

Chapter 1: Introduction

	page
What is the transgender agenda?	2
No such thing as a ‘trans person’	3
Excluding women	7
Men only	7
No one knows what a woman is	8
Women excluding women	10
Tokenistic inclusion	11
Transgender rather than transsexual	12
Individualism	13
Preliminary examples	17
Conclusion	23
References	24

The transgender agenda is presented to the public as a matter of a few individuals seeking redress for unjust treatment by the wider society. They are supposedly a ‘marginalised and vulnerable group’. But that is not the agenda of the transgender phenomenon. Rather than defending the rights of a small number of individuals, the transgender agenda seeks to change society by abolishing any separate category of ‘women’, and it looks like succeeding as it meets with acceptance and agreement everywhere.

So far, it has had the power to get people fired for stating biological facts, to get disagreement and rational argument redefined as ‘discrimination’, ‘hate speech’ and ‘transphobia’, to get feminist organisations defunded and feminist objections de-platformed, to indoctrinate school children with absurdly false beliefs, to damage the bodies of children and young people especially girls, to get laws passed that discriminate against women and anyone who dares to disagree, to get people detained by the police, to successfully convey the idea that privileged entitled men are a ‘vulnerable’ group, to mandate coerced speech (use feminine pronouns to refer to men or lose your job), and to render meaningless the language used to speak about sexual differences.

Above all, it has the power to render meaningless the notion of ‘women’. To the extent that this is accepted throughout society, infiltrating powerful institutions that organise the lives of all of us, there is no separate category for actual women. In practice this means that there is nowhere women can go where men cannot intrude. And given the level of male violence against women, which even the malestream acknowledges (although usually omitting the word ‘male’), this can only increase the danger for women and children. So while the dominant narrative makes it seem as though the transgender agenda is too trivial to worry about—‘just a few individuals’—in fact, it has repercussions that permeate the whole of society. There

are women throughout society, and wherever women are, the transgender agenda stakes a claim to be there too.

Hence, there is a lot to say about the transgender phenomenon, and so this website is initially devoted solely to a lengthy criticism of transgenderism. There are a couple of reasons for the length. One is that the details are important. It is the accumulation of details that best illustrates the extent of the transgender spread, its penetration into institution after institution and eventually into the lives of all of us.

Another reason is that the lies that fuel the transgender agenda require detailed refutation. It takes only a moment to tell a lie, but showing that it *is* a lie often takes an enormous amount of work clarifying the confusion it creates, unpacking its logic, and chasing up the evidence exposing its falsity. It is not always sufficient to counter a false assertion with a true one, it must be shown to be false.

For example, the transgender claim that trans people are more ‘vulnerable’ than the general population is usually stated as a bald assertion, and not only by trans organisations but also by government departments, human rights organisations, the United Nations, etc. Discovering whether or not that assertion is true requires an exhaustive search for instances of that vulnerability, as well as investigation of the research findings cited as evidence (when research findings are cited).

It’s also impossible to prove a negative—‘No, trans people are not more vulnerable than the rest of us’. There’s always room for doubt, and to make one’s case on the balance of probabilities requires lengthy exposition. So although lengthy texts are not popular, especially text written by a virtually unknown author writing from a position as maligned, slandered, smeared and vilified as radical feminism, I make no apologies for its length. It contains a great deal of information that could be useful for anyone needing resources to convince the well-intentioned. (Transgender acolytes will never be convinced, no matter how much evidence is placed before them).

The writings on this website are academic in the sense that they proceed by way of arguments, evidence and theoretical generalisations. Hence, they do require more concentrated attention than texts such as stories or newspaper articles. Unpacking trans-speak is a laborious task. Because it is created to purvey lies and misinformation, unravelling it not only requires searching for the disconfirming evidence, it also requires disentangling the syntax and exposing the real meanings hidden behind the gobbledegook. That requires some very hard thinking. It’s not easy to do and the result is not always easy to read. However, I do try and make it as easy as possible by avoiding esoteric jargon, or explaining it when I have to use it.

What is the transgender agenda?

It’s an ideology, a system of meanings and values centring around the false belief that men can change themselves into women and that children can change sex. Because it interprets ‘women’ as just another male version of femininity, ‘identifying’ away the fact that women are the female sex, it overrides women’s sex-based right to freedom from male encroachment. It has spread so far and so fast throughout society that it must be driven by extraordinarily powerful vested interests.

Any detailed investigation of what those vested interests might be I discuss in the ‘Explaining transgender’ chapter. For the moment, I’ll just say that the transgender agenda is yet another ruse of male supremacy. It is one more onslaught in the service of male supremacy’s ugly dream of a world without women, in this case, by

substituting artificial man-made ‘women’ for actual women and obliterating language specific to women. It is a gigantic fraud, a backlash against feminism fuelled by that rank misogyny that Germaine Greer warned us about in *The Female Eunuch*: ‘Women have no idea how much men hate us’. More precisely, it is a male supremacist *society*, including, unfortunately, other women, that hates women or condemns us to irrelevance. Misogyny is what gives the trans agenda its energy and supplies it with the power to override not only women’s basic rights, but also reality itself.

That is why there must be no compromise, no pandering to ‘trans rights’ (they already have the same rights as anyone else), no ‘gender identity’ slipped surreptitiously into the lives of all of us, no kindly acceptance of a ‘diversity’ that includes transgenderism but excludes women, especially lesbians. The only way to solve the problems I detail here is to abolish any notion of ‘transgender’ (and ‘transphobia’), to stop calling disagreement and criticism ‘hate speech’, to divest ourselves of any notion that people can change sex and especially that men can be women, to abolish the medical practices visited on children and young people in the service of the trans phenomenon, and to delete ‘gender identity’ from laws and regulations. The trans lobby would react with outrage, but no amount of intimidation can change lies into truth.

Thankfully, there is an enormous wave of resistance to the transgender agenda. This resistance has been kept from public knowledge by transgender-mandated censorship, but it is evidence that male supremacy doesn’t always get its own way, that it is not the only social arrangement possible. Widespread though it is, it is not omnipotent. There are other kinds of human relationship, as there must be, otherwise the human race would have ceased to exist long ago, given how lethal male supremacy is.

No such thing as a ‘trans person’

The overall conclusion I have drawn from the immense amount of information I have examined, is that there is no such thing as a ‘trans person’. There may indeed be people who are distressed about the sex they are, but that distress cannot be cured by ‘crossing over’ to the opposite sex because that’s impossible. Hence I cannot accept any notion of ‘transwomen’, ‘transmen’ or ‘trans kids’, and anyone who describes themselves as ‘non-binary’ or ‘gender fluid’, etc., etc. remains one sex or the other.

Of course I didn’t really need an immense amount of information. A moment’s reflection on the notion that men can be women is all that is needed to realise that it’s false. But while it cannot be rationally argued that there exists a ‘trans people’ category of persons, the transgender agenda has generated a number of other more or less unpleasant personae. Among them are men who are so enraptured by femininity that they want for themselves what is usually reserved for women. They want to be seen as women, or they insist they *are* women, but what they are doing is simply donning a fetishised femininity. They do it because they are sexually excited both by the paraphernalia of femininity and by the discomfort that their masquerade arouses in women. There are also men, they may even be the same men, who are enraged at being excluded from the category of ‘female’ and attempt to create their own version and impose it in the place of real women. As well, there are men who have found in the transgender agenda a marvellous resource for gleefully lashing back at feminism by demolishing any separate category for women. There are also men who use it to get close to women in order to rape and sexually harass them, especially in women’s prisons. Then there are adolescent male thugs of any age on social media who

threaten to rape and kill women who disagree with them. These adult men are the main drivers of the trans narrative, the ones whose desires have been allowed to override perceptions of reality itself.

There are also the women who want to share in the benefits and privileges of being seen as male, young women who have so internalised the misogyny of a male-supremacist society that they loathe their own bodies and/or lesbian desires; and there are children and young people seduced by the latest adolescent craze on TikTok (or wherever). There are also those kindly, tolerant people, unfortunately many of them women, who accept ‘trans people’ for what they say they are, out of a misplaced sense of ‘respect’ and because ‘it’s only a few individuals’. There may even be people who have ‘a profound and often debilitating sense of alienation from one’s bodily sex’ (Anderson, 2018),¹ although trying to change into the opposite sex will not alleviate this kind of distress. Most unpleasant of all, there is a social order that is peculiarly susceptible to the transgender message and willing to regulate the lives of everybody in accordance with its demands. It is not just a matter of particular kinds of individuals, but of generalised meanings and values that permeate throughout a society blindly indifferent to the needs of women.

The trans lobby complain that this is to ‘deny the legitimacy of trans subjectivity’ (e.g. in the Open Letter² objecting to Holly Lawford-Smith’s Feminism course at the University of Melbourne—I discuss this in the ‘Evidence’ chapter). I admit it. That is indeed what I am doing. If men can’t be women, then claims that they are women are indeed illegitimate. This statement of mine is, in their terms, an instance of ‘transphobia’. Most critics of transgenderism deny that they are ‘transphobic’, understandably, because it means ‘a range of negative attitudes and feelings such as hatred, disgust, contempt, prejudice and fear towards people who are gender variant’ (according to one trans-captured organisation) (RANZCP, 2021). I haven’t come across a single critic of transgenderism who says anything that looks remotely like that definition. But I am not going to do deny that what I have to say is ‘transphobic’, both because I find the term meaningless (apart from its thuggish attempt at censorship), and because denying something tends to reinforce it. And anyway, insults are not arguments. They may silence opposition but they don’t convince.

The transgender agenda interprets arguments saying that there is no such thing as ‘trans’ to mean that people who say they’re ‘trans’ don’t exist. As Ruth Hunt, Stonewall’s CEO, put it: ‘We will always debate issues that enable us to further equality, but what we will not do is debate trans people’s rights to exist’ (Hunt, 2018). Or as another trans apologist said: ‘WoLF [Women’s Liberation Front] denies the existence of transgender individuals and portrays trans women as dangers to cis [sic] women’ (Farkas, 2020). This is a typical instance of transgender distortion of what is actually said. Rejection of ‘trans’ as a category of persons is not saying someone doesn’t exist. To say ‘there is no such thing as a trans person’ is not to say that the

¹ My copy is an ebook, hence there is no point in giving page numbers. Ryan T. Anderson is one of those on the Right whose position on the ‘trans’ question is similar to the feminist position. (I discuss this in the ‘Feminism and the Right’ chapter). He and the organisation he belongs to, the Heritage Foundation, have been helpful in giving a public voice to US feminists, especially the Women’s Liberation Front (WoLF).

²<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1sDbh6iO9bYvStZyeiI4We5Z9EgxEfk1UhvjtO1zJyMI/mob ilebasic>

people who refer to themselves as such do not exist. It is simply to say that, whatever is motivating them, it cannot be a desire to change sex because that's impossible—and the viciousness that greets any disagreement or criticism however mild, does suggest that what is being defended is indefensible.

Saying that it is not possible to change sex is not to say that the feelings underlying that belief are false. It is saying that, whatever 'gender dysphoria' is, it is not a desire to change sex and that those feelings need to be interpreted otherwise. Neither does disbelief in the trans agenda mean that you have to challenge every man you meet who claims to be a 'woman' (or woman claiming to be a 'man'). It is quite possible to relate to people claiming to be the opposite sex just as people. The subject of transgender might not even arise in everyday interactions, although this is less likely when acquiescence to the trans agenda is institutionally mandated, e.g. workplaces with no separate toilet facilities for women, or where the use of feminine pronouns to refer to men is obligatory.

I myself reject the notion of 'trans' altogether, but there are other critics of transgenderism who do not find the notion of 'trans people' problematic, and who even accept some of the transgender claims. I suspect that this acceptance stems from the politeness and just plain decency of transgenderism's critics. They accept what people say about themselves, while objecting to what the trans lobby is doing to women and children. For example, one critic of the transgendering of children, Toby Young, says:

it would be a mistake to dismiss all the critics of the current direction of policy as Bufton Tufton types who think men are men and women are women and there's an end to it. Many believe that children with genuine cases of Gender Dysphoria should be supported and, in some cases, given the help they need to start transitioning (Young, 2019: 10).

Whatever a 'Bufton Tufton type' is (presumably a pompous, opinionated, right-wing git), the statement that 'men are men and women are women' is true, and that is indeed an end to it. The 'trans kid' is an invented concept (Brunskell-Evans and Moore, eds, 2019), and there are no 'genuine cases of Gender Dysphoria'. And how is it possible to tell the difference between the 'genuine' and the non-genuine anyway? Young does acknowledge this problem. 'The tricky thing is that word "genuine", he said. 'How can you tell?' He suggests that 'neuroscience' might be the answer. Although he admits the evidence 'is fairly limited to date', it is an hypothesis he 'quite likes' because it implies that there *are* ineradicable differences between the sexes (Young, 2019: 17-19). But if that is the case, it must be possible to distinguish female from male, and this is ruled out by leaving open *any* possibility that people can change sex.

Again, Sarah Ditum is a trenchant critic of the misogyny of transgender's linguistic erasure of women, but she also accepts some of their claims, in this case, of vulnerability:

Trans people face substantial injustices, most significantly violence (perpetrated, like all violence, largely by men) and discrimination. The process of applying for a gender-recognition certificate is intrusive and burdensome for many, and there are frustrating waiting lists for medical transition, which are compounded when doctors appear unsympathetic or obstructive (Ditum, 2018).

But these are all transgender lies. Men claiming to be women don't face substantial injustices, violence and discrimination, the GRC process in the UK is neither intrusive nor burdensome, and most of these men aren't bothering with medical 'transition'. As Fair Play for Women (2018) said, 'The vast majority of male-born transwomen [sic] still have a penis'. Ditum is an insightful critic of transgender's treatment of women, but she doesn't question the concept of 'trans people' or their claims about injustice, etc.

Kathleen Stock has also written insightfully and at length about the dangers of trans ideology (Stock, 2018a, b, c, d, 2019a, b, c, 2020a, b, c) and there is much to commend in her book, *Material Girls*, where she says quite clearly that 'you can't actually change or "trans" sex, literally speaking'. And yet she still wants to retain a notion of 'trans people'. She uses the term throughout her book, even at one point saying 'Trans people are trans people. We should get over it' (Stock, 2021: ebook, chapter 8). By this latter statement she means that they deserve to be safe and not to be shamed, and to have the same life opportunities as everyone else. There isn't a single critic of the trans agenda, myself included, who would disagree with this. But it only means that they're people, not that they are 'trans'.

In order to resolve the contradiction between her knowledge that no one can change sex and the transgender claim that you can, she introduces the notion of 'a fiction'. 'Most of the time', she said, 'I choose to immerse myself in a fiction about sex change for trans people, where it seems they would wish me to'. But the trans lobby is unlikely to be satisfied with being seen as a fiction. They insist that they're *really* women. Moreover, colluding with the trans fiction violates women's sex-based rights to freedom from male violence and harassment, and everyone's right to free speech. As one reviewer of her book said,

women's rights cannot be secure where men are enabled to "become women" legally. It should not be the business of the law to sustain immersive fictions which are harmful to society and to the individual. After all, women's rights vs trans activism could aptly be described as reality vs fiction (flow, 2021)

The overarching problem with Stock's thesis is that she doesn't believe in male domination. 'Patriarchy' is something radical feminists think: 'radical feminists think ... [that] women and girls' oppression is ... grounded in something called "the patriarchy"—a systematic set of social relations that acts to disadvantage and immobilise females relative to males' (Stock, 2021: chapter 8). She makes no attempt to connect the idea of patriarchy with the demands of the trans agenda, despite the fact that she is well aware of the consequences for women of those demands. In fact, she explicitly rejects such an account, which she refers to as the 'so-called "dominance" model of the sexes':

it is as if, long ago, there was only a blooming, buzzing confusion of flesh, and perhaps also of sexual parts of different shapes. Then one day, a group of people came along and artificially moulded this proliferation into two categories for their own nefarious purposes, calling it "natural": the dominant males and the dominated females (Stock, 2021: chapter 2).

This trivialises the notion of male domination, which is a system, not 'a group of people'. But if you can't see male supremacy then you can't see that the transgender agenda is yet one more male supremacist ruse to obliterate women.

I came to the conclusion that there were no ‘trans people’ because people can no more change their sex than the old-time alchemists could change lead into gold. I also came to realise that there are no ‘trans people’ whose needs are not being met, whose human rights are being violated, and who are particularly vulnerable to discrimination, stigmatisation, harassment, assault and even murder, because there was simply no evidence that such things were happening. As well, anything that requires lies, censorship and thuggery for its survival doesn’t deserve to exist. In fact, in the research I did, I found no good reason why there should be a phenomenon called ‘transgender’ at all, and every good reason why there should not.

It is important to hold fast to this realisation because even the slightest compromise with the transgender agenda means that it wins at women’s expense. As Jennifer Bilek has pointed out:

The minute we allow a man to walk over this line, the minute we allow for this in word or in action, that he is any kind of woman, and start fighting for what these men have taken from us after they have walked over this line, we have lost the war. We may, at some point, reclaim a wee bit of ground, but we won’t win the war until this line is reclaimed. Men are not women. Ever. They are not a subset of women. Ever. They do not transition from being male. Ever. Transgenderism is one big Psyops (Bilek, 2020).

For other accounts saying there is no such thing as ‘trans’, see: Bilek, 2021, 2022; Long, 2020.

In contrast to the transgender agenda, reality is the existence of two sexes; and men who call themselves ‘women’ remain men in their sense of entitlement and in their dissociation from that reality. There can be no ‘true’ transgender in the sense of changing sex. No one has ever changed their sex no matter how many procedures they have undergone and no matter how successfully they ‘pass’ as the opposite sex. Men remain men (and women remain women), genetically, chromosomally, in the hormonal effects of puberty on their bodies. Most importantly for the influence they have on society, men remain men in their behaviour, their sense of entitlement and their dissociation from reality. Or as Jane Clare Jones put it:

the [social media] wires are currently full of male people ... who seem to think they are the living breathing instantiation of “smash the patriarchy” because they dare to pair some nail-varnish with their beards, all while acting like exactly the same entitled, narcissistic, dependency-denying, mind-over-matter, female-erasing assholes that they always were (Jones, 2019).

Excluding women

Men only

The trans agenda assumes a symmetry between women and men (when women are remembered at all)—women can change sex too. However, the trans agenda’s treatment of women differs from the way men are treated. Women do not have the social power that men do, and so there are vastly different implications for women than there are for men. While men who claim to be ‘women’ demand to be included in women’s sport, women who claim to be ‘men’ have made no such demands of men’s sport; while women have good reasons to fear men, whether trans or not, who

enter women's toilets, change rooms, etc., men have no reason to fear women who enter men's spaces; and while trans-identified men have been claiming the right to be incarcerated in women's jails, trans-identified women are not clamouring to be allowed into men's jails. Moreover, as feminist commentators have pointed out, the 'inclusive' language changes demanded by the trans lobby apply only to women and not to men. Cancer Research UK, for example, refers to 'cervix holders' rather than 'women', but it refers to 'men' in its messages about prostate and testicular cancer, rather than to 'prostate holders' or 'testicle holders' (Brunskell-Evans, 2020; Ditung, 2018).

The male supremacist interest behind the trans agenda is to obliterate women—by deleting the word 'women' from female-specific areas (even from female anatomy), by turning 'women' into a category that includes men, and by mutilating women's bodies to turn them into ersatz 'men'. This is disguised by the de-gendering of the language that implies that there *is* a symmetry when in fact there is not. What are actually male interests are presented as the interests of all. The campaign for 'self-identification' or 'self-id' is one example of this. The demand is put in terms of transgender 'people', but in fact this is a demand by men who want it to be made easier for them to legally penetrate women's spaces while retaining their male genitals.

That 'self-id' is only about men was inadvertently made clear in a letter by the director of the UK Human Rights Watch sent to the Prime Minister, Boris Johnson, in June 2020 (Ward, 2020). This letter was asking the UK government to retain its commitment to 'reforming' the Gender Recognition Act by making it legally permissible for men to be accepted as 'women' simply because they say so. The 'exclusion' of men from women's spaces was mentioned three times in a letter of fewer than 500 words. In the first paragraph, the author said that he had seen reports that the government 'might explicitly exclude transgender women [i.e. men] from "women-only" spaces'. Later he said that 'We are particularly concerned by media reports suggesting that the government plans to exclude trans women [i.e. men] from women-only spaces'; and he concluded by saying, 'We urge you to reject any policies that would subject trans women [i.e. men] to discrimination and expose them to harm, in particular by denying them access to safe spaces for women'. 'Trans men' (i.e. women) were not mentioned at all.

Another example of the de-gendering of what are in fact male interests can be found in the Queensland government's 'conversion therapy' legislation. As an example of a practice that is not 'conversion therapy', the Act gives 'speech pathology services for trans-gender and gender-diverse *persons* who wish to alter their voice and communication to better align with their gender identity' (Queensland Government, 2020: 19, s.213F—emphasis added). But it is not 'persons' who would want speech pathology services to alter their voices, only men. The voices of women taking testosterone deepen automatically and permanently.

No one knows what a woman is

The transgender demand is that the meaning of 'women' must change. In fact, it must be rendered meaningless, since its meaning has always been the opposite of 'men' and hence it excludes men by definition. This is a task the trans agenda has been working at assiduously for some time now. Helen Joyce (2020), staff journalist at *The Economist* and author of *Trans: When Ideology Meets Reality* (2021), has given a number of examples of transgender definitions of 'woman' that either do not notice its meaninglessness,

don't care, or glory in it. Joyce exposes absurdity of each of them in her own commentary.

- 'A woman, for me', said Sally Hines, a British professor of Sociology and (of course) Gender Identity, 'is someone who feels that they are a woman'.
- A British member of parliament, John Nicolson, said '[Women are] people who want to be so defined. I think people should be able to be who they want to be'.
- Susan Stryker, a US 'transwoman' (i.e. a man) writing in *Time* magazine, said, not surprisingly, '[The word 'woman' is a] useful shorthand for the entanglement of femininity and social status regardless of biology—not as an identity, but as the name for an imagined community that honors the female, enacts the feminine and exceeds the limitations of a sexist society'.
- UN Women quoted Aaron Philip, 18-year-old (in 2019) fashion model and 'transwoman' (i.e. a man), on the definition of 'woman': 'Every woman is a woman. Women are multifaceted, intergenerational, international. They are limitless, formless ... women are the world'.
- The British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy said, 'Many people identify as women. However, what this means varies a great deal depending on their other intersecting attributes. It is important not to assume, for example, that being a woman necessarily involves being able to bear children, or having XX sex chromosomes, or breasts. Being a woman in a British cultural context often means adhering to social norms of femininity, such as being nurturing, caring, social, emotional, vulnerable, and concerned with appearance. However, of course not all women adhere to all these things', etc. It is to be hoped that the people who need help with mental disorders can avoid therapists so out of touch with reality.

Perhaps the most ridiculous source defining 'woman' in obeisance to the transgender *dictat*, even more ridiculous than the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy, is the Australian Academy of *Science* (sic—emphasis added). In April 2019, the Academy released its 'Decadal Plan' for 'removing barriers to participation' of women and girls in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) training (AAS, 2019). For critical commentary on this decision, see: Lane, 2020a, b).

Right at the very end of the report, in Appendix 5 on the last page of text before the reference list (AAS, 2019: 58), the authors defined 'Woman/Women': 'Anyone who identifies as a woman, including cisgender (personal gender identity corresponds with sex assigned at birth), transgender (personal gender identity does not correspond with sex assigned at birth), non-binary and intersex persons who identify as a woman (or girl)'. (The 'assigned at birth' terminology is trans-speak denial of the reality of sex). In other words, the participation of men and boys in STEM training counts as the participation of women and girls, as long as those males call themselves 'women' or 'girls'. It beggars belief that an organisation supposedly devoted to science could deny one of the most basic facts of human existence, but such is the power of the trans lobby.

Women excluding women

One of the more bizarre and worrying aspects of the transgender agenda is the support it gets from women. It would seem that a large number of the most stalwart defenders of the claim that men can be ‘women’ are women (Biggs, 2019). The last two CEOs of Stonewall (rightly referred to as ‘the mothership of the Trans Rights Movement in the UK’) (Jones, 2020), Ruth Hunt and Nancy Kelley, are women, and it is under their management that Stonewall became such a rabid defender of ‘trans rights’. Kelley has no qualms about insisting that men can be lesbians if they say so, while Hunt’s commitment to the transgender agenda would appear to be no impediment to her path to a successful career. In 2019 when she left Stonewall, Hunt became Baroness Hunt of Bethnal Green (Bartosch, 2021a).

Some of the most enthusiastic and influential purveyors of the transgendering of the young are women: Susie Green, CEO of Mermaids, one of the groups most successful at lobbying the powers-that-be in the UK for the transgendering of the young; Johanna Olson-Kennedy, Medical Director of the Center for Transyouth Health and Development at the Children’s Hospital in Los Angeles, the largest ‘gender’ clinic in the US; Peggy Cohen-Kettenis, prime mover of the puberty-blocking regime; and in Australia, Michelle Telfer, head of the Gender Clinic at the Royal Children’s Hospital in Melbourne.

None of these female acolytes, famous and successful or not, make transgender claims for themselves, although Susie Green has a son who claims to be female, with her enthusiastic support,³ and Olson-Kennedy’s marriage partner is a woman living as a ‘man’ (Brown, 2015). But they, along with the mostly young women who participate in the baying mobs of trans activists, fight for ‘trans rights’ as steadfastly and as mindlessly as any of the adult men do. Perhaps they believe that they are being kind and defending a ‘vulnerable’ minority. But by defending the transgender agenda, they are engaging in the ‘repressive tolerance’ that serves to mask the actual relations of power (Marcuse, 1969; Thompson, 2003). They are upholding the ‘rights’ of a socially powerful group—men—while purporting to defend a small group of supposedly badly-treated individuals.

Why the trans agenda should have captured so many women, or any women at all, is an interesting question. Michael Biggs (2019) has suggested that at least part of the answer is that transgenderism has actually been promoted by feminism’s social construction thesis that argued that biology was irrelevant. This form of ‘mainstream feminism’, he said, prepared the ground for transgenderism’s denial of biology: ‘By denying biological differences [feminists since the 1970s] inadvertently eroded the distinction between male and female, which now licenses a social movement that undermines the interests of women and girls’ (Biggs, 2019). (The problem was actually the use of the word ‘gender’, and not ‘some feminists’. This is discussed further in the ‘Language’ chapter).

But there have always been women who have embraced masculinist projects as their own, even against their own best interests, because that’s where the power lies (Campbell, 1987; Dworkin, 1983), including the power of naming what counts as reality. One of the ways in which domination operates is by monopolising the

³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2ZiVPh12RQY>

meanings whereby we understand the world. As institution after institution gets drawn into the transgender worldview, the meanings and values it purveys become the dominant meanings and values. Women, as members of the general public, can be as susceptible as men to being hoodwinked by the trans ‘vulnerability’ trope, coupled as it is with the strategy of piggybacking on the rights of lesbians and gays (see the ‘Piggybacking’ chapter).

But the fact that there are a lot of women who embrace the transgender cause does not mean that it is not a male supremacist enterprise. It is. If something harms women and reinforces men’s oppression of women, then it is male supremacist, even if women themselves embrace it. Strong evidence for this is the threat transgender poses to women, not only to our safety, but also to any recognition that we exist at all as an autonomous category of the human separate and different from men (apart from our common humanity). Even stronger evidence for the male supremacist nature of transgenderism is that fact that it has been so successful.

Tokenistic inclusion

The transgender agenda has provided places for women. They are allowed to support men in the men’s claims to be ‘women’, and they are allowed to call themselves ‘men’ and undergo the medical and surgical procedures necessary for donning a masculine appearance. But like every other male-dominant institution, transgender inclusion of women is tokenistic. As Janice Raymond said,

The female-to-constructed-male transsexual promotes the “illusion of inclusion”. She is assimilated into the transsexual empire in much the same way that women are assimilated into other male-defined realities—on men’s terms (Raymond, 1980: xxi).

This tokenistic inclusion gives the impression that the transgender phenomenon belongs to both sexes, whereas it actually serves an arcane purpose for the masculinist psyche while subordinating women to that purpose. Its acceptance by social institutions shows the same indifference to the rights of women and children that already permeates society.

But the transgender inclusion of women (as ‘men’) is not just tokenistic. It serves an important function for the transgender cause. It enables feminine language to be detached from women, thus obliterating ways of speaking about female specificity. Women calling themselves ‘men’ means that the female specificity of terms referring to women must be deleted. So pregnant women become ‘pregnant persons’, ‘childbearing individuals’ and ‘birthing parents’; women become ‘people with a cervix/uterus’ or just ‘non-men’; and ‘breastfeeding’ becomes ‘chestfeeding’, with claims that men can do it too (e.g. MacDonald, 2013). In the trans lexicon the word ‘woman’ must never be applied to actual women, only to men claiming to be ‘women’. This neutering of the category ‘women’ is necessary if it is going to include men, as the transgender agenda insists it must. As Angela C. Wild of ‘Get the L Out’ said, when we are banned from using sex-specific vocabulary in talking about women, ‘talking about ourselves in those terms is a forbidden act’. In order to resist this, she said, using the vocabulary that is forbidden to us is ‘a particularly urgent political act’ (Wild, 2019: 3).

It is men (and their female acolytes) who are demanding detrimental changes to institutions, degrading the language, bullying the unconvinced into silence or

submission, and demanding that transgender activists be permitted to go wherever they choose and thrust their way into places where they do not belong. For that reason, most of what I have to say applies to the men who are calling themselves ‘women’ rather than to the women who are calling themselves ‘men’—except when the issue directly applies to females, e.g. the erasure of lesbianism, the astounding increase in the numbers of girls and young women presenting at ‘gender identity’ clinics.

Transgender rather than transsexual

Elsewhere, I said I preferred to use the term ‘transsexual’ rather than transgender because it was the original term and because the term ‘gender’ is meaningless (Thompson, 2020) (although for that very reason it has been extremely useful in distorting the feminist message). However, I have since changed my mind, and here I use the term transgender. I still find the term ‘gender’ meaningless but for that very reason it is the most appropriate term to describe the phenomenon discussed here.

Something has changed. As Sheila Jeffreys said more than two decades ago, “Transsexualism has a new face in the nineties in “transgenderism” which employs queer and postmodern theory and politics to render transsexualism progressive’ (Jeffreys, 1997: 56). Jeffreys herself does not agree that transgenderism is progressive, although it is official left-wing policy everywhere (see the ‘Feminism and the Left’ chapter). Jeffreys sees it as a violation of human rights because it involves ‘the mutilation of healthy bodies and the subjection of such bodies to dangerous and life-threatening continuing treatment’ (Jeffreys, 1997: 59-60). Despite that, the transgender phenomenon is now having an impact on society that marks a difference from the earlier transsexual phenomenon, which did involve only a tiny number of mostly male individuals who lived their lives without making undue demands on the rest of society (although Raymond saw the writing on the wall much earlier). I still use the term ‘transsexual’ to refer to those transsexual men who were involved in the transsexual process before the transgender surge, and to refer to those who are not caught up in the transgender ideology, either implicitly or explicitly. Some of them have even come out publicly against it.

In that sense, I am in partial agreement with a group who refer to themselves as ‘genuine transsexuals’ (Transsexual Voices Matter, 2018). I don’t agree that there is anything ‘genuine’ about transsexualism (because no one can cross over to the other sex). Moreover, their claim to be ‘women’ is as imperialistic as the transgender lobby’s. But these transsexuals do not make the same claims on society as the transgender phenomenon does, and they see themselves as quite different. They see transgenderism as contemptuous of the term ‘transsexual’ when it says that the term is ‘outdated, non-medical, archaic, disused and even transphobic’; and they object to transgenderism’s claims that there is no need for a medical diagnosis, and that ‘all hard won legal rights protecting transsexuals’ should be expanded to include just about anyone. Moreover, transsexuals ‘seek recognition within [the] terms’ of the current system of ‘gender’ (i.e. they insist on the existence of two sexes, they just don’t like the one they are), whereas ‘transgender persons [see themselves as] more politically progressive in refusing to comply with it’ (Elliot, 2009: 6).

While I disagree that there is anything genuine about men’s claims to be women, these are adult men capable of making their own decisions. To the extent that they ‘have spent their entire lives trying to seamlessly integrate in the society without

drawing unnecessary attention, seeking confrontation or gaining unfavourable reputation' (Transsexual Voices Matter, 2018), they differ from the exponents of the transgender agenda. At the same time, transsexualism has always contained the seeds of the transgender agenda it later became, as Raymond (1980) saw so clearly when she named it an 'empire'. And Miranda Yardley (2018) has argued that these 'genuine transsexuals' are not really very different from the transgender lot after all, given their claims to be 'women' and their rage against feminists who refuse to accept them as women (and their use of the insulting term 'terf'). Still, he does agree that 'the identity of "transsexual" is being swept aside by "transgender"', and that there has been a change, even if that change is nothing more than a further development of what was there all along.

Individualism

In referring to the phenomenon under discussion, I use the term 'transgender agenda' (or alternatively, 'transgender narrative/ phenomenon/ ethos/ process/ cause/ imagination/ worldview/ bandwagon/ lobby/ universe/ ideology/ system/ pathway',⁴ etc. or simply 'transgender', 'trans' or 'transgenderism'), in order to avoid referring to individuals. What I have to say is not a criticism of individuals or a complaint about what adults do with their own bodies and lives. I am not talking about individuals, men *or* women, at all. I am talking about how the female sex is defined. I am talking about what might be variously called a framework, a worldview, a culture, a mindset about the reality of sexual difference, an ideology that has spread throughout society, a belief system of understandings, of meanings and values. This belief system is held and maintained by individuals, but it is not a personality characteristic or a personal opinion of particular individuals. Rather, it is a shared version of reality that anyone can adopt (or refuse to).

One example of the kind of distinction I'm making is the point I made above about the reactions to any statement that there's no such thing as transgender. A statement about meaning—the interpretation of what certain feelings mean—is taken to be a statement about individuals. Saying that transgender doesn't exist is taken to mean that people who identify as 'trans' don't exist. That is not what it says, although it does say that their identity as 'trans' doesn't exist because it doesn't refer to anything in reality. It also has no referent in everyday language. Saying that transgender doesn't exist means that any belief that it is possible to change sex is false, and that anyone who believes that is mistaken. It doesn't say that the people who hold that belief have ceased to exist. It doesn't even say that their belief or their feelings have ceased to exist, simply that it is a false belief about those feelings.

Of course, being disbelieved about one's feelings can feel annihilating, and if it were simply a matter of what someone said about their feelings it would be presumptuous to tell them they're wrong. But that is not what the transgender agenda is about. It is not just a matter of someone's feelings. Rather, it is a project to change society for all of us, to the detriment of women and children in the first place, certainly, but also of anyone who wants to publicly disagree or to do anything to challenge the trans hegemony. This is not something that is inherent in individuals. It's a belief system that can be embraced or rejected. And it's only in that sense that it's relevant to talk

⁴The 'pathway' terminology is transgender's own: https://bnssgccg-media.ams3.cdn.digitaloceanspaces.com/attachments/govbody_5Nov19_item6.4.pdf

about individuals, because each of us has a choice about whether we accept that belief system (or aspects thereof), or whether we reject it, ignore it, modify it, etc. Trans activists are exercising that choice by insisting that men can be ‘women’ and attacking anyone who disagrees with them, and trans-critical dissenters are exercising that choice by refusing to be browbeaten into silence.

(In parenthesis, I want to point out that I prefer to use the term ‘trans-critical’ rather than ‘gender critical’. Although I am critical of ‘gender’, I see that as a different problem to that of transgenderism, although there are connections (see the ‘Language’ chapter). Julia Long also rejects the term ‘gender critical’, although my reason is different from hers (Long, 2020). She says it is not an accurate description of some of transgender’s self-styled critics in the UK because they do not go far enough in their rejection of the transgender agenda. They continue to use terminology such as ‘transwoman’, as well as feminine pronouns to refer to men, and they claim to be in favour of ‘trans rights’ despite the fact that the notion of ‘trans’ is fictitious. ‘I neither accept the fiction of transgenderism’, Long says, ‘nor the “right” of an individual to be treated according to this fiction’. Long says that it is paradoxical that ‘much of what is written and spoken in the name of British gender critical feminism in fact does the ideological work of transgenderists for them, promulgating their fictions as legitimate and valid through speaking their language’. I agree with Long’s criticism—see my discussion above of Ditum’s and Stock’s acceptance of aspects of the trans ideology. But that is not my reason for rejecting the term ‘gender critical’. Rather, I think that the term ‘trans-critical’ more precisely identifies what the disagreement is about).

To return to the topic of individualism: to interpret the transgender belief system as something inherent in individuals would be to collude with the individualism that marks the transgender agenda itself. That is one of the main ways it fends off criticism, by defining ‘gender’ in terms of individuals’ ‘identities’ and ‘feelings’. This personalising of ‘gender’ renders it unarguable. Who can disagree with someone else’s feelings or question their identity? The only expert is the one whose feelings and identity they are.

To give just one typical example of transgender’s individualising strategy, taken from the Australian government’s *Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender*. The Australian government is not a transgender organisation and yet it has succumbed to the transgender agenda, like so many of the other institutions I discuss:

Gender is part of a person’s personal and social identity. It refers to the way a person feels, presents and is recognised within the community. A person’s gender may be reflected in outward social markers, including their name, outward appearance, mannerisms and dress (Australian Government, 2013b: 4)

It might seem as though the Australian government’s use of the term ‘social’ in ‘social identity’ and ‘outward social markers’ (as well as ‘social footprint’—see below) means that this definition is not individualistic. But this usage doesn’t refer to the social conditions within which we live our lives as women and men. Rather, ‘social’ here has the superficial meaning of ‘recognised within the community’ (i.e. publicly) only *after* his⁵ ‘gender identity’ is seen to exist, and because he says it does, *after* he already has a

⁵ I use the masculine pronoun because transgender is a masculinist project.

‘gender identity’. It doesn’t mean that ‘gender identities’ are social constructs, arising out of the social arrangements around what it means to be female and male. A ‘social footprint’ has the same superficial connotations. It is defined as

evidence of a person’s identity operating in the community. A social footprint can be established using credentials or other information (changes of name, details of education/qualifications, electoral register entries, employment history, and interactions with organisations such as Australia Post, banks, financial institutions and State and Territory public authorities) which establish a person’s use of an identity in Australia over time (Australian Government, 2013b: 10).

In other words, he already has an ‘identity’ before he gets a ‘social footprint’. The ‘identity’ he says he has is what his ‘social footprint’ is based on.

There is no explanation in this government document of the reasons why common understandings of what it means to be female or male have been abolished in favour of ‘gender identity’. In 2013, the Australian Labor government deleted (‘repealed’) the definitions of ‘woman’ and ‘man’ in the 1984 *Sex Discrimination Act*. It also substituted the words ‘a different sex’ instead of the words ‘the opposite sex’ throughout the Act (Australian Government, 2013a) (although it’s not clear why—the ‘trans’ word is ‘gender’, not ‘sex’, and the argument is that there are lots of different ‘genders’, not ‘sexes’).

As well as the deletion of ‘man’ and ‘woman’, the Australian government’s ‘preferred approach’ to collecting information about ‘a person’s use of an identity ... over time’ also makes it clear that common understandings of ‘sex’ are irrelevant for government purposes: ‘the preferred approach is for Australian Government departments and agencies to collect gender information. Information regarding a person’s sex would not ordinarily be required’ (Australian Government, 2013b: 3). The government appears not to have noticed that, without ‘information regarding a person’s sex’, there is no possibility of recording a person’s ‘footprint’ over time. If government documents record only that a man who calls himself a ‘woman’ is ‘female’ but not that he is ‘male’, then he is not being recorded accurately. The only reason for these changes in the Australian anti-discrimination legislation is that there exist certain male individuals who say they are ‘women’. The Australian government was not interested in asking where this entirely new way of seeing the social world might have come from, nor what the social consequences of these changes might be.

My use of the term ‘transgender agenda’ is intended to avoid this kind of individualising discourse whereby ‘gender identity’ is something that arises autonomously within individuals, unconnected to what might be happening in the society those individuals inhabit, and which inhabits them. (This strategy of individualism is not confined to the Australian government or even to the transgender agenda. It is an ideological ploy characteristic of a society of domination, serving to deflect attention away from systematic structures of power. What I am talking about is not a characteristic of individuals. It’s a coherent set of meanings and values, coherent, that is, as long as you accept the initial premise that people can change sex and that the category of ‘women’ is something created by men. This set of meanings and values does define individuals in certain ways, but it is those definitions I am criticising, not the individuals themselves.

For other critiques of individualism, see: Thompson, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2005.

To say that a man can't be a woman is not to say that that man doesn't exist, although it *is* to say that there is no such category of persons as 'transwomen'. Instead, there is a category of men who mistakenly claim to be 'women' with a typically arrogant masculine sense of entitlement whose only relationship to the category of 'women' is to destroy it. To say that 'gender identity' is a delusion is not to call anyone delusional. A man claiming to be a 'woman' may not actually believe that he is. He may be doing it to be provocative, to enrage 'feminists' he believes are threatening his prerogatives. To say that the transgender agenda is based on a lie is not to say that anyone is lying. Many of these men are no doubt sincere in their belief that what they feel is some kind of essence of womanhood (although that interpretation is wrong because it's not possible). As adults, they are anyway entitled to make their own decisions, although they are not entitled to ride roughshod over the needs of others.

Having said that, I agree that what I have to say is relevant to any individual who identifies as transgender because I am talking about their worldview. But their worldview is *not* a personal possession. It has effects far beyond a few transgender individuals. I *am* critical of the appalling behaviour of some individuals, those who have come to be known as trans activists. Because the transgender agenda is indefensible—being based on a falsehood it cannot be defended with rational argument and evidence—disagreement and criticism are too often met with censorship, insults, vitriolic abuse and violence. But my main objection is not to the fact that some few individuals see the world in a certain way and live their lives in accordance with it, but to the imposition of this worldview onto others. Transgenderism stops being simply a personal predilection when it intrudes upon the lives of others who didn't choose to get caught up in it.

Commitment to the transgender agenda is not confined to individuals who identify as transsexual. There are many people, unfortunately many of them women, who embrace the agenda even though they themselves are not transsexual (e.g. Scottish MP Mhairi Black, actress Emma Watson, NHS GP Adrian Harrop, journalist and left-wing pundit Owen Jones, 'Harry Potter' actor Daniel Radcliffe—to name some well-known ones). In contrast, there are transsexual men who are critical of aspects of the agenda and of the uses to which it has been put, and who do not claim they are women, for example:

- Miranda Yardley in the UK ('Most transsexual women are heterosexual males') (link on 'Home' page);
- Debbie Hayton in the UK ('Trans women are men. Get over it!') Hayton, 2020; Hellen, 2019; Lyons, 2019);
- Kristina Jayne Harrison who gave evidence in support of Maya Forstater who had been fired because she tweeted that 'trans men cannot be women' (Lyons, 2019);
- Jenn Smith in Canada ('The truth is a man can't be a woman ... Express as you want, but let's not get untethered from physical reality') (MacLeod, 2019);
- the 14 transsexual people who sent a letter to Members of the Scottish Parliament outlining their concerns about proposed changes to the Gender Recognition Act "As transsexual people we are horrified by the impact on women" (Davidson, 2019); and

- the transsexuals mentioned above who object to the ways in which the transgender agenda defines their own reality.

Moreover, although the majority of people fighting the transgender empire are women, usually feminists, they have a number of male allies. Brunskell-Evans lists a number of men in the UK, none of them transsexual, who are supporting women's resistance out of their own conviction (Brunskell-Evans, 2020: chapter 4.1, note 14). So the transgender agenda is neither confined to 'transgender' individuals (people who do not claim any 'transgender' status can embrace it), nor is it accepted by everyone who qualifies (not all transsexual people accept it). It is a worldview, as I have said, that anyone can accept and anyone can reject.

Preliminary examples

Below are some brief discussions of a random number of organisations captured by or warmly embracing the transgender agenda. This is not an exhaustive list, they are illustrative examples only. They do, however, give some preliminary idea of how widespread the transgender influence is and how it operates. Further examples are dealt with more fully in what follows after this Introduction.

US Planned Parenthood has a section on their website on 'gender identity', which tells us that '[y]our gender identity is an important part of who you are', that '[t]here's more to gender than just male and female', and offers the reader an opportunity to '[l]earn about trans identities'.⁶

The Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW), Queensland Branch, objected to a proposed amendment to the Queensland Government's anti-discrimination legislation, which would have protected everybody's right to use what it called 'traditional gender based language'—examples explicitly noted in the Bill were: 'male, female, man, woman, boy, guy, girl, him, her, he, she, Mr, Mrs, Miss, Ms, husband, wife, widow or widower'—and to provide services specific to one 'gender' (i.e. sex) or the other (Queensland Government, 2018). The AASW said that the amendment was against the interests of transgender people. It would give 'individuals, businesses, and other organisations the right to mis-gender a gender-diverse person who does not identify as male or female'. It could 'be detrimental to the mental health of trans- and gender-diverse individuals who are already identified as a vulnerable group', and 'undermines the dignity and human rights of gender diverse people' (AASW, 2018).⁷

In fact, the amendment would have given people some protection against transgender bullying: a student whose essay was marked down because they failed to comply with transgender language usage; employees who were sanctioned or fired because they wouldn't put pronouns in their email addresses or wouldn't refer to men claiming to be 'women' with feminine pronouns. The amendment was not passed.

The Melbourne International Comedy Festival decided to delete Barry Humphries' name from its top award, named after him (the Barry Award), when Humphries publicly criticised transgenderism. He is reported to have said that transgender was a 'fashion',

⁶ <https://www.plannedparenthood.org/learn/gender-identity>

⁷ This publication no longer appears on the AASW website, However, the organisation's enthusiasm for the transgender agenda (now designated 'The LGBTIQ+ community) is undiminished: 'AASW stands against discrimination of The LGBTIQ+ community' – <https://www.aasw.asn.au/aasw-stands-against-discrimination-of-the-lgbtq-community/>.

that the surgery was ‘self-mutilation’, and that Caitlyn Jenner was a ‘publicity-seeking rat-bag’. His name was deleted from the festival’s award despite the fact that he was one of the festival’s founders in 1987, and that he is probably the most famous comedian in the world today (O’Neill, 2019). The award now has the ponderous title, the ‘Melbourne International Comedy Festival Award for Most Outstanding Show’.⁸ It would seem that the current Comedy Festival organisers have no sense of humour, along with their transgender masters.

Girlguiding UK has also succumbed to transgender propaganda. A 2018 policy statement says that boys who say they’re girls can join the organisation as girls, and men who say they’re women can be adult leaders: ‘If a child or young person self-identifies as a girl or young woman then they are able to join any of our youth sections appropriate to their age ... If an adult self-identifies as a woman then they are able to undertake all adult roles in guiding’ (Girlguiding, 2018). In April, 224 concerned people (current and former unit leaders, volunteers and parents) signed an open letter objecting to the new policy on the grounds that boys who ‘identified’ as girls were still male, and that the policy put girls at risk, reinforced gender stereotypes and ignored parents’ concerns. The organisation’s Chief Guide and CEO have both denied this, saying that the criticism was “inaccurate, aggressive and counter to the values we hold dear” (Marsh, 2018).

This is typical of the transgender response to criticism, consisting solely of insults without a shred of argument or evidence. The organisation said that it had developed the policy with the advice of ‘other organisations with experience of supporting transgender children and young people’. At the same time, it denied that it had been influenced by “individuals or pressure groups” (Marsh, 2018). But organisations ‘with experience of supporting transgender children and young people’ are undoubtedly pressure groups for the transgender lobby, as is Stonewall. Girlguiding is one of over 30 voluntary organisations that are Stonewall’s ‘Diversity Champions’.⁹ They were also reported to have consulted with Gendered Intelligence (McGrath, 2018). They appear not to have consulted with any gender-critical women’s rights organisations, e.g. 4th Wave Now, 11th Hour, Mumsnet, Fair Play for Women, Gender Health Query, Graham Linehan, Parents with Inconvenient Truths about Trans, Sex Matters, Transgender Trend, Women Are Human, etc., all of which are freely available on the internet.

Like every organisation that accepts the transgender narrative, Girlguiding UK wants to have it both ways. They recognise, they say, ‘that gender critical beliefs are protected under the Equality Act and that there are girls and volunteers who hold gender critical beliefs within our membership. We respect and value their right to do so, and to express those beliefs’. They go on to say, however, that ‘Girlguiding is also, and shall remain, a home for trans people’ (Girlguiding UK, 2022. See also: Hussain, 2022). But it is not possible to allow the expression of ‘gender-critical beliefs’ while insisting that there is a ‘trans people’ category of persons. The ‘gender-critical belief’ (actually, the insistence on reality) is that there is no such thing as a ‘trans person’, only girls and boys, women and men. If Girlguiding UK is going to continue to provide ‘a home for trans people’ by allowing boys masquerading as ‘girls’ to join, and

⁸ <https://www.comedyfestival.com.au/about-us/awards>.

⁹ <https://sex-matters.org/campaigns/keeping-track-of-stonewall/>.

men who masquerade as ‘women’ to become guiding leaders, the ‘expression of gender-critical beliefs’ would mean protesting against that, loudly and clearly. Judging on past performance, Girlguiding UK does not ‘respect’ that kind of expression. On the contrary, anyone who engages in that kind of ‘expression’ is likely to be expelled.

Boy Scouts in the UK, however, which is open to girls as well as boys, have reversed their initial favourable response to the trans lobby, scrapping a number of policies. They got rid of the ban on referring to children as boys or girls; they no longer insist that parents be kept in the dark about a child’s ‘transition’; their equal opportunities policy has reintroduced the category of ‘sex’ that was previously has deleted in favour of ‘gender identity’; and most references to Mermaids have been removed because they found it was promoting misinformation. One of the Scouts’ advisers for this decision to reject the transgender agenda was Linda Bellos (Gilligan, 2019), who herself has been a target of trans spite (see the ‘More havoc_the law’ chapter).

Banks, it would seem, have joined the forward march of the gender industry by closing the bank accounts of critics of transgenderism. In November 2021, a bank in the Netherlands, called ‘bunq’ or ‘Bank of the Free’, closed the account of a Dutch feminist organization, Voorzij (For Her). The reason given was that Voorzij ‘discriminates against trans women [i.e. men] by not standing up for their interests’ (Neale, 2023). Called ‘de-banking’, this banking policy came to public attention in June 2023 when Nigel Farage revealed that his bank, Coutts, had closed his bank accounts, supposedly because the balance in his accounts had fallen below the required minimum. However, he also acquired a document from the bank that said that his views didn’t “align with our values”, and that his having an account with them presented “a material and ongoing reputational risk to the bank. His publicly-stated views were at odds with our position as an inclusive organization” (Neale, 2023. See also: Jack and Thomas, 2023).

This generated massive publicity (as the closing of the Dutch feminist organisation’s account did not), and exposed other account closures, many of them belonging to people who publicly disagreed with the transgender agenda. First Direct, a division of HSBC, closed the account of Wings over Scotland, an organisation devoted to exposing the capture by the gender industry of political institutions in Scotland. Metro Bank blocked the application for a business account by Our Duty, a support group for parents concerned that their children have been caught up in the transgender phenomenon. Metro Bank’s refusal came a month after they had joined the Stonewall ‘Diversity Champions’ scheme. Yorkshire Building Society closed the account of a vicar, Richard Fothergill, after he posted a comment on their website disagreeing with their promotion of gender ideology with a link to a news report critical of Drag Queen Story Hour. The Royal Bank of Scotland (a brand of the NatWest Group) told Professor Lesley Sawers, the Equalities and Human Rights Commissioner for Scotland, that her joint account with her husband would be closed, with no explanation. Another bank refused to accept the account, on the grounds that there was ‘a mark against her name’ (Neale, 2023).

Farage himself believed that his accounts were closed because he was a ‘Politically Exposed Person’ and because the banks blamed him for Brexit (Neale, 2023). But ‘inclusive’ is a transgender code for including men in the category of ‘women’ (although the trans-smitten never say so), and the year before the closures Farage had publicly expressed disagreement with the transgender agenda. He had been on

television mocking the new ‘transgender Barbie doll’, and he had had some kind of altercation with a male ‘trans athlete’ who had told him that ‘Trans women aren’t taking over’.¹⁰ It is therefore quite possible that Farage, too, was being punished for publicly dissenting from the transgender agenda.

Censorship is one of transgender’s main strategies for spreading their influence throughout society (see the ‘Strategies’ chapter). If no dissenting voices can be heard, transgender becomes the only voice listened to, with its ‘trans people’ and ‘LGBTIQ (etc.) community’. But refusing banking facilities to people because of their views, no matter how abhorrent, goes well beyond censorship. The banking industry has no mandate even to inquire into what its customers do or don’t believe, much less to operate as though that had some relevance for the way the industry functions. That transgender’s reach extends that far is, not to put too fine a point on it, terrifying.

Organised religion, at least some aspects, has also taken the transgender agenda on board without discussion, debate, or the raising of questioning voices.

The Church of England, for example, has published ‘pastoral guidance for clergy on how to use the rite of Affirmation of Baptismal Faith in the context of gender transition’ (Church of England, 2018). This Affirmation is not a second baptism, the authors say, but rather a renewal of ‘the commitments made in baptism and in a public setting and provides space for those who have undergone a major transition to re-dedicate their life to Jesus Christ’. The publication of this document followed on from ‘a motion overwhelmingly adopted at General Synod in 2017 recognising the need for transgender people to be welcomed and affirmed in churches’, and was approved by the House of Bishops. It was produced in consultation with three Anglican priests, all of whom had ‘a personal interest in this matter’ (Church of England, 2018), namely, they were all transgender men claiming to be ‘women’.

Now, the Church of England is a tolerant and inclusive organisation (with some exceptions, e.g. the Sydney archdiocese, the Evangelical Alliance). Transgender people are already welcome in the church, as should be clear from the fact that some have been ordained as priests: “‘The Church of England welcomes and encourages the unconditional affirmation of trans people, equally with all people’”, the document said (Church of England, 2018). Why then do they need special treatment? This Affirmation of Baptismal Faith is usually simply for people who want to renew their faith for whatever reason, without being singled out as a special category. Why is transgender ‘transition’ singled out for special mention in this context? I suspect a whiff of male entitlement here. What the Church of England does within its own ranks is of course its own business. But there is the issue of women priests and bishops, fiercely resisted by the evangelical wing of the church. Counting men as ‘women’ is hardly going to help that cause.

Judaism in the UK also seems to have embraced the transgender cause, or at least the left-wing Liberal/Reform denominations have. A report in *The Jewish Chronicle* (Harpin, 2018) said that Liberal Judaism had defended Mermaids against objections raised by ‘MPs and women’s organisations’ to Mermaids’ receipt of a £500,000 grant by the national lottery. “‘Liberal Judaism’”, they tweeted, “‘would like to express our support for Mermaids. Mermaids is a charity that provides vital services supporting

¹⁰ Search for: ‘Trans athlete tells Nigel Farage “Trans women aren’t taking over’’, and ‘Nigel Farage mocks new transgender Barbie doll’.

young trans and gender nonconforming people, and their families, to achieve a happier life in the face of great adversity”’. Its senior Rabbi Danny Rich tweeted, “‘We stand with Mermaids’”. In October 2018, the senior rabbi to Reform Judaism revealed her child was transgender.

In an address on the status of transgender people in Jewish law in a lecture at the London School of Jewish Studies, an United Synagogue Rabbi said that it didn’t matter where transgender people sat in an Orthodox shul (where men and women are seated separately). They’ve got enough trouble, he said, without turning that into a big issue. But if this doesn’t matter, why does it matter that women must sit separately from men? In fact, admitting ‘trans women’ (i.e. men) into the women’s section of the synagogue would break the law (Harpin, 2018). And one wonders if the rabbi asked the women about this.

But then, Liberal/Reform Judaism does not regard *halakha* (traditional Jewish law) as binding. Orthodox Judaism (which does) doesn’t accept the transgender agenda. According to another report in *The Jewish Chronicle* (JC Reporter, 2019), Jewish law does not recognise ‘gender change’. That report said that a group of Strictly Orthodox women were preparing a judicial review challenge against the City of London’s decision to open the Hampstead Heath Ladies Pond to ‘trans women’ (i.e. men). That decision, they said, meant that they could no longer swim there because Jewish law forbids women to be in a state of undress in the company of men.¹¹

The UK’s National Health Service (NHS) is thoroughly in thrall to the transgender agenda, wreaking havoc throughout an institution that seems to have abandoned its caring principles. The most obvious example of this is the transgenering of the young (see the three ‘Transgenering the young’ chapters. For another example of a hospital giving transgender demands priority over women’s safety, see the ‘Lies, damned lies ...’ chapter).

One of the nastiest examples of the transgender influence on the NHS involved a private hospital, the Princess Grace, where a woman was refused vital surgery because she complained about a transgender man intruding into the room while she was being examined in preparation for the operation. She had requested all-female facilities when she filled in the pre-admission form because she had been sexually assaulted and was fearful of being in intimate situations with strange men. She also said that she would only answer questions about her sex, not her ‘gender identity’. But when she was being physically assessed before the operation, a man in a blond wig and bright lipstick entered the treatment room and stared at her. She suspected that this was deliberate although she had no proof (Sales, 2022).

She complained about this intrusion and reiterated her need for all-female nursing staff during the week following the surgery. In response, the hospital told her that they would no longer be giving her the surgery. The reasons given were typical transgender evasions: that the hospital “did not share her beliefs”, and that it was committed to protecting its staff from “unacceptable distress” and “discrimination and harassment”. The private firm that owned the hospital released a statement giving the usual transgender lying non-explanation for the hospital’s refusal:

¹¹ For more detail about the different strands of Judaism and their approaches to transgenerism, see: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transgender_people_and_religion#Judaism

Some [patient requests], such as a request for “single sex care”, are particularly challenging, given the diversity of our colleagues and our need to prioritise patient safety. Regrettably, in some circumstances, it might be necessary to cancel a procedure if there is insufficient time to discuss such a request ahead of the patient’s admission (Sales, 2022).

Nothing was said about what would be *sufficient* time for discussion. The woman had been at home for three days waiting for the required pre-op medication when she learned about the cancellation. The hospital didn’t contact her to tell her the operation had been cancelled, nor did they suggest any time-frame for ‘discussion’. She found out about the cancellation when she contacted the hospital herself when the medication did not arrive.

The story has a reasonably happy ending. On 22 October 2022, in response to an online petition demanding that the woman’s operation be reinstated, the hospital’s owner found another hospital where she could receive the same treatment she had been refused at Princess Grace (CitizenGo, 2022). This decision was good news for the woman concerned, but those responsible for the refusal at the Princess Grace hospital were not sanctioned for their reprehensible decision. As far as I know, they were not even reprimanded, nor did they publicly apologise. In the eyes of the policy-captured, trans ideology can presumably justify anything.

Male sexual fetishism is central to the self-id demands of transgender men with fully intact male genitals. (See the ‘Fetishism’ section of the ‘Explaining transgender’ chapter). What the social acceptance of ‘gender identity’ does not take into account is that, for many of these men, intruding into women’s spaces is a sexual fetish. The widespread acceptance of the transgender phenomenon has provided fetishists with support from officialdom for their predilection. Nowhere is there any official recognition that making it lawful for men to appear naked and sexually aroused in spaces conventionally reserved for women and children conflicts with the offence of ‘indecent exposure’. And if organisations (e.g. gyms, swimming pools, stores selling women’s lingerie) cannot eject these men and the police will not arrest them, then their behaviour does become lawful, or at least, not unlawful.

So disgusting behaviour on the part of some of the men claiming to be ‘women’, as they flaunt their sexual fetish, is socially condoned. One Australian example involved ‘an obese, balding, hairy, greasy looking man’ in a store selling women’s underwear, who was trying on bras out in the open where he was visible to anyone who came into the lingerie department. He was ‘[l]eering at himself in the mirrors as he kneaded his flabby, bra covered moobs [man boobs]; all but groaning & drooling as he’d knead, dropping a hand to his crotch every few seconds to dig & pull at it before trying another bra’. The woman telling the story said she complained to the saleswoman about this behaviour, but the saleswoman told her that she was unable to tell him to leave because she’d be fired if she did. The saleswoman also said that he came into the shop regularly in order to do this.¹² This is hardly in the store’s interests, since they are likely to lose customers by pandering to trans demands in this way.

¹² ‘Buy one, get one free male creep’ – <https://www.noconflicttheysaid.org/home/page/18> (viewed 23.8.2021)

Another example involved a naked man in a women-only spa in Los Angeles in June 2021, who was exposing himself to the women and girls in the jacuzzi. When a woman complained to the staff, she was told that there was nothing they could do about it because he ‘might’ be a ‘transgender woman’ and asking him to leave was against state law. But reprehensible as the staff reaction was, what followed the woman making her complaint public was even worse. She recorded her encounter with the staff on a video, which she uploaded to social media, and this led to a demonstration outside the spa protesting the fact that women in California had no right to single-sex spaces. This protest was faced with a counter-protest of around 200 self-styled ‘antifa’ (anti-fascist—sic) members. This mob were so threatening towards a woman wearing a t-shirt saying ‘This witch doesn’t burn’ (and presumably other protesters as well) that she was forced to leave (Bartosch, 2021b).

But even that was not the worst the trans agenda could do. The trans-friendly *Guardian* produced two articles claiming that what the woman complained of didn’t happen. The *Guardian*’s favourite misogynist, Owen Jones, said that it was ‘a campaign of lies’, and another two reporters said that the protests “offered a case study in how viral misinformation can result in violence, and provided clear evidence of the links between anti-trans and far-right movements”. This mention of violence is nicely agent-deleted. In fact all the violence emanated from the antifa side. And the only ‘evidence’ of any link between the Right and the protests about naked men in women’s spaces was a lone woman with a banner saying ‘homosexuality is a sin’. Since many of the protesters were lesbians and gays from LGB Fightback, that was hardly the consensus of the protesters (Bartosch, 2021b).

And then, in late August, five weeks after the appearance of the second *Guardian* article, a warrant was issued for the man’s arrest. He was, it seems, a registered sex offender with two prior convictions of indecent exposure. The new charges related to five felony counts of indecent exposure in connection with the incident at the spa, together with six felony counts of indecent exposure in December 2018. Other women had also come forward to complain about the man’s presence and behaviour at the spa (Ngo, 2021). The *Guardian* did acknowledge the arrest warrant, but continued to accuse the protesters of far-right extremism. No mention was made of the fact that this man, convicted sex-offender though he is, would be housed in a women’s prison. California has a *Transgender Respect, Agency and Dignity Act* that allows individuals who are ‘transgender, non-binary and intersex, regardless of anatomy’ to be housed and searched according to their ‘gender identity’ (Bartosch, 2021b). (See the ‘Prisons’ chapter).

There are many more examples of disgusting behaviour (and worse) on the part of men claiming to be ‘women’. (See the ‘This never happens’ link). Possibly not all ‘transgender’ men behave in this way, although the desire to invade female spaces is a common male sexual fetish. But the claim itself is an attack on women. It is a demand that women accept men as women with an implicit threat of verbal abuse or outright violence if they do not. Men do get violent when women don’t do what men want them to do, and the more unreasonable the demand the more likely the violence.

Conclusion

What I am concerned about, then, is the acceptance of the transgender worldview by numerous organisations throughout society, despite the fact that it is based on a belief that is so clearly false and so detrimental to women. When the claim that men are

women becomes part of mainstream culture, it has effects far beyond the small number of individuals who ‘identify’ as the opposite sex. *Their* numbers might be small, but the influence of the transgender agenda is everywhere. Everyone is affected because that claim changes the meaning of ‘women’ for all of us. While the effects of the transgender hegemony are most serious for women because it obliterates ‘women’ as a separate category, it is not only women who are affected. In that sense, it is in everyone’s interests to resist the transgender agenda

References

- AAS (2019) *Women in STEM: Decadal Plan* Australian Academy of Science, Australian Academy of Technology and Engineering, April – <https://www.science.org.au/files/userfiles/support/reports-and-plans/2019/gender-diversity-stem/women-in-STEM-decadal-plan-final.pdf>
- AASW (2018) ‘Submission to the Inquiry into the *Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018*’ Australian Association of Social Workers, November – <https://www.aasw.asn.au/document/item/11497>
- Anderson, Ryan T. (2018) *When Harry Became Sally: Responding to the Transgender Moment* New York and London: Encounter Books
- Australian Government (2013a) *Sex Discrimination Amendment (Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Intersex Status) Act 2013* – <https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2013A00098/Download>
- Australian Government (2013b) *Australian Government Guidelines on the Recognition of Sex and Gender* – <https://www.ag.gov.au/Publications/Documents/AustralianGovernmentGuidelinesontheRecognitionofSexandGender/AustralianGovernmentGuidelinesontheRecognitionofSexandGender.pdf>
- Bartosch, Josephine (2021a) ‘Stonewall came tumbling down’ *The Critic* 31 August – <https://thecritic.co.uk/stonewall-came-tumbling-down/>
- Bartosch, Josephine (2021b) ‘Wheesht Spa: the *Guardian* would prefer it if women kept their mouths shut’ *The Critic* 6 September – <https://thecritic.co.uk/wheesht-spa/>
- Biggs, Michael (2019) ‘How feminism paved the way for transgenderism?’ *Quillette* 1 August
- Bilek, Jennifer (2020) ‘Women ceding ground to transgenderism’ *The 11th Hour* 4 September – <https://www.the11thhourblog.com/post/women-ceding-ground-to-transgenderism>
- Bilek, Jennifer (2021) ‘Feminists’ self-annihilating investment in “true trans”’ *The 11th Hour* 12 June – <https://www.the11thhourblog.com/post/feminists-self-annihilating-investment-in-true-trans>
- Bilek, Jennifer (2022) ‘Has “ROGD parent” become an identity?’ *11th Hour* 9 February – <https://www.the11thhourblog.com/post/has-rogd-parent-become-an-identity>
- Brown, Michael Eric (2015) ‘Marry for love: Aydin and Jo Olson-Kennedy – The love story of one transgender couple’ *Gay Weddings Magazine* 22 September – <https://gayweddingsmag.com/marry-for-love-aydin-and-jo-olson-kennedy-the-love-story-of-one-transgender-couple/>
- Brunskell-Evans, Heather (2020) *Transgender Body Politics* North Geelong, Victoria: Spinifex Press [ebook]

- Brunskell-Evans, Heather and Michele Moore, eds (2019) *Inventing Transgender Children and Young People* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing
- Campbell, Beatrix (1987) *The Iron Ladies: Why Do Women Vote Tory?* London: Virago
- Church of England (2018) 'Guidance for gender transition services published' *The Church of England* 11 December – <https://www.churchofengland.org/more/media-centre/news/guidance-gender-transition-services-published>
- CitizenGo (2022) 'Princess Grace—a total disgrace' *CitizenGo* 22 October – <https://citizengo.org/en-gb/ot/209315-princess-grace-total-disgrace>
- Davidson, Gina (2019) 'Transsexuals tell MSPs that act changes could have “horrific” impact on women' *The Scotsman* 22 April – <https://www.scotsman.com/news/politics/transsexuals-tell-msps-that-act-changes-could-have-horrific-impact-on-women-1-4912495>
- Ditum, Sarah (2018) 'Trans rights should not come at the expense of women's fragile gains' *The Economist* 5 July – <https://www.economist.com/open-future/2018/07/05/trans-rights-should-not-come-at-the-cost-of-womens-fragile-gains>
- Dworkin, Andrea (1983) *Right-Wing Women: The Politics of Domesticated Females* London: The Women's Press
- Elliot Patricia (2009) 'Engaging trans debates on gender variance: a feminist analysis' *Sexualities* 12(1): 5-32
- Fair Play for Women (2018) 'The vast majority of male-born transwomen still have a penis' 22 July – <https://fairplayforwomen.com/penis/>
- Farkas, Meredith (2020) 'When speech isn't free' *American Libraries Magazine* 1 May – <https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2020/05/01/neutrality-when-speech-isnt-free/>
- flow (2021) 'Review of *Material Girls* by Kathleen Stock' *Wild Woman Writing Club* 14 May – <https://wildwomanwritingclub.wordpress.com/2021/05/14/review-material-girls-by-kathleen-stock/comment-page-1/>
- Gilligan, Andrew (2019) 'Scouts earn U-turn badge after scrapping trans policy' *The Sunday Times* 26 May
- Girlguiding UK (2018) 'Equality and diversity policy: transgender and gender reassignment' – <https://www.girlguiding.org.uk/making-guiding-happen/policies/girlguiding-policies/equality-and-diversity-policy/transgender-gender-reassignment/>
- Girlguiding UK (2022) 'Girlguiding settlement statement' 19 April – <https://www.girlguiding.org.uk/about-us/press-releases/girlguiding-settlement-statement/>
- Harpin, Lee (2018) 'Liberal Judaism backs controversial transgender rights charity Mermaids' *The Jewish Chronicle* 19 December – <https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/liberal-judaism-backs-controversial-transgender-rights-charity-mermaids-1.474108>
- Hayton, Debbie (2020) 'The inconvenient truth about transwomen' *UnHerd* 22 January – <https://unherd.com/2020/01/scotlands-gender-recognition-act-is-a-hostage-to-fortune/>
- Hellen, Nicholas (2019) 'Trans woman Debbie Hayton faces ban for transphobia' *The Sunday Times* 22 December

- Hunt, Ruth (2018) 'Our work for trans equality is at the heart of our mission for acceptance without exception' *Stonewall* 4 October – <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/node/100426>
- Hussain, Danyal (2022) 'Girlguiding leader who was sacked after objecting to policy allowing boys who identify as female to join may rejoin after reaching settlement with the organisation' *Daily Mail* 21 April – <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-10738521/Girlguiding-leader-sacked-objecting-trans-policy-reaches-settlement.html>
- Jack, Simon and Daniel Thomas (2023) 'Nigel Farage bank account shut for falling below wealth limit, source tells BBC' *BBC News* 20 July – <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-66097039>
- JC Reporter (2019) 'Strictly Orthodox women "to take action" against opening Hampstead Heath Ladies Pond to transgender swimmers' *The Jewish Chronicle* 25 May – <https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/strictly-orthodox-women-to-mobilise-against-opening-hampstead-heath-ladies-pond-to-trans-swimmers-1.484633>
- Jeffreys, Sheila (1997) 'Transgender activism' *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 1(3): 55-74
- Jones, Jane Clare (2019) 'Judith Butler: how to disappear patriarchy in three easy steps' *Jane Clare Jones* 24 January – <https://janeclarejones.com/2019/01/24/judith-butler-how-to-disappear-patriarchy-in-three-easy-steps/>
- Jones, Jane Clare (2020) "'Unreasonable ideas": A reply to Alison Phipps' *Jane Clare Jones* 15 January – <https://janeclarejones.com/2020/01/15/unreasonable-ideas-a-reply-to-alison-hipps/amp/>
- Joyce, Helen (2020) 'She who must not be named' *Quillette* 20 June – <https://quillette.com/2020/06/20/she-who-must-not-be-named/>
- Joyce, Helen (2021) *Trans: When Ideology Meets Reality* Oneworld Publications
- Lane, Bernard (2020a) 'Blokes can be women: scientists' *The Australian* 27 May
- Lane, Bernard (2020b) 'All-new female formula: just add anyone' *The Australian* 28 May
- Long, Julia (2020) 'A meaningful transition?' *Uncommon Ground* 12 May – <https://uncommongroundmedia.com/a-meaningful-transition-julia-long/>
- Lyons, Izzy (2019) 'Transgender woman accused of "hate speech" after wearing t-shirt stating she is still biologically male' *The Telegraph* 22 December – <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2019/12/22/transgender-woman-accused-hate-speech-wearing-t-shirt-stating/>
- MacDonald, Trevor (2013) 'Trans women and breastfeeding: the health care provider' *Milk Junkies* 2 July – <http://www.milkjunkies.net/2013/07/trans-women-and-breastfeeding-health.html>
- MacLeod, Andrew (2019) 'BC's increasingly bizarre anti-SOGI bandwagon' *The Tyee* 29 May – <https://thetyee.ca/News/2019/05/28/Anti-SOGI-Speaker-Attracts-Dubious-Company/>
- Marcuse, Herbert (1969) 'Repressive tolerance', in Wolff, Moore Jr and Marcuse, 1971
- Marsh, Sarah (2018) 'Girlguiding defends transgender policy after criticism' *The Guardian* 26 September – <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/sep/26/girlguiding-defends-transgender-policy-after-criticism>

- McGrath, Rachel (2018) 'There is a row about transgender Girlguides and this is why' *Huffington Post* 26 September – https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/girlguiding-transgender-policy-debate_uk_5bab97d7e4b082030e771cea
- Neale, Alan (2023) 'De-banking/the latest weapon in the corporate bid to normalize gender ideology' *The 11th Hour* 24 July – <https://www.the11thhourblog.com/post/de-banking-the-latest-weapon-in-the-corporate-bid-to-normalize-gender-ideology>
- Ngo, Andy (2021) 'Sex offending suspect claims transgender harassment in Wi Spa case' *New York Post* 2 September – <https://nypost.com/2021/09/02/charges-filed-against-sex-offender-in-wi-spa-casecharges-filed-against-sex-offender-in-notorious-wi-spa-incident/>
- O'Neill, Brendan (2019) 'Barry Humphries and the transgender thought police' *The Spectator* 17 April – <https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/barry-humphries-and-the-transgender-thought-police/>
- Queensland Government (2018) *Anti-Discrimination (Right to Use Gender-Specific Language) Amendment Bill 2018* – <https://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/view/pdf/bill.first/bill-2018-080>
- Queensland Government (2020) *Health Legislation Amendment Act 2020* – <https://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/view/whole/html/asmade/act-2020-031>
- RANZCP (2021) 'Recognising and addressing the mental health needs of the LGBTIQ+ population: Position Statement 83' *Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists* August – <https://www.ranzcp.org/news-policy/policy-and-advocacy/position-statements/mental-health-needs-lgbtqi>
- Raymond, Janice (1980[1979]) *The Transsexual Empire* London: The Women's Press
- Sales, Dan (2022) 'EXCLUSIVE: Hospital refuses to operate on sex attack victim after she requests all-female care because she fears mixed sex facilities are unsafe for women' *MailOnline* 20 October – <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-11316141/Hospital-bans-sex-assault-victim-op-female-care-request.html>
- Stock, Kathleen (2018a) 'Academic philosophy and the UK Gender Recognition Act' *Medium* 8 May – <https://medium.com/@kathleenstock/academic-philosophy-and-the-uk-gender-recognition-act-6179b315b9dd>
- Stock, Kathleen (2018b) 'Anonymised responses from other academics to my articles on sex, gender, and philosophy' *Medium* 18 May – <https://medium.com/@kathleenstock/anonymised-responses-from-other-academics-to-my-articles-on-sex-gender-and-philosophy-f1cc0db04554>
- Stock, Kathleen (2018c) 'Changing the concept of "woman" will cause unintended harms' *The Economist* 6 July – <https://www.economist.com/open-future/2018/07/06/changing-the-concept-of-woman-will-cause-unintended-harms>
- Stock, Kathleen (2018d) 'Women's Place talk: full text House of Lords' *Medium* 10 October – <https://medium.com/@kathleenstock/womens-place-talk-full-text-house-of-lords-oct-10th-2018-b1f3d70c4559>
- Stock, Kathleen et al (2019a) 'Doing better in arguments about sex, gender, and trans rights' *Medium* 23 May – <https://medium.com/@kathleenstock/doing-better-in-arguments-about-sex-and-gender-3bec3fc4bdb6>
- Stock, Kathleen (2019b) 'Are academics freely able to criticise the idea of 'gender identity' in UK Universities?' *Kathleen Stock* 3 July –

- <https://medium.com/@kathleenstock/are-academics-freely-able-to-criticise-the-idea-of-gender-identity-in-uk-universities-67b97c6e04be>
- Stock, Kathleen (2019c) 'Blackface is evil—why isn't drag?' *Magazine Spare Rib* 23 October
- Stock, Kathleen (2020a) 'Not your feminist' *Kathleen Stock* 1 May – <https://kathleenstock.com/not-your-feminist/>
- Stock, Kathleen (2020b) 'On the death spiral of academic feminism' *Kathleen Stock* 30 November
- Stock, Kathleen (2020c) 'Trans policies in UK Universities: some highlights' *Kathleen Stock* 29 December – <https://kathleenstock.com/highlights-of-trans-policies-in-uk-universities/>
- Stock, Kathleen (2021) *Material Girls: Why Reality Matters for Feminism* Fleet/Little, Brown
- Thompson, Denise (1997) 'Feminism and the problem of individualism' (working paper) UNSWorks, Library of the University of New South Wales [access under 'Links']
- Thompson, Denise (1998) 'Individualising the social: or, whatever happened to male domination?' (working paper) UNSWorks, Library of the University of New South Wales [access under 'Links']
- Thompson, Denise (1999) 'The trouble with individualism ...: a discussion with some examples' (working paper) UNSWorks, Library of the University of New South Wales [access under 'Links']
- Thompson, Denise (2003) 'Power and distaste: tolerance and its limitations' – <http://users.spin.net.au/~deniset/brefpap/ftolerance.pdf>
- Thompson, Denise (2005) 'Liberalism, human rights and a culture of domination: a feminist analysis—Individualism: some distinctions' – <http://users.spin.net.au/~deniset/dwinp/02indiv.pdf>
- Thompson, Denise (2020) *Masculinity & the Ruling of the World* print on demand
- Transsexual Voices Matter (2018) 'Our statement' *Transsexual Voices Matter* – <https://www.facebook.com/tsvoices/>
- Ward, Benjamin (2020) 'Letter to UK Prime Minister on Gender Recognition Reform' *Human Rights Watch* 17 June – <https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/06/17/letter-uk-prime-minister-gender-recognition-reform>
- Wild, Angela (2019) *Lesbians at Ground Zero: How Transgenderism is Conquering the Lesbian Body* March. London: Get the L Out – <http://www.gettheloutuk.com/blog/category/research/lesbians-at-ground-zero.html>
- Wolff, Robert Paul, Moore Jr, Barrington and Marcuse, Herbert (1971) *A Critique of Pure Tolerance* London: Jonathan Cape
- Yardley, Miranda (2018) 'Transsexual Voices Matter' 17 August – <https://mirandayardley.com/en/transsexual-voices-matter/>
- Young, Toby (2019) 'Why are so many schoolchildren coming out as trans?' in Young and Davies-Arai, pp.1-20
- Young, Toby and Stephanie Davies-Arai (2019) *Transgender Children: A Discussion* November. London: Civitas – <http://www.civitas.org.uk/content/files/2399-B-Transgender-Children-WEB.pdf>

© Denise Thompson 2023