Doi: 10.32481/djph.2025.07.15

Legislation as Trauma:

The Mental Health Toll of Anti-LGBTQ Policy on Clients in HIV Care

Elise Mora, LCSW

AIDS Delaware

Abstract

The recent surge in anti-LGBTQ+ legislation across the United States has far-reaching consequences that extend beyond civil rights, posing a significant but underrecognized threat to public mental health—particularly for LGBTQ+ individuals living with or at risk for HIV. This article explores how such legislation operates as a form of structural trauma, exacerbating minority stress, anticipatory grief, and psychological distress among clients in HIV care. Drawing on clinical experience, trauma-informed practice, and existing literature, it demonstrates how discriminatory policies compromise mental health, disrupt care engagement, and deepen medical mistrust. Through composite case vignettes and evidence-based analysis, the article highlights the role of the mental health clinician as both a therapeutic and systemic advocate. It concludes with urgent recommendations for culturally competent care, trauma-informed public health systems, and policy advocacy to resist harm and promote resilience among LGBTQ+ populations. Ultimately, the piece calls for a unified public health response that affirms identity, fosters healing, and safeguards the dignity and well-being of marginalized communities.

Introduction

Across the United States, a surge of anti-LGBTQ+ legislation has redefined the landscape of rights, visibility, and safety for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer individuals. From laws targeting access to gender-affirming healthcare and participation in sports to restrictions on inclusive curricula in schools, these policies have rapidly evolved from political talking points to lived realities. Although much attention has been paid to the legal and civil rights implications of these developments, the impact on mental health has received comparatively less attention in public health discourse. For individuals whose identities are shaped by multiple intersecting forms of marginalization, the resulting impact has been especially profound, often manifesting as significant psychological and emotional trauma.

For LGBTQ+ individuals living with or at risk for HIV, the stakes are very high. The interconnection of stigma, healthcare discrimination, and fear of legal repercussions can create a toxic psychosocial environment that directly undermines engagement in care, medication adherence, and overall wellness. In my role as a Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) at an HIV service organization, I witness the psychological toll this legislative hostility inflicts on my clients. These are not abstract policy debates; they are flashpoints for real-world trauma, anxiety, and despair.

Even when such laws are not passed, their mere proposal or discussion in the public sphere can incite fear, retraumatize clients who have histories of marginalization, and reinforce a sense of otherness and vulnerability. Many of my clients have referenced feeling dehumanized as they have engaged in and bore witness to political discourse, largely after they listen to transphobic and homophobic justification for anti-LGBTQ+ policies, spewed by people that are not a part of the LGBTQ+ community. This phenomenon functions as a chronic trigger for many LGBTQ+ individuals, activating hypervigilance, depression, and isolation. These mental health effects are not only detrimental in their own right but also complicate efforts in HIV prevention and care. As a nation, making progress in those areas requires trust, community engagement, and psychological resilience.

This article explores the complex ways anti-LGBTQ+ legislation serves as a form of structural trauma, shaping the mental health outcomes of clients engaged in HIV services. Drawing from clinical experience, relevant literature, and trauma-informed practice, I aim to outline the urgent need for culturally competent, affirming mental health care, and to situate the mental health clinician as a critical ally in both individual healing and systemic advocacy.

The Psychological Impact of Anti-LGBTQ+ Legislation

The psychological consequences of anti-LGBTQ+ legislation are profound and far-reaching, often functioning as *structural violence* that perpetuates trauma and distress.[1] Structural violence is a "form of violence wherein social structures or social institutions harm people by preventing them from meeting their basic needs." There is an insidious lethality; structural violence leads to unnecessary harm and even death through disparities, and it often goes unrecognized as it is woven into the fabric of systems and institutions. When laws or policies invalidate identity, restrict access to care, or encourage social exclusion, they send a powerful message to LGBTQ+ individuals: you are not safe here. For those already managing minority stress (the chronic psychological strain caused by stigma, discrimination, and marginalization) these messages compound an already heavy burden.

Minority Stress and Legislative Harm

Minority Stress Theory, originally conceptualized by Dr. Ilan Meyer, posits that LGBTQ+ individuals experience chronic stress as a result of their marginalized status in society.[2] This stress is not simply the result of isolated incidents of prejudice. It is cumulative, occurring across a person's lifespan and at multiple levels: interpersonal, institutional, and structural. Anti-LGBTQ+ laws exemplify this structural level of oppression, reinforcing the idea that LGBTQ+ identities are less valid or even nefarious.

These policies trigger and reinforce internalized stigma, displayed by feelings of shame, guilt, or self-hatred that individuals may carry as a result of societal rejection. For clients, this can manifest as persistent self-doubt, low self-esteem, or even suicidal ideation. In my clinical work, I have seen clients experience significant spikes in anxiety and depressive symptoms in response to news of legislation targeting gender-affirming healthcare or banning LGBTQ+-inclusive books in schools. Even clients who are not directly affected by a particular law still feel its reverberations, particularly when the legislation is accompanied by hostile public discourse.

Anticipatory Grief and Hypervigilance

Another psychological phenomenon I frequently observe is *anticipatory grief*. This is defined as the mourning of future losses that have not yet occurred.[3] Many LGBTQ+ clients fear that rights they've fought for (such as marriage equality or gender recognition) will be stripped away. They grieve the potential future where their children may be unsafe at school, or where they may be denied medical care. This form of grief, while often invisible, takes a measurable toll on mental health and day-to-day functioning.

Clients also describe a heightened sense of vigilance in public spaces, healthcare settings, and workplaces. Hypervigilance, which is a common response to trauma, results from a learned need to scan environments for signs of danger or rejection. It interferes with the ability to relax, to feel joy, and to focus on long-term goals. Over time, this psychological state can lead to burnout, substance use, and social withdrawal.

Youth and the Mental Health Crisis

Among LGBTQ+ youth, the mental health consequences of anti-LGBTQ+ legislation are even more acute. The Trevor Project's 2023 National Survey on LGBTQ Youth Mental Health found that 86% of transgender and nonbinary youth reported that recent debates about anti-trans bills negatively impacted their mental health.[4] The constant political scrutiny and dehumanization contribute to rising rates of anxiety, depression, and suicidal ideation in an already vulnerable population.

For young people navigating identity formation, these policies don't just limit access to affirming care or education; they fundamentally disrupt the process of self-acceptance. They create environments where it is unsafe to be authentic, to seek help, or to trust adults and institutions. These mental health harms are not incidental. They are predictable outcomes of policy decisions made without regard for public health, and seemingly with the direct and willful intention of causing harm to LGBTQ+ people and communities.

Impacts on Clients in HIV Care

For LGBTQ+ individuals engaged in HIV prevention, treatment, and supportive services, the effects of homophobic and transphobic legislation are not just psychological – they are clinically, medically, and societally significant. Stigma and stress linked to identity-related discrimination create direct barriers to engagement in HIV care and prevention. These barriers compound existing social determinants of health such as poverty, racism, unstable housing, and limited access to transportation, making it more difficult for individuals to stay connected to lifesaving services.

Stigma and Disengagement from Care

Clients often come to HIV care already carrying complex trauma histories. They report experiences of family rejection, bullying, homelessness, and intimate partner violence with tragic frequency. When these lived experiences are then validated by state-sanctioned discrimination in the form of legislation, they reinforce deeply internalized beliefs about unworthiness and danger. This undermines the therapeutic alliance that providers work so hard to establish.

In my work, I have witnessed clients abruptly disengage from therapy or medical appointments following high-profile legislative developments. For example, one client, a Black gay man living with HIV, stopped coming to sessions after his home state passed a law banning LGBTQ+ education in schools. Though the law did not affect him directly, he described feeling "erased" and "hunted," expressing a belief that "they don't want people like me to exist." This sense of erasure can quickly lead to hopelessness, which then impairs motivation to remain adherent to antiretroviral therapy (ART) or attend follow-up visits.

Even clients who remain in care may do so warily, carrying skepticism that their providers are truly safe allies. For transgender and nonbinary clients, this is especially acute. When anti-trans legislation dominates the media, it becomes harder to trust that healthcare spaces will honor pronouns, provide appropriate medical interventions, or even treat them with respect. This apprehension isn't paranoia; it's a rational response to systemic harm.

Medical Mistrust and Cultural Disconnection

Medical mistrust among LGBTQ+ populations, particularly among LGBTQ+ people of color, is well-documented. It is rooted in a history of pathologization, exclusion, and neglect by healthcare systems, including the early years of the HIV epidemic. Anti-LGBTQ+ laws reinforce this mistrust by signaling that discrimination is not only tolerated but codified. This makes the task of re-establishing trust in healthcare settings an uphill battle.

Clients often question whether their providers will be required to follow laws that discriminate, or whether services they depend on will be cut, such as housing referrals, hormone therapy, or LGBTQ-specific support groups. Even the suggestion that these supports might be compromised can cause clients to preemptively withdraw. For those engaged in prevention programs such as PrEP navigation or syringe exchange services, this can lead to increased risk of HIV acquisition.

Intersectionality and Compounded Risk

The impact of anti-LGBTQ+ laws is not felt equally. Individuals who hold multiple marginalized identities are especially vulnerable to falling through the cracks of HIV care systems. For example, being Black or Latinx, low-income, disabled, undocumented, or a survivor of the criminal legal system means experiencing much more stress and adversity accessing medical care and supportive services. Anti-LGBTQ+ legislation rarely exists in a vacuum; it often coexists with efforts to restrict reproductive rights, criminalize homelessness, or defund public health services.

Transgender women of color, who already experience some of the highest rates of HIV incidence and violence, face disproportionate harm when gender-affirming healthcare is restricted. Their mental health suffers not only due to the trauma of systemic erasure but because their very survival strategies, such as accessing hormones or engaging in sex work, are further criminalized.

As a mental health clinician, I see how these compounded layers of oppression create a sense of fatalism. When a client believes their future is unsafe, uncertain, or unsanctioned by society, their ability to engage in consistent, preventive health behavior naturally declines. What is needed is a structural response that affirms identity, validates experience, and actively resists harm.

The Role of the Mental Health Clinician

In the face of growing legislative hostility, mental health clinicians occupy a critical position in the continuum of HIV care. We are often among the first to witness the emotional fallout of anti-LGBTQ+ policies and it is a core function of the work we do to help clients process and survive it. The clinician's role extends beyond symptom management. We are also advocates, cultural brokers, and stabilizing forces in systems that are chaotic and exclusionary.

Providing Affirming, Trauma-Informed Care

At a minimum, affirming care means recognizing LGBTQ+ identities not as clinical problems but as valid and integral parts of the human experience. In practice, this includes using correct names and pronouns, understanding the diverse experiences within LGBTQ+ communities, and acknowledging how systemic oppression contributes to distress. It involves believing our clients when they describe the very real harm they have experienced as a result of vilification of their respective identities.

For clients living with or at risk for HIV, affirming care also requires understanding how HIV stigma intersects with other stigmas related to gender, sexuality, race, and class. Trauma-informed care in this context means not only treating trauma symptoms, but preventing retraumatization by creating a therapeutic space rooted in choice, safety, trustworthiness, collaboration, and empowerment.[5] It means anticipating that many LGBTQ+ clients have been harmed by institutions and may enter care guarded, skeptical, or ashamed.

As clinicians, we help clients reframe this distress not as a personal deficit but as a logical reaction to systemic injustice. This can be a powerful intervention in and of itself. For example, validating that a client’s anxiety in medical settings is a reasonable response to transphobic laws and past discrimination helps shift the focus from “what’s wrong with you?” to “what’s happened to you?” which is a cornerstone of trauma-informed practice.

Clinical Interventions That Support Resilience

Mental health clinicians can deploy a range of interventions to support LGBTQ+ clients navigating the stress of hostile policy environments:

- Psychoeducation: Helping clients understand the connection between systemic oppression and mental health symptoms reduces self-blame and increases empowerment.
- Narrative therapy: Encouraging clients to author their own stories in resistance to dominant, oppressive narratives fosters identity pride and psychological integration.
- Cognitive-behavioral strategies: Teaching grounding techniques, cognitive reframing, and emotion regulation skills can mitigate the impact of chronic stress and help clients maintain engagement in care.
- Harm reduction approaches: Acknowledging the realities of clients’ coping strategies (including substance use or sex work) without judgment allows for more honest therapeutic relationships and supports realistic goal setting.

Importantly, clinicians should also recognize when systemic issues, and not individual pathology, are at the root of a client’s distress. We are not solely responsible for changing unjust laws, but we are responsible for reducing the harm those laws inflict.

Advocacy and Systemic Engagement

Mental health clinicians cannot afford to remain neutral in the face of anti-LGBTQ+ legislation. Silence can be interpreted by clients as complicity. Advocacy within and beyond the clinical setting is part of our ethical responsibility to uphold client dignity and reduce harm.

Clinicians can:

- Advocate within healthcare systems for LGBTQ+ inclusive policies, such as gender-affirming forms, inclusive intake procedures, and anti-discrimination training.
- Partner with community organizations that support LGBTQ+ health, housing, and legal advocacy to create holistic care ecosystems.
- Engage in public discourse by writing op-eds, giving talks, or testifying about the mental health impacts of anti-LGBTQ+ policy. Bring clinical expertise into the policy arena.
- Train colleagues and future professionals in affirming, anti-oppressive practice.

These actions communicate to clients that they are not alone and that their mental health providers are active allies. In environments where the law may not protect them, knowing that their clinician will stand up for them and their community can be a lifeline.

Case Vignettes

To illustrate the lived realities of clients navigating the dual pressures of HIV and anti-LGBTQ+ stigma, the following composite vignettes demonstrate how legislation can act as both a psychological and practical barrier to care. All names and identifying details have been changed to protect client confidentiality.

Vignette 1: Marisol – "I'm Just Tired of Fighting for Everything"

Marisol is a 27-year-old transgender Latina woman receiving PrEP and gender-affirming hormone therapy through an HIV prevention program. After Texas passed legislation restricting access to gender-affirming care for youth, she began experiencing depressive episodes and expressed fears that adults would be next.

Though she was not a minor, Marisol's care was provided through a public health initiative funded partially by state dollars. She worried aloud that her hormone access could be next: "They're starting with kids because they think people won't fight as hard for them. But we're all on the chopping block."

Marisol's mental health symptoms exacerbated, and she began using methamphetamines more regularly, something she had previously avoided for over a year. In a one-on-one therapy session, she admitted, "I know it's not safe, but it numbs everything. I'm just tired of fighting for everything—my identity, my healthcare, my safety." Her experience underscores how legislative attacks erode hope, particularly for transgender women of color, and how hopelessness can reintroduce risk behaviors that increase HIV vulnerability.

Vignette 2: Darius – "What's the Point of Staying on Meds If They Don't Want Me Alive?"

Darius is a 21-year-old nonbinary person recently diagnosed with HIV. They were initially highly motivated to engage in care, attend support groups, and begin antiretroviral therapy (ART). However, after their home state introduced legislation criminalizing gender-affirming healthcare for youth and mandating that school counselors report students exploring gender identity, Darius became withdrawn and distrustful.

Though legally an adult, they had only recently aged out of a school system that had already been unsupportive. The new law, and the social discourse surrounding it, reopened old wounds. “It just feels like they’re legislating my disappearance,” they said during a session. “What’s the point of staying on meds if they don’t want me alive anyway?”

Darius began missing doses of ART, stating that it felt futile. They described dreams about being detained or forcibly outed, symptoms of reactivated trauma that had been dormant. Through sustained therapeutic work that validated their fears while reinforcing their right to exist and thrive, Darius was eventually able to reengage with their care plan, but the emotional impact remained lasting.

These individual accounts illustrate how policy can operate as a form of chronic trauma—one that seeps into clients’ bodies, identities, and care routines. For mental health clinicians and HIV care providers, understanding these dynamics is essential to offering responsive and affirming care.

Community and Policy Recommendations

To address the multifaceted harm that anti-LGBTQ+ legislation inflicts on mental health, especially within HIV care settings, public health professionals must engage in proactive, coordinated strategies at both the clinical and policy levels. The impact of these laws is not inevitable; it is the result of choices made by institutions and leaders. Similarly, healing and resilience can be cultivated through systems that choose equity, affirmation, and accountability.

1. Strengthen LGBTQ+ Cultural Competence in Healthcare Settings

Many clients disengage from HIV services not because they reject care, but because they do not feel safe or respected. Every public health organization, from state departments to local clinics, must invest in LGBTQ+ cultural competency training across all staff roles. This includes:

- Training in trauma-informed, identity-affirming language and practices.
- Regular review of intake forms, signage, and marketing materials to ensure they are inclusive.
- Hiring and retaining LGBTQ+ staff, especially those who reflect the communities served.

Affirming care is not an optional service enhancement. It is a foundational element of effective HIV prevention and treatment.

2. Invest in Mental Health Services as Core HIV Infrastructure

Mental health must be understood as integral to HIV care. Chronic stress, stigma, and trauma directly affect medication adherence, sexual health decision-making, and engagement with prevention services. Funding structures, especially Ryan White and CDC-backed initiatives, should explicitly support embedded mental health services within HIV clinics and community-based organizations.

Models of integrated care that include therapists, case managers, and peer navigators working collaboratively have demonstrated success in improving retention in care and mental health outcomes.[6] These models should be scaled and supported.

3. Build Trauma-Informed Public Health Systems

Trauma-informed principles can be extended from the clinic to the systemic level. Public health departments should:

- Create feedback loops with LGBTQ+ community members to ensure services are meeting needs.
- Respond rapidly to changes in the legislative landscape that may affect LGBTQ+ residents.
- Develop messaging and outreach that actively counters stigma and misinformation.

When public health institutions act swiftly to affirm LGBTQ+ people during times of political hostility, they send a powerful counter-narrative of safety and belonging.

4. Promote Protective Legislation and Challenge Harmful Laws

Mental health and HIV care professionals have a vital role in public policy. Their voices lend clinical and moral authority to advocacy efforts. Recommendations include:

- Supporting nondiscrimination ordinances and inclusive health policies at the local and state levels.
- Opposing legislation that targets LGBTQ+ healthcare, education, or expression.
- Providing testimony, public comments, or letters to legislators about the impact of anti-LGBTQ+ policies on clients.

Professional organizations (including NASW, APA, and APHA) should also continue issuing statements and policy briefs that educate lawmakers and the public about the consequences of discriminatory laws.

5. Resource and Uplift LGBTQ+ Community-Based Organizations

LGBTQ+ community organizations are often the first and most trusted responders when clients are in crisis. These groups provide culturally specific support, legal advocacy, crisis intervention, and affirming social spaces. Yet they are frequently underfunded and overextended.

Public health systems must:

- Fund these organizations sustainably, not just through short-term grants.
- Partner with them in program design, not just service delivery.
- Defer to their expertise in engaging hard-to-reach populations.

In moments of legislative crisis, these organizations often serve as lifelines. Supporting them is both a moral and a strategic imperative.

Conclusion

Anti-LGBTQ+ legislation does more than deny rights. It commits violence and it enacts trauma. For LGBTQ+ individuals, especially those living with or vulnerable to HIV, these laws represent a form of systemic violence that deepens psychological distress, undermines care engagement, and fractures trust in institutions. They are not abstract policy disputes; they are lived realities that manifest as anxiety attacks, substance use relapses, depressive episodes, and interrupted treatment adherence.

Mental health clinicians working within HIV care systems are uniquely positioned to bear witness to these impacts and respond with care that is trauma-informed, affirming, and justice-oriented. Yet we cannot work in isolation. Healing in the face of structural harm requires collective action: from healthcare systems that affirm identity, to policymakers who reject bigotry, to communities that rally around their most marginalized members.

If public health is to serve all people, it must actively resist policies that endanger some. This moment calls on clinicians, advocates, researchers, and public health leaders to speak plainly about the damage being done and to act boldly to protect the mental health and dignity of LGBTQ+ people.

The question is not only how we care for our clients in the therapy room, but how we help build a world where that care is no longer needed to survive injustice.

Ms. Mora may be contacted at emora@aidsdelaware.org.

References

1. Sánchez-Sauco, M. F., Villalona, S., & Ortega-García, J. A. (2019, November). Sociocultural aspects of drug dependency during early pregnancy and considerations for screening: Case studies of social networks and structural violence. *Midwifery*, *78*, 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2019.07.017 PubMed
2. Meyer, I. H. (2003, September). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(5), 674–697. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674 PubMed
3. Sweeting, H. N., & Gilhooly, M. L. M. (1990). Anticipatory grief: A review. *Soc Sci Med*, *30*(10), 1073–1080. https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(90)90293-2 PubMed
4. The Trevor Project. (2023). 2023 national survey on LGBTQ youth mental health. https://www.thetrevorproject.org/survey-2023/
5. SAMHSA. (2014). SAMHSA's concept of trauma and guidance for a trauma-informed approach. *Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration*. https://ncsacw.samhsa.gov/userfiles/files/SAMHSA_Trauma.pdf
6. Pinto, R. M., Berringer, K. R., Melendez, R., & Mmeje, O. (2018, November). Improving PrEP implementation through multilevel interventions: A synthesis of the literature. *AIDS and Behavior*, *22*(11), 3681–3691. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-018-2184-4 PubMed

Doi: 10.32481/djph.2025.07.15
