

Written evidence from LGB Alliance [CCI0058]

SUBMISSION FROM LGB ALLIANCE

1 ABOUT

LGB Alliance is a limited company 12338881 and registered charity 1194148 (England and Wales). LGB Alliance was formed in October 2019 in response to the decision of Stonewall, once itself an LGB rights campaigning organisation, to ban any discussion on issues of sex and gender and how they relate to lesbian, gay and bisexual people. Specifically, there were serious concerns about Stonewall's unqualified adoption and promotion of the belief that everyone has a "gender identity" – a concept about which there is no scientific consensus – as separate from, and overriding, biological sex. We refer to this belief as "gender identity ideology". In addition, Stonewall insisted that there was to be "no debate" about this belief.

LGB Alliance will focus on the following questions from the Call for Evidence:

- 2 What are the primary barriers and threats to community cohesion?
- 4 What can be done at a local and national level to improve community cohesion?

2 INTRODUCTION

Dame Sara Khan's 2024 review "Threats to Social Cohesion and Democratic Resilience – a new strategic approach" introduces us to her term "**Freedom-restricting Harassment**".

This term perfectly describes the experience of LGB Alliance since its first meeting on 22 October 2019.

That evening, Allison Bailey tweeted:

"This is an historic moment for the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual movement. LGB Alliance launched in London tonight, and we mean business. Spread the word, gender extremism is about to meet its match". 11:12 PM · Oct 22, 2019

Within hours, a coordinated campaign of "**Freedom-restricting Harassment**" began.

Christine Burns – a well-known author and *gender identity activist* [NB we use this term instead of the term "trans rights activist", which we believe is inaccurate and misleading], who influenced public policy on the Gender Recognition Act (GRA) and related issues through the trans lobby group Press for Change – encouraged people to "run them [LGB Alliance] ragged" and has continued to campaign against LGB Alliance to this day.

Following Burns's example, other gender identity activists encouraged each other to tweet "LGB Alliance is a hate group – pass it on." This triggered an explosion of online vitriol directed against LGB Alliance – before the new organisation had issued a single public statement. In our view, this anecdote shows that **a serious threat to social cohesion had formed under the radar.**

3 UNDER THE RADAR: "DENTONS PLAYBOOK"

A highly influential international resource advises gender identity activists who want to introduce legislative or policy changes – especially in relation to youth – to do so quietly. It recommends avoiding any media coverage or scrutiny at all if possible. It also advises activists who are trying to get measures that might attract opposition onto the statute book to attach them to other, popular measures. The latter tactic serves as a mode of distraction. This dual strategy has been applied adroitly in multiple jurisdictions and organisations. In the Republic of Ireland, for instance, Gender Self-ID legislation was attached to the Equal Marriage bill at the very last moment and adopted with

no public debate. At international level, all UN committees but one have switched to “gender” instead of “sex” – again with no wide-ranging discussion. The one exception is the Committee for the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Currently, activists are trying to insert “gender” even into CEDAW.

The report that recommends this strategy is called “**Only Adults? Good Practices in Legal Gender Recognition for Youth**”.¹ It was published jointly by IGLYO (the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and Intersex Youth & Student Organisation), the Thomson Reuters Foundation, and the global law firm Dentons.

The “Dentons’ Report” or “Dentons’ Playbook”, as it has become known in some circles, has acquired a certain infamy for its underhand recommendations.

The Dentons Playbook advises activists to avoid obstacles such as having to deal with different opinions, investigations of the unforeseen consequences of controversial legislation, and above all robust debate. In other words, they are advised to steer clear of many of the mechanisms of what would once have been considered a vibrant democracy. It is particularly shocking that the recommendations focus on children and young people, teaching them to find workarounds to normal democratic processes in order to achieve unpopular goals.

The journalist James Kirkup laid out the threat to democracy posed by this report in an article in *The Spectator* on 2 December 2019.² Kirkup was astonished by what he read – and no wonder, for the Dentons Playbook strategy has achieved rapid and radical change worldwide with very little opposition. Most worryingly, a huge medical scandal has arisen as a direct result of teaching children that they all have a “gender identity” and may have been born in “the wrong body”. Fundamentals such as the fact that humans are either male or female and that biological sex is immutable, that women and girls need their own spaces for safety, privacy, and comfort, that men cannot be lesbians, that puberty is a vital stage in the development from childhood to adulthood, and that homosexuality means sexual orientation to others of the same sex have all been overturned silently and – initially – virtually unopposed. In the UK the leading organisation promoting this new doctrine was Stonewall. We will describe Stonewall’s strategy and policies in some detail because they exemplify the point we are making: that sweeping changes have been introduced into society under the radar, without public scrutiny or debate.

While the “Dentons report” was not published until Nov 2019, Stonewall and others had been actively using the tactics summed up by their catch phrase “no debate” since 2015. Back door lobbying took place, and society was fundamentally changed with no consultation or democratic scrutiny.

4 STONEWALL UK

Stonewall built up an unassailable reputation for evidence-based lobbying to achieve legislative change over several decades, most notably under Ben Summerskill OBE up to 2014. Its skilful activism helped to achieve significant progress for LGB people. By 2019, when LGB Alliance formed, a consensus existed across all mainstream political parties, as well as in the Church, armed forces, NHS, police, courts, public and private institutions that not only did Stonewall represent all lesbians,

¹ <https://www.trust.org/resource/only-adults-good-practices-in-legal-gender-recognition-for-youth/>

² <https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/the-document-that-reveals-the-remarkable-tactics-of-trans-lobbyists/>

gays and bisexuals but that what Stonewall said was progressive and good. Stonewall had become a trusted advisor to Government and to hundreds of organisations and companies through its Diversity Champions scheme.

Stonewall changed course dramatically in 2015, but its reputation sailed on regardless. Its new CEO, Ruth Hunt (now Baroness Hunt of Bethnal Green) took the personal decision to shift away from protecting gay rights and to embrace gender identity doctrine instead. There was to be “no debate” about the change. Consequently, the shift went almost unnoticed in the general public and in the institutions that had embedded it in their structures. Only those who had met with her beforehand and implored her not to change course saw immediately what was happening. From 2015 onwards, Stonewall adopted its own version of key sections of the Equality Act – giving organisations what turned out to be illegal advice and promoting gender identity ideology. This has become painfully clear in court to several public institutions and private companies that unfortunately relied on that advice. They had been taught what we call “Stonewall Law” instead of the law of the land.

According to the fictional “Stonewall Law”:

1. Gender identity is one of the nine protected characteristics.
2. Men who “identify” as women have the right to access women’s toilets, refuges, prisons, sports teams, changing rooms etc.
3. Any man who “identifies” as a woman and is attracted to women is a lesbian
4. Lesbians who say explicitly that they are not open to dating men who identify as women are akin to racists
5. “Misgendering” is unlawful discrimination

Among its other activities, Stonewall has also campaigned to scrap the criminal offence of sex by deception, and it promotes plans to ban what are deceptively referred to as “transgender conversion practices”. On the latter: it is abundantly clear from similar legislation in other countries – especially the much-praised law in the Australian state of Victoria – that this ban would make it virtually impossible for therapists to take on gender-confused children. The therapists would not want to risk a false accusation of “conversion practices” and it would become even harder than now to find a therapist who provides neutral, exploratory psychotherapy as recommended by the Cass Review.

Stonewall, which once championed gay rights, has redefined homosexuality itself. Its glossary states:

H O M O S E X U A L

This might be considered a more medical term used to describe someone who has a romantic and/or sexual orientation towards someone of the same gender. The term ‘gay’ is now more generally used.

Stonewall also maintains that Gender Self-ID is progressive – following the view promoted in the United States that it is the next frontier of civil rights. In any case, Stonewall says, it is just a small administrative change.³ Stonewall has also described puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones, and paediatric gender surgery as useful “gender affirming treatments for children”.

Those who use the Dentons Playbook to impose gender identity doctrine on countries worldwide (as far possible under the radar) seek consistently to introduce three types of legislation, which we

³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3L1gP7YrEzI>

therefore call the essential *trptych* of gender identity doctrine. Again, this doctrine has no factual or evidential basis and in most countries – the UK being a notable exception – the laws are introduced without widespread scrutiny or publicity. They are all given misleading labels to confuse the public.

1. A law enabling people to choose their own sex. This is labelled “Gender Self-ID” and is described as a form of self-determination
2. A law to prevent children and young people who are confused about their sexuality receiving exploratory psychotherapy. This is labelled a “Ban on conversion therapy/practices” and is attached to a ban on gay conversion therapy, by way of distraction.
3. A law ending free speech to close down opposition. This is labelled a “Ban on hate speech”

As it advanced its programme of change, Stonewall enjoyed direct access to the Prime Minister, Leaders of the Opposition, the Scottish First Minister, Leader of the Senedd and a succession of Women and Equalities Ministers. It believed it was in a perfect position to ensure that the above three laws – the triptych of gender identity ideology – would soon be law in England, Wales and Scotland – with Northern Ireland to follow.

Stonewall’s key tagline during this entire period was NO DEBATE.

This brief history of Stonewall’s attempt to impose gender identity doctrine on the United Kingdom, using principles that were later consolidated in the Dentons Playbook, explains why the reaction to the formation of LGB Alliance was so ferocious.

FREEDOM-RESTRICTING HARASSMENT: THE CASE OF LGB ALLIANCE

Stonewall needed the public to carry on believing it represented all lesbians, gay men and bisexuals. After all, that is how it had built its reputation. That was how it came to enjoy the public's trust. Everyone who was involved in promoting gender identity doctrine insisted that there was a single "LGBTQ+ community" which supported this programme. Thus the emergence of a small group of lesbians, gays and bisexuals, many of whom had been active supporters of Stonewall but who were now opposed to Stonewall's change of course, was akin to heresy. It threatened the entire project. LGB Alliance disrupted the (false) narrative of a single unified "community" striding towards a better, fairer future. It tore up the script. It had to be destroyed. That is why a campaign of "Freedom-Restricting Harassment" began, and why it continues right up until this day.



There was a consensus among gender identity activists as well as other charities and NGOs – which all supported Stonewall – that LGB Alliance must be smothered at birth. Stonewall was the most powerful of these organisations, but there were many other LGBT+ and other charities who took their cue from Stonewall and did their utmost to prevent LGB Alliance getting off the ground.

LGB Alliance's first public meeting was held at Oran Mor in Glasgow in January 2020. The key focus was to campaign against the Scottish Government's Bill to introduce Gender Self-ID for persons aged 16 and over.

The poster shown on the left, produced by our opponents – but which we subsequently adopted to express pride in standing alone against self-ID – illustrates the climate in which we were operating.

In short, we believe that this history of Stonewall's imposition of gender identity doctrine on UK society and the disproportionate determination to crush LGB Alliance is a perfect example of Freedom-restricting harassment in action. It has prevented us accessing diverse resources, caused us to live and work at times in an atmosphere of fear, accustomed to constant insults and threats, and it has forced us at every stage to adopt high-level security measures despite initially operating on a shoestring.

In 2019 LGB Alliance requested that EHRC set up a statutory inquiry into Stonewall and whether it has breached the Equality Act. The correspondence has continued since then, with a full legal opinion from Aileen McColgan KC – a final response has not yet been received. All of this correspondence can be made available to the Women and Equalities Select Committee.

From 2015 onwards anyone who disputed “Stonewall Law” was told that there was to be no debate, and should they dare to continue they would be called a variety of names from transphobe to bigot to Nazi, and **Freedom-restricting Harassment** would begin in earnest.

In the case of LGB Alliance this included online and offline threats, abuse, refusal of services, newspaper or underground ads being cancelled, and vilification by a wide range of celebrities and politicians who made unsubstantiated claims that LGB Alliance was right-wing and funded by secret donors in the USA.

Remember – a number of high-profile individuals chose to lie and defame a charity standing for LGB rights. A charity whose Articles of Association were based on those of Stonewall. Why? Because they wanted to close the charity via a sustained campaign of **Freedom-restricting Harassment** as they had become devotees of gender identity ideology and refused to doubt its tenets. The campaign to shut down LGB Alliance culminated in a case brought by Stonewall (who withdrew early on), Mermaids, the Good Law Project, the LGBT Consortium and Gendered Intelligence to have LGB Alliance’s charitable status removed. See below.

Question 2 What are the primary barriers and threats to community cohesion?

Community cohesion depends on:

- i. truth
- ii. trust
- iii. shared language
- iv. balancing of competing rights
- v. safeguarding of the vulnerable – especially children

That means that the primary barriers and threats are lies, lack of trust, misleading language, no consideration of balancing rights and a lack of safeguarding.

Political parties and institutions continue to underestimate the anger of women and LGB people about the destruction of our rights taking place in plain sight. Equally politicians and public figures underestimate how important child safeguarding is – in the words of Baroness Hilary Cass – “it is everyone’s responsibility.”

We will restrict our comments to what has happened to LGB people and child safeguarding over the last decade or so - and leave others to speak about the devastation of women’s rights during the same period.

i) TRUTH

When politicians accept a basic lie as a truth – “trans women are women” – and say so in public, confidence is blown apart. When leaders of parties cannot define a woman, or an MP tells us than a man can grow a cervix, or an MP says in court than a man who defines himself as a lesbian IS a lesbian – previously-held certainties disappear.

When the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) is so captured that it states (incorrectly) in its UN Universal Periodic Review submission several years ago that gender identity is a protected characteristic and issues guidance to the Equality Act which is based on Stonewall Law rather than the actual law, social cohesion is immediately at risk. (EHRC is now open to correcting mistakes such as these, but much damage has been done with weak or incorrect guidance to public bodies).

When the EHRC, OFCOM, BBC, IPSO, both Houses of Parliament, the Civil Service, the NHS, the armed forces, the judiciary and the police are all members of Stonewall’s “Diversity Champions Scheme” and compete for rankings in its Workplace Equality Scheme there can be no social cohesion. Why? Because all of these bodies are bound by a version of the Nolan Principles to impartiality; to neutrality, or to “policing without fear or favour”. These are meant to be the public watchdogs setup to protect against totalitarianism. All this was lost along with truth itself. Even in today’s Times (31 Jan 2025) we read of the latest example – the corruption of IPSO. <https://www.thetimes.com/article/00c2df26-7fe8-417c-9557-776cda1ebe4f?shareToken=4740035267c3517791c6d0801ca14087>

ii) TRUST

A democracy depends on citizens believing that they can influence issues of interest and on justice being seen to be done.

Time and time again LGB Alliance has been refused admission to contributing to decision making – whether it be at the Equality and Human Rights Commission, National Council for Voluntary Service, LGBT Foundation, Birmingham City University UPR workshops, Equally Ours or *even at the roundtable convened by More in Common as they researched their Rapid Evidence Review for Dame Sara Khan.*

The EHRC did eventually engage with LGB Alliance, and indeed apologised for not having a dialogue sooner, but so much damage had already been done and EHRC has never included LGB Alliance in any strategic discussions.

NCVO initially refused us membership, which included a range of training opportunities and room hire at reduced rates which could have been extremely useful for LGB Alliance as a new and inexperienced charity. After legal action was threatened in 2024, LGB Alliance was finally admitted.

At Westminster, not a single member of the shadow cabinet was willing to speak to LGB Alliance during the period 2019–2024, unless conducted under Chatham House rule.

Some brave Conservatives did agree to meet – *despite advice from Civil Servants not to do so*. When news of LGB Alliance’s first meeting with Kemi Badenoch became known another spate of outrage ensued across social and other media.

Excluding interested people and organisations from normal policy discussions simply because their views are different is the hallmark of a totalitarian regime. This is what LGB Alliance faces day to day, although some progress has been made. A great deal of credit is due Women and Equalities Ministers Kemi Badenoch, and Liz Truss before her, who were not afraid to listen to all sides.

iii) LANGUAGE

Since 2015, when the Chief Executive of Stonewall Ruth Hunt (now Baroness Hunt of Bethnal Green) decided to add the T to LGB, lesbians, gays and bisexuals have been grouped together as LGBT, LGBT+, LGBTQIA+ and the rest. Hunt did not consult any lesbian, gay or bisexual Stonewall supporters, and in fact denied that she had any plans to add the T when she was standing to be the new CEO of Stonewall.

Lesbians, gays and bisexuals are told by politicians that we have no choice in the matter. The following passage from Hansard gives the words of a heterosexual MP, Alicia Kearns, speaking to a gay male MP, Neale Hanvey, on 1st March 2024:

“The hon. Gentleman is entirely right, but there was one letter missing in his LGB: the letter T. We do not divide the LGBT community in this place. Members can say that they have concerns about what we are doing, but by removing the T, the hon. Gentleman is suggesting that transgender people do not exist. He is suggesting that they are less than other LGB people, and I will not stand for that, because it was trans people who stood with gay people at Stonewall; it was trans people who fought alongside them for LGB rights. I will happily discuss the intricacies of legislation with the hon. Gentleman, but when he chooses to eradicate, that is wrong”.

[<https://www.parallelparliament.co.uk/mp/alicia-kearns/vs/neale-hanvey>]

This is offensive not only because Kearns is rewriting homosexual history, but she is insisting that there is no choice. Either gays and lesbians agree to be LGBT or she – a straight woman – will not stand for it! Could there be a clearer example of **“Freedom-restricting Harassment”**?

The government, the BBC, NHS, the media, Royal Colleges, Universities, courts, the police and all other public and private institutions insist on using “LGBTQ+” despite our protestations. How often do we have to explain that same-sex sexual orientation is about relationships with others? It has nothing to do with people’s identity issues, with men who like to cross dress or anyone who is convinced that he or she is the opposite sex.

Anyone who knows about the early history of the transsexual movement knows that the initial organisations wanted nothing to do with homosexuals. Later on, they decided it was strategically wiser to join LGB groups in order to expedite their demands.

The use of “preferred pronouns” is a way to enforce gender identity doctrine and is completely redundant in a rational world. Yet we see these requested in official documents from the NHS to schools to job application forms. So many people object to this precisely because it is yet another example of **Freedom-restricting Harassment** in which proponents of an ideology are allowed to insist that others “play along” with their requirements because the alternative is exclusion.

Language Recommendations

*A new social cohesion strategy is needed in which letter combinations such as LGBTQ+ and LGBT should be dropped – in the same way that BAME has been dropped.

* The use of “preferred pronouns” should be abolished

*In news reporting, individuals should be described in such a way as to promote clarity and understanding. A lesbian is not a gay man. A bisexual is not “queer”. There is no such thing as “an LGBTQIA+ person”.

iv) BALANCING OF RIGHTS

The Rapid Evidence Review on Harassment and Censorship by More in Common is a perfect example of how rights have not been balanced during the past decade or so. More in Common is known for spreading the view that debates on sex and gender are “toxic”, and “polarising”. Even worse, More in Common has adopted a false “two sides” narrative, suggesting that gender identity (“trans rights”) activists and gender critical activists are equally culpable in harassing, terrorising, and attempting to silence the other side. Were it not so serious, this would be laughable.

Anyone who has lived through the last decade in the UK and observed the world around them would know that there are zero examples of trans people being forced into silence at work or indeed losing their jobs because of their beliefs like Eleanor Frances, Allison Bailey, Maya Forstater, Professor Jo Phoenix, Professor Kathleen Stock and others.^{4 5 6 7 8}

There are no examples of trans people trying to attend or leave a meeting who are then followed, jostled, shouted at and jeered at by mobs wearing balaclavas. No examples of trans people finding that their venues have decided to cancel their meetings because they are trans. There are no examples of meetings of trans people being protested and or attacked by gender-critical people. Yet there are multiple examples of meetings of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals being picketed and attacked by gender identity activists, including on one occasion Kirsty Blackman MP.⁹

⁴ <https://www.thetimes.com/uk/society/article/the-civil-servant-who-challenged-transgender-ideology-and-won-b7lrpq8m>

⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/employment-appeal-tribunal-decisions/allison-bailey-v-stonewall-equality-ltd-and-others-2024-eat-119>

⁶ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/60c1cce1d3bf7f4bd9814e39/Maya_Forstater_v_CG_D_Europe_and_others_UKEAT0105_20_JOJ.pdf

⁷ <https://www.leighday.co.uk/news/news/2024-news/prof-jo-phoenix-wins-gender-critical-discrimination-case-against-open-university/>

⁸ <https://www.bbc.co.uk/sounds/play/m001153q>

⁹ <https://www.scottishdailyexpress.co.uk/news/politics/snp-mp-accuses-joanna-cherry-25276503>

That is why the first LGB Alliance meeting was held at a secret venue. Time and time again, venues refuse to host meetings at which gay or lesbian speakers are billed. It is of great concern that More in Common appear not to have noticed the cancellations of events with Julie Bindel or Joanna Cherry for example – which were widely publicised. They appear to have missed all the court cases mentioned above – and also the successful case brought by Denise Fahmy against the Arts Council for their removal of a grant to LGB Alliance.¹⁰

More in Common mentions “anecdotal evidence of harassment faced by groups of gender critical activists”. Once again this is risible – there is so much factual reporting from the streets to social media to the law courts that anecdotal evidence is superfluous.

Finally, the imagery used against homosexuals is consistently violent, pornographic and misogynist. How could More in Common not be aware of this?

The only reasonable conclusion to be drawn is that the rights of trans people are seen as in a special class which supersede all others. This makes a cruel joke of the idea of social cohesion. Until groups such as More in Common address the issue in an evidence-based way they will continue to produce disappointing work of the kind we see in their 2023 “Rapid Evidence Review”.

By contrast, in Section 2.4 of her report –**2.4 “Freedom-restricting harassment and freedom of expression”** Dame Sara Khan draws attention to the ground breaking case brought by Mermaids vs Charity Commission to have LGB Alliance’s charitable status withdrawn. She comments: *“Passionate debates and disagreements are important markers of a healthy democracy. As tribunal judges rules in the case between the transgender rights charity Mermaids and the LGB Alliance, there is ‘no legal right to be free from criticism by those who disagree with you or prevent those who hold beliefs that the law recognises as protected from expressing themselves or seeking to persuade others of their point of view.’ Such freedom of speech is vital to democracy and must be upheld.”* Dame Sara is correct, but in the current environment it is extremely challenging for LGB Alliance to exert that freedom of speech.

v) SAFEGUARDING

If we want to understand the damage that *a lack of social cohesion* can do to any society, we need to look no further than the *appalling tragedy we have seen unfold as a direct result of gender identity ideology*.

A society has been brainwashed so effectively that it has allowed medical experiments on children to take place.

Social media influencers on Reddit, Tik Tok, YouTube and others have been hugely influential with millions of young viewers tuning in to a range of stories about the magical benefits of “changing sex”.

Schools have welcomed gender identity activists in to spread their beliefs which have in turn been picked up by many children – particularly the most vulnerable. Thus our education system has created a pipeline of patients into totally unnecessary gender identity services leading in many cases to sterilisation, loss of sexual function and lifelong medical care. It has also created “de-

¹⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/employment-tribunal-decisions/ms-d-fahmy-v-arts-council-england-6000042-slash-2022>

transitioners” who regret decisions made when they were far too young to consent to the interventions recommended to them.

Thankfully The Cass review has changed the landscape not only in the UK but around the world – but there is more to do. While more and more countries and states are issuing outright bans on puberty blockers, hormones and life changing surgery such as double mastectomies or castration on minors, some of our politicians continue to support these experimental and dangerous treatments.

For example, this very Women and Equalities Select Committee (WESC) chose to invite two witnesses who supported the use of these banned substances (puberty blockers) to give evidence to them on Wed 22 January, but did not invite the globally acclaimed expert Baroness Hilary Cass - despite her 4-year groundbreaking work which resulted in the Cass Review - <https://cass.independent-review.uk/home/publications/final-report/>.

Sitting in the public section was Keira Bell – herself a de-transitioner (who has just launched a Judicial Review of the Secretary of State for Health Wes Streeting’s failure to ban cross-sex hormones for minors).

Keira’s comment after the hearing was damning:

“It is now clearer than before that these ‘experts’ – one of whom was in charge of my treatment – do not have children’s wellbeing as their priority. I found it deeply troubling and hurtful to hear their lack of emotion in this matter, the denial of the lack of evidence and their ideologically driven spiel. I am sickened by the continuous lies and evasion of facts and accountability.

A minor in distress signifies a deeper problem, rather than a need for experimental drugs to drastically alter their physical appearance – damaging them in the process. The system these so-called experts work with leans on this distress and twists it in a way that profits them, instead of genuinely helping these people via honest enquiry and therapy. This is something the Cass Report has recommended and it is something I wish was afforded to me as a teenager – Keira Bell”

One of the most fundamental duties of a fully functioning healthy society is to guard children from abuse of any kind. In that we have singularly failed, and LGB Alliance believes that WESC should be leading the charge in banning all unnecessary medicalisation of children rather than promoting it.

What can be done at a local and national level to improve community cohesion?

What can be done at a local and national level to improve community cohesion?

If we follow through on our analysis of the barriers to social cohesion, we see the biggest problem is a lack of both truth and trust.

LGB Alliance believes that community cohesion will only improve at local and national level once we re-establish basic truths which are fundamental to a healthy liberal democracy.

APPENDIX

JOANNA CHERRY KC - INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF ADVOCATES AND BARRISTERS (ICAB) WORLD BAR CONFERENCE

Joanna Cherry KC and Trustee of LGB Alliance addressed the ICAB World Bar Conference in Belfast in 2024, saying that in her view LGB Alliance is a “case study in “Freedom-restricting harassment”:

“The phenomenon of “freedom-restricting harassment”

Dame Sarah Khan DBE is the independent advisor to the UK government for social cohesion and resilience. She says that free-speech in England is being threatened by a “ dangerous climate of harassment and censorship.” which she calls “freedom-restricting harassment”.

She notes that conflicts between different rights and freedoms, including the debate about biological sex versus gender identity have presented particular problems.

LGB Alliance – a case study in freedom-restricting harassment

The experience of the founders of a charity called LGB Alliance provides a case study in freedom restricting harassment. LGB Alliance was founded in 2019 by lesbian activists who wanted to provide support and advice to LGB people who don’t accept gender identity ideology.

Within hours of its launch LGB Alliance was branded a hate group on social media. This happened before they had made a single public statement. The founders received a barrage of abuse and threats. Some politicians used Parliamentary privilege to make defamatory attacks on the group. Media outlets carried misleading stories about them and refused a right of reply. Campaigners tried to prevent the organisation from finding space to hold meetings or a conference.

Alison Bailey found herself the victim of a campaign to take away her livelihood as a barrister because she tweeted supportively about LGB alliance.

Under duress the Arts Council of England withdrew a grant to LGB Alliance and when an employee, Denise Fahmy, called out the underlying homophobia, she herself became the subject of harassment and discrimination and had to go to an employment tribunal.

Thanks to Maya Forstater’s case she was successful.

In 2021 the Charity Commission accepted LGB Alliance’s application to register as a charity. A vicious campaign to overturn that decision followed culminating in legal action to have LGB Alliance struck off the register. The case was brought by Mermaids, a charity which was set up to support children and young people questioning their “gender identity”. Basically, they

did not see a space for a charity which questioned their world view. Ultimately, Mermaids lost on the issue of standing. But the tribunal also said.

'Charitable status does not come with any guarantees of funding nor any freedom from criticism or debate. It is no part of the Commission's function (nor of this Tribunal) to tell people what to think, or to regulate public debate in a context where there are deeply held, sincere, beliefs on all sides of the discussion.'

As a result of their considerable victory for freedom of expression in resisting this attempt to remove their charitable status at last LGB Alliance have started to get some of the mainstream media coverage that had previously been denied.

However, their victory came at a considerable cost. Mermaids is a wealthy charity. LGB alliance is not, and they were left with a bill for over £250,000."

OFCOM

An extremely damaging incident took place in 2020 which we believe has resulted in LGB Alliance being excluded from public discussions on key issues of sex and gender. John Nicolson MP defamed LGB Alliance at a meeting of DCMS on 15 December 2020 – and Dame Melanie Dawes, Head of OFCOM, concurred with his defamatory comments:

John Nicolson: *"I notice that the BBC seems to be under the impression that it has to balance all its reports about trans issues now by calling in transphobic groups like the so-called LGB Alliance, to give a counter-argument. This is absurd because you would never do a report on racism, for example, and call in a racist organisation to say that they do not think black people have a right to equality. What can the BBC do to address this? Do you think it is buckling under a very well-funded, concerted campaign to attack trans people, which seems to have been given undue prominence recently?"*

Dame Melanie Dawes: *"I think it is a very good point, and a very good example of something that we have been talking to Stonewall about, about how the broadcasters can, when they feel they need to bring balance into a debate, do it in an appropriate way, rather than in the way that you just described, which can be extremely inappropriate."*

On 15th Dec 2021 LGB Alliance requested an immediate Zoom call with Dame Melanie Dawes to ask her to retract her endorsement of John Nicolson MP's comments to her at the DCMS committee, as quoted above. Ofcom initially responded by offering a Zoom call in the New Year. After LGB Alliance pointed out that a more urgent dialogue was needed, a phone call took place with Adam Baxter, Director, Standards and Audience Protection.

Since these defamatory statements were made by John Nicolson MP and endorsed by Dame Melanie, several publications have repeated them – causing ongoing reputational damage to LGB Alliance and our supporters.

We have had several phone and Zoom calls and email exchanges with Ofcom. These have been disappointing. Ofcom refuses to acknowledge responsibility for the fact that Dame Melanie's comments are often used in articles written to attack and undermine our charity.

LGB Alliance has been on the BBC twice only – despite lengthy correspondence and meetings. We believe that both OFCOM and the BBC see Stonewall's gender identity ideology as their default position and they will not allow LGB Alliance's views to be heard.

March 2025