

*Chapter 3: Lies, damned lies ...*

	page
Transsexual lying	2
Transgender lying	3
Faux 'feminism'	6
Self-identification	9
Toilets	12
Lying in other institutions	14
ONS	14
NHS	15
National Theatre Green Room bar	16
Conclusion	17
References	17

---

The ideal subject of totalitarian rule is not the convinced Nazi or the convinced Communist, but people for whom the distinction between fact and fiction (i.e., the reality of experience) and the distinction between true and false (i.e., the standards of thought) no longer exist (Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, quoted as the epigraph to Suissa and Sullivan, 2021).

The transgender agenda violates both Arendt's reality of experience and her standards of thought. There is the original lie that people can change sex, or more precisely (because that's what it's really all about) that men can be 'women'. 'Transwomen are women. Get over it', proclaims a t-shirt available from Stonewall for £14.99.<sup>1</sup> Sometimes the lie is couched in terms of an outright denial that there are two sexes. As one acolyte put it, 'sex, defined as "either of two divisions of organisms distinguished respectively as male or female", *does not exist*'. Instead, there is 'a myriad of genders, formed genetically, biologically and culturally' (Rosenblum, 2000: 503—emphasis added).

Because its foundational premise is a lie, other falsehoods are inevitable. Once you start lying you have to continue. Because lies cannot be defended rationally, the acceptance of that lie leads to more lies, not only on the part of the transgender agenda itself, but also on the part of any organisation or individual who embraces it. And because there is no rational way of defending lies, the only defence left is screams of outrage, bullying, and the silencing of disagreement, dissent and criticism.

I use the terminology 'lies' rather than simply 'falsehoods' because the attempt to mislead can only be deliberate. The existence of two and only two sexes must be among the best known facts of the human condition. Anyone who denies that is lying, not just mistaken, confused, deluded or misguided. The denial is not

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://stonewalluk.myshopify.com/products/trans-women-are-women-get-over-it-t-shirt>

inadvertent. It is part of a deliberate campaign to subvert the reality of sexed bodies, especially women's. That might not be the motivation of those caught up in it, especially the young. But it is the logic of the transgender agenda.

### **Transsexual lying**

The lying did not begin with the switch to transgender. Transsexualism is based on the same foundational premise and hence has the same shaky relationship with the truth. Billings and Urban (1982) cited a number of twentieth-century medical proponents of transsexualism who, the authors said, 'were shocked by a bizarre revelation', which was that 'transsexuals had routinely and systematically lied' (p.273). They were able to do this (fairly) convincingly because of the vast amount of information on transsexualism that was publicly available.

As early as 1968, researchers had noted that patients demanding surgery "tailor their views of themselves and their personal histories to prevailing 'scientific' fashion" (Billings and Urban, 1982: 274, quoting Kubie and Mackie, 1968). Robert Stoller himself expressed uneasiness at the facility with which transsexual patients could reel off their symptoms. "[M]ost patients who request sex reassignment are in complete command of the literature and know the answers before the questions are asked", he said (Billings and Urban, 1982: 273, quoting Stoller, 1973). Norman Fisk, psychiatrist and co-founder of the 'gender' program at Stanford University, also expressed doubts about the authenticity of what transsexual men were reporting to their doctors. '[W]e began to see patients that appeared to be nearly identical', he said.

"Soon it became conspicuously and disturbingly apparent that far too many patients presented a pat, almost rehearsed history, and seemingly were well versed in precisely what they should or should not say or reveal. Only later did we learn that there did and does exist a very effective grape-vine" (Billings and Urban, 1982: 274, quoting Fisk, 1973).

Perhaps it was at this time that Fisk believed that transsexualism was 'a psychological phenomenon, some abnormality in rearing or family dynamic'. By 1985 he was quoted in a newspaper saying that he 'really believed' that transsexualism 'may well occur while the fetus is developing in the mother'.<sup>2</sup> How he related that to the evidence he had encountered of the very effective grape-vine he didn't say. Billings and Urban (1982: 274) said that that grape-vine was 'facilitated by the Erickson [sic] Educational Foundation's patient services, [which] conveyed tips on each [gender identity] clinic's evaluative criteria and on "passing"', together with Benjamin's *Transsexual Phenomenon* and the autobiographies of famous transsexuals.

The Erickson Educational Foundation was founded in 1964 by Reed Erickson, a woman presenting as a 'man' (original name, Rita Mae Erickson), who had become one of Harry Benjamin's patients in 1963.<sup>3</sup> It lasted until 1977 (Raymond, 1994: 191n6), although Erickson didn't die until 1992 at the age of 74. She funded it with her own personal fortune (eventually \$US40 million), which was built on the millions her father had left her when he died.

The foundation paid for a number of 'New Age' research projects (e.g. homeopathy, acupuncture, altered states of consciousness), but its chief focus was transsexualism.

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://transascity.org/files/news/1985\\_04\\_18\\_Aberdeen\\_SD\\_Daily\\_News\\_11A.jpg](http://transascity.org/files/news/1985_04_18_Aberdeen_SD_Daily_News_11A.jpg)

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.uvic.ca/transgenderarchives/collections/reed-erickson/index.php>

It was a major source of money for the work on transsexualism in the 1960s and 1970s, when it sponsored numerous public addresses for medical professionals, clergy, police, and students in tertiary education, as well as ‘educational’ films, newspaper articles and radio and television appearances for the general public, a quarterly newsletter, a set of ‘educational’ pamphlets, and the publication of *Transsexualism and Sex Reassignment* by John Money and Richard Green<sup>4</sup> in 1969, and *Man, Woman, Boy, Girl* by Money and Anke Ehrhardt in 1972. (Norman Fisk was also a beneficiary of its largesse).

It was also influential in subsidising the early work at the Johns Hopkins Clinic, and in the setting up of the Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association<sup>5</sup> (which later morphed into the World Professional Association for Transgender Health—WPATH—the flagship of the international transgender fleet). So there were plenty of publicly available resources that could be used to put together a ‘transsexual’ narrative.

For a small Finnish study (15 men and 17 women) where eleven of each sex were found to have misled or ignored the advice of the psychiatrist, and stated that they had been ‘instructed by other transgender persons’ on how to find transgender medical interventions on their own, see: Pimenoff and Pfäfflin, 2011. See also: Dhejne, 2017.

### **Transgender lying**

With the turn to ‘transgender’ the falsehoods have multiplied. No longer are they simply used by transsexual individuals to convince medical professionals of their pressing need to ‘change’ into the opposite sex. Now they are used to incorporate all of us, and especially powerful institutions, into the transgender agenda. And yet a small amount of research, even a modicum of common sense, is sufficient to expose many of the lies.

A blog called ‘Trans Facts’ (2018) lists a number of lies that prop up the transgender agenda, together with links to the evidence that refutes them. The blog post calls them ‘myths’, but that’s just a polite way of saying ‘lies’:

- ‘Transwomen have surgery to transition’, says the ‘myth’. But most men who present as ‘women’ don’t have surgery. The text gives a figure of 80%-95% of these men who keep their male genitals. For a similar percentage, see the discussion of ‘self-identification’ below.
- ‘Transwomen in the UK are more at risk of murder’. They’re not. See the discussion of transgender murder rates in the ‘... and statistics’ chapter.
- ‘Half of transgender young people attempt suicide’. They don’t. This is a lie to emotionally blackmail parents into giving in to the trans demands channelled through their children. See the discussion of suicide in the ‘... and statistics’ chapter.

---

<sup>4</sup> John Money could be said to function as God the Father whose Son is Richard Green, a former student of Money’s at Johns Hopkins’ (Raymond, 1980: 4).

<sup>5</sup> <http://web.uvic.ca/~erick123/>. See also: Devor and Matte, 2006).

Denise Thompson

- ‘Transwomen pose no risk to women and girls’. They do because they are men and just as likely to be violent as other men. See the resources in the ‘Violence’ section of the ‘Other strategies’ chapter.
- ‘Men would not identify as transgender to attack women and girls’. They do. See the resources in the ‘Violence’ section of the ‘Other strategies’ chapter.
- ‘Puberty blocker drugs are harmless’. They are not. See the ‘Transgendering the young—1’ chapter.
- ‘You can be born with a female brain in a male body’. Rubbish! is the only rational response to this.
- ‘Sex is assigned at birth’. This only applies to that miniscule minority of people called ‘intersex’, whose sex at birth is not clear, or it becomes clear at puberty that it was wrongly assigned. For everyone else, sex at birth is the most obvious thing about us.
- ‘Legal sex change is difficult and invasive in the UK’. It’s not. As the text of this ‘Trans facts’ blog says, ‘The UK Gender Recognition Act (2004) is one of the most liberal in the world, requiring neither surgery nor drugs for legal sex change’. See the ‘Self-identification’ section below.
- ‘Transwomen have no advantage over biological women in competitive sport’. They do. Being male, they have greater body size, muscle mass, heart and lung capacity than women, and this advantage is not reversed by taking female hormones (Trans Facts, 2018).

These ‘myths’ have been exposed as lies over and over again, and still the trans juggernaut rolls on.

Transgender activists have no qualms about telling outright lies, if a denial by Stephen Whittle (a woman who claims she is a ‘man’) is any indication. At the time her denial was quoted in the pages of *The Guardian* (Fazackerley, 2018), Whittle was a highly successful academic who had made a career out of academe’s embrace of the trans phenomenon. She was professor of equalities law at Manchester Metropolitan University, founder of the trans lobby group, Press For Change, and co-editor of an academic ‘transgender studies’ anthology (Stryker and Whittle, eds, 2006). She denied that the academic trans lobby was accusing or censoring anyone. “Trans academics have mostly tried really hard not to accuse”, she said, “and certainly not to ‘no platform’ anybody”.

This would be news to those trans-critical academics accused of ‘transphobia’, ‘hate speech’, etc., for disagreeing that men can be women. It would also be news to those deprived of a public voice because of their disagreement with the transgender agenda. “[T]hese voices”, she said, “are making trans people look like the extremists”. This is another lie. Trans activists are not being *made* to look like extremists, they *are* extremists. (See the ‘Violence’ section of the ‘Other strategies’ chapter). She follows this up with another lie. “Sadly”, she says, “it will have the effect of shutting down the debate” (Fazackerley, 2018).

This is a particularly obnoxious example of falsehood, given that it is her own side that is shutting down the debate. Trans activists do not engage with their critics. They scream abuse, like the male student at Reading University who shrieked at a professor

who was critical of the proposed changes to the Gender Recognition Act, that she was a “transphobic Nazi who should get raped”. The professor said her university was supporting her, but trans activists have indeed been successful in getting institutions to ‘no-platform’ critics. A group of 54 academics, including this professor, had already written to the *Guardian*, saying that critical analysis of transgenderism was being suppressed in universities (Fazackerley, 2018). Not only do trans activists refuse even to listen to arguments, much less address them, they seem to have the power to prevent anyone else hearing those arguments too. (See the ‘Censorship’ section of the ‘Other strategies’ chapter).

It’s not as though the trans lobby don’t know the truth. They do. That shows in their denials. To take just one example of many: in reaction to a proposed event in December 2019 to discuss ‘schools and gender diversity’ at Edinburgh University, the co-chair of the university’s Staff Pride Network (‘an inclusive network that serves as a resource for the rich diversity of LGBT+ employees across the institution, including PhD students’),<sup>6</sup> said

“When someone has said publicly that they don’t believe trans women are women or, more harmfully, that trans women are men and should somehow be held accountable for the actions of a minority of predatory men in the world, that isn’t really a debate, it’s just hateful speech about an already marginalised minority” (Fazackerley, 2020).

So this spokesperson had heard that ‘trans women’ weren’t women, that they were men with the same pattern of violence as other men, but he (she?) chose not to believe those true statements, defining them instead as ‘hateful speech’.

This tactic of turning rational disagreement into ‘hate speech’ has been enormously successful. And yet, it is not difficult to see these justifications as lies, although it does take a bit of thinking, an ability that is peculiarly lacking in relation to the trans agenda. The first lie is to interpret the impossibility of men changing into ‘women’ as only ‘a belief’, when the truth is that it’s reality, whatever anyone believes. Then there’s the basic premise of the transgender agenda, that men claiming to be ‘women’ are women, when the truth is that they remain men, whatever they do to their bodies, and some of them don’t do anything except deck themselves in femininity.

There’s also the insistence that men claiming to be ‘women’ don’t have the same propensity for violence as other men, when they do, because they remain men. (See the ‘Prisons’ chapter). The trans-critical point about transgender men and violence is distorted into something it is not. To say that transgender men have the same pattern of violence as other men is not to ‘hold them accountable for the actions of a minority of predatory men in the world’. It is simply to say that they are still men, a truth that the trans lobby must deny, of course, if it is to hold fast to its basic false premise.

Finally, disagreement is labelled ‘hateful’ and the familiar ‘vulnerability’ trope is wheeled out: ‘an already marginalised minority’. But if men who claim to be ‘women’ can get universities everywhere—it’s not just Edinburgh and it’s not just universities—to succumb to their demands, they are hardly a ‘marginalised minority’. There is one point, however, on which this member of Edinburgh University’s Staff

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.ed.ac.uk/equality-diversity/edi-groups/staffpride-network/about>

Pride Network is quite correct, and that is his insistence that ‘that isn’t really a debate’. There is no possibility of debating with a lie held with the emotional force behind the trans agenda.

This particular event was cancelled because of a campaign by the campus trans lobby. The speakers, they said, had ‘a history of transphobia’, another trans-speak term for the truth. Another reason why it was cancelled was because the organiser was afraid that the speakers would be abused (Fazackerley, 2020). And who would have been doing the abusing? Not the speakers or their trans-critical supporters, but the trans lobby themselves, having failed to silence dissent any other way. These are bully-boy tactics which, as a form of power, is an efficient way to cow people into submission. The trans lobby uses such tactics frequently.

### *Faux-‘feminism’*

Another transgender lie is its claim that its dictates are some kind of ‘feminism’. One example of this is what is called a ‘Feminist Declaration’ (WRC, 2020; JL, 2021), issued by the so-called Women’s Rights Caucus of the International Gay and Lesbian Rights Association (ILGA) in March 2020. In June 2021, a shortened version appeared on the website of a trans organisation that calls itself ‘GATE: Trans, Gender Diverse and Intersex Advocacy in Action’. Called ‘An Affirmation of Feminist Principles’ (GATE, 2021), it is signed by 18 organisations, four of which have ‘women’ in their titles. It is circulated under the banner of ‘UN trans advocacy week’, which supposedly ‘takes place in Geneva at the UN Human Rights Council in June/July each year’.<sup>7</sup> There is no mention of this ‘week’ on the UN website, and as far as I can find out, the UN is not concerned with ‘trans’ as a specific issue. Instead, it subscribes to the piggybacking ploy (see the ‘Piggybacking’ chapter). It simply repeats the LGBT (etc.) acronym without singling out any one of the categories for special mention (e.g. “‘Stand up against hate” towards LGBTIQ+ people, say UN leaders”).<sup>8</sup>

The earlier Declaration mentioned above is a response to what its authors perceived to be the ‘the gaps’ in the UN Commission on the Status of Women’s reaffirmation of the UN’s commitment to ‘gender equality’ (Paletta, 2020). It does include some superficially feminist content, e.g. ‘Noting that the neoliberal economic order ... [is a barrier to] advancing women’s and girls’ rights and feminist organizing ... while taking advantage of women and girls’ labor in all spheres’ (WRC, 2020: para.4a).

But the other issues it includes disqualify it as a feminist document. For example, it lists ‘cisgenderism’ as one ‘form of oppression’ (along with 18 others including patriarchy and capitalism) (WRC, 2020: para.3). Not only is this not a feminist term, it is actually anti-feminist because the purpose of the ‘cis-’ prefix is to open up a linguistic space for men to call themselves ‘women’: they are ‘transwomen’ and the rest of adult female humanity becomes ‘cis-’.

But the insistence that men cannot be ‘women’, of any sort, is one of feminism’s basic principles. Any discourse that uses the term ‘cisgender’ approvingly violates that principle. The offense is compounded by the use of such phrases as ‘women, girls and

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://gate.ngo/projects/un-trans-advocacy-week/>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.un.org/en/delegate/%E2%80%98stand-against-hate%E2%80%99-towards-lgbtiq-people-say-un-leaders>

gender non-conforming people’, ‘gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics’, ‘gender affirming services and care’, and referring to ‘people’ (instead of women) in the context of abortion (para.14e).

One of the most glaring anti-feminist aspects is the Declaration’s position on prostitution. It refers to prostituted women as ‘sex workers’, and calls for ‘sex work’ to be recognised as ‘work’ and ‘fully decriminalised’ including ‘sex workers, their clients and third parties’ (pimps? brothel keepers and owners? sex traffickers?). It also denies that there is any connection between prostitution and sex trafficking, calling for an ‘end to the conflation of trafficking and sex work’ (WRC, 2020: para.17a-e).

This is blatant anti-feminism. There is no such thing as ‘sex work’. It’s prostitution, which feminism quite rightly sees as violence against women (Barry, 1984, 1995; Bindel, 2017; Jeffreys, 1997; Raymond, 2013). As Andrea Dworkin said, ‘Hurting women is bad. Feminists are against it, not for it’ (quoted in Farley, 2013). The terminology of ‘sex work’ interprets prostituted women as willing participants in the sex acts men pay for. It also interprets prostitution as something women do, rather than as something engineered by men whose arrogant sense of entitlement licenses them to use women as masturbatory penis receptacles.

The declaration’s denial that prostitution is connected to sex trafficking is yet another lie. As Kathleen Barry concluded from the enormous amount of research she has done in the area, ‘Trafficking in women is the oldest, most traditional form of procuring for prostitution’ (Barry, 1995: 165). Prostitution flourishes through sex trafficking and slavery. It is an institution staffed by women (and children) who are prostituted by men who have no qualms about violating the rights of others to get what they want. The declaration’s lying use of the term ‘sex work’ alone should exclude it from any form of feminism whatsoever.

But there is also a whiff of paedophilia in the Declaration calls upon the relevant authorities to

Eliminate all laws and policies ... limiting [the] legal capacity of adolescents ... to provide consent to sex ... End the criminalization and stigmatization of adolescents’ sexuality, and ... promote a positive approach to young people’s and adolescents’ sexuality that ... respects their agency to make ... decisions on matters concerning their bodily autonomy, pleasure and fundamental freedoms (WRC, 2020: para.14a, g).

As the feminist Women’s Human Rights Campaign pointed out in its criticism of the shorter ‘Affirmation’, the paedophile movement has always used the language of children’s ‘sexual rights’ as justification for their own desires (WHRC, 2021b). WHRC also noted that at least two of the organisations listed as signatories to the petition had a history of promoting paedophilia, i.e. ILGA (the International Lesbian and Gay Association) and COC Amsterdam.

The authors of the Declaration have strenuously denied that they support paedophilia. They never have, a spokesperson said:

ILGA World categorically, and in no uncertain terms, does not advocate to eliminate or lower the general age of consent, nor supports paedophilia in any way, shape or form—and never has (Paletta, 2021).

But the statement that ILGA ‘never has’ supported paedophilia is demonstrably false. At an international conference of gay (and tokenistic ‘lesbian’) organisations in

Barcelona in 1980, paedophilia was defended on the grounds that paedophiles were an oppressed sexual minority concerned only to endorse young people's right to sexual autonomy. There were some dissenting voices, mainly lesbians, but the general consensus of the international gay movement was pro-paedophilia. ILGA's acceptance of paedophile groups such as NAMBLA (North American Man Boy Love Association) meant that it lost its observer status in the UN Economic and Social Council in 1993 (Paternotte, 2014). ILGA did expel NAMBLA in 1994, although not because they disagreed with them, but because of their concern about losing their UN credentials. ILGA was eventually re-admitted to special status with the UN in 2011 (ILGA, 2011).

COC, another of the signatories to the 'Affirmation' and a member of ILGA, also has a history of supporting paedophilia. COC started in 1946 as the Shakespeare Club, changing its name to the *Cultuur en Ontspannings Centrum* (Culture and Recreation Centre) in 1949. Its original purpose was to organise social activities for lesbians, gay men and bisexuals, and to campaign for the repeal of discriminatory laws. Later, like gay groups everywhere, it focused on the HIV/AIDS epidemic, legal equality and social acceptance. Still later, again like gay groups everywhere, it was captured by the alphabet soup piggybacking ploy some time around 'the early days of the 21<sup>st</sup> century'.<sup>9</sup>

ILGA may have repudiated their earlier support for paedophilia, but they were certainly favourably disposed in the 1980s. At a conference the year after the Barcelona conference (in 1981), COC presented a paper recommending that homosexuals show solidarity with paedophiles because both were discriminated against by compulsory heterosexuality. "A successful homo-emancipation should include pedo-emancipation", the paper was quoted saying. It also called for the abolition of age of consent laws, making the paedophile-friendly claim that "children often have the same capacity for sexual response as adults" (Paternotte, 2014). According to one commentator (Sandfort, 1986), COC was responsible for the 'abolishment [sic] of oppression towards pedophilia', and this acceptance by COC, this supportive commentator believed, 'hopefully will broaden the idea of the gay identity'. So it is not true that ILGA and COC have never supported paedophilia. The historical record says otherwise.

ILGA's support for paedophilia was a long time ago, that's true, and they did expel NAMBLA (among others), although not for any principled reason but because NAMBLA's membership cost them their UN status. ILGA are outraged that they should be accused of supporting paedophilia currently. An author writing for an organisation called 'TransSafety.Network' reiterated the 'never has' denial (quoting ILGA, 2011), and attributed the fact of NAMBLA's membership (without naming them) to carelessness: 'paedophile advocacy groups ... joined before [ILGA] implemented a more rigorous screening process'. This person also said that 'ILGA has explicitly taken a stance against child sexual exploitation since 1990 and expelled paedophile advocacy groups ... in the years shortly after' (Moore, 2021).

The target of this person's ire, and ILGA's rage, was an earlier statement from the Women's Human Rights Campaign, published on the Sydney Feminist Legal Clinic's website in March 2021. Headed 'Feminism has been co-opted to support an agenda

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://international.coc.nl/about-us/>



to lower the age of consent' (WHRC, 2021a), this was a reaction to the Declaration's demands concerning adolescents and sexuality. "These demands", WHRC said, 'would remove the ability to protect children from exploitation by adults and older adolescents'.

ILGA (2011) said that they were only following the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Their 2011 statement dutifully included the UN clause about protecting children from sexual exploitation and abuse; and the so-called 'feminist' Declaration includes a statement urging governments to '[r]espect the rights of all individuals to exercise autonomy over their lives, including their sexualities, identities and bodies, desires and pleasures free from all types of discrimination, coercion and violence' (WRC, 2020: para.14).

But neither the 2020 Declaration nor the 2021 Affirmation had anything to say about protecting children from sexual exploitation and abuse. They don't mention sexual exploitation and abuse at all. Their demands about sexuality in relation to young people and adolescents are couched only in terms of their assumptions about the young people's own sexuality: the 'capacity of adolescents to provide consent to sex', 'young people's and adolescents' agency to make decisions', and 'their bodily autonomy, pleasure and fundamental freedoms'. This is a paedophile demand. Although the desire emanates from adult men, paedophile discourse attributes the desire to the young people and the children who are the objects of these men's sexual desires.

So it's not at all certain that current alphabet soup organisations have managed to divest themselves of every last trace of paedophile preferences. At least one commentator (Paternotte, 2014) believes that there has been a 'slow decline of pro-paedophilia stances' on the part of the international gay movement. But if these faux-feminist manifestoes' defence of the 'sexual freedom' of adolescents is any guide, paedophile demands for acceptance are once again being piggybacked onto gay and lesbian concerns, this time under the trans umbrella.

The status of ILGA's commitment to paedophilia might be ambiguous. They do strenuously deny it, but at least part of their denial is clearly untrue (the 'never has' assertion), and their language at times mirrors paedophile interests. But however ambiguous their commitment to paedophile interests, these two documents emanating from the international alphabet soup fraternity, the Declaration and the Affirmation, are certainly not feminism. Indeed, they are sometimes virulently anti-feminist, e.g. their position on prostitution, their embrace of the 'cis-' prefix, their use of the term 'persons' instead of 'women' in the context of abortion. Calling something 'feminist' does not make it so. There must also be a willingness to embrace feminist principles. Not only do these two documents not do that, they are actually instances of anti-feminism being paraded as feminism itself.

### *Self-identification*

It should be obvious that the notion of 'self-identification'—if a man says he's a 'woman' then he is and must be acknowledged as such—is a lie, especially (although not only) in the case of men who retain their male genitals. Men are not women, and no matter how often or how loudly the trans agenda says they are, that doesn't make it true. Yet self-identification is central to the transgender project. As a transgender woman (claiming to be a 'man') said, 'Self-identification is a lynchpin of transgender

identity politics in the United States and, increasingly, throughout the globalizing world ... gender self-determination is a matter of liberation in the face of brutality and trauma' (Zimman, 2019: 149, 172). She believes that it is an understandable response to what she sees as 'the force of normative gender assignment and socialization and in the face of cultural hostility, violence, and delegitimation' of 'trans people' (p.150).

It would seem, though, that self-identification is not available to everyone. One of this academic paper's peer reviewers asked 'whether this [transgender] community sees other identities, such as age and race, as open to self-identification'. The author refused to answer because, she said, 'this comparison ... is mobilized to deauthenticate trans people's identities', and she was going to 'leave the topic for discussion in other spaces' (Zimman, 2019: 158n6). And yet this question goes to the heart of the 'self-identification' thesis of her paper, and a refusal to answer it should have meant that the paper was rejected for publication in any reputable academic journal. The fact that it was accepted is an example of the abysmal depths to which academe has plunged under the influence of postmodernist 'queer theory'.

Self-identification means that the majority of adult men who identify as 'women' are no longer having their genitals removed, and this has been happening for some time now:

[quoting *Gender Outlaw* by trans activist man, Kate Bornstein:] The category [of transgender men who haven't had surgery] describes those who live in society as their opposite gender, but who do not wish to change their biological sex, either because they feel the surgery is too expensive or too risky, or because they are happy with their bodies the way they are (Peek, 2004: 1217).

nonoperative transgender individuals try to break out of society's norms altogether by not surgically transforming their sex to match their gender identity ... [citing Peek, 2004:] Nonoperative transgenders view themselves as the opposite sex, but do not feel it necessary to pursue surgical means to change their body to match that of the preferred sex (Mann, 2006: 95, 96)

a majority of transgender people [i.e. men] do not have genital surgery even if they live fully in the "other" gender' (Tarzwell, 2006: 196).

One transgender man who says he's a 'woman' and who argues for self-identification is Sally Goldner, Executive Director of Transgender Victoria. He is an influential voice in this Australian state. The Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission, for example, is wholly supportive of him, having provided him with a platform on which to tell his story his own way in the third person using feminine pronouns.<sup>10</sup> He has received a great deal of support from the mainstream: as presenter of 3CR radio's queer program, *Out of the Pan*; as star of an autobiographical documentary, *Sally's Story*; as a recipient of the LGBTI Victorian of the Year award in 2015; as the subject of favourable articles in the media ('Sally Goldner lands top award for her dedication to transgender advocacy', *The Age* 15 October, 2015); and as an expert frequently consulted by the media (SBS News, *The Sydney Morning Herald*)

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://humanrightscommission.vic.gov.au/index.php/news-and-events/profiles/item/1021-sally-goldner-executive-director-transgender-victoria>

and elsewhere—Senior Rights Service). In 2016 he was inducted into the Victorian Women’s [sic] Honour Roll by the Victorian Women’s Trust, despite the fact that he is not a woman. And yet he still complains about the way the media depicts the trans narrative (Goldner, 2019).

He gives the following reasons why ‘trans people’ want to be able to declare themselves to be the opposite sex without the involvement of the medical profession, without taking any ‘cross-sex’ hormones, and without going through any surgical procedures:

Trans people are fighting for the right to get a legal document that doesn’t breach our privacy and “out” us when presented. We’re fighting for the right to get our identity verified online in an hour like cisgender people, rather than having to send paperwork by post and wait 15 days, probably missing out on a job in a tight job market. We’re fighting for the right to not be pathologised by having a health professional “approve” our gender when cisgender people don’t have to go through this experience. We’re fighting for the right not to be forced into often costly surgery that often involves jumping through hoops set down by a medical profession frequently dominated by limited perspectives (Goldner, 2019).

But the ‘we’ he is speaking for are adult men. It is adult men who are pushing the ‘self-id’, no-surgery program, while young women are still having surgery, most commonly the amputation of their breasts, and children are still being dosed with puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones. They’re not being forced into it either, they are unfortunately clamouring for it.

According to the later US Transgender Discrimination Survey (James et al, 2016) (admittedly not the most reliable source of information), women (‘transgender men’) were more likely than men (‘transgender women’) to have undergone surgery, 42% of female respondents in comparison with 28% of male respondents (p.100). Thirty-six per cent of the female respondents had had their breasts removed. And while adult men are vociferously declaring they don’t have to have surgery to be ‘women’, or indeed, any medical interventions at all, that doesn’t apply to children, who are still being prevented from developing into normal sexed adults. ‘Self-id’ is about men who want to be recognised as women while still retaining their male genitals.

Self-identification is necessary if the transgender agenda is to continue its onslaught on society. It resolves the conflict between men’s (understandable) reluctance to lose their genitals, and male supremacy’s latest attack on women. The fact that it is a lie is irrelevant to the power and thrust of a strategy designed to demolish women. Very few men these days are getting themselves castrated in order to qualify as ‘women’. The earlier US Transgender Discrimination Survey (Grant et al, 2011: 79) found that 78% of men claiming to be women had not had ‘vaginoplasty’ (for which castration is necessary).<sup>11</sup> This proportion was made up of 64% who wanted it someday and 14% who didn’t want it at all. The update (James et al, 2015) reported that only 12% of the male transgender respondents had had ‘vaginoplasty or labiaplasty’, and only 11% had had their testicles removed (‘orchidectomy’) (p.102, Figure 7.14).

---

<sup>11</sup> ‘Inversion of the penile skin is the method most often selected to create a neovagina by surgeons performing sex reassignment surgery’ (Wikipedia, 19 September 2020).

In other words, 88% of the so-called ‘transwomen’ who replied to this survey still had intact male genitals. The 88% was made up of 12% of respondents who said they didn’t want it at all, 22% who said were not sure if they wanted it, and 54% said that they wanted it some day. The reason why they hadn’t already had it might have been because they couldn’t afford it, although the push for ‘self-identification’ would suggest that they didn’t want it after all. Only 25% of all respondents, male or female, had had ‘any surgery for gender transition’ (i.e. not just genital surgery).

An Australian survey of transgender health (Callender et al, 2019) didn’t ask any questions about surgery, only about whether respondents had ‘undertaken processes (medical or non-medical) to alter their body as a way of affirming their gender’ (79.7% said ‘yes’) (p.22). Another Australian survey (Hyde et al, 2014: 24, Table 12), however, also found that very few ‘trans’ people had had surgery, only 27.8% (263 of 946 respondents). The report of the survey doesn’t say whether those who had had surgery were women or men. But given that the later US survey (James et al, 2015) found that most of those who had had surgery were women, it is possible that the Australian results were similar, and the percentage of men claiming to be women while still retaining their male genitals is likely to be similar to the percentage uncovered in the US survey.

That 88% is not necessarily representative of men claiming to be ‘women’ more generally. As the report said, ‘respondents in this study were not randomly sampled and the actual population characteristics of transgender people in the U.S. are not known’ (James et al, 2015: 26). (This latter statement is contradicted in a later footnote referring to ‘Prior research using *representative* samples of transgender adults’) (p.61n21—emphasis added). But whatever the exact percentage, what evidence there is says that the majority of men the transgender agenda calls ‘transwomen’ have fully intact male genitals. They simply call their male genitals ‘female’ and expect everyone to agree with them.

This is borne out by one of the violent trans activist reactions on social media to women who disagree, ‘Suck my lady dick/cock’. This is the language of rape. This is the language of men who hate women, not of women to each other. Not only do these men retain their male genitals, they also retain typically misogynist male attitudes and behaviour towards women. This is why women are so worried about proposals to allow men to ‘become’ women simply by saying so.

### ***Toilets***

Another example of lying is the claim that men posing as ‘women’ are in danger if they go into men’s toilets. One example of this claim occurred in the letter about the Gender Recognition Act the director of Human Rights Watch sent to UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson (see the ‘Introduction’ chapter):

This proposal [not to ‘reform’ the GRA] would force trans women [i.e. men] to use male facilities, despite strong evidence that this puts them at risk of violence. Conversely, there is no evidence that allowing trans women [i.e. men] access to women-designated spaces, which has been the case for a number of years, puts other women at risk (Ward, 2020).

That word ‘other’ is another lie. Actual women are not an ‘other’ type of woman, we are the only women there are.

I have assumed that ‘male facilities’ means ‘toilets’, ‘rest rooms’, or ‘bathrooms’ (as they say in the US), given that that’s what all the fuss has been about. If there were any ‘strong evidence’ of violence occurring in these places, it would surely be found in the transgender surveys, but it isn’t.

The analysis of the UK government’s 2018 *National LGBT Survey* (UK Government, 2018), for example, reported no incidents of violence experienced by ‘transwomen’ (i.e. men) in male toilets. The two people quoted who ‘felt under threat of verbal and physical abuse in public spaces ... particularly in gendered spaces, such as public toilets and changing facilities at sports centres’, were both women (p.53-4). A ‘trans man’ (i.e. a woman) said, ‘I have felt unsafe in public toilets more than anywhere else’, and ‘an assigned female at birth non-binary person’ said, ‘I have been dragged out of multiple club toilets and shouted at by people in the toilets as they believed I did not belong in the girls’.

Moreover, 39 respondents commented that the proposed changes to the Gender Recognition Act posed a threat to *women* in women-only spaces, including toilets. As one of these commenters said,

“Access to female only spaces such as refuges, rape crisis centres, women’s prisons is being jeopardised by the possibility that biological males can access them solely by self-identifying as female. This is unacceptable and unsafe” (UK Government, 2018: 54)

This was a fairly extensive survey with 108,100 responses, although only 13% (around 14,000) were from transgender people, and only just over a quarter of those (26% or just over 3,500) were ‘trans women’ (i.e. men) (UK Government, 2018: 4, 16). Still, not a single one of those three and half thousand men mentioned that they had experienced violence in male toilets. It’s true that they were not specifically asked about this, but then neither were the women quoted above asked about it, yet they felt strongly enough to comment.

This absence of concern about male toilets is confirmed by the US surveys. The report of the earlier survey (Grant et al, 2011) contained no instances of ‘transwomen’ (i.e. men) being attacked in male toilets. ‘Bathrooms’ were discussed simply in terms of lack of ‘access to essential gender-appropriate facilities’ in educational institutions and workplaces (pp.35, 39, 56).

The later survey (James et al, 2015), however, did uncover instances of violence against transgender people in restrooms. One percent (228 respondents) said that they had been physically attacked in a public restroom in the past year, in places such as restaurants, shopping malls, or movie theatres; and 0.6% (139 respondents) said they had been sexually assaulted in a restroom in the past year (pp.16-17, 226-7). But it’s not clear that those respondents who were attacked in restrooms were all men calling themselves ‘women’. There were 27,715 respondents to the survey, but only 32% were ‘transwomen’ (i.e. men). Another 31% were ‘trans men’ (i.e. women), while the remainder were scattered amongst the other 23 ‘genders’ listed (p.44). So we don’t know whether the respondents who were attacked were men or women; nor do we know whether they were attacked in male or female toilets (the report doesn’t say). Moreover, the numbers are small, although 59% said they avoided using public restroom in the past year ‘because they were afraid of confrontations or other problems they might experience’ (p.17).

Another study (Herman, 2013), this time of 93 respondents, found that eight had been assaulted in a public toilet, but again the report doesn't say whether those who were attacked were men or women, nor whether they were attacked in male or female toilets. So it would seem as though there is some evidence that transgender people get attacked in public toilets, but it hardly counts as strong evidence. In the first place the numbers who mention it are small. More importantly, the survey reports don't say who was attacked nor where they were attacked. They could be women in men's toilets, or they could be butch women in women's toilets (like the respondent quoted above). There is plenty of evidence of the transgender lobby *saying* that men posing as 'women' are at risk in men's toilets. But once again, if the lack of evidence is any guide, this is yet another transgender lie.

### **Lying in other institutions**

The lies are not confined to the transgender agenda itself. Any organisation that embraces it must also lie. Here are three examples of institutions where staff are forced to lie as a result of policy capture by the transgender agenda.

#### **ONS**

In the case of the UK statistical agencies, the Office of National Statistics (ONS, for England and Wales) and the National Records of Scotland (NRS) the overarching lie is that 'gender identity' is a demographic variable equivalent to 'sex'. But that one big lie leads to other forms of dishonesty as the authorities struggle to accommodate themselves to the original lie. The question of transgender influence on countries' Censuses is discussed further elsewhere (in the '... and statistics' chapter). Here, I discuss a single incident where the authorities told lies in order to avoid being faced with reasonable objections to their proposed changes to the 'sex' question in the 2021 Census.

This was a lie the ONS told about the outcome of a round table meeting of academics and 'other stake-holders' to discuss the changes (Sullivan, 2021). The meeting was called by Iain Bell, the Deputy National Statistician at the ONS, and held on 24 June 2020. It was a response to a request by social scientist, Alice Sullivan, Professor of Sociology at University College London and Director of the Centre for Longitudinal Studies and the 1970 British Cohort Study. Sullivan said that she 'stressed the importance of hearing the views of quantitative social scientists in particular' at the meeting, pointing out that they had not yet been consulted about the proposed changes. The meeting was attended by six quantitative social scientists, all of whom had signed a letter criticising proposals to substitute 'gender identity' for 'sex' in the census (Sullivan, 2020). As well, there were six other academics and six representatives of policy groups and government bodies.

The lie involves the ONS' claim that there was no consensus at this meeting. But as Sullivan pointed out, 'this lack of consensus was artificially generated'. Of the 18 participants, 11 were deliberately chosen for their pro-trans stance. Of the six attendees from government and policy, five were trans acolytes. The sixth was a trans critic—Dr Nicola Williams from Fair Play for Women, an organisation devoted to defending women's sex-based rights from trans encroachment. The six academics chosen by the ONS were not social scientists nor experts in survey design or data analysis. Instead, their fields of study included theology and religious studies, material sciences, law, and (not surprisingly) gender studies. Moreover, all six were known to

be trans acolytes. (This is not a term Sullivan used. Instead she said, they ‘all supported the self-identification view and were opposed to asking people’s sex, objectively defined’) (Sullivan, 2021).

In other words, ONS had stacked the meeting, not only against critics of ‘gender identity’, but also against anyone who was likely to have any expertise in census methodology. Although there were seven critics among the attendees, they were outnumbered by the other eleven, all of whom were trans supporters, while the academics among them had none of the relevant expertise. As Sullivan pointed out, the ONS couldn’t find six pro-self-id academics with quantitative social science expertise (or they didn’t want to). Instead, the academic representation at the meeting was confined to non-data users (Sullivan, 2021: 6-7).

Nothing the ONS said was an outright lie. It is after all true that the meeting could not come to a consensus. The lie is the assumption that there was any genuine attempt at consensus. There was not. The stacking of the meeting ensured that no consensus was possible, as of course there cannot be. There is no possibility of reaching a consensus between the lie that ‘gender identity’ is a demographic variable and ‘sex’ is not, and the truth that the demographic variable is ‘sex’, not ‘gender identity’.

### **NHS**

The British National Health Service succumbed to the transgender lure long ago. Its influence on the medicalising of children and young people at the Gender Identity Development Service at the Tavistock and Portman Trust is discussed elsewhere (in the chapters on the transgenering of the young). Here, I discuss a particularly egregious lie emanating from one of the NHS’ hospitals as a direct result of transgender-influenced NHS policy.

In 2021, a woman brought a complaint to the police that she had been raped when she was a patient in a hospital. When the police contacted the hospital authorities, they were told that the woman could not have been raped because the ward she was in was a single-sex ward and there were no men in it at that time.

The case came to the attention of the House of Lords, where Baroness Nicholson of Winterbourne raised the issue during a debate on single-sex wards. She said that the woman’s story was confirmed by CCTV and witnesses: “They [the authorities] forgot that there was CCTV, nurses and observers”. She also said that what the woman had suffered, not only by being raped but also by being disbelieved, was a direct result of the NHS policy known as Annex B. The policy says that patients are to be accommodated in single-sex wards according to their ‘gender identity’. The result, said Baroness Nicholson, is

“that hospital trusts inform ward sisters and nurses that if there is a male, as a trans person, in a female ward, and a female patient or anyone complains, they must be told that it is not true—there is no male there” (Dixon, 2022).

She went on to say that she thought it was “completely wrong” of the NHS to instruct staff “to tell a straightforward lie”.

The NHS said they were reviewing the policy, but the outcome doesn’t look hopeful for women. At least one of those on the review team is a transgender advocate. He

was quoted saying that the team was committed to “supporting the maintenance/strengthening of trans rights in the update”. As another female member of the House of Lords, Baroness Fox of Buckley, said, “when somebody says that there are no plans to reduce the existing rights of transgender people, what women hear ... is that women-only wards are not guaranteed at all”. It looks as though the NHS remains enraptured with the transgender agenda, a worrying outcome for the health of the nation.

For a series of lies about GIDS’ puberty blocker trial (2010 to 2014), by GIDS/Tavistock, the Health Research Authority and at least one Research Ethics Committee, see: Biggs, 2020: 10-12.

### *National Theatre Green Room bar*

Another organisation where lies have been told in the service of the transgender cause is the National Theatre Green Room bar in London. The lies concern the reactions of the staff and management to messages on the t-shirts worn by a group of lesbian customers (Peak Trans, 2019).

On Friday 5 July 2019, a female staff member refused to serve the lesbians because they were wearing t-shirts saying ‘Women will not submit. Get over it’ and ‘Lesbian, noun, a woman who loves other women’. She also objected to the fact that they had been involved with the ‘Get the L Out’ action at the Pride march the year before. ‘She walked off saying she didn’t want anything to do with us’, one of the lesbians said. Another of the lesbians said that the reason for refusing to serve them given by the duty manager was that ‘there were trans staff coming on duty at the next shift change who could find our t-shirts upsetting and could be seen as hateful’.

The lie here is that the t-shirt messages were ‘upsetting’ or ‘hateful’. They were meant to be provocative, but they are hardly likely to provoke anyone who is not in thrall to the trans agenda; and anyway, the messages are meant to retrieve some degree of agency in the face of trans invalidation of lesbian reality (Peak Trans, 2019).

The lying was continued by the National Theatre management. In response to a tweet by one of the lesbians saying that the Green Room bar had refused to serve them, management tweeted their guidelines: ‘We politely ask visitors not to demonstrate or distribute campaign material without prior consent. Abuse towards staff and other visitors won’t be tolerated’, they said. The implication was that that was what the lesbians had been doing, but that’s another lie. The only thing that might have qualified as demonstrating or distributing campaign materials, leaving aside the important question of the right to free speech, was their t-shirts. But the management explicitly denied that: ‘The NT has not and would not ever discriminate against an individual on the basis of their sexuality—or indeed because they were proudly declaring this on a t-shirt’—another lie. It was exactly what the National Theatre were doing, and the duty manager had said so. The NT’s excuse was that the lesbians’ ‘behaviour ... impinges on the ability’ of ‘our trans staff, company and audience members ... to feel supported and safe’. The management did not say what it was about the group’s behaviour that was so threatening to the trans staff, etc. Presumably it was the ‘abuse’ mentioned in the guidelines—another lie. The lesbians weren’t abusing anyone, proof of which can be found in a number of videos of the event (Peak Trans, 2019).



This is just a single example of complicity with the need to pile lie upon lie upon lie to defend transgenderism. All the lies, no matter how they were expressed—refusal of service, quoting irrelevant guidelines, outright denial—added up to one over-riding lie: that the messages on the lesbians' t-shirts were harmful to 'trans people', that the lesbians were abusing people when they weren't.

It's true that those messages were directed against the trans agenda, but they were also responses to prior trans messages showing contempt for women. The first one said that women will not submit to being bullied into accepting men as women. The 'Get over it' was a reference to transgender's own impertinent slogan, blazoned abroad everywhere (and proudly supplied, for a price, by Stonewall). The other message, that said that lesbians are *women* who love women, was a response to men claiming to be 'lesbians'. To punish those who convey these messages is censorship that serves a particular purpose: to silence any criticism of the transgender agenda. That criticism may indeed be 'hurtful' to certain 'trans people', but it is also hurtful to women to allow men to call themselves 'women' and thrust themselves into women's private spaces.

The most worrying aspect of this incident is that the National Theatre Green Room bar is not a trans organisation defending its own interests. In fact, its management was acting *against* its interests by alienating customers in order to defend the trans agenda. This is an illustration of the power and reach of the trans agenda and of its misogyny, that utter inability to see the world from the standpoint of women. It is true that the staff member who originally refused to serve the lesbians was a woman, and probably a lesbian herself. But women are not immune from misogyny, unfortunately. Misogyny is where the power is, and where the power is defines social life for all of us. We can resist and refuse to be implicated, but not all of us do all of the time. Being a woman is not an automatic guarantee of resistance and refusal.

### **Conclusion**

In this chapter I have discussed a few of the lies told by and on behalf of the transgender agenda. It is, of course, by no means an exhaustive list. It is meant for illustrative purposes only, to show the effect the trans agenda has on those who accept it. This theme of falsehood continues throughout every section of this website devoted to the transgender agenda, but most explicitly in the '... and statistics' and the 'Where's the evidence?' chapters. In the first, I discuss some of the ways in which the almost universal acceptance of transgender has influenced the official, public collection of statistics, as well as the ways in which transgender uses statistics to support its claims. In the second I discuss the research transgender appeals to in support of its claims, arguing that it is too methodologically weak to serve any such purpose.

### **References**

- Barry, Kathleen (1984[1979]) *Female Sexual Slavery* New York and London: New York University Press
- Barry, Kathleen (1995) *The Prostitution of Sexuality* New York and London: New York University Press
- Biggs, Michael (2020) *The Tavistock's Experimentation with Puberty Blockers* Transgender Trend, 18 December – <https://www.transgendertrend.com/product/the-tavistocks-experimentation-with-puberty-blockers/>

- Billings, Dwight B. and Thomas Urban (1982) 'The socio-medical construction of transsexualism: an interpretation and critique' *Social Problems* 29(3): 266–82
- Bindel, Julie (2017) *The Pimping of Prostitution: Abolishing the Sex Work Myth* Melbourne: Spinifex Press
- Callander, D., J. Wiggins, S. Rosenberg, V. J. Cornelisse, E. Duck-Chong, M. Holt, M. Pony, E. Vlahakis, J. MacGibbon and T. Cook (2019) *The 2018 Australian Trans and Gender Diverse Sexual Health Survey: Report of Findings* Sydney, NSW: The Kirby Institute, UNSW Sydney
- Devor, Aaron and Nicholas Matte (2006) 'ONE Inc. and Reed Erickson: the uneasy collaboration of gay and trans activism', in Stryker and Whittle, eds pp.387-406
- Dhejne, Cecilia (2017) *On Gender Dysphoria: Thesis for Doctoral Degree* Stockholm, Sweden: Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet – [https://openarchive.ki.se/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10616/45580/Thesis\\_Cecilia\\_Dhejne.pdf](https://openarchive.ki.se/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10616/45580/Thesis_Cecilia_Dhejne.pdf)
- Dixon, Hayley (2022) 'Hospital told police patient was not raped because alleged attacker was transgender' *The Telegraph* 17 March – <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2022/03/17/hospital-told-police-patient-not-raped-alleged-attacker-transgender/>
- Farley, Melissa (2013) 'Prostitution, liberalism, and slavery' *Logos: A Journal of Modern Society & Culture* – <http://logosjournal.com/2013/farley/>
- Fazackerley, Anna (2018) 'UK universities struggle to deal with “toxic” trans rights row' *The Guardian* 30 October – <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2018/oct/30/uk-universities-struggle-to-deal-with-toxic-trans-rights-row>
- Fazackerley, Anna (2020) 'Sacked or silenced: academics say they are blocked from exploring trans issues' *The Guardian* 14 January – <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2020/jan/14/sacked-silenced-academics-say-they-are-blocked-from-exploring-trans-issues>
- Fisk, Norman (1973) 'Gender dysphoria syndrome (the how, what, and why of a disease)', in Donald Laub and Patrick Gandy, eds *Second Interdisciplinary Symposium of Gender Dyphoria Syndrome* Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, pp.7-14
- GATE (2021) 'An affirmation of feminist principles' *Trans, Gender Diverse and Intersex Advocacy in Action* June – <https://gate.ngo/category/programs/un/>
- Goldner, Sally (2019) 'Media outlets constantly twist trans issues and I'm sick of it' *Crikey* 9 August
- Grant, Jaime M., Lisa A. Mottet, Justin Tanis, Jack Harrison, Jody L. Herman and Mara Keisling (2011) *Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey*. Washington: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force – [https://transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/resources/NTDS\\_Report.pdf](https://transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/resources/NTDS_Report.pdf)
- Herman, Jody L. (2013) 'Gendered restrooms and minority stress: the public regulation of gender and its impact on transgender people's lives' *Journal of Public Management & Social Policy* 19(1): 65-85
- Hyde, Zoë, Maryanne Doherty, P. J. Matt Tilley, Kieran A. McCaul, Rosanna Rooney and Jonine Jancey (2014) *The First Australian National Trans Mental Health Study: Summary of Results 2013* School of Public Health, Curtin University –

- [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273775827\\_The\\_First\\_Australian\\_National\\_Trans\\_Mental\\_Health\\_Study\\_Summary\\_of\\_Results/link/550d2d6b0cf2752610980b91/download](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273775827_The_First_Australian_National_Trans_Mental_Health_Study_Summary_of_Results/link/550d2d6b0cf2752610980b91/download)
- ILGA (2011) 'ILGA and the ECOSOC Status controversy' *International Lesbian and Gay Association* – <https://ilga.org/ilga-ecosoc-status-controversy>
- James, Sandy E., Jody L. Herman, Susan Rankin, Mara Keisling, Lisa Mottet and Ma'ayan Anafi (2016) *The Report of the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey* Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality – <https://www.transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/usts/USTS%20Full%20Report%20-%20FINAL%201.6.17.pdf>
- Jeffreys, Sheila (1997) *The Idea of Prostitution* Melbourne: Spinifex Press
- JL (2020) 'A piece of the PIE' *The Glimmer Update* 31 March – <https://grahamlinehan.substack.com/p/a-piece-of-the-pie/comments#comment-1621459>
- Kubie, Lawrence S. and James B. Mackie (1968) 'Critical issues raised by operations for gender transmutations' *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 147: 431-43
- Mann, Rebecca (2006) 'The treatment of transgender prisoners, not just an American problem—a comparative analysis of American, Australian, and Canadian prison policies concerning the treatment of transgender prisoners and a “universal” recommendation to improve treatment' *Tulane Journal of Law and Sexuality* 15: 91-133 – <https://journals.tulane.edu/tjls/issue/view/344>
- Moore, Mallory (2021) 'The trajectory of an anti-LGBT conspiracy theory' *TransSafety.Network* 11 April – <https://transafety.network/posts/alba-whrc-conspiracy/>
- Paletta, Daniele (2020) 'Women's Rights Caucus issues Feminist Declaration marking 25th anniversary of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action' *International Lesbian and Gay Association* 9 March – <https://ilga.org/CSW64-Womens-Rights-Caucus-feminist-declaration-Beijing25>
- Paletta, Daniele (2021) 'Statement responding to false allegations about ILGA World' *International Lesbian and Gay Association* 12 April – <https://ilga.org/statement-responding-false-allegations-about-ILGA-World>
- Paternotte, David (2014) 'The International (Lesbian and) Gay Association and the question of pedophilia: tracking the demise of gay liberation ideals' *Sexualities* 17(1-2): 121-38
- Peak Trans (2019) 'Blog: A gay man and several lesbians walked into a bar ...' *Peak Trans* 8 July – <https://www.peaktrans.org/blog-a-gay-man-and-several-lesbians-walked-into-a-bar/>
- Peek, Christine (2004) 'Breaking out of the prison hierarchy: transgender prisoners, rape, and the eighth amendment' *Santa Clara Law Review* 44(4): 1211-48 – <https://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/lawreview/vol44/iss4/11/>
- Pimenoff, Veronica and Friedemann Pfäfflin (2011) 'Transsexualism: treatment outcome of compliant and noncompliant patients' *International Journal of Transgenderism* 13(1): 37-44 – [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233316153\\_Transsexualism\\_Treatment\\_Outcome\\_of\\_Compliant\\_and\\_Noncompliant\\_Patients](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233316153_Transsexualism_Treatment_Outcome_of_Compliant_and_Noncompliant_Patients)
- Raymond, Janice (1980[1979]) *The Transsexual Empire* London: The Women's Press
- Raymond, Janice (1994) *The Transsexual Empire: The Making of the She-Male* New York and London: Athene Series, Teachers College Press, Columbia University –

- <https://janiceraymond.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/The%20Transsexual%20Empire.pdf>
- Raymond, Janice (2013) *Not a Choice, Not a Job: Exposing the Myths about Prostitution and the Global Sex Trade* Washington DC: Potomac Books
- Rosenblum, Darren (2000) “‘Trapped’ in Sing Sing: transgendered prisoners caught in the gender binarism” *Michigan Journal of Gender & Law* 6: 499-571
- Sandfort, T. (1986) ‘Pedophilia and the gay movement’ *Journal of Homosexuality* 13(2-3): 89-110
- Stoller, Robert J. (1973) ‘Male transsexualism: uneasiness’ *American Journal of Psychiatry* 130: 536-9
- Stryker, Susan and Stephen Whittle, eds (2006) *The Transgender Studies Reader* New York and London: Routledge
- Suissa, Judith and Alice Sullivan (2021) ‘The gender wars, academic freedom and education’ *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 10 March – <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1467-9752.12549>
- Sullivan, Alice (2020) ‘Sex and the census: why surveys should not conflate sex and gender identity’ *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 23 – <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1768346>
- Sullivan, Alice (2021) ‘Sex and the Office for National Statistics: a case study in policy capture’ *The Political Quarterly* – <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/1467-923X.13029>
- Tarzwel, Sydney (2006) ‘The gender lines are marked with razor wire: addressing state prison policies and practices for the management of transgender prisoners’ *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 38(1): 167-219
- Trans Facts (2018) ‘Trans Fact Checker: the reality behind the myths’ *Trans Facts* 11 December – <https://transfacts.blogspot.com/>
- UK Government (2018) *National LGBT Survey: Research Report* Government Equalities Office, July [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/721704/LGBT-survey-research-report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/721704/LGBT-survey-research-report.pdf)
- 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>
- WHRC (2021a) ‘Feminism has been co-opted to support an agenda to lower the age of consent’ *Women’s Human Rights Campaign* 29 March – [https://feministlegal.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Media-Release-on-CSW-and-ILGA-\\_28-Mar-2021-1.pdf](https://feministlegal.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Media-Release-on-CSW-and-ILGA-_28-Mar-2021-1.pdf)
- WHRC (2021b) ‘The anti-feminist principles: WHRC responds to NGO CSW’s “Affirmation of Feminist Principles”’ *Women’s Human Rights Campaign* July – <https://www.womensdeclaration.com/en/resources/anti-feminist-principles/>
- WRC (2020) ‘Feminist [sic] declaration on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women’ *Women’s Rights Caucus* March – <https://iwhc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Beijing-25-Feminist-declaration.pdf>
- Zimman, Lal (2019) ‘Trans self-identification and the language of neoliberal selfhood: agency, power, and the limits of monologic discourse’ *Journal of the Sociology of Language* – [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331282695\\_Trans\\_self-identification\\_and\\_the\\_language\\_of\\_neoliberal\\_selfhood\\_Agency\\_power\\_and](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331282695_Trans_self-identification_and_the_language_of_neoliberal_selfhood_Agency_power_and)

[\\_the\\_limits\\_of\\_monologic\\_discourse/link/5d3e433192851cd0468f9d86/download](#)

© Denise Thompson 2023