

House Pulls Anti-Boycott Bill Amid Outcry Over Free Speech, Foreign Influence Concerns

by yourNEWS Media Newsroom | May 5, 2025



H.R. 867, which would have criminalized support for UN or EU-backed boycotts of Israel, was withdrawn from a scheduled House vote following backlash from GOP lawmakers.

By yourNEWS Media Newsroom

A controversial bill aimed at expanding federal anti-boycott laws to include international governmental organizations such as the United Nations and European Union has been pulled from the U.S. House of Representatives' voting schedule following strong opposition from key Republican lawmakers.

[H.R. 867, the IGO Anti-Boycott Act](#), introduced by Rep. Mike Lawler (R-NY), sought to apply the provisions of the [Anti-Boycott Act of 2018](#) to foreign-led boycotts backed by international bodies. The legislation proposed civil fines of up to \$300,000 and criminal penalties as high as \$1 million or 20 years in prison for violations related to boycotts of U.S. allies like Israel.

Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene (R-GA), who led the opposition, announced on X that the bill had been withdrawn: ["I'm told we are no longer voting on this. It's been pulled."](#) She added, "Now let's vote on the promises we made the American people... and make DOGE cuts permanent with recessions!!!"

Greene had earlier declared her intent to vote "NO," stating, "It is my job to defend Americans' rights to buy or boycott whomever they choose without the government harshly fining them or imprisoning them."

Rep. Thomas Massie (R-KY) [echoed](#) Greene's position, saying he too would oppose the bill. Former Rep. Matt Gaetz issued a scathing critique, warning that H.R. 867 could "punish dissent or 'thought

crimes' with prison." He [added](#), "Antisemitism is a real problem. It deserves a response far more serious and thoughtful than this dangerous and unconstitutional Lawler virtue signal."

The bill had garnered bipartisan support, including from Reps. Josh Gottheimer (D-NJ), María Elvira Salazar (R-FL), and Brian Fitzpatrick (R-PA). It sought to insert the term "international governmental organization" alongside "foreign country" in the 2018 law and extend [reporting requirements](#) to boycotts promoted by IGOs. It also mandated that the president issue an annual public report identifying boycotting entities.

Proponents argue that the bill would defend American sovereignty by shielding U.S. businesses from foreign political coercion. "The bill applies already existing federal law to IGO's like the United Nations," [Lawler said on X](#). "Who knew you were such a fan of defending the UN?"

Critics, however, said the measure infringed on constitutionally protected freedoms. As [Gaetz questioned](#), "If this bill becomes law, how many Israeli products do I need in my home to avoid fines or prison?"

The legislation also drew attention to previous enforcement actions under the 2018 law, including fines imposed on companies such as [Quantum Corporation](#), [Wabtec Corporation](#), and [Pratt & Whitney](#) for failing to report foreign boycott requests, mostly from Gulf nations.

In response to Gaetz's criticism, one user [defended](#) the bill as a protection against international interference: "It's about defending American sovereignty and blocking foreign and international pressures... It doesn't target individuals for exercising their rights."

The Arab League's boycott of Israel remains a central focus of such legislation. While many member states no longer enforce the decades-old policy, it remains formally in place in nations including Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, and Qatar.

With H.R. 867 now shelved, the debate over the balance between protecting U.S. allies and preserving civil liberties continues to divide lawmakers—raising questions over how future anti-boycott legislation might be reshaped.

