

## Written evidence submitted A Member of the Public (GRA0050)

The impact of the Gender Recognition Act 2004 and the proposed reforms is wide reaching. I am a female science teacher and have been so for more than 10 years. I have asked to remain anonymous because I am fearful that my career could be in jeopardy regarding my views on this matter. Despite the Equality Act 2010 giving me protection under the protected characteristic of my beliefs and that my views are in line with current science, but this debate is so toxic what is truth has been incorrectly labelled as hate. Many women have been ostracized for speaking out in defence of the rights women have fought hard and long for. These rights were put in place to redress the imbalances of political power and opportunities, because of our biological sex and stereotypes associated with this. I cannot and will not teach teenagers wrong science, I am bound by legislation and personal integrity to keep my students safe and the current gender identity ideology comes into conflict with both of those objectives. I am pleased that recent DfE guidance reminds schools that children are not born in the wrong body and that schools and teachers should be diligent when resourcing teaching materials to ensure that this idea is not indoctrinated to our students. I have also had the misfortune of being seriously ill and needing to be hospitalised for a considerable length of time. I was in a very vulnerable situation and required intimate care on a daily basis for weeks. I would have struggled emotionally, and my recovery would have been affected if this care were provided on a mixed sex ward or if the staff providing the intimate care were male. I hope that further inquiries into why the exponential numbers of young girls are opting out of womanhood and claiming non binary or male status are initiated as a result of this evidence collection exercise and that the preparations and support are readied and put in place for the large number of young people that have had regrettable irreversible medical interventions as a result of gender identity ideology.

The ideology underpinning gender identity is based on circular thinking and harmful sex stereotypes. The mantras transwomen are women and transmen are men are not science based and implies that there is a subset of women that have male biology and a subset of men that have female biology. The mantras are instead a derivative of queer theory. I accept I live in a society where individuals are free to believe in anything they choose, however I am free to disagree without prejudice and to reject the imposition of those beliefs on wider society. Legislation should be based on objective and evidence-based reasoning that can be applied fairly to all. The Gender Recognition Act 2004 does not do this. A man is an adult human male, and a woman is an adult human female and the terms male and female have definitions based on biological sex. (A female is a member of the species that produces the large gamete, the egg and the male is the member of the species that produces the small gamete the sperm).

The ongoing vitriol and stifled debate surrounding the proposed reforms of the gender recognition act 2004 has and continues to be destructive and divisive to all involved. Much of this negativity had arisen by legislation and policies that have been passed largely by stealth and institutions being captured by ideology without consulting all groups of people that it would impact. I believe at this stage, a deep and transparent reflection of the legislation and guidance surrounding this area needs to occur and I welcome this evidence-based inquiry.

Evidence in this area of public discourse can be difficult to gather, validate and share due to the silencing, shaming and cancelling that critics of this ideology have faced, however the following data have been taken from the Office of National Statistics based on Home Office and Ministry of Justice records and reports and is based on the biological terms male and female.

In 2013, 95.4% of the British prison population was male and 4.6% was female, in 2019 this was 95% male and 5% female, a consistent ratio over time. In 2013, 75% of defendants in the criminal justice system were male and 25% female, in 2017 it was 73% males and 27% female. The percentage of murder victims that were male and female in the UK at the end of 2019 was 64% and 36% respectively and the percentage of men and women perpetrating murder in 2019 was 92% and 8% respectively. The proportion of males and females convicted of sexual offences in the UK in the year ending 2017 (no data for 2019 available) are 98% and 2% respectively. The victims of sex crimes in 2017 were 80% female and 20% male and victims of rape were 88% and 12% female and male and respectively. Citations can be provided on request for this data. In conclusion, males are the overwhelming perpetrators of violent crime and make up the significant proportion of the prison population. Males are also the largest victims of violent crime. Females make up many of the victims of sexual crimes and are a significantly small proportion of the offenders of such crime. Therefore, it would be accurate to summarise that violence and sexual assaults are largely male crimes.

This is why up until very recently single sex spaces in areas of society where individuals are more vulnerable such as, toilets, changing rooms, hospital wards, the prison estate, overnight accommodation, crisis shelters (homeless, domestic violence and rape) etc exist. There has been no significant change in the offender statistics that would justify the removal of those single sex spaces and without credible significant evidence to show otherwise, these spaces should not be removed by the inclusion of men just because they opt to identify as female. As a society we have excluded all males from female only spaces, even though a small proportion of males offend but because nearly all violent and sex offenders are male. Dhejne *et al* 2011, published a long term follow up study of transexuals and they compared the crime statistics for this group with the rest of the population. Fair Play For Women had summarised that their data showed no difference between males and males who identified as females in their patterns of male violence. This was 6 times higher for committing any crime compared with women and 18 times higher for committing violent crime compared with women. They also showed that women who identified as men were more likely to be violent than women but slightly less so than men, at 4 times more likely to commit any crime and 7 times more likely to commit violent crime compared to women.

World Rugby had recently conducted an inquiry into the current evidence on whether males who identify as females should be allowed to play in female rugby at the elite and professional level. All the current evidence suggests that this would be unsafe and unfair for women due to the physical differences between the sexes, which are not eliminated after medical interventions for gender dysphoria. This debate that sports regulators are having comes as a direct consequence of the GRA 2004, the protected characteristic of gender reassignment in the Equality Act 2010 and the confusion surrounding the invocation of the single sex spaces exemption of the Equality Act 2010. The Equality Act does need to be clarified and/or amended or reformed in my opinion to remove this confusion. However, we are navigating this debate which has morphed into a witch hunt of those who have concerns or disagree with the ideology underpinning it, which makes it difficult to express valid concerns openly.

Given that females make up such a small percentage of convicted sex offenders a small number of males identifying as females could dramatically distort the data to show a rapid increase in females committing a crime that has historically been committed by males. Fair Play for Women reported that a freedom of information request to the Ministry of Justice

claimed 60 out of the 125 (48%) trans identified prisoners in 2016 were convicted sex offenders. Given that the proportion of sex offenders is mostly male and the victims of sex crimes are largely female it is concerning that policies are permitting dangerous men to be housed in the female prison estate based on gender identity ideology, regardless of whether they hold a gender recognition certificate. Two conclusions can be drawn about this 48%; are men who identify as women more likely to be sex offenders or are male sex offenders abusing the policy on housing trans identifying men into the female prison estate? This problem has arisen due to institutional policy capture and vociferous campaigning by trans lobby groups, driven by gender identity ideology behind closed doors. The wider public would not consent to these wholesale changes to single sex spaces if all evidence and information regarding this debate was open and free from unjustified accusations of transphobia.

What we do know is that there are individuals who are male who push the social norms of how men are expected to express themselves, dress and behave and similarly for females. I have no problem with this and welcome diversity in individual expression without telling untruths. How males and females express themselves does not need to be legislated for as if they are the opposite sex. If individuals are struggling with their healthy physical body they need psychotherapy that is free to examine all possible causes of the distress, not invasive and permanent drug and medical interventions. This is not how we treat sufferers of eating disorders or other mental health issues regarding self-perception. If some males feel threatened using male only spaces they need to campaign and raise this issue so that all males feel safe in such places. The Gender Recognition Act 2004 in my opinion is not fit for purpose. It was pushed through parliament under the guise that couples who wanted same sex marriage despite one of the individuals identifying as the opposite sex, could not marry at the time (see Hansard). Same sex marriage is now legal; therefore, the Gender Recognition Act 2004 is obsolete in that respect. There is still a relatively small number of individuals applying for a gender recognition certificate, I believe this is because the sex marker on passports and driving licences could be changed prior to the Gender Recognition Act 2004 and now that same sex marriage is legal the whole act is redundant. Lastly, in my personal view the terms trans and gender are so subjective and vague that it is difficult to interpret legislation such as the Equality Act 2010 without causing a negative impact on other protected characteristics such as sex and sexual orientation, which have an objective basis in biology. If gender is essentially a sex-linked cultural stereotype (clothing, role, expression, etc) why are we enforcing such stereotypes in law? Nobody can change sex and criminal patterns in males do not change even after medical interventions, so again, why are we changing legislation and policies to enable abuse? Especially as the current legislation and indoctrination of gender identity ideology it is driving unhealthy demand for unnecessary elective, experimental and cosmetic medical interventions. If the gender reassignment protected characteristic is eliminated from the Equality Act 2010 and sex is bolstered by reference to the unlawful discrimination against a man or woman because they present differently to sex linked cultural stereotypes, that would be a fair, honest and long lasting amendment to the Act, protecting everyone.

Legislation and policy should be in place to provide safety, fairness and dignity at its core. Therefore, I hope that the safety of women and girls is clearly established when reforming any further legislation regarding this matter, given the statistics I mentioned at the start of my evidence.

October 2020

Sources used can be found using the following links

Crime statistics <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice>

Fair Play for Women violent crime statistics <https://fairplayforwomen.com/criminality/>

Dhejne C *et al* (2011), Long-term follow up of transexual persons undergoing sex reassignment surgery: cohort study in Sweden.

<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0016885>