

Women and Equalities Committee – Reform of the GRA – call for evidence

I am responding to this call for evidence because I am concerned about the harm being done by the gender identity movement.

Children are being told their sex is 'assigned' rather than observed at birth, and encouraged ('affirmed') to believe their brain and the rest of their body can somehow be different genders. Young people are suffering irreversible long-term damage from experimental medical and surgical interventions. Women's human rights are being eroded by trans-identifying men occupying women's single-sex spaces, winning women's sports prizes and demanding the right to work in roles providing intimate contact with vulnerable women, for example in rape crisis centres.

The foundations of the law are damaged when official records are knowingly falsified. No individual should be given the right to change the correctly observed sex recorded on their birth certificate. Nor should trans-identifying male criminals be recorded as women.

<https://committees.parliament.uk/call-for-evidence/291/reform-of-the-gender-recognition-act/>

Will the Government's proposed changes meet its aim of making the process "kinder and more straight forward"?

The process is already far too easy. People genuinely suffering from the delusion that they are (or are meant to be) the other sex should receive professional mental-healthcare. Those who are simply living out their fantasies should continue to be allowed to do so, but within the bounds of laws that protect other people's rights, such as women's rights to single-sex spaces and facilities. When the state colludes with delusions or fantasies, it is harmful both to society and to those individuals it encourages to chase an unattainable fantasy.

Should a fee for obtaining a Gender Recognition Certificate be removed or retained? Are there other financial burdens on applicants that could be removed or retained?

No.

Should the requirement for a diagnosis of gender dysphoria be removed?

No. Without this, it is simply an aid to men wishing to live out their sex fantasies and young women seeking to escape the pressures of being female in an unequal world.

Should there be changes to the requirement for individuals to have lived in their acquired gender for at least two years?

No. This is little enough – and what does it mean other than taking an other-sex name and wearing clothes typically worn by the other sex? In other words, simply conforming to outdated gender stereotypes?

What is your view of the statutory declaration and should any changes have been made to it?

It seems meaningless when a transman (Freddy McConnell) can start receiving IVF a few days after receiving a GRC, for which she had signed a declaration that she intends to live permanently as a man.

Does the spousal consent provision in the Act need reforming? If so, how? If it needs reforming or removal, is anything else needed to protect any rights of the spouse or civil partner?

A spouse should have the right to divorce a gender-changing partner immediately, to avoid being legally trapped in a relationship they have not chosen.

Should the age limit at which people can apply for a Gender Recognition Certificate (GRC) be lowered?

No. Most young people seeking to escape puberty or adulthood have personal or psychological problems that should first be treated sympathetically with counselling or psychotherapy and practical help. Many have autism, or are gay and afraid of acknowledging this, or have been bullied or sexually abused, or witnessed domestic violence. The normalisation of abusive and misogynistic pornography is enough to make any girl dread becoming a woman. The sheer number of children in one school class or social group reveals the power of peer-group pressure and social contagion.

What impact will these proposed changes have on those people applying for a Gender Recognition Certificate, and on trans people more generally?

The government should not be opening more gender clinics or allowing speedier transition. Young people are already being ushered too quickly into irreversible changes with unknown long-term effects. Most of those put on puberty blockers, for example, go on to have further (experimental) medical and surgical interventions, whereas those who aren't given drugs are more likely to grow out of the wish to change their gender.

What else should the Government have included in its proposals, if anything?

The harmful and inhumane GRA should be repealed, and all the wretched and regressive sex stereotypes it relies on should be dropped in the dustbin of history. Let men wear make-up and high heels if they wish, let women be butch lesbians – let people live how they like, as long as they don't infringe anyone else's human rights.

Does the Scottish Government's proposed Bill offer a more suitable alternative to reforming the Gender Recognition Act 2004?

Wider issues concerning transgender equality and current legislation:

Why is the number of people applying for GRCs so low compared to the number of people identifying as transgender?

This suggests that most trans people do not wish to be tied into living as the opposite sex, with legal documentation etc. Therefore, for most, identifying as transgender is clearly a lifestyle choice that may change in future.

Are there challenges in the way the Gender Recognition Act 2004 and the Equality Act 2010 interact? For example, in terms of the different language and terminology used across both pieces of legislation.

There are serious challenges, which at present are having harmful impacts on women's rights. Wrong information has been spread about the terms of both acts. Most importantly, sex (an inescapable biological fact) is often conflated with gender (an identity that may be fluid or reversible), leading to trans-identifying men claiming the right to use women's single-sex services and facilities. Also, I believe 'gender reassignment' in the 2004 act was originally understood to include radical surgery. In reality, very few trans people now undergo this, but still believe they have a protected characteristic. This means that the trans-identifying men using women's single-sex spaces may be fully male-bodied. As statistics show that transwomen commit sexual offences at the same rate as non-trans men, this is an obvious threat to women's and girls' safety.

Are the provisions in the Equality Act for the provision of single-sex and separate-sex spaces and facilities in some circumstances clear and useable for service providers and service users?

No – see above. Also, there is too much room for argument about whether women really need privacy in enclosed spaces such as toilets and changing rooms, or in services such as rape crisis centres and domestic-violence refuges. That need should not be questioned.

If not, is reform or further guidance needed?

Yes. We need correct guidance at least, and preferably reform to protect women and girls more clearly.

Does the Equality Act adequately protect trans people? If not, what reforms, if any, are needed

Trans people already have all the same rights that everyone has, plus some extra ones such as the right to change their birth certificate and the right, after committing a crime, to change their identity without anyone having the right to identify them by their former name. Any reforms should strengthen protection of those characteristics that are not lifestyle choices, eg age, disability, race, sex, sexual orientation. No concessions to transpeople should be allowed that impinge on women's rights.

What issues do trans people have in accessing support services, including health and social care services, domestic violence and sexual violence services?

Are legal reforms needed to better support the rights of gender-fluid and non-binary people? If so, how?

No. Members of the gender-identity movement already have full human rights, and the right to present themselves as they wish. UK society in general is tolerant of people's sexuality and behaviour. The advantages they now seek would be harmful to women and children. Gender-fluid and non-binary are simply ways of expressing personality. Inventing new genders that need new rights opens up a rabbit-hole that any government would be foolish to dive into.