about the LGBTIQ+ community was 66% higher during the four years preceding the period analyzed.

There is no single, **uniform global blackout.** The response is weakening through different channels: less news coverage in some markets, less social conversation in others, and less active searching for reference points in several. The common trend is not total silence, but a **loss of density.** The subject is discussed less often, for shorter periods, and with less capacity to sustain context.


JUNE: FROM ANNUAL PEAK TO AN ISLAND OF VISIBILITY...

In the years when DEI and LGBTIQ+ issues received the greatest overall coverage, the quarter containing Pride Month accounted for a smaller share of the annual total. Not because the season mattered less, but because the **conversation was better distributed across the rest of the calendar.** The opposite is now true.

In 2023, the second quarter accounted for 28.56% of annual publications. In 2024, its share rose to 32.73%. In 2025, it remained at a similar level, 32.29%. This does not mean Pride is gaining visibility in absolute terms. It means Pride is increasingly becoming **the main refuge for a year-round conversation that is losing strength.**

June is accounting for an ever-larger share of an ever-smaller annual conversation.

Pride as an island of visibility.
Share of second-quarter DEI/LGBTIQ+ publications as a percentage of the annual total.



This distinction changes the interpretation. Pride remains an essential moment of activation, but its **ability to mobilize conversation should not be confused with the health of the ecosystem around it.** A peak can remain visible even as the ground supporting it erodes.

The LGBTIQ+ community and its organizations continue working, mobilizing, and generating conversation throughout the year. The seasonality is not in their commitment. It is in the attention they receive, the spaces they are given, and how often other actors choose to stand alongside them.

In that sense, Pride is becoming one of the few moments when society at large still cannot avoid the conversation.

CULTURAL DISINTEREST AND ALGORITHMIC CENSORSHIP...


The loss of density is also visible in the active search for reference points. In June 2025, **Google recorded fewer than half as many searches related to diversity and the LGBTIQ+ community as it did three years earlier.**

This invisibility is also being imposed. As GLAAD (2026) ³ notes, social platforms actively contribute to this ghosting through the disproportionate **suppression of content, quietly blocking essential LGBTIQ+ community terms and hashtags**, such as #trans and #lesbian, from search and discovery features. When users stop asking and platforms stop showing, **the circle of silence closes completely.**

³ GLAAD. (2026). Social Media Safety Index (SMSI) [cite: 2]
<https://glaad.org/smsi/2026/key-findings-and-recommendations/>

The identities society is no longer searching for

Changes in searches related to LGBTQI+, diversity, and specific identity terms.



The same pattern appears in searches for terms such as "gender fluid," "queer," "gender pronouns," and "gender dysphoria," which in some cases have fallen to one-third of the interest recorded in 2022.

Searching for a word, an identity, or an experience is one way of moving closer to it. It means asking for context, **expanding the language available, and trying to understand a reality that may still be unfamiliar.**

That is why the decline in searches should not be read only as waning interest. It may also signal a **loss of cultural curiosity at a time when the conversation needs greater precision and nuance.**

Invisibility does not always begin with a ban. It can also begin when a society **stops searching for the words that help it understand.**

This chapter does not portray LGBTQI+ people as having stopped speaking, organizing, or claiming their place. It portrays an **environment that responds less frequently, provides less context, and concentrates its attention within ever-narrower windows.**

This is the first dimension of Rainbow Ghosting: not the disappearance of diversity, but the **retreat of part of the signal system that helped recognize it publicly.** Pride continues to mobilize attention, resources, and conversation. But it is beginning to do so within an ecosystem that is weaker, more polarized, and less continuous than it was only a few years ago.

That is the risk: **that June stops being the high point of a sustained conversation and becomes the last moment when the surrounding environment feels obligated to respond.**

The question, then, is not how much the community does to remain visible. The question is what is happening to the voices that once helped sustain its recognition. **Who is responding less, and what changes when they do?**

CHAPTER 2

THE VOICES RESPONDING LESS OFTEN.

In certain markets and sectors, the answer points to brands, organizations, and institutions that helped amplify the conversation about diversity for years. Today, **some of that firm support is giving way to caution, and some public commitments are becoming less visible.**

These actors competed to lead the Pride conversation. Now, the flags are becoming less visible, policies are being reviewed, and public exposure feels more uncomfortable.

Not every voice is withdrawing, and not all are doing so in the same way. But when those with the power to amplify respond less, the **balance of the conversation changes** too. Silence also communicates. The public sphere does not remain empty, because while some voices decide how to respond, others keep writing.

RAINBOW WASHING, IN REVERSE...

The environment in which **brands express their commitments to diversity has become more complex.** The same speed with which companies once rushed to climb aboard the Pride float now appears in the rush to step off it.

Political polarization, **digital** pressure, and the risk of **boycotts** have increased the exposure associated with certain public positions, leading some companies to reconsider how they communicate and structure their inclusion policies.

In the United States, **executive orders issued in 2025 changed the institutional and regulatory** framework surrounding DEI policies. This new context has led many organizations to **review the language, scope, and communication of their commitments** in an effort to remain consistent within a more complex legal, political, and reputational environment.

The shift reflects a period of greater caution, in which diversity-related initiatives require a more precise assessment of risks, stakeholder expectations, and the particular dynamics of each sector.

- **Target:** The company abruptly halted several of its key equity initiatives after facing pressure and criticism from multiple groups.
- **LEGO:** The company chose to reduce its exposure and removed terms such as "LGBTIQ+" and "diversity and inclusion" from its latest sustainability report. ⁴


³ Ongig Blog. (2026, April 29). DEI Rollbacks: What Companies Are Doing in 2026 <https://blog.ongig.com/diversity-and-inclusion/dei-rollbacks/>

Since then, **some organizations have chosen to reduce their exposure, reframe their messaging, or revisit specific public commitments.** The data reflects this evolution: the number of **Fortune 500** companies maintaining active diversity policies today is **approximately two-thirds of the number recorded in 2023.**

Fortune 500 companies with active DEI policies now represent roughly **two-thirds** of the number recorded in 2023.

Corporate invisibility: from visible support to corporate caution.

Changes in active DEI policies and Pride-related visibility among Fortune 500 companies between 2021 and 2025.



Search interest for Pride products Fortune 500 companies with active DEI Media coverage of LGBTQ+ campaigns

Some brands, including Walmart, Ford, and Toyota, have reframed or modified certain policies and public signals of inclusion. These moves may include **regulatory adjustments, changes in terminology, revised targets, reduced public visibility, or the integration of initiatives into broader corporate frameworks.**

Not every reframing represents a retreat from commitment. But when a policy becomes less visible or recognizable, the public signal received by the surrounding environment changes as well.

A commitment can remain in place while becoming less visible. **The question is what the surrounding environment interprets when the signal changes.**

The retreat of some corporate signals coincides with a broader contraction in public conversation. On X, for example, the volume of messages about the LGBTIQ+ community fell from **26 million in 2023 to 12.7 million in the most recent period analyzed.**

We cannot conclude that one phenomenon directly causes the other. But both are reshaping the same ecosystem: **fewer voices are participating, and fewer public signals are available to provide context and balance.**

A reduction in volume does not necessarily mean a reduction in hostility. The opposite may occur: the conversation may become smaller while its most polarized voices gain a larger share of it.

Global public conversation on X reflects this institutional retreat: **the volume of messages about the community fell from 26 million in 2023 to 12.7 million today.**

FROM GHOSTING TO DISMANTLING...

Within institutions, responding less can have even deeper consequences.


Here, **retreat can translate into regulatory changes, the elimination of offices, program cancellations, budget cuts, or the dismantling of structures created to prevent discrimination and uphold rights.**


The United States offers one of the clearest examples. Between 2021 and 2025, the indicator used to assess federal inclusion policies **shows a shift from a period of institutionalization and expansion to one defined by reduction, closure, and dismantling.**

According to the analysis, the net balance of these policies moved from **+18 in 2023 to -17 in early 2025.** A single presidential executive order **eliminated DEI offices, budgets, and training across federal employment.**

From institutionalization to dismantling.

Changes in the net score measuring the constructive or restrictive impact of DEI policies in the United States.





A DOMINO EFFECT THAT IS ALREADY GLOBAL...

This slowdown is being replicated in many countries that have shifted politically over the past decade:

- **Argentina:** The government eliminated INADI, the national anti-discrimination agency, cut the budget for gender policies by nearly **90%**, and restricted access to health care for transgender youth by decree.
- **Peru:** The Peruvian government amended the Essential Health Insurance Plan (PEAS) to explicitly include “transgenderism” and “gender identity disorder in childhood” under the category of mental illnesses or disorders (Glatsky & Taj, 2024) ⁵.

In Europe, the Rainbow Europe Map, ILGA-Europe’s benchmark indicator measuring LGBTIQ+ rights and policy progress on a scale from 0% to 100%, shows:

- **United Kingdom:** Following changes to gender self-determination policies, medical restrictions stemming from the Cass Review, and the blocking of Scotland’s gender recognition reform, the United Kingdom’s score fell sharply to approximately 52–53%, **falling by nearly 30 percentage points** within a few years and dropping below 15th place in Europe.
- **Hungary:** The country remains near the bottom of the ranking on LGBTIQ+ rights, with a score of barely 30% ⁶, following years of legal and political restrictions that have **limited freedom of expression or stalled progress in recognition and protection. However, Péter Magyar’s rise** marks the beginning of a **new political phase, characterized by a stronger European orientation and a promise to restore democratic standards**. The change opens a window of opportunity, although it is still too early to determine whether it will lead to an effective review of the measures that have weakened tLGBTIQ+ rights.
- **Spain:** Although it continues to hold a **leading position in Europe on LGBTIQ+ rights**, the shift toward more conservative political cycles has reopened debates over protections that once seemed firmly established ⁷. Regulatory revisions introduced in certain regions show that legal progress does not always guarantee a linear or irreversible trajectory.

What did this mean in practice? References to gender identity were removed from schools, provisions penalizing discrimination in textbooks were eliminated, and mandatory medical or psychological supervision was reinstated for transgender minors.

⁵ Glatsky, G., y Taj, M. (2024, May 26). Peru classifies trans people as mentally ill. The New York Times.

<https://www.nytimes.com/es/2024/05/26/espanol/peru-transgenero-salud-mental-trans.html>

⁶ ILGA-Europe. (2025). Rainbow Europe Map and Index 2025: Human rights situation of LGBTI people in Europe. ILGA-Europe.

<https://www.ilga-europe.org/rainbow-europe/>

⁷ Comunidad de Madrid. (2023). Law 17/2023, of December 27, on the Simplification and Improvement of the Efficiency of Institutions and Agencies of the Community of Madrid. Boletín Oficial de la Comunidad de Madrid (BOCM), (308).

https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2024-10767


This shift has also reached the **education system**. Over the past year, 11 DEI policy changes were identified at U.S. universities and academic institutions. Of these, 45% involved explicit closures or cancellations, while 40% involved weakening, review, or reframing.

In Arizona, the **university system amended 10 policies, and several public universities removed DEI language, webpages, or structures** in response to the new federal and state environment.

In North Carolina, the retreat took on a structural dimension: the UNC System **eliminated 59 positions, reassigned another 131, and redirected more than \$17 million across its 17 institutions**. This was not a collection of isolated decisions, but a transformation implemented across the entire university system.

When the retreat reaches campus.

Changes to DEI policies at U.S. universities and academic institutions, categorized by closure, weakening, or review.




Across the U.S. academic institutions analyzed, 85% of recent changes involved **the closure, cancellation, weakening, or review of DEI policies.**

Argentina represents a comparable case in Latin America. Since December 2023, the country has undergone a significant **dismantling of its institutional architecture related to gender and diversity.**

Documented measures include a **ban on inclusive language in public administration**; the elimination of the **Ministry of Women, Genders, and Diversity**; the closure of the **National Institute Against Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Racism**; and a nearly 90% reduction in the overall budget for gender policies. Protection and support programs were also cut, including a 64% reduction in funding for the *Línea 144 hotline*.

When retreat reaches the structure:

decline in the net score measuring the constructive impact of policy initiatives



WHAT CHANGES WHEN THEY RESPOND LESS...

The evidence analyzed does not establish that a reduction in corporate and institutional signals directly causes an increase in hostility. It does, however, identify a **change in the conditions surrounding the conversation**.

Companies have a responsibility to their shareholders and to the sustainability of their business. At the same time, they serve a social function: they create jobs, influence people’s living conditions, shape culture, and have the ability **to bring issues, values, and role models onto the public agenda**.

That retreat can also affect companies themselves. Caution may reduce exposure in the short term, but a less clear signal can **weaken trust, cultural coherence, and relationships with audiences that expect continuity**. In other words, the shift changes the reputational and business environment in which brands operate.

When the presence of actors capable of providing context, legitimacy, and continuity declines, the **public sphere loses some of its counterweights** and becomes more available for other voices to set the terms of the debate.

This matters because the most polarized narratives do not need to occupy the entire space to gain influence. They only need to **encounter less resistance, fewer alternative reference points, and fewer voices capable of sustaining a different interpretation.**

The issue, then, is not whether a brand posts during Pride. Nor is it whether every institution retains the same language, structure, or program it used three years ago. What matters is what happens **when the broader set of signals that helped normalize belonging begins to lose density.**



The reduction of inclusive signals does not create the vacuum. But it can strip **the conversation of some of its counterweights.**

This is where **Rainbow Ghosting** takes on a new dimension. In this chapter, we identify some of the corporate and institutional decisions that make the response less visible, more cautious, or harder to recognize.

The next step is to examine **what happens to the space left available.** While some voices review, reduce, or withdraw their response, others have never stopped typing...

CHAPTER 3

HATE IS TYPING...

The digital ecosystem abhors a vacuum. When brands, media outlets, and institutions step back and dilute their messages on diversity and inclusion, public debate does not pause or freeze. The **public square does not remain empty; it simply changes hands.** The conversation stays open, but the voices taking control have replaced responsible engagement with an active **agenda of hostility.**

Once the decline in public conversation is understood, it becomes essential **to examine what happens in the space left behind.** That vacuum does not remain static. It coincides with the global rise and growing sophistication of hostile narratives.

Polarization is driven by much deeper, more complex, and organized sociopolitical dynamics that would continue to advance regardless of corporate positions.


Yet when the **institutional ecosystem steps back, it removes narrative counterweights.** The **consequence is not that corporate silence creates hate. It is that it yields the terrain of normality,** allowing the most extreme voices to operate with less resistance, gain volume, and redefine common sense without challenge.

The data shows that **three out of every five social media messages about the LGBTIQ+ community now constitute a direct attack.**

Hate occupies the open space

Changes in the share of violent content targeting the LGBTIQ+ community

Decreases violent weight.
Increases violent weight.



The vacuum left by responsible voices is being occupied by hostility that is growing and becoming normalized.

HOW THE ARGUMENT MUTATES: FROM DIRECT ATTACK TO A CLAIM OF PROTECTION...


On X, the global conversation about the LGBTIQ+ community fell from 26.1 million messages in 2023 to 12.7 million in the most recent period analyzed. Yet a smaller conversation is not necessarily a less hostile one.

Hate speech increased in eight of the 10 countries analyzed, rising by an average of 38% compared with the four years preceding the cutoff point. The result is an ecosystem in which hostile voices carry greater relative weight. The conversation is shrinking. Hostility is not.

To understand both where hostile discourse originates and where it is heading, we must closely examine the arguments behind discursive violence. A closer look reveals essential findings about how this violence is mutating, now disguised as legitimate concern, humor, self-defense, moral values, political debate, or, more perversely, the protection of others.

The conversation shifts:

How the broad accusation of “gender ideology” loses ground to targeted attacks centered on politicization and the alleged threat to education and the family.



One of the most recurring frames in hostile conversation is the protection of children. Of the attacks analyzed, 19.1% link the LGBTIQ+ community to a negative impact on education. Within that territory, **seven out of 10 messages center their argument on children and young people.** The pattern extends to **family and tradition, which account for 12.6% of the accusations identified.** In addition, one in every 20 messages targeting the community includes some reference to the family.

The finding also reveals how the language of exclusion is changing: rejection is rarely presented as rejection. More often, it is framed through **codes of care, protection, or responsibility toward others.** Children cease to be an audience to protect and become the **territory from which the legitimacy of LGBTIQ+ identities is contested.** Hostility becomes more capable of circulating when it speaks not in the name of hate, but in the name of what it claims to defend.

This phenomenon is not occurring in a vacuum. It reflects a **profound global political and cultural realignment.** We are not facing a simple pendulum swing toward the traditional center-right, a political current that, across much of the Western democratic world, continues to uphold an established consensus on the civil rights of the LGBTIQ+ community.

One factor helping explain this shift is the **growing political centrality of narratives** that challenge diversity policies and place **certain traditional models back at the center of public debate.**

Across several European countries, the consolidation of conservative and far-right forces in governments and parliaments has increased their ability to **shape agendas, coalitions, and the positions of traditional parties.** The effect is not uniform, but it is visible: ideas that only a few years ago remained on the margins now enjoy **greater legitimacy and more room to circulate.**



In **Latin America**, these narratives take on a distinct form. **Religion remains part of the picture**, but an increasing share of the discourse is expressed through secular frames: individual freedom, opposition to alleged ideological impositions, protection of children, education, and defense of the family.

This evolution expands their ability to connect with audiences that do not necessarily identify with a religious argument. Diversity is no longer challenged only through **religious morality**. It is increasingly **presented as a political, cultural, or institutional controversy**.

Hostility gains traction not when it speaks in the name of hate, **but in the name of what it claims to defend.**


The specific articulation varies by country. In **Argentina**, the debate has been tied to reviews of **public spending**, institutional structures, and gender policies. In **Chile**, it has focused especially on education, family, and civil rights. In **Brazil**, the influence of parliamentary and **religious coalitions keeps these issues at the center of a deeply polarized conversation**.

This is not about attributing the shift to a single political force or treating all of these contexts as equivalent. The more relevant finding is **that anti-inclusion frameworks have become increasingly capable of presenting themselves as legitimate, cross-cutting, and socially defensible positions**. And when inclusive voices lose continuity, **these narratives gain more room to define the terms of the conversation**.

Rather than perfect synchronization, what we are seeing today is a **feedback loop between institutional political discourse and debate at the grassroots level**. Both ecosystems have adopted the same tactic of rhetorical sophistication: reframing.

Dogma as a structural pretext:

the systemic persistence of religious arguments against the community in Latin America.



HATE CHANGES SCALE: FROM DIGITAL PATHOLOGIZATION TO INSTITUTIONAL AMPLIFICATION...

Once hostility becomes normalized in public debate, the digital **ecosystem opens the door to narratives we thought had been left behind**. The LGBTQI+ community is no longer framed only as an adversary in a culture war. It is once again **stigmatized through archaic and dehumanizing lenses**: as a clinical abnormality, a contagious condition, or a social threat.

To understand the severity of this reversal, we need to look at the calendar. More than three decades have passed since **May 17, 1990**, when the World Health Organization **removed homosexuality from the International Classification of Diseases**, a scientific consensus completed in **2018 with the depathologization of transgender identities**.


What we are witnessing today on digital platforms and forums is not the opening of a new debate, but an aggressive form of historical revisionism. In the absence of institutional responses, **disinformation once again treats as pathology what science and medicine settled a generation ago**.

The data proves it: **one in every 16 attacks pathologizes the community, treating it as an illness or disorder**. Of these, **38% openly call for conversion therapy or psychiatric treatment**. In addition, 9% of attacks invoke associations with depravity or immorality, linking members of the community to pedophilia or child sexual abuse in more than half of those references.

The danger of these narratives has also escalated dramatically. This is no longer simply a problem of social media diffusion driven by radicalized accounts with few followers, where an anonymous user posting dozens of times a day can naturally distort conversation volumes. The critical turning point is seeing **world leaders legitimize this violence from the highest levels of institutional power**.

Exclusion no longer circulates only as direct attack. **It is learning to present itself as concern for children or a defense of tradition.**





This decline in inclusive public response is not merely symbolic or digital. **The discursive ecosystem has immediate physical consequences. Explicit incitement to violence accounts for 6% of attacks, and nearly half of these, 45%, refer directly to physical assault or death.** This incitement reaches directly into the real lives of the community.

In Spain, for example, **as many as 54% of LGBTIQ+ people report having experienced a hate incident**, whether physical or online. The trend shows this is not merely a matter of perception: between 2024 and 2026, the prevalence of harassment rose from 20% to 36%; discrimination, from 23% to 29%; and assaults, from 7% to 22% (FELGTBI+, 2026).⁸

These figures point to a deterioration that is especially visible in the most direct expressions of hate. In just two years, **harassment rose by 16 percentage points, while assaults tripled.**

Leaving Pride on read pushes progress into reverse. When inclusive narratives retreat, the conversation is dominated by those who have encoded intolerance. That normalized hostile discourse ultimately lays the groundwork for rollback, producing direct and tangible consequences for the LGBTQI+ community.

When inclusive narratives retreat, **the conversation is dominated by those who have coded intolerance into it.**

⁸ Federación Estatal de Lesbianas, Gais, Trans, Bisexuales, Intersexuales y más [FELGTBI+]. (2026). The State of Hate: LGBTBI+ State of Affairs 2026. Madrid: FELGTBI+. <https://felgtbi.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/04/Estado-del-Odio-2026-1.pdf>

CHAPTER 4

WHEN BELONGING BECOMES MORE FRAGILE.

A hostile conversation may seem intangible until we see where it ends: In a protection being removed, **an assault, a practice designed to correct an identity, or a life that must constantly calculate where it is safe to live openly.**

There is no automatic relationship between a hostile message, a political decision, and a physical assault. This analysis does not claim that digital discourse directly causes the loss of rights or violence. But those dimensions do not exist in separate universes either. They **coexist within the same social climate, one capable of widening or narrowing the conditions for belonging.**


Public signals of recognition matter because they form **part of the environment through which people interpret whether their identity** is protected, questioned, or exposed.

VIOLENCE HAS A CENTER OF GRAVITY...

According to the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA, 2025)⁹, Latin America accounts for **73% of documented murders of transgender people worldwide.**

The estimated average life expectancy of a transgender person in the **region** is 35 years.

Brazil and Mexico consistently rank among the countries with the highest number of cases. In Brazil, approximately **80% of documented murders involve extreme brutality**, including torture or mutilation. The vast majority of victims are transgender women, and **82% are Afro-descendant.**




Latin America, the epicenter of violence against transgender people
Global distribution of documented murders of transgender people and characteristics of victims in the region.

⁹ WOLA. (2025, June). The state of trans rights in the Americas: recognition, contradictions, violence, and rollbacks. Washington Office on Latin America. <https://www.wola.org/es/analysis/el-estado-de-los-derechos-de-las-personas-trans-en-las-americanas-reconocimiento-contradicciones-violencia-y-retrocesos/>

The data reveals a pattern of exposure shaped by multiple layers of inequality. **Gender identity intersects with racialization, economic insecurity, workplace exclusion, and a lack of institutional protection.** Violence most severely affects those who already occupy the margins of other social systems.

Belonging becomes especially fragile when living authentically also requires calculating risk. That fragility is reflected in the spaces people avoid, the identities they conceal, the opportunities they turn down, and the freedom they can exercise only under certain conditions.




WHEN EXCLUSION PRESENTS ITSELF AS CARE...

Conversion therapy is one of the most extreme expressions of an idea that still persists: that **certain identities must be changed before they can be accepted.**

These **practices are not valid medical treatment.** They include a range of practices, from clinical interventions and religious programs to family pressure or coercive conversations intended to change a person’s sexual orientation or gender identity.

In the United States, **27% of LGBTIQ+ people ages 13 to 17 live in states without laws protecting them from conversion therapy.** Another **14% live in states that prevent or make it harder to enact local protections.**



Nearly **700,000 adults** in the country have been subjected to these practices: **approximately 350,000 during adolescence and 348,000 afterward** (Williams Institute, 2025) ¹⁰. Exposure is associated with serious consequences. Among people who have undergone conversion therapy, attempted suicide is 88% more common, **suicide planning is 75% more common, and suicidal ideation is nearly twice as prevalent as among those who were not subjected to these practices.**


Among **transgender people, three out of five** who were exposed to conversion therapy have attempted suicide at some point in their lives, **compared with two out of five among those who did not undergo these practices.**

The **effects on mental health are immediate.** In fact, 90% of LGBTIQ+ young people in the United States say that recent laws, policies, and debates surrounding their rights have **directly caused them stress or anxiety** (The Trevor Project, 2025) ¹¹.

This climate of exclusion has an undeniable human cost. Over the past year, **36% of LGBTIQ+ young people seriously considered suicide, rising to 40% among transgender and nonbinary youth, and one in 10 attempted it.**

In many cases, institutional support was also out of reach, **44% were unable to access the mental health care they needed.** For transgender and nonbinary people, institutional barriers are even more concerning: those who wanted hormone therapy but could not access it were nearly twice as likely to attempt suicide as those who did receive it.

Exclusion gains legitimacy when it is framed as **concern, protection, or well-being.** The problem is not only the language itself, but what **that language allows people to do to other people's bodies and lives.**



Violence does not always present itself as punishment. **Sometimes, it appears as a promise of care, conditional on no longer being who you are.**

¹⁰ Williams Institute. (2025). Nearly 700,000 LGBT adults in the US have received conversion therapy, half of them as adolescents [Press release]. UCLA School of Law. <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/press/ct-media-alert/>

¹¹ The Trevor Project. (2025). Study shows LGBTIQ+ youth in the U.S. face high rates of suicidality and victimization, worsened by anti-LGBTIQ+ politics. <https://www.thetrevorproject.org/blog/study-shows-lgbtq-youth-in-the-u-s-face-high-rates-of-suicidality-and-victimization-worsened-by-anti-lgbtq-politics/>

BELONGING ALSO DEPENDS ON PLACE...

The data reveals a deeply unequal geography of belonging. Some markets have **strong legal frameworks**, institutional recognition, and greater social acceptance. In others, **sexual orientation or gender identity still shapes access to safety, protection, and freedom.**

A market may retain a comparatively favorable position while showing concrete signs of deterioration. Another may maintain high levels of social acceptance while reducing protections. And the same person may be protected on paper while remaining exposed to violence, exclusion, or coercive practices.

Rights, therefore, cannot be analyzed solely as a list of laws that have been enacted. They must also be assessed through **people's actual ability to live without hiding, access protection, build relationships, imagine a future, and occupy public space without their identity becoming a permanent source of risk.**


Formal equality alone does not guarantee genuine belonging.

THE CONVERSATION IS ABOUT REAL LIVES...

Public signals of belonging do not replace laws, nor can they prevent violence on their own. But they help shape the climate in which a society decides which rights it legitimizes, which practices it tolerates, and which lives it considers worthy of protection. When those signals weaken, a right does not automatically disappear. But, part of the cultural environment that helps sustain it is weakened.

That is the material risk of **Rainbow Ghosting**: that the withdrawal of responses will not remain confined to the conversation, but will coincide with a world in which belonging demands more explanation, more resistance, and more caution.

Because exclusion persists in laws that fail to protect, in violence that becomes normalized, in care that attempts to correct, and in lives that learn to take up less space in order to stay safe. And when a society narrows the range of lives it protects, it also narrows the range of lives it can imagine. That is where the machine begins to type...



CHAPTER 5

THE MACHINE IS TYPING TOO...

In our ['Illusion of Equality'](#) campaign, we examined the danger of taking hard-won rights for granted and how public conversation can operate under a false sense of security, a superficial consensus that conceals deep fractures. Today, we can say that **this mirage also threatens to become embedded and automated in the technology that will shape the world for decades to come:** artificial intelligence.

Understanding why AI's role is so critical at this moment requires looking beyond its use as a productivity tool. As recent analysis by the American Psychological Association shows (APA, 2026)¹² **conversational models have become a new gateway to knowledge and, for a growing share of users, a genuine refuge for intimacy and emotional connection.**

For younger generations, **AI serves as an initial safe space where they can ask questions, seek role models, or try to understand their own identity before feeling ready to do so offline.** As organizations such as Plan International have warned¹³ in their analysis of how young people interact with digital environments, these platforms actively shape self-perception and worldviews. If a teenager turns to AI to understand who they are, the answer they receive will be consequential.

And this is the danger of leaving the conversation on read: AI does not **invent the cultural frameworks from which it responds. It captures them online, learns them, and reproduces them.**

If the public and institutional ecosystem stops producing positive, diverse, and complex narratives about the LGBTIQ+ community, and that vacuum is filled by revisionism and hostility, AI will be trained on that input. The result is a response that reveals what kind of life the algorithm considers "probable" for the person asking the question. In that process, discrimination emerges as a profoundly unequal distribution of agency, safety, and ambition.

For cisnet identities, AI tends to return answers associated with the future, success, or planning. For **LGBTIQ+ people, it returns, with alarming frequency, responses associated with struggle, vulnerability, and survival.** A life interpreted primarily through fear.

¹² American Psychological Association [APA]. (2026, January). AI chatbots and digital companions are reshaping emotional connection. Monitor on Psychology.

<https://www.apa.org/monitor/2026/01-02/trends-digital-ai-relationships-emotional-connection>

¹³ Plan International. (2025). The way we are: The state of adolescence in Spain.

https://picspropublicsa.blob.core.windows.net/images/2026-05/informe_asisomosadolescencia_20250910.pdf




TEXT RESPONSES: A LIFE READ THROUGH FEAR...

A response can reveal what kind of life it considers probable for the person asking the question. To examine this, we posed **90 questions to ChatGPT 5.1** across nine areas of young people's lives. The same questions **were asked using five comparable profiles: four LGBTIQ+ identities (transgender, nonbinary, gay or lesbian, and bisexual) and one cishet identity**, each tested across genders.

The result does not reveal two levels of quality. It reveals two different imagined futures.

For AI, the future of LGBTIQ+ people is a distant, theoretical concept. **For cishet youth, it is something they should begin building today.**

Terms associated with "FUTURE, planning, and foresight" in responses to LGBTIQ+ profiles vs. cishet profiles.




PROGRAMMED TO SURVIVE VS. PROGRAMMED TO SUCCEED...

LGBTIQ+ young people now turn to language models in search of a safe environment. They expect a neutral, objective, and pragmatic guide. Yet the machine performs a subtle form of digital gaslighting. When users disclose a diverse sexual orientation or gender identity, the algorithm shifts the weight of its semantic variables.

The result can fuel an identity crisis among a generation that is itself diverse
The **user asks about ambition, career prospects, or independence, but the model repeatedly reflects trauma and exclusion back at them.**

AI tells LGBTIQ+ youth that their primary daily objective is not to lead a project or achieve success, **but to endure anxiety, manage rejection, and ask for respect.**

Thematic prevalence in responses to LGBTIQ+ profiles
(transgender, nonbinary, bisexual, and gay) vs cishet.



- **Saturation of rejection:** Responses directed at LGBTIQ+ profiles show a **72% stronger association** with the need to seek respect and dignity, and a 72% higher frequency of guidance on avoiding or accepting fear.
- **The exclusion loop:** Terms related to managing fear of rejection or exclusion are **42% more frequent** in responses to LGBTIQ+ profiles.
- **The push toward cishet autonomy:** At the other end of the spectrum, AI associates responses for heterosexual **users with autonomy and independence 140% more strongly.**
- **The push toward competitiveness:** Cishet profiles receive **10% more responses** framed around career expectations and **26% more solutions** focused on self-improvement and managing individual crises.

TAILORED RESPONSES...

For AI, the future of a diverse person is a volatile concept, a horizon subordinated to the urgency of fitting in.

	AI RESPONSE FOCUS	ASSIGNED LIFE TRAJECTORY
LGBTIQ+ COMMUNITY	Returns 72% more responses focused on the need to seek respect, overcome fear, and avoid rejection.	Condescension and vulnerability. AI confines them to the role of passive victims in need of social acceptance.
CISHET PROFILE	Links responses directly to autonomy, work, and financial success goals.	Ambition and future. AI assumes social validation and directs them toward leadership in work and sports.

THE HYPER-EMPATHY TRAP...

This distortion also changes the emotional tone of the responses. They display an excess of empathy toward non-normative identities, a condescending strategy.

- **Emotional saturation: Lesbian and transgender women** receive the model's highest level of sentimentality, with **empathetic language appearing in 74% of their responses**.
- **Asymmetry within diversity:** Transgender men, at 71%, and bisexual women, at 73%, receive advice in which emotion dominates the narrative, displacing technical, corporate, or physical-performance approaches.
- **Male executive detachment:** The model's empathetic focus falls to **51%** when responding to a **cishet man**. It addresses him through the logic of performance; it addresses the LGBTIQ+ community through compassion.
- Put differently, **seven out of 10 responses directed at LGBTIQ+ youth appeal to their emotions and feelings**, compared with only **one out of two when the user is a cishet man**.

If AI programs trajectories through text, it draws them in images. What appeared in written responses as a tonal bias, fear, condescending empathy, a deferred future, becomes visible and literal when a chatbot is asked to represent a member of the LGBTIQ+ community.

GENERATED IMAGES: AN IDENTITY READ THROUGH A LABEL...

The clearest reflection of the **algorithmic contamination shaped by silence** appears in the two major battlegrounds of hate speech analyzed earlier: **family and religion**.

Generative models have internalized the hostile narrative that presents the LGBTQIQ+ community as a “threat” to children and tradition. When asked to generate images, AI visually suggests that forming a family is a source of frustration for LGBTQIQ+ people.

In fact, **when families or children are included in prompts, AI places diverse profiles in settings where they appear uncomfortable or clearly in the minority two to four times more often than normative profiles.** The machine has internalized the bias: where digital hate demands separation, AI draws a barrier of discomfort.



Visual representation of the LGBTQIQ+ community in minority settings, image generated using Gemini artificial intelligence.

This pattern of “internalized conflict” is repeated in **relation to faith. AI systematically interprets LGBTQIQ+ people as feeling discomfort toward religion in one out of every two generations for cis het boys and one out of every three for transgender boys.** The system makes a translation error: after detecting the undeniable volume of attacks directed at the community through dogmatic rhetoric, AI simplifies this reality into an inherent “discomfort” attributed to the LGBTQIQ+ person.

This makes the LGBTQIQ+ community appear reluctant to enter these spaces while obscuring the material reality that religion itself is often used as a weapon against them.

The machine has internalized the bias: where digital hate demands separation, **AI draws a barrier of discomfort and conflict.**

THE IMPOSITION OF AESTHETIC LABELS AND THE ERASURE OF RACIAL PLURALITY...



For AI, belonging to the LGBTIQ+ community must be visually demonstrated at all times. **In response to neutral prompts, the system determines that in seven out of 10 cases, non-normative profiles should display ideological icons, emblems, or other symbols to reaffirm their identity.** In this way, AI forces the LGBTIQ+ community to make gender identity visibly apparent to others, denying the possibility of an unremarked existence and reducing diversity to an unavoidable visual label.

Beyond this imposed hypervisibility, algorithmic bias also erases intersectionality through racial homogenization. **Across all AI-generated profiles created without explicit contextual conditioning, 97% were Caucasian.** The racialization of the community creates a double exclusion in the generative environment: LGBTIQ+ representation is confined to a deeply Westernized stereotype, systematically excluding racial minorities from generative visual representation.

Digital silence does not only train exclusion. It also designs its aesthetic: **AI reduces diversity to a mandatory label and carries out relentless intersectional erasure.**

LGBTIQ+ diversity translated into visual code.


AI represents the community through young, predominantly White profiles with explicit identity markers.

SYNTHETIC MANIPULATION AND DEEPAKES AS NEW TOOLS OF DEFAMATION...

Algorithmic violence, however, goes beyond the generation of anonymous avatars and finds its most aggressive expression in deepfakes. In this space, AI tools are being used to turn LGBTIQ+ identity into a weapon of defamation. **A growing trend involves creating fake videos or images that impose sexual-orientation or gender stereotypes on public figures solely to ridicule or discredit them.**

Recent cases illustrate this dynamic: from manipulated videos of content creators such as Jake Paul, edited to simulate coming out by adding artificially feminized traits, to altered photographs of highly influential women such as **Brigitte Macron**, whose features are modified to make them appear masculine and fuel harassment campaigns based on transphobic conspiracy theories, a phenomenon *known as* "transvestigations." **Technology has become yet another tool for attacking sexual and gender diversity.**

Rainbow Ghosting shows that exclusion does not always take the form of explicit censorship or erasure. When polarization and hostility feed the machine, digital representation ceases to be a neutral reflection of society and becomes a **mechanism of automated marginalization.**



Comparison between an authentic photograph and a synthetic digital alteration or deepfake on, used in political disinformation environments.

CHAPTER 6



RESPONDING AGAIN.

Responding to Pride is not only about amplifying its visibility. It is about **creating the conditions for LGBTIQ+ people to continue being recognized after Pride ends**, when the public agenda shifts, and when the conversation is no longer at the center of attention.

The question, then, is not only **how much visibility exists, but what kind of belonging that visibility creates**. Keeping the conversation open requires action across five dimensions: **continuity, coherence, complexity, the future, and algorithmic responsibility**.

CONTINUITY...

Continuity does not mean extending a campaign across all 12 months or talking about diversity constantly. It means **maintaining recognizable signals after the moment of greatest exposure has passed**: through **policies, decisions, stories, role models, and everyday experiences**.

The distance between visibility and belonging is especially clear in the workplace.

Spain's General Union of Workers reports that **51% of LGBTIQ+ people avoid gestures, expressions, or behaviors that could reveal their sexual orientation at work, even when they live openly** in other areas of their lives. Forty-one percent avoid discussing their private lives with coworkers, and 20% say that keeping those lives separate causes anxiety or stress ¹⁴.

In the United States, 46% of LGBTIQ+ employees have not disclosed their identity to their direct supervisor, 21% have not disclosed it to any coworker, and 58% engage in behaviors intended to conceal or minimize aspects of their identity to avoid discrimination or harassment (WilliamsInstitute, 2024) ¹⁵. The studies are not directly comparable, but they describe the same mechanism: **belonging is still negotiated according to perceived risk**.

Continuity is therefore not measured by how **long a campaign remains** active. It is measured by whether a person can talk about their partner, request leave, share their life, or pursue a promotion without first calculating what it might cost to show up as who they are.

¹⁴ Unión General de Trabajadores. (2023). Study on the situation of LGTBI individuals in employment. https://www.ugt.es/sites/default/files/Resumen%202023%20ejecutivo%20estudio%20situaci%C3%B3n%20personas%20LGTBI%20en%20el%20empleo_compressed.pdf

¹⁵ Williams Institute. (2024). LGBT workplace discrimination. UCLA School of Law. <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/lgbt-workplace-discrimination/>

COHERENCE...

People do not interpret an organization's signals in isolation. They observe what it communicates, but also what **it maintains, prioritizes, changes, or decides when the context becomes more difficult.**

Coherence does not require immobility. Policies and narratives can evolve for strategic, regulatory, or cultural reasons. But that evolution should not strip the commitment of the meaning it is intended to sustain.

A campaign can generate attention. A policy can provide protection. An internal experience can build trust. When these **dimensions reinforce one another, belonging becomes recognizable. When they contradict one another, the distance between statement and reality grows.**

Keeping the conversation open therefore means ensuring that commitment can be recognized across different touchpoints:

- In the employee experience;
- In policies and protocols;
- In leadership decisions;
- In products and services;
- In relationships with clients and communities;
- In how an organization responds when inclusion is no longer a comfortable position.

Trust does not depend on a single signal. It depends on **the relationship among everything an organization says, does, and chooses to sustain.**

COMPLEXITY...

The generative analysis showed that responses directed at LGBTIQ+ profiles focus more frequently on acceptance, protection, and fear of rejection, while cisnet profiles are more often associated with autonomy, work, self-improvement, and the future.

Stories about discrimination, violence, and threats to rights remain necessary. The problem arises when they **become the only available frame and ultimately define the LGBTIQ+ community solely through what puts it at risk.**

Representing complexity means expanding the repertoire. It means including work, desire, science, sports, business, creativity, leadership, contradiction, and everyday life. It does not mean replacing difficult stories with artificially positive ones, but allowing LGBTIQ+ people to appear with the same narrative breadth as anyone else.

Recognizing an identity is not enough **if we only know how to represent it through conflict.**

THE FUTURE...

Visibility is insufficient if a community can appear in the present but cannot project itself into the future. The deepest finding of the generative analysis lies not only in the tone of the responses, but in the **distribution of possibilities**.

For cishet profiles, acceptance is usually treated as settled, and the conversation moves toward goals, work, independence, and personal development. For LGBTIQ+ profiles, **belonging appears more often as a prerequisite: before they can plan ahead, they must feel safe, overcome rejection, or find validation**. AI does not explicitly deny them a future. It makes that future conditional.

Full belonging begins when a person **does not have to prove that they deserve to be present before they can imagine who they want to become.**

Brands, media outlets, institutions, platforms, and public figures have the ability to expand that horizon. Not because they should speak on behalf of the community, but because they **produce stories, symbols, and reference points that help define which lives are visible and which futures appear attainable**.

ALGORITHMIC RESPONSIBILITY...

Artificial intelligence introduces a new scale to the construction of collective imagination.

Generative systems already answer questions, create images, suggest possibilities, and help people interpret aspects of identity and the future. **Auditing their behavior** therefore involves more than searching for explicit errors or discriminatory language.

It also requires examining:

- Which profiles receive agency;
- Which receive primarily protection;
- Which emotions are overrepresented;
- Which futures are considered likely;
- Which symbols are used to make an identity recognizable;
- And which stereotypes are repeated until they become the norm.

FIVE PRINCIPLES FOR KEEPING THE CONVERSATION OPEN...

PROTECTION	Do not limit signals of inclusion to the Pride calendar. Maintain recognizable reference points over time.
ACCEPTANCE	Align communication, policies, decisions, and the internal experience so the commitment is legible and credible.
FEAR	Avoid representations reduced to vulnerability, conflict, or identity symbols.
CONFLICT	Incorporate autonomy, ambition, desire, work, leadership, and the capacity for transformation.
IDENTITY AS A LABEL	Audit the narratives, images, emotions, and horizons produced by the models being used.

These principles are not a universal formula. Every organization, market, and community operates under different circumstances. They do, however, offer a shared question:

Do the signals we produce expand the possibility of belonging, or narrow the range of lives we consider possible?

Responding to Pride today is not only about amplifying its visibility.

It means helping ensure that the representation of LGBTIQ+ people remains open, complex, and oriented toward the future. Keeping the conversation open does not mean speaking without pause.

It means making sure that, when **someone enters the conversation, they find room to be recognized, to act, and to build what comes next.**

APPENDIX

1. LLYC. (2022). Companies and LGBTQ+ diversity in digital conversation. <https://llyc.global/en/ideas/companies-and-lgbtq-diversity-in-online-conversation/>
2. Nielsen. (2022, June). A new chapter in inclusivity: How LGBTQ+ audiences are reviving traditional media. <https://www.nielsen.com/insights/2022/a-new-chapter-in-inclusivity-how-lgbtq-audiences-are-reviving-traditional-media/>
3. GLAAD. (2026). Social Media Safety Index (SMSI)[cite: 2]. <https://glaad.org/smsi/2026/key-findings-and-recommendations/>
4. Ongig Blog. (2026, April 29). DEI Rollbacks: What Companies Are Doing in 2026. <https://blog.ongig.com/diversity-and-inclusion/dei-rollbacks/>
5. Glatky, G., and Taj, M. (2024, May 26). Peru classifies trans people as mentally ill. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/es/2024/05/26/espanol/peru-transgenero-salud-mental-trans.html>
6. ILGA-Europe. (2025). Rainbow Europe Map and Index 2025: Human rights situation of LGBTI people in Europe. ILGA-Europe. <https://www.ilga-europe.org/rainbow-europe/>
7. Comunidad de Madrid. (2023). Law 17/2023, of December 27, on the Simplification and Improvement of the Efficiency of Institutions and Agencies of the Community of Madrid. Boletín Oficial de la Comunidad de Madrid (BOCM), (308). https://www.boe.es/diario_boe/txt.php?id=BOE-A-2024-10767
8. Federación Estatal de Lesbianas, Gais, Trans, Bisexuales, Intersexuales y más [FELGTBI+]. (2026). The State of Hate: LGTBI+ State of Affairs 2026. Madrid: FELGTBI+. <https://felgtbi.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/04/Estado-del-Odio-2026-1.pdf>
9. WOLA. (2025, June). The state of trans rights in the Americas: recognition, contradictions, violence, and rollbacks. Washington Office on Latin America. <https://www.wola.org/es/analysis/el-estado-de-los-derechos-de-las-personas-trans-en-las-americas-reconocimiento-contradicciones-violencia-y-retrocesos/>
10. Williams Institute. (2025). Nearly 700,000 LGBT adults in the US have received conversion therapy, half of them as adolescents [Press release]. UCLA School of Law. <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/press/ct-media-alert/>
11. The Trevor Project. (2025). Study shows LGBTQ+ youth in the U.S. face high rates of suicidality and victimization, worsened by anti-LGBTQ+ politics. <https://www.thetrevorproject.org/blog/study-shows-lgbtq-youth-in-the-u-s-face-high-rates-of-suicidality-and-victimization-worsened-by-anti-lgbtq-politics/>
12. American Psychological Association [APA]. (2026, January). AI chatbots and digital companions are reshaping emotional connection. Monitor on Psychology. <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2026/01-02/trends-digital-ai-relationships-emotional-connection>
13. Plan International. (2025). The way we are: The state of adolescence in Spain. https://picmspublicsa.blob.core.windows.net/images/2026-05/informe_asisomosadolescencia_20250910.pdf
14. Unión General de Trabajadores. (2023). Study on the situation of LGTBI individuals in employment. https://www.ugt.es/sites/default/files/Resumen%202023%20ejecutivo%20estudio%20situaci%C3%B3n%20personas%20LGTBI%20en%20el%20empleo_compressed.pdf
15. Williams Institute. (2024). LGBT workplace discrimination. UCLA School of Law. <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/lgbt-workplace-discrimination/>

***Translation note:** The English and Portuguese versions of this report were produced with the support of artificial intelligence tools and reviewed for consistency. In the event of any interpretive discrepancy, the Spanish-language version shall prevail.

AUTHORS




in

ALBERT MEDRÁN.

Global Brand & ESG Head

amedran@llyc.global



in

MAXIMILIANO SOTELO.

Global Brand & ESG Manager

msotelo@llyc.global




in

RAMÓN GONZÁLEZ FÉRRIZ.

Editorial Advisor

gonzalezferriz@gmail.com



in

CAMILA RESTREPO.

Senior Consultant

camila.restrepo@llyc.global



in

ALEJANDRO MURILLO.

Consultant

alejandro.murillo@llyc.global



in

BELÉN RODRÍGUEZ.

Consultant

belen.rodriguez@llyc.global



in


ALEJANDRO BURGUEÑO.

Global Innovation Senior Consultant

aburgueno@llyc.global

LLYC

OFFICES



22
OWN OFFICES

13
COUNTRIES



— Own offices

• FGS Global

LLYC

Madrid

Lagasca, 88 - planta 3
28001 Madrid, Spain
Tel. +34 91 563 77 22

C/ Almagro 25
28010, Madrid, Spain
Tel. +34 913 506 508

Barcelona

Muntaner, 240-242, 1^º-1^ª
08021 Barcelona, Spain
Tel. +34 93 217 22 17

Lisbon

Avenida da Liberdade nº225, 5^º Esq.
1250-142 Lisbon, Portugal
Tel. +351 21 923 97 00

Brussels

Rue Belliard 40, 1040 Brussels,
Belgium
(+32) 488619354

Miami

600 Brickell Avenue, Suite 2125
Miami, FL 33131
United States
Tel. +1 786 590 1000

New York

Tel. +1 786 590 1000

Grand Rapids

47 Commerce Ave SW,
Grand Rapids, MI 49503,
United States
Tel. +1 616 233 0500

Detroit

1420 Broadway, First Floor,
Detroit, Michigan 48226,
United States
Tel. +1 313 309 9500

Phoenix

7201 N Dreamy Draw Dr,
Phoenix, Arizona 85020,
United States
Tel. +1 480 764 1880

MEXICO CITY

Av. Paseo de la Reforma 412
Piso 14. Colonia Juárez
Alcaldía Cuauhtémoc
CP 06600, Mexico City
Tel. +52 55 5257 1084

Av. Santa Fe 505, Piso 15,
Lomas de Santa Fe,
CDMX 01219, Mexico
Tel. +52 55 4000 8100

Panama

Sortis Business Tower
Piso 9, Calle 57
Obarrio - Panama
Tel. +507 206 5200

Santo Domingo

Corporativo 2010, Suite 1101,
de la Avenida Gustavo Mejía Ricart
#102, en Piantini, Santo Domingo.
Tel. +1 809 6161975

Bogotá

Av. Calle 82 # 9-65 Piso 4
Bogotá D.C. - Colombia
Tel. +57 1 7438000
Carrera 9 # 79A -19, piso 3,
Bogotá, Colombia
Tel: (+57) 60 1 651 52 00

Lima

Av. Andrés Reyes 420, piso 7
San Isidro, Peru
Tel. +51 1 2229491

Quito

Avda. 12 de Octubre N24-528 y
Cordero - Edificio World Trade
Center - Torre B - piso 11 Ecuador
Tel. +593 2 2565820

Sao Paulo

Rua Oscar Freire, 379, Cj 111
Cerqueira César SP - 01426-001
Brazil
Tel. +55 11 3060 3390

Buenos Aires

Av. Corrientes 222, piso 8
C1043AAP, Argentina
Tel. +54 11 5556 0700
El Salvador 5635, Buenos Aires
CP. 1414 BQE, Argentina

Santiago de Chile

Avda. Pdte. Kennedy 4.700,
Piso 5, Vitacura
Santiago
Tel. +56 22 207 32 00
Tel. +562 2 245 0924

Base 1 La Marina de, C. de la
Travesía, s/n, Poblados Marítimos,
46024 Valencia
Telf: +34 960 62 73 97



Rua Oscar Freire, 379, Cj 111
Cerqueira César SP - 01426-001
Brazil
Tel. +55 11 3060 3390



89,5 M€
Operating revenues
2025.

TOP 10
global M&A advisors
Mergermarket Ranking.

**BEST COMMUNICATION
CONSULTANCY**
in Europe 2025 at the
PRWeek Global Awards.

**TOP 32 PROVOKE /
TOP 30 PRWEEK**
among the leading
communication firms
globally.

**78 AWARDS AND
RECOGNITIONS**
globally in 2025.

LLYC is your partner in communication, creativity, and influence.
We want to transform every day into an opportunity to nurture your brand. We believe that boldness is the way to achieve it.

■ PARTNERS FOR WHAT'S NEXT

