

EQUITY

FORWARD

The Heritage Foundation and Family Research Council: *Mirror Images of Hate*

[The Heritage Foundation](#) is fond of branding itself as a think tank of establishment conservatives. In reality, Heritage regularly spouts hateful ideas that are detrimental to LGBTQ individuals, women, people of color and low-income workers. Heritage’s policy positions are not dissimilar from those of peer organizations such as the Family Research Council (FRC) that have earned [designation from the Southern Poverty Law Center as hate groups](#).

More information on Heritage’s hateful policies and its influence on the Trump administration can be found in our report, [“The Heritage Foundation’s Health Department: How an Increasingly Radical Right Wing Think Tank Is Controlling HHS – to the Detriment of Reproductive Health and Other Human Rights.”](#)

Policy Position Comparison Between The Heritage Foundation and the Family Research Council

	The Heritage Foundation	Family Research Council
Anti-Abortion	<p>Heritage Is Opposed to a Women's Right to Obtain an Abortion and Works to Undermine Women’s Access to Reproductive Healthcare</p> <p>"Since Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton effectively legalized abortion on demand, more than 58 million children have been denied the right to life. For over forty years the pro-life community has worked to counter the devastating impact abortion has had on mothers, fathers, and their unborn babies, witnessing to the fundamental truth that from the moment of conception, a distinct human being with inherent worth and dignity has the right to life. With pro-life majorities in the House and Senate, and a President who has committed to defend innocent life, Congress has the opportunity of a generation. Passing key pro-life legislation should be among the highest priorities in the 115th Congress."</p>	<p>FRC Believes Roe v. Wade Was Wrongly Decided and Actively Works to Have the Decision Reversed</p> <p>"Few things touch on the sanctity of human life more than the practice of abortion. A pregnancy should not simply be 'terminated,' as if it were something impersonal and problematic and it cannot be without physical and emotional consequences. A child in the womb is a distinct, developing, wholly human being, and each time a mother decides or a father pressures to end such a life it is a profound tragedy. Abortion harms the mother as well, and deprives society of the gifts of the unborn... The Roe v. Wade decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, declaring abortion to be a constitutional 'right,' was without foundation in the text of the Constitution and thus was wrongly decided, and we look forward to the day when this grave error will be corrected."</p>

EQUITY

FORWARD

The Heritage Foundation and Family Research Council: *Mirror Images of Hate*

Policy Position Comparison Between The Heritage Foundation and the Family Research Council Continued

	The Heritage Foundation	Family Research Council
Opposes ACA's Birth Control Coverage	<p>Heritage Prioritizes Anti-Abortion Ideology and So-Called "Conscience Rights" Over Access to Health Care</p> <p>"The Department of Health and Human Services under President Obama decided to require insurance plans to cover abortion-inducing drugs, contraceptives, and sterilization. Commonly referred to as the 'HHS mandate' or 'contraception mandate,' that requirement conflicts with the beliefs of many employers, individuals, and religious organizations regarding the protection of unborn human life. They regard it as an intolerable burden. The Supreme Court has provided relief to closely held businesses and to certain religious institutions. But as long as the mandate is in place, many individuals and organizations still face a disturbing choice: Either violate their sincerely held religious or moral beliefs or pay steep fines and, perhaps, forgo offering or obtaining health insurance altogether. When President Trump took office, these people and those who sympathize with them hoped that he would make religious liberty great again... It's past time for the president to make good on his promise."</p>	<p>FRC Prioritizes Anti-Abortion Ideology and So-Called "Conscience Rights" Over Access to Health Care</p> <p>"FRC supports the right of health care professionals and organizations who have conscientious objections to reject participation in or cooperation with the delivery and marketing of abortion or abortifacients, sterilization, contraception, embryo-destroying research or treatments, or euthanasia. Neither the state nor professional licensing bodies can be permitted to impose treatment or referral mandates which violate this right of conscience."</p>

EQUITY

FORWARD

The Heritage Foundation and Family Research Council: *Mirror Images of Hate*

Policy Position Comparison Between The Heritage Foundation and the Family Research Council Continued

	The Heritage Foundation	Family Research Council
Supports Abstinence-Only Education	<p>Heritage Falsely Claims the Abstinence Education Programs Are Effective</p> <p>"Teenage sexual activity is a major problem confronting the nation and has led to a rising incidence of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), emotional and psychological injuries, and out-of-wedlock childbearing. Abstinence education programs for youth have been proven to be effective in reducing early sexual activity. Abstinence programs also can provide the foundation for personal responsibility and enduring marital commitment."</p>	<p>FRC Endorses Abstinence Education Programs, Equates Consent-Based Sex Ed to Pornography</p> <p>"Despite a few naysayers, President Trump's return to an emphasis on sexual risk avoidance education should be, and in many cases is, a welcome relief to students and parents... The answer to keeping the health of our nation's youth at the forefront of our nation's priorities is not increasingly graphic and pornographic sex ed classes."</p>

EQUITY

FORWARD

The Heritage Foundation and Family Research Council: *Mirror Images of Hate*

Policy Position Comparison Between The Heritage Foundation and the Family Research Council Continued

	The Heritage Foundation	Family Research Council
Supports LGBTQ+ Discrimination	<p>Heritage Denies Reality Of LGBTQ+ Discrimination, Claims That Protections for LGBTQ+ Rights Are Forcing Others to “Embrace and Live Out” Homosexuality</p> <p>"In the United States of America, people who identify as LGBT are free to live as they want. But SOGI laws, including FFA, are not about freedom—they are about coercion. SOGI laws are about forcing all Americans to embrace—and live out—certain beliefs about human sexuality. They are not about protecting the freedom of people to live as LGBT, but about coercing everyone else to support, facilitate, and endorse such actions. This is one fundamental problem in equating coercive antidiscrimination laws with permissive religious freedom laws. And imposing a bad coercive policy on everyone while exempting select faith-based institutions is anything but fairness for all."</p>	<p>FRC Denies Reality Of LGBTQ+ Discrimination, Says Gay Rights Are Invasive, Harmful and Not As Important as “Religious Liberty”</p> <p>"With increasing fervor, LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) activists are urging local, state, and federal governments to expand the protected categories under existing laws to bar 'discrimination'—in areas such as employment, housing, and public accommodations—on the basis of 'sexual orientation' and 'gender identity' the special protections found in SOGI laws: 1) are not justified in principle; 2) are invasive and cause tangible harms; and 3) are coercive and cannot be reconciled with religious liberty."</p>

SOURCES: Family Research Council, “Conscience Protection,” accessed 21 February 2019, <https://www.frc.org/conscience-protection>; Slattery, Elizabeth and Melanie Israel (30 September 2017). “Americans Still Wait for Trump to Protect Health-Care Conscience Rights,” The Heritage Foundation, accessed 21 February 2019, <https://www.heritage.org/health-care-reform/commentary/americans-still-wait-trump-protect-health-care-conscience-rights>; Family Research Council, “Abortion,” accessed 21 February 2019, <https://www.frc.org/abortion>; Israel, Melanie (23 February 2017). “Defending Life: Opportunities for the 115th Congress,” accessed 21 February 2019, <https://www.heritage.org/life/report/defending-life-opportunities-the-115th-congress>; Sprigg, Peter (December 2018). “Why ‘Sexual Orientation’ and ‘Gender Identity’ Should Never Be Specially Protected Categories Under the Law,” Family Research Council, accessed 21 February 2019, <https://downloads.frc.org/EF/EF18L25.pdf>; Anderson; Rector, Robertson (8 April 2002). “The Effectiveness of Abstinence Education Programs in Reducing Sexual Activity Among Youth,” accessed 21 February 2019, <https://www.heritage.org/education/report/the-effectiveness-abstinence-education-programs-reducing-sexual-activity-among>.