

Chapter 13: Some transgender strategies: organisation, censorship

	Page
The trans lobby gets organised	2
UK—Stonewall	2
UK—Mermaids	7
UK—‘Gendered Intelligence’	12
Australia—ACON	14
Australia—The Gender Centre	15
US—The Human Rights Campaign	15
US—other trans lobby groups	17
Discussion	19
Censorship	21
Social media	21
Other media	31
Discussion	34
References	36

Because of its falsehoods, the transgender agenda cannot convince rationally. It cannot provide valid arguments to support its case, nor point to empirical evidence supporting it. So it employs disreputable strategies, the main one of which is to lie. But there are other strategies it uses to get the non-thinking public to accept it. Many of those strategies have already been mentioned and two are discussed at length elsewhere: in the ‘Piggybacking’ chapter; and in the ‘Where’s the evidence?’ chapter which describes the capture of research and the universities. In this and the next two chapters, I discuss other strategies employed to get the transgender message across.

In this chapter I discuss some of the organisations established to sell the transgender message to the wider public. This involves the well-funded organisations that piggyback on the LGB by purporting to represent all the categories in the ever-expanding acronym, but in fact specifically devoted only to transgender and its discursive demolition of the category of sex. I also discuss some of the forms of censorship intended to prevent reasoned critique from being publicly aired. This is by no means an exhaustive overview. It is intended simply to convey some sense of what it is that is being censored and of the sheer absurdity of defining disagreement and criticism, or even exasperated anger, as ‘hate’. In the next two chapters I discuss the violence with which transgender greets any criticism, disagreement or assertion of women’s sex-based rights, and transgender’s own assertion of ‘rights’ for the non-existent category of ‘trans people’.

The trans lobby gets organised

UK—Stonewall

Stonewall has rightly been referred to as ‘the mothership of the Trans Rights Movement in the UK’ (Jones, 2020). It was originally founded to defend the interests of (usually) gay men and (perhaps) lesbians, but it has been thoroughly captured by the trans agenda. Named after the 1969 Stonewall protests in New York City’s Greenwich Village, against police persecution of gay men and lesbians, its original purpose when it was set up in 1989 was to fight the homophobic Section 28 of the 1988 *Local Government Act*. Introduced by the extreme right-wing government of Margaret Thatcher, this legislation banned local authorities from ‘promoting homosexuality’. It prevented them from spending money on educational materials favourable to a ‘gay lifestyle’ in local libraries, and prohibited access to gay internet resources on school computers. Schools weren’t a direct target of the legislation, but it did intimidate teachers and lead to staff self-censorship, even though no one was ever prosecuted under the legislation. It was repealed in 2003 (Gillan, 2003). Hence, Stonewall’s original purpose was to defend lesbians and gay men from the extremist Right.

Stonewall still presents itself as a champion of gay rights, although it is now no such thing, being wholly dominated by the T. As the leading publicist for the transgender phenomenon in Britain, its preferred strategy is the obliteration of the lesbian and gay (and bisexual) parts of the acronym (unless they can be made to serve transgender interests). Stonewall added the ‘T’ in 2016 after it received a grant of £100,000 from the Arcus Foundation, which was to be allocated only to ‘trans’ issues (Brunskell-Evans, 2021). Stonewall did consult (at least part of) their constituency about accepting this donation to “integrate trans-specific work”. But the constituency consisted only of ‘trans people’, around 700 of them. No lesbians or gay men (or bisexuals) were consulted (Bartosch, 2021b). Once the T was introduced, Stonewall’s self-presentation as the champion of the LGB as well became a falsehood. Now its primary, if not its only, focus is the T at the expense of everyone else, and its self-advertisement as ‘Europe’s largest lesbian, gay, bi and trans (LGBT) charity’ is a lie (Joyce, 2019).

Diversity Champions Programme

As one of its main strategies for spreading its message throughout society by capturing workplaces, Stonewall has a ‘Diversity Champions Programme’, which it describes as ‘the leading employers’ programme for ensuring all LGBTQ+ staff are free to be themselves in the workplace’.¹ (See also: Maslin, 2021). This involves organisations *paying* Stonewall to be indoctrinated with the transgender message. This is a most ingenious ploy. Not only does Stonewall make money from its training courses (read: indoctrination), it traps people into defending those courses and the message they convey because they’ve paid good money for them.

Sex Matters has compiled a list of ‘Diversity Champions’, both current and those organisations that have withdrawn from the scheme. Sex Matters say that they try to

¹ <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/diversity-champions-programme>

keep the list up to date by crossing out those that have left (although leaving the names there) and adding any new ones.²

Employers' progress in meeting with Stonewall's demands is measured by a Workplace Equality Index (WEI), 'the definitive benchmarking tool for employers to measure their progress'. 'where organisations are ranked according to how closely they meet Stonewall's definition of "inclusion"' (Bartosch, 2021b).

Leaving aside the fact that Stonewall these days is not at all concerned about lesbians and gay men, as well as the bizarre notion that employers have a responsibility to help their employees 'be themselves', there is the question of how this scheme operates in practice. And it operates by policing employees' speech (e.g. they must use feminine pronouns to refer to men and address them as 'Miss', 'Ms', 'Mrs' or 'Ma'am'), falsifying data on sex (coding men as 'women'), coercing women into accepting men in intimate female spaces, and silencing people who might have any objections, even to the point of firing them.

Stonewall doesn't put it like this, of course. Instead, it describes 'what the best employers do' in terms of 'robust policies ... to support employees who are transitioning', 'changing identification cards, records or documents', 'gender-neutral language and explicit statements of inclusion', and 'training ... for all staff on the role of an ally, including ... relevant terminology, [and] what transphobia looks like'.³ But 'supporting employees who are transitioning' means requiring women to accept men in intimate female spaces; and 'changing identification cards' means coding men as 'women'; and 'relevant terminology' in trans terms is feminine language applied to men; and Stonewall's definition of 'transphobia' means no one is allowed to argue with them. This scheme benefits no one, not even those who identify as 'trans'. People resent being coerced into something they don't agree with, and that resentment affects their relationships with those they perceive as the source of the demands. All these caveats and prohibitions just add another level of misery to the neo-liberal workplace which is already hyper-regulated (for employees, not employers).

Why would organisations acquiesce in this? The answer is that it enables the organisation to give a low-cost tick to the 'equality, diversity and inclusion' mantra, which is neo-liberalism's way of responding to the social unrest of the 1960s and 1970s while still maintaining the same exploitative system. But while the tick might be a cheap virtue-signal for each individual organisation, it is a money-spinner for Stonewall. Scottish Water, for example, pays Stonewall £2,500 a year to be a 'Diversity Champion' (Macaskill, 2021), and that is the lowest fee Stonewall charges (Courea, 2021). As part of its concern with 'diversity in the broadcasting sector', the UK communications regulator, Ofcom, paid Stonewall over £26,750 plus VAT between 2007 and 2021.⁴ (See also: Sex Matters, 2021). Income from fees for Stonewall's programs, including the 'Diversity Champions' scheme, amounted to £3,269,477 in the year ended 30 September 2019 (Stonewall, 2019: 30). In the same year, income from government sources was £702,295, while total income was £8,316,000, although even that enormous sum didn't allow them to break even.

² <https://sex-matters.org/campaigns/keeping-track-of-stonewall/>

³ <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/what-best-employers-do>

⁴ https://www.ofcom.org.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/217118/membership-stonewall.pdf

Expenditure was £9,125,000 (p.16). Interestingly, the Arcus Foundation didn't give them any money in 2019, although it had donated £36,695 the previous year (p.29). The organisation's 'key personnel', the Executive Directors and the CEO, are handsomely rewarded. They are paid 'at the market rate', and Stonewall regularly reviews executive pay 'to ensure that it is in line with market norms' (p.15). Would that feminist organisations had such a luxury!

In 2018, the Big Lottery awarded Stonewall just under £500,000, to be paid over five years, to be used 'to "empower trans leaders and organisations" with a "particular focus on leadership, media and influencing"' (Read, 2018). It was thoroughly criticised in the media on a number of grounds (Gilligan, 2018b; MailOnline Reporter, 2018). One criticism was that the purpose for which the money was given—to fund their media and influencing campaigns—was political activity, and that this was against the Fund's rules. Another objection was that one of the 'influencers' (a man posing as a 'woman') had not only been a 'sex worker' (so-called), he continued to portray this positively in his stage show called 'Wardrobe Changes and Four Cocks'. He is also one of those transgender men who bully young lesbians to have sex with them with taunts of 'cotton ceiling' (a prurient reference to the lesbians refusing men sexual access by keeping their panties on).

The fact that the grant was just under £500,000 is perhaps significant, given that grants of over that amount had to be approved by an external board, while grants under that amount could be approved by senior management. It was suggested that these new grants to Stonewall (and Mermaids—see below) were connected to the fact that the Lottery's portfolio development director had attended an event held in 2017 by the LGBT Consortium. This person also went on a leadership course run by Stonewall, and was later named an LGBT role model. Thus the trans lobby had an advocate within the ranks of the Lottery's senior management. They were less lucky with another Lottery-funded ploy, the employment of a new staff member at the LGBT Consortium to write grant applications and work on a new funding model. This employee was so dismayed at what he saw there, that he resigned. He tweeted that he had sent a report to the Lottery, but they said they didn't receive it (Gilligan, 2018b). Perhaps the Royal Mail failed, or the computers went down. Or perhaps (perish the thought!), someone is lying.

Another objection to so much money being given to these 'transgender' organisations concerned the Lottery's funding priorities. Less money was being given to projects with 'women' and 'older people' in the titles, although the Lottery disputed this, saying that such projects didn't always have the actual words in their titles. However, while the information is only anecdotal, there are reports of women's refuges and support for the elderly losing Lottery funding (Gilligan, 2018b).

Despite all these objections, the trans lobby prevailed. The Big Lottery did not withdraw the funding, and Stonewall (and Mermaids) found themselves richer by almost £100,000 a year for the next five years. (It was recorded as £98,966 in their financial statement for 2019) (Stonewall, 2019: 29). The Tax Payers' Alliance estimated that between 2019 and 2021 Stonewall had received at least £3,105,877 from 3,127 public sector organisations, in addition to £702,295 from nine government grants (Bartosch, 2021b). No women's advocacy group has ever seen so much money.

Stonewall's influence waning?

Fortunately, Stonewall doesn't always get its own way. The reaction of highly placed personnel in some police districts (see the 'More havoc: the police' chapter) is a hopeful sign that the transgender flood is starting to recede in the UK, as is the rejection of transgender claims by some courts and tribunals. Another positive sign is that organisations are being challenged on their membership of Stonewall's 'Diversity Champions' scheme. Some are withdrawing altogether, although not officially for ethical reasons; and some very important people are publicly voicing harsh criticisms of it. It is perhaps in reaction to this wave of withdrawals that Stonewall decided to take down its 'Champions' list, rather than seeing their support diminishing or being publicly reprimanded for claiming support where there is none.

In 2020, Oxfordshire County Council withdrew its 'Trans Inclusion Toolkit' from local schools after a 13-year-old schoolgirl initiated a judicial review of its 'Diversity Champions' membership. The girl's legal team argued that the Council had consulted with no one but trans groups before introducing the policy, and that it made false statements about the law. The High Court gave permission to seek a judicial review, but the Council withdrew the Toolkit before the matter went to court (Cunningham, 2021).

In September the same year, the Crown Prosecution Service was challenged by a 15-year-old schoolgirl about its 'hate crime' guidance to schools and its affiliation with Stonewall. The CPS did withdraw the schools guidance, but refused to leave the 'Champions' scheme, and the girl's legal team then applied for a judicial review (Cunningham, 2021). This was unsuccessful, as transgender mouthpiece, *Pink News*, gleefully reported. The judge argued that the CPS' membership of the 'Diversity Champions' scheme would not have any influence on prosecutors' decisions because it was confined to employment matters. "There is no basis for asserting that the individual prosecutor will be influenced in any way by the CPS' status as a Diversity Champion", the judge was quoted saying. Membership was not "capable of giving rise to actual bias or the appearance of bias in relation to prosecutorial decisions ... The CPS maintains its membership as a Stonewall Diversity Champion in its capacity as an employer, not in relation to its capacity or functions as a prosecutorial authority" (Parsons, 2021). But as one lawyer pointed out, the influence of the 'Diversity Champions' scheme was not confined to the CPS' role as employer. There was plenty of evidence, she said, that the Workplace Equality Index is deliberately designed to reach into every aspect of an organisation's operation, not just with its staff but also with the public. So although this particular case might have failed, this lawyer said, that should not reassure public bodies about their affiliation with Stonewall (Cunningham, 2021. See also: Hamilton and Ames, 2021).

In March 2021, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) told Stonewall they would not be renewing their membership of the 'Diversity Champions' scheme. The official explanation given was financial reasons.⁵ However, in an interview in *The Times* (Wright, 2021), the EHRC's Chair, Baroness Falkner, made it very clear that at least part of that decision to withdraw involved disquiet at Stonewall's practices. Although she didn't mention Stonewall specifically, the views she criticised were clearly those emanating from the trans lobby. "Women must have the right to

⁵ <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/our-response-sex-matters-open-letter>

question transgender identity without being abused, stigmatised or risking losing their job”, she was quoted saying. She also said that the EHRC was determined to protect freedom of belief, that

“[s]omeone can believe that people who self identify as a different sex are not the different sex that they self identify ... A lot of people would find this an entirely reasonable belief” (Wright, 2021).

She also expressed concern about the abuse that was happening, especially anonymous abuse online, and said that the EHRC would be pushing the government to do something about it (Wright, 2021. See also: Bartosch, 2021a). I think the UK EHRC might be the only human rights organisation in the world to stand up to the trans lobby. Most if not all of the others have been thoroughly captured.

Sometimes Stonewall can be its own worst enemy, or as one lawyer put it, ‘damaged by friendly fire from its CEO, Nancy Kelley, who compared dissent from its orthodoxies to anti-Semitism’ (Cunningham, 2021). Kelley did this soon after Baroness Falkner’s statement appeared in the media. She said that Stonewall believed in freedom of speech (another trans lie), but that that freedom was “not without limit”. Where beliefs are “harmful or damaging—whether it’s antisemitic beliefs, gender-critical beliefs, beliefs about disability—we have legal systems that are put in place for people who are harmed by that” (Courea, 2021). This is a typical transgender slur against trans-critical arguments, although it’s usually expressed as ‘Nazi’ or ‘fascist’, mostly online.⁶ Kelley did not do her own cause any good with such a bizarre comparison.

At around the same time as the EHRC withdrew, a number of other public sector organisations also withdrew from the ‘Diversity Champions’ scheme, including the House of Commons, the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency (Courea, 2021), the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, and Channel 4 (Somerville and Swerling, 2021). The UK employment dispute service, the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS), also withdrew, like the EHRC, “for cost reasons”. The above-mentioned lawyer said that there were other challenges to Stonewall’s influence, namely the Ministry of Justice’s policy relating to men in prison claiming to be ‘women’, the EHRC’s guidance on single-sex spaces, and the College of Policing’s policy on “non-crime hate incidents” (Cunningham, 2021). Also in May, Liz Truss, at that time the Minister for Women and Equalities in the Tory government, was quoted saying that she recommended that all government bodies withdraw from the ‘Diversity Champions’ scheme. She said she shared the EHRC’s concern about ‘value for money’, especially as the civil service had its own ‘workplace diversity’ program (Courea, 2021). Unlike Baroness Falkner, Truss did not publicly criticise the trans lobby’s influence.

In August 2021, Ofcom announced that they had reviewed their relationship with Stonewall and decided to ‘step back from’ their membership of the ‘Diversity Champions’ programme, giving two reasons. The first was that they had now ‘laid the foundations’ for supporting ‘LGBTQ+ colleagues’ and they were ‘confident’ that they could ‘move ahead positively, without ... the programme’. The second reason was that they had ‘considered whether our relationship with Stonewall poses a conflict or

⁶ See, for example, the Etsy website: <https://www.etsy.com/ca/listing/605692496/nazi-terfs-fck-off-patches>

risk of perceived bias’, because there had recently been ‘significant scrutiny of some of Stonewall’s policy positions’. ‘As the communications regulator’, they said, ‘an important part of our responsibility is to ensure we remain impartial and independent at all times’.⁷

However, Ofcom’s step away from the ‘Diversity Champions’ scheme is hardly likely to improve their reputation for impartiality. They are continuing their participation in the Workplace Equality Index scheme, and refuse to release any information about it because to do so might cause commercial harm to Stonewall (Sex Matters, 2021). But Stonewall is a registered charity. What possible commercial interests could it have, especially as it is at least partly publicly funded? And being publicly funded, as is Ofcom, isn’t there a responsibility for transparency? Certainly the *Charities Act 2011* says so. It requires charities to keep accounting records ‘which are sufficient to show and explain all the charity’s transactions’, and ‘disclose at any time ... the financial position of the charity’ (s.130). True, this applies to Stonewall, not to Ofcom, which is not a charity although it is a public body with its own requirement for openness. If Stonewall is required to be open about its financial position, why is Ofcom secretive? Secrecy is hardly likely to contribute to a reputation for impartiality.

For criticism of Stonewall’s influence on the medical profession, see: Helyar et al, 2021.

UK—Mermaids

Mermaids is one of the groups most successful at lobbying the powers-that-be in the UK for the transgenering of the young, especially in its influence on GIDS and GIDS’ successors. Mermaids says on its website, that it ‘supports transgender, nonbinary and gender-diverse children and young people until their 20th birthday’, and provides ‘chat support to students up to the age of 25’. It also says it ‘supports’ the families, and professionals such as teachers, GPs, social workers, and health workers in the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services.⁸ Mermaids does not, however, support parents who are devastated by their children’s claims to be the opposite sex, and by the medical mutilations their children are insisting on with Mermaids’ enthusiastic support. Nor does it support medical professionals who disagree with the medicalising of healthy children. But wherever there are children, there is Mermaids. As Heather Brunskell-Evans has pointed out, Mermaids has been in the forefront of the making of the ‘transgender child’ (Brunskell-Evans, 2019).

Mermaids tell us that they started in 1995 as a small support group for parents, ‘sitting around the kitchen table’, but they have long moved on from that small folksy beginning. Susie Green, Mermaids’ CEO for most of its existence, is one of the world’s leading advocates for the medicalising of children. Despite the fact that she has no medical training (Gilligan, 2018a), she has been an energetic and enthusiastic promoter of Mermaids’ agenda of medical procedures for children, up to and including surgical castration. In 2009, she took her 16-year-old son to Thailand to have his male genitals removed and the surgical creation of an artificial vagina,

⁷ <https://www.ofcom.org.uk/about-ofcom/latest/media/media-releases/2021/statement-stonewall-diversity-champions>

⁸ <https://mermaidsuk.org.uk/about-us/>

‘vaginoplasty’. This is a well-known fact, having been splashed all over social and mass media ever since it happened, including by Green herself (Artemisia, 2019).

Green is quite frank about this. In a YouTube video, she tells us, ‘At sixteen, my daughter [i.e. son] underwent gender reassignment surgery’, although she didn’t mention Thailand or any details of the surgery.⁹ She is much feted in the media, being regularly interviewed and favourably quoted. She is also invited to speak at conferences and other public professional events, e.g. the Westminster Social Policy Forum and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health conference. In 2015, she was asked to give evidence to the inquiry into ‘transgender equality’ conducted by the Women and Equalities Committee of the House of Commons (Artemisia, 2017). What she had to say was well-received. Mermaids was quoted favourably eleven times in the report of the inquiry (UK Women and Equalities Committee, 2016), despite the fact that much of what Green said was highly dubious. What she said about suicide risk among young ‘trans’ people was actually false (see the ‘... and statistics’ chapter). As one commentator noted, ‘No one who peddles made-up claims should be advising government committees’ (Artemisia, 2017). (Green resigned as CEO in November 2022) (Gentleman, 2022).

Mermaids say on their website that they have ‘trained’ professionals in many areas: the NHS, education, general practice, social work, mental health services, the police, ‘and the workplace’. But they do not mean training in the relevant fields of expertise in each of these areas, as of course they are not equipped to do. They mean ‘trained’ in ‘gender awareness’; and they have had unimpeded, and unsupervised, access to these professionals, including teachers, primary and secondary, to carry out this ‘training’.

The ‘training’ Mermaids gives teachers was described by a trainee teacher who was required to take part in one of those sessions in 2018 (Kearns, 2018. This *Spectator* publication no longer appears on the internet). It was run by the mother of one of the children, a so-called ‘trans’ child, on behalf of Mermaids. Part of the ‘training’ involved a chart picturing a row of 12 coloured figures ranging from a pink Barbie in a pink, flowing dress at one end to a brown GI Joe in a military uniform with a gun at the other, thus regurgitating a succession of stereotypical sex roles. Teachers were told that this depicted a ‘gender spectrum’, and they were asked where they and their students fitted along the line. The literature handed out said that the children could contact Mermaids directly if they couldn’t talk to their teachers; and the teachers were told that they shouldn’t tell the children’s parents that their child was ‘trans’. Telling parents their child was being influenced by transgender ideology was put in terms of ‘outing’ the child.

There has been unrelenting pressure on the NHS and GIDS from Mermaids and others such as the Gender Identity Research and Education Society (GIRES) and the egregiously misnamed Gendered Intelligence, as well as from the pro-trans opinions emanating from the media (especially *The Guardian* but also the BBC). In particular, GIDS has been constantly pushed to give puberty blockers to children below the age of 16 (Biggs, 2020a), giving in to that pressure with the above-mentioned trial of puberty blockers for children from the age of 12 (Charlesworth, 2021: 6).

And yet, as Stephanie Davies-Arai told the House of Lords, neither Mermaids nor any of the other trans lobby groups contain any clinical or educational professionals or

⁹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2ZiVPh12RQY>

child development experts (Transgender Trend, 2019a). As Kathleen Stock (2018) asked, what authority does Mermaids have to advise public bodies on the law, on medicine, on social policy, on education, and so on? What is their expertise, given they have little or no professional qualifications? Such questions are rarely raised, let alone answered, so all-pervasive is transgender's policy capture of institutions, including institutions supposedly devoted to the welfare of children.

Another institution that has embraced Mermaids is the British royal family, or at least certain members of it. The Duke of Sussex (aka Prince Harry) has been quoted saying vaguely positive things about Mermaids at a meeting of a number of charities supporting young people with 'mental health issues'. Mermaids had been invited to the meeting, in recognition of the supposedly important work it does, by Heads Together, an umbrella charity run by the Royal Foundation, set up in 2009 by princes William (Duke of Cambridge) and Harry, later joined by their wives (Catherine and Megan). Prince Harry was reported to say that Mermaids was 'on the front line of mental health work in the UK', and that they 'needed to highlight more "success stories" of those who have overcome mental health issues' (Furness, 2019). Oh well, he's not the first member of the royal family to get it wrong (on many different fronts), and he won't be the last. The Royal Foundation is completely taken in. A spokesman was reported to have said: "Mermaids are one of a number of important organisations who are working on the frontline to support the mental health and wellbeing of young people in Britain" (Furness, 2019).

Like Stonewall, Mermaids is well-funded. As already mentioned, they were also given a Big Lottery grant of £500,000 towards the end of 2018. In response to protests the Lottery said that it would undertake a review (MailOnline Reporter, 2018), although its Chairman said that they "do not see any reason not to fund this" (Gilligan, 2018a). See also: Weakley, 2019). Not surprisingly, the Lottery's review said that they found no reason to withhold the funding, and yet among the allegations it investigated was the accusation that Mermaids uses misleading statistics, and that its training courses are "unprofessional" and spread "misinformation" (Plummer, 2019).

Given the wealth of evidence that these allegations are in fact true, I wonder what it was that the review investigated. They said that there was no evidence that Mermaids' statistics were misleading, and yet critic after critic has provided just that evidence. (See the '... and statistics' chapter). Rather than looking for any evidence, they took the usual pusillanimous way out by saying that 'gender research was "complex and controversial"' (Plummer, 2019. See also: Mohdin, 2019). A hint for the euphemism-watchers among us—the word 'complex' usually means 'I'm not going to inquire any further because I know I'm wrong and I don't want to admit it'. The Lottery's review then called for 'more research and investment into the field', oblivious to the fact that disinterested research in the transgender field is exactly what the trans lobby is so hugely successful at stifling.

As well as the nearly £100,000 a year from the Big Lottery in 2018, Mermaids had received £35,000 from the Department for Education and £128,000 from Children in Need in 2017 (Kearns, 2018). A graph provided by Michael Biggs shows Mermaids' income from 2004 to 2020. In 2004, it was zero and it did not increase much until 2015 when it started to take off. It then increased steeply until in 2020 when it had reached something around £900,000 (Biggs, 2020b). Mermaids tell us in an online journal that only 22% of their income for 2019/2020 came from grants, the rest was

made up of 42% donations, 27% legacies, 4% training and 5% other.¹⁰ They don't give any amounts, but one donation was over £250,000 raised in January 2019 by a YouTuber who played the video game Donkey Kong 64 (whatever that is) for as long as he could (Plummer, 2019). But whatever the source of their income, Mermaids is not struggling financially.

Mermaids' influence waning?

However, like Stonewall, Mermaids has also faced widely publicised defeats. In July 2023, its appeal against the Charity Commission's decision to register LGB Alliance as a charity was dismissed (First-tier Tribunal, 2023). The Charity Commission's decision (to register the LGB Alliance as a charity) had been published on 29 April 2021, and Mermaids took the Charity Commission to a tribunal in an appeal against that decision less than two months later, on 1 June 2021. Given the short length of time between the announcement of the LGB Alliance's charitable status and Mermaids' appeal against it, Mermaids must have been preparing its appeal before the announcement, probably ever since the LGB Alliance applied to be registered as a charity on 13 March 2020 (First-tier Tribunal, 2023: para.45).

The Tribunal's decision was not an outright defeat for Mermaids because it didn't criticise them. In the first place, the dismissal rested only on a legal technicality, namely:

the fact that Mermaids and those they support have been affected emotionally and/or socially is insufficient to provide them with standing to bring this appeal, no matter the depth of the feelings resulting from the Decision or the strength of their disagreement (First-tier Tribunal, 2023: para.76).

Mermaids did not qualify as a 'person... [whose] legal rights [were] impinged, altered or affected by the Commission's decision' (para.34) to register LGB Alliance as a charity.

Moreover, the LGB Alliance activities that Mermaids was complaining about happened *before* they were registered as a charity (as well as after), and hence Mermaids 'failed to establish the causal relationship' between the LGB Alliance's charitable status and the effect of their activities on Mermaids (para.71). So although Mermaids' spiteful ploy was defeated, it was not defeated because of its spite, which the Tribunal judges didn't notice. The Tribunal even seemed to be somewhat sympathetic to Mermaids and its concerns:

It is very clear to us that Mermaids profoundly disagrees with the Commission's Decision [to register the LGB Alliance as a charity] emotionally, politically and intellectually. We acknowledge that this disagreement is sincere, as are the concerns that have been voiced before us (First-tier Tribunal, 2023: para.76).

It was not the Tribunal's task to adjudicate between the competing claims and the truth or otherwise of each of them, despite its appeal to 'facts' (First-tier Tribunal, 2023: paras.39-56). Its task was to decide whether or not Mermaids had any legal standing to bring the case against the Charity Commission, and whether or not the

¹⁰https://mermaidsuk.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Mermaids_journal_2020_FINAL_compressed.pdf

LGB Alliance’s activities in relation to Mermaids changed as a result of their (the Alliance’s) registration as a charity. The answer in both cases was ‘no’, but that was for dissociated legal reasons, not because Mermaids had done anything wrong, either in bringing the appeal or in its standard operating procedures. There was no criticism of Mermaids (nor, thankfully, of the LGB Alliance). Mermaids did not, as one commentator put it, ‘finally get... the scrutiny it deserves’ (Myers, 2022). But at least it did not get what it asked for.

For the Charity Commission’s response to the Tribunal’s verdict, see: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/charity-commission-responds-to-mermaidslgb-alliance-tribunal-verdict>;

for a discussion of the case sympathetic to the LGB Alliance, see: O’Neill, 2023;

for a discussion of the LGB Alliance and the reasons it was formed, see the ‘Piggybacking’ chapter.

Before the Tribunal had published its decision on the LGB Alliance’s charitable status (in July 2023), but after Mermaids had appealed against that decision (on 1 June 2021), the Charity Commission had opened a ‘regulatory compliance case’ investigating Mermaids (on 28 November 2022).¹¹ The Commission noted that opening the case was not in itself a finding of wrong-doing (Dixon, 2022), but charities don’t get investigated for ‘regulatory compliance’ if they’re doing the right thing.

The investigation followed on media reports critical of Mermaids. *The Telegraph* reported that Mermaids had been supplying breast binders to girls as young as 14, without their parents’ knowledge, since 2019. A spokesperson for the Commission said that

“[c]oncerns have been raised with us about Mermaids’ approach to safeguarding young people. We have opened a regulatory compliance case and have written to the trustees” (Dixon, 2022).

Concerns were also raised about children being told that puberty blockers were safe and ‘totally reversible’, and about Mermaids congratulating a teenager who said they wanted ‘all the surgeries’ (Dixon, 2022; Myers, 2022).

The Times reported that a Mermaids trustee had given a presentation in 2011 at a conference hosted by an organisation that promotes paedophilia. He resigned when *The Times* reporter contacted Mermaids and told them about it. It would seem that the London School of Economics, though, where he was an assistant professor of ‘gender and sexuality’, had no qualms about employing him (Bannerman, 2022). (For transgender’s corruption of universities, see the ‘Where’s the evidence?’ chapter).

Mermaids reacted to the Charity Commission’s action by closing its online services, because of what they called “intolerable abuse”. They were quoted saying

“We have regrettably continued to receive a high volume of distressing, and in some cases threatening, calls, emails and web chat contacts as a result of some of the recent coverage” (Nicholson, 2022).

¹¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/regulator-announces-statutory-inquiry-into-mermaids>

But ‘intolerable abuse’ is probably no more accurate a description of what was happening than their claims of ‘vulnerability’ and ‘marginalisation’, or their accusations of ‘hate speech’, ‘transphobia’, etc. Typically, Mermaids gave no examples of the ‘intolerable abuse’. It was probably no more than their critics voicing their glee that someone in authority was taking notice.

I have been unable to find anything about the outcome of the Charity Commission’s regulatory compliance case against Mermaids. The Commission’s website says that they were going ‘to publish a report detailing what issues the inquiry looked at, what actions were undertaken as part of the inquiry and what the outcomes were’.¹² But there’s no sign of it. However, there were other consequences. In October, the Lottery paused its £500,000 grant, and the Department for Education removed Mermaids from its mental health and wellbeing resources for schools (Myers, 2022; Nicholson, 2022).

For an argument that trans ideology has spread far beyond Mermaids, see: Bartosch, 2022.

UK—‘Gendered Intelligence’

As already discussed (in the ‘Transgendering the young 3’ chapter), Gendered Intelligence is another trans organisation devoted to transgendering the young. It runs ‘gender diversity workshops’ for youth group leaders, school teachers and university lecturers that teach them how to ‘recognise’ young ‘trans’ people and support them in that belief (Brunskell-Evans, 2020. The original title of this article was ‘The Care Quality Commission: an executive arm of Stonewall?’). Its CEO, Jay Stewart, a woman who claims to be a ‘man’, was an advisor on transgender issues to the Ministry of Justice, and serves on the Prison Service’s Transgender Advisory Board that is responsible for the policy of placing men claiming to be ‘women’, including sex offenders, in women’s prisons (Biggs, 2018).

Established in 2008, it is also a registered charity. Like Stonewall and Mermaids it charges fees for its ‘Professional and Educational Services’, although its ‘services for youth and communities’ are funded by grants and donations.¹³ It too has plenty of money. Most of its revenue comes from the public money it is paid selling ‘training’ to the public sector, but it was set up with a grant of £50,000 from the Equality and Human Rights Commission, and BBC Children in Need gave it £116,000 (Biggs, 2018). The NHS, the London Museum, the Lottery, and the pharmaceutical company Burroughs-Wellcome have also given it money (4th Wave Now, 2015). BBC Children in Need ‘awards grants each year to organisations supporting disadvantaged children and young people in the UK’.¹⁴ Children might be disadvantaged because they believe they are the opposite sex, but Gendered Intelligence exists to reinforce that belief, not to tell them they are perfectly fine the way they are. ‘It’s so important,’ Stewart was reported to say, ‘to be teaching children in schools that they can be anything that they want regardless of the gender that they have been given at birth’ (4th Wave Now, 2015). And this pernicious nonsense—‘Kiddies, you can change sex if you want to’—is heavily funded by the powers-that-be in the UK (and not only there).

¹² <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/regulator-announces-statutory-inquiry-into-mermaids>

¹³ <https://genderedintelligence.co.uk/about-us/our-aims.html>

¹⁴ <https://www.bbc.com/charityappeals/appeals/grants>

Gendered Intelligence targets educational institutions from kindergarten to university. It used to have access to children as young as four, at least up to 2015, when 20 primary schools a year were paying it to ‘train’ children about ‘gender identity’ (4th Wave Now, 2015). However, on its website the lowest age mentioned is eight, while the age-range for their youth camps is 11-25.¹⁵ But if one of their ‘training’ sessions is any indication, they are hardly suitable for children (or anyone else, for that matter). In June 2019, they hosted a session for teachers at primary, secondary and higher education levels at an art gallery showing an exhibition called ‘Kiss My Genders’. The title itself should have sounded a warning to these teachers of the young, with its veiled reference to ‘Kiss my ass’ porn videos. And indeed the content of the exhibition was highly sexualised, with rubber fetish as a theme, photos depicting sado-masochistic practices and, in one case, a close-up photo of an erect penis. Some of the exhibition material was actually pornographic, in particular a movie depicting a stylised gang rape of a man (Transgender Trend, 2019b). This is presumably the kind of thing Gendered Intelligence expects the teachers to take back to the children and young people in their care, although the exhibition had nothing to say about ‘gender identity’. Instead, it was a celebration of sexual fetishism. If Gendered Intelligence can’t tell the difference between ‘gender identity’ and fetishistic kinky sex, perhaps there is no difference.

According to Michael Biggs (Biggs, 2018), Gendered Intelligence is largely responsible for translating queer theory into public policy, and it has played a key role in training academic staff and university administrators. Its course, ‘Trans Awareness’, has been repeated in dozens of universities. Merton College Oxford, for example, paid them to give the course to its staff, and the Oxford University Student Union wanted it to be obligatory for all staff in welfare roles every two years.

Heather Brunskell_Evans has argued that Gendered Intelligence is just as guilty as Mermaids for providing the young with transgender information such as how to get breast-binders and ‘packers’ (stuffed cloth protuberances mimicking male genitals for little girls to wear in their pants) (Brunskell_Evans, 2022). While the latter are not as physically damaging as breast-binders, they are psychologically damaging because they purvey a lie. Maleness is no more a piece of stuffed cloth than femaleness is the accoutrements of femininity.

There are other trans lobby groups in the UK. There’s Press for Change (founded by a woman claiming to be a ‘man’, Stephen Whittle), the Gender Trust and The LGBT Foundation and GIRES, which produced ‘training’ resources for the Royal College of General Practitioners (Transgender Trend, 2020), and which, along with Mermaids, was vociferously opposed to GIDS’ cautious policy of not administering puberty blockers to children until 16 years of age (Biggs, 2019). They were also instrumental, again along with Mermaids, in getting Tavistock to capitulate to their demands to lower the age at which children could be dosed with these medications (Biggs, 2019). But I’m not going to discuss them in detail. All of them are on the same ideological page, all of them have far too much influence on public policy, especially medicine, and all of them need to be disbanded if the transgender influence on British society is to be ended.

¹⁵ <https://genderedintelligence.co.uk/support/trans-youth.html>

Australia—ACON

Stonewall's Workplace Equality Index also operates in Australia. As Stonewall's counterpart in New South Wales, ACON, put it on their 'Pride in Diversity' website: 'The Australian Workplace Equality Index originally drew from the rich experience, expertise and methodology of the Diversity Champions Workplace Equality Index published by Stonewall in the UK ... The AWEI now stands as the definitive national benchmark on LGBTQ workplace inclusion'.¹⁶

For a list of organisations signed up for 'Pride Inclusion' programs, see: <https://www.prideinclusionprograms.com.au/members-list-2/> (viewed 23 January 2024).

Like Stonewall, ACON was originally established to support gay men, specifically in connection with the AIDS crisis, and it says that 'HIV prevention' is still one of its main aims. (Its acronym originally stood for 'Aids Council of NSW'). Again like Stonewall, any mention of lesbians is tokenistic at best. ACON do have a section called 'women' but ACON's category of 'women' includes men claiming to be women: 'We're here to help women in LGBTIQ communities take control of their health'; and at least one mention of 'lesbians' is decidedly peculiar: 'lesbian, bisexual, queer (LBQ) and other same-sex attracted women'.¹⁷ What other 'same-sex attracted women' are there apart from lesbians and bisexual women?

Despite its linguistic confusion, ACON like Stonewall has won the approval, and the financial support, of government. They announced that the NSW government 'has today advised ACON that it will invest up to \$3.5 million in the development of a Health Centre that provides health care, support and referral services to LGBTIQ+ people in NSW'.¹⁸ It is not clear when ACON heard about this largesse since there is no date on this announcement, but December 2019 is mentioned as a date in the future. In 2021, they received over \$16.9 million in grant money—\$12,639,286 from NSW Health, \$584,291 from the Local Area Health District, and \$3,682,200 from 'Other' (Kowalski, 2022a). They also fund raise. Its fund-raising organisation, GiveOUT, raised over \$150,000 between 2016 and 2021 and their goal in 2021 was \$15,000.¹⁹

One of their greatest achievements for the trans cause must be the capture of Australia's national public broadcaster, the ABC (Australian Broadcasting Commission). In 2021, ACON awarded it Gold status for its achievement of 177 points out of 200 in the AWEI (Cross, 2022a, b). Gold is not the top award, that's Platinum. They missed out on the highest accolade, despite their CEO's dancing on a float in the Mardi Gras parade, because he hadn't spoken at an LGBTQ event. However, the ABC had clearly worked hard to gain their 177 points. Some of the reasons for its high score are:

- ... its 'all gender toilets' policy;

¹⁶ <https://www.pid-awei.com.au/>.

¹⁷ <https://www.acon.org.au/who-we-are-here-for/women/#talk-touch-test>

¹⁸ https://www.aconhealth.org.au/acon_welcomes_nsw_government_commitment_funding_lgbtiq_health_centre

¹⁹ <https://www.acon.org.au/about-acon/latest-news/#give-to-acon-on-giveout-day-on-15-october-2021>

- ... its program, ‘First Day’, about a trans child starting high school;
- ... the ‘ABC Kids’ program recognising awareness of ‘Wear it Purple Day’, an LGBTQ youth charity that features images of a young woman with a mastectomy on its website; and
- ... its CEO, David Anderson, defending the ABC’s support of ‘transition leave’ at a Senate Estimates meeting (Cross, 2022b).

This is just a small sample of ABC initiatives kowtowing to the transgender cause.

For more details about the capture of the ABC, see: Kowalski, 2022b;
for the organisations and individuals who received ACON awards in 2022, see: <https://www.pid-awei.com.au/2022-lgbtq-inclusion-awards-results/>;
for detailed critiques of ACON, see: <https://aconexposed.org/wp/site-map/>;
for criticism of the ABC’s refusal to engage in debate about its relationship with ACON, by Media Watch host, Paul Barry, see: Tabakoff, 2022.

Australia—The Gender Centre

Another trans organisation presenting itself as ‘a service devoted to the well-being of transgender people’ (described as ‘a group that experiences a high rate of homelessness’), is the Sydney Gender Centre.²⁰ It tells the usual transgender lies, for example, in relation to homelessness it says, ‘Transgender and Gender diverse people fall between the cracks at rates far higher than the general population’.²¹ No evidence for this assertion is cited, and indeed, there *is* no evidence because ‘transgender and gender diverse people’ are not a demographic category and hence cannot be compared to the general population. In fact, the segment of the population most at risk of homelessness is older women (AHRC, 2019). Nonetheless, it too finds favour with governmental authorities, being funded by the Sydney Local Health District and the NSW Department of Communities and Justice under the Specialist Homeless Service program, and supported by the Ministry of Health.

US—The Human Rights Campaign

The egregiously misnamed ‘Human Rights Campaign’ (HRC) is the largest transgender lobbying group in the US. One commentator, a mother grieving for her daughter caught up in the transgender process, referred to it as ‘one of the biggest ringleaders of the “transgender” drive’ (Mothers Grim, 2023a). It is not in fact a human rights organisation at all. The ‘transgender people’ whose ‘rights’ the Human Rights Campaign are championing are largely the men who feel entitled to call themselves ‘women’, along with the youngsters caught up in the transgender delusion. Like its counterparts elsewhere, the only ‘rights’ it is concerned with are the entitlements of men to pose as ‘women’ and of children and young people to harm themselves. It has no interest in the needs of lesbians or gay men, despite its constant reference to the LGB(etc.) acronym. Indeed, it actively works against their interests when it advocates the conversion of lesbian and gay young people into ‘trans people’.

²⁰ <https://gendercentre.org.au/about-us/who-funds-us>

²¹ <https://gendercentre.org.au/about-us/>

(For a discussion of the HRC's peevish complaints about how 'vulnerable' 'trans people' are, see the '... and statistics chapter').

It has its own version of Stonewall's AWEI, called the Corporate Equality Index (CEI). Founded in 2002 initially with 319 participants, there were over 1,200 businesses participating 20 years later in 2022. These were in all 50 States (employing over 20 million workers) and overseas (employing 39 million workers), according to their 2022 Corporate Equality Index report.²² This is not the most trustworthy of sources, nevertheless there can be no doubt that the HRC, like trans organisations everywhere, has had a tremendous influence on society. As they boast in their report, 91% of Fortune 500 companies 'have gender identity protections enumerated in their nondiscrimination policies'. It is true that not all companies are convinced of the rightness of the transgender cause. There were companies that received scores of 0, 10 or 20 on the CEI rating scale in 2021. However, they were few and far between and hardly typical of the majority (Mothers Grim, 2023a).

For HRC's boasting about its influence, see: <https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/human-rights-campaign/>.

The CEI is not the HRC's only propaganda initiative. In 2004, they added the State Equality Index (SEI), which rates all 50 States and Washington DC 'in six areas of law and assigns the states to one of four distinct categories'.²³ As HRC's Interim President (a woman?) put it in her introduction to the 2021 report, 'we gain value through the SEI in understanding the impact of legislative attacks on our community in states across the country'.²⁴ In 2007, they added the Healthcare Equality Index (HEI), and in 2012, 'the Municipal Equality Index with the slogan, "Equality drives economic growth" (Mothers Grim, 2023a). In 2022, they added the Long-Term Health Equality Index (LEI), along with an advocacy group for 'LGBTQ+' seniors called SAGE (originally known as 'Senior Action in a Gay Environment', re-named by the HRC, 'Services and Advocacy for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Elders'). This is a canny move on HRC's part. As the mother mentioned above said,

There will be a growing population of aging "transgender" Americans living in mentally and physically broken bodies thanks in part to the campaign creating a population of such patients for the "transgender" industry to use as their medical experiment (Mothers Grim, 2023a).

With LEI and SAGE, and the continuing acquiescence of the US medical industry, they'll be able to monopolise the 'healthcare' of those mentally and physically broken people.

For a detailed account of the intimate connection between HRC and the pharmaceutical companies, in particular, Pfizer and the Pharmaceutical Research and Medical Association (PhRMA), see: Mothers Grim, 2023a, b, c.

This is not a small, struggling organisation, unlike organisations devoted to women's rights. It is well-funded by its corporate donors. According to its 2019/2020 tax

²² <https://reports.hrc.org/corporate-equality-index-2022>

²³ <https://www.hrc.org/resources/state-equality-index>

²⁴ https://reports.hrc.org/2021-state-equality-index-2?_ga=2.19837432.1130493175.1674596764-926548221.1668622368

return (HRC, 2020), its total revenue for that year was over \$US44 and a half million (slightly down on the preceding year when it was almost \$US50 million) (p.1 of 130). (See Table 1 below).

Table 1: HRC tax return, 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2020

Revenue	\$US
Total revenue current year	44,604,113
Total revenue previous year	48,947,596
Highest amount donated	1,292,342
Least amount donated	5,000
All salaries and benefits	18,664,464
President's compensation:	589,217
Salary	570,446
Other	18,771

Source: HRC, 2020

There were 474 individual donors. The highest amount contributed by an individual was over a million dollars, with 19 donations in the hundreds of thousands, and 233 in the tens of thousands, ranging from \$95,000 to \$10,000. The least amount was five thousand dollars (pp.16-94 of 130). It spent over \$18 and a half million in employee salaries and benefits (p.1 of 130). The president's 'compensation' was nearly \$600,000 (p.7 of 130), and there were 91 individual employees who were paid more than \$100,000 (p.8 of 130). The president was provided with first-class air travel 'on occasion' because his 'schedule often requires last minute changes in travel plans, and, therefore, fully refundable tickets are frequently used' (p.117 of 130). This is hardly a grass-roots campaign fighting on behalf of vulnerable people.

US—other trans lobby groups

Again, the HRC is not the only transgender lobby group. There's GLAAD, originally a media monitoring organisation founded in 1985 by gay men in response to the *New York Post's* sensationalised coverage of HIV and AIDS. It was initially an acronym for 'Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation', but the acronym is now the whole name and is no longer spelled out because it doesn't include the T (Donym, 2018).²⁵

Its embrace of the transgender agenda didn't happen until 2013, according to one commentator (Beeman, 2014: 35). It was preceded by the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force which succumbed to the transgender push in 1997 ('added transgender people to its mission statement'), PFLAG (Parents, Families, and Friends of Lesbians and Gays), captured in 1998, and the Human Rights Campaign which capitulated in 2001 ('amended its mission statement') (Beeman, 2014: 35). GLAAD, too, is well-funded, although not to the same extent as the HRC. In financial year 2017-2018, it was the top grant recipient of 'LGBTI' funding in the global north, having received over \$US5 million (GPP, 2020: 91).

There's GLSEN, another US organisation originally devoted to gays and (perhaps) lesbians that has subsequently been taken over by the T. Originally known as 'Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network', it too only uses the acronym now (Anderson, 2018, chapter two). It presents itself as 'the leading national education organization focused on ensuring safe and affirming schools for all students'. This sounds like something no reasonable person could possibly disagree with, except that

²⁵ <https://www.glaad.org/about>

‘affirming’ is trans-speak for forbidding debate, disagreement and criticism. The piggybacking tactic comes in the next sentence. They ‘envision a world’, they say, ‘in which every child learns to respect and accept all people, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity/expression’ (ACLU, 2017: 11).

Then there’s GATE—Global Action For Trans Equality—a non-profit NGO which announces itself as ‘an international advocacy and expert organization focused on gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics [who] work towards justice and equality for trans, gender diverse, and intersex (TGDI) communities’.²⁶ It claims it was founded in 2009, but the earliest date on publications on its website is 2013, it received its first round of funding in 2015 and, according to its 2015 tax return, that was the year the organisation was set up (Donym, 2018) (2014 on its 2021 tax return) (GATE, 2022).

They are particularly concerned with what they refer to as ‘the anti-gender movement’: ‘With the rise in anti-[trans]-rights movements across the globe came a wave of hatred and bigotry towards TGDI people on a scale unseen in living memory’.²⁷ Wow! This ‘anti-trans’ movement, they tell us in their 2022 Annual Report, has ‘huge budgets’ and ‘in many cases they are within governments as political parties or political actors, or they’re in powerful positions that allow them influence within governments’ (GATE, 2023: 11). As should be clear to anyone who has read this far, this is a tissue of lies. Transgender’s critics are far from having huge budgets. All their activist work challenging transgender’s influence is volunteer, and when they are taken to court by the trans lobby, they need to fund-raise. It is the trans lobby that occupies positions powerful enough to influence governments. In fact, this is an example of projection on transgender’s part. They are accusing their opponents of what they themselves are doing.

GATE, too, are funded to an extent undreamt of by any trans-critical organisation, although not to the same extent that the HRC is. In the 2021 calendar year, their gross receipts were \$980,865, with \$767,980 of that from contributions and grants, while their revenue after expenses was \$104,038. Their ‘net assets or fund balances’ were \$1,137,599 (GATE, 2022). As Sue Donym asks, ‘Does this sound like an innocuous, grassroots organization to you?’ (Donym, 2018). Clearly, it isn’t transgender’s opponents, those who refer to themselves as ‘gender-critical’, who have the huge budgets.

Another US trans lobby group with a not inconsiderable budget (bigger than GATE’s but much smaller than the HRC’s) is the National Center for Transgender Equality (NCTE). It is the source of the two US Transgender Surveys (Grant et al 2011 and James et al, 2016) (see the ‘... and statistics’ chapter), and they ran another one in 2022, ‘early insights’ from which are to be released in February 2024.²⁸

According to their tax return for 2021, their gross receipts were \$4,087,337 (although ‘Total revenue’ is quoted as \$4,081,730, a discrepancy of \$5,607), with \$4,041,236 of that from ‘Contributions and grants’. Their revenue after deducting expenses was \$1,081,174 (NCTE, 2022), a vast improvement on 2015 when it ended the year

²⁶ <https://gate.ngo/>

²⁷ <https://gate.ngo/2022-annual-report/>

²⁸ <https://www.ustranssurvey.org/>

\$175,000 in debt (Donym, 2018), and an improvement on the previous year’s \$72,923. Their ‘net assets or fund balances’ were \$5,177,267 (NCTE, 2022).

The information about paid employees is confusing. On page 1 (NCTE, 2022), we are told that there were five paid employees in 2021, a statement confirmed by the listing of five names against amounts they were paid on page 8 (see Table 2 below). However, the amount spent on employee salaries and benefits entered on page 1—\$2,095,167 or around half of their quoted gross receipts—was over 2½ times greater than the total of the amounts listed against the names, i.e. \$787,632. Whatever the reason for the discrepancy (and perhaps I’m missing something), the compensations as stated are munificent. It’s extraordinary how well it pays to purvey lies.

Table 2: NCTE tax return 2021, salaries and benefits

Name and title	Position	Salary	Other
Mara Keisling, Executive Director	Officer	\$213,391	\$18,902
Rodrigo Lehtinen, Executive Director	Officer	\$153,085	\$12,963
Jamalea Westerhold, Deputy Executive Director	Highest compensated employee	\$139,047	\$10,590
Daniel Shad, Director of Development	Highest compensated employee	\$111,601	\$9,911
Lisa Mottet, Senior Strategist	Highest compensated employee	\$113,962	\$4,180
Totals		\$731,086	\$56,546
		Total	\$787,632

Source: NCTE, 2022: 8

Whatever the NCTE spends on their stated policy to ‘advocate to change policies and society to increase understanding and acceptance of transgender people’, as they say on their tax return, the organisation, like all the trans organisations discussed here, is a nice little money-spinner for its employees. (For the National Center for Lesbian Rights and the Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice, see the ‘Lesbian erasure’ section of the ‘Transgender wreaking havoc’ chapter).

For Sue Donym’s extended critique of these trans organisations, which she calls ‘astroturf’ because they ‘promote... becoming your authentic self, whilst being inauthentic [themselves]’, see: Donym, 2018.

Discussion

All these organisations (and more) have been enormously successful in spreading the transgender message throughout society. They have influenced institutions as disparate as the medical profession, social policy, education and workplaces both private and public. And yet none of these trans organisations has any expertise in the areas they have encroached upon. The responsibility for this state of affairs lies, not just with the trans lobby itself, but also with a society that is so susceptible to cleverly orchestrated lies.

The trans lobby is extraordinarily well organised. It is extraordinary because what is being organised is not only a lie, it is a lie that contradicts one of the basic facts of the human condition, i.e. that there are two, and only two, sexes. For that kind of lie to be as successful as it has been, it must be able to call upon enormous reserves of power,

as indeed it does. The most obvious form that power takes is money. As Jennifer Bilek pointed out, this is no grass-roots, civil rights movement, it is big business (Bilek, 2018), and big business has been happy to fund it. But there is another, related form of power operating here—male entitlement. Men get money and access to the law because they are entitled to it under male supremacist conditions.

Fortunately, those are not the only social conditions and resistance to the transgender agenda has been there all along, subdued and suppressed though it might be (although not for anyone who cares to take the trouble to investigate). Hopefully, the truth—that there is no such thing as ‘gender identity’, that there are no ‘trans people’ similar to lesbians and gays, and that children and the young who are distressed about their sex do not need to be treated medically or surgically—will eventually prevail.

Censorship

Another of transgender's strategies for gaining social acceptance is the censorship of dissenting views. Even though screams of outrage are unlikely to convince anyone of the rightness of the transgender cause, they are very effective in silencing critics. As Jane Clare Jones said, one way in which the trans political project has been achieved is by 'silencing public interrogation by bullying dissenters, hamstringing the press and public bodies, and making sure that everyone understands the very high social sanctions for speaking out' (Jones, 2018).

Below are a few illustrative examples. Sometimes it is individuals who are censored. They are refused the opportunity to speak because they are known to dissent from the trans message, even when what they would be speaking about has nothing to do with transgender. Sometimes it is the dissenting ideas that are suppressed. Public media either ignore them or actively suppress them. One especially cunning form of censorship is to purport to present 'both sides', giving transgender lies as much weight and credence as the truth. Social media are some of the worst offenders. Criticism of transgender is not only refused expression in mainstream media, it is also barred from many social media outlets. Twitter, Facebook, Wordpress, Medium, even online seller Etsy, have all banned users for their trans-critical views. (For censorship in academic publishing, see the 'Journals' and 'Universities' sections in the 'Where's the evidence?' chapter).

One of the earliest examples of censorship involved Sheila Jeffreys. She is, it is true, a major irritant for the transgender mob and a prime target for attack because of her outspoken criticism. On this occasion, she was initially asked to speak at a conference on youth and sexuality called 'Have your say', to be held in Melbourne in July 1995. She accepted the invitation but pointed out that she would have to say something about 'transsexualism as a human rights violation' because she felt a responsibility towards any young lesbians or gay men who might be considering it. She was immediately disinvited. 'Criticism', she commented, 'was seen as unsupportive of the "transgenders" who might be present and this was to be a very "supportive" conference' (Jeffreys, 1997: 70).

On 12 May 2019, Helen Steel was ejected from a protest camp organised by the left-wing activist organisation, the Land Justice Network. The reason? She was known to have campaigned against the proposed reform of the Gender Recognition Act, and therefore she was supposedly violating the LJN camp "safer spaces policy" just by being there, and her presence was "a risk to the safety of trans people". Such 'reasons' verge on the demented, yet another example of transgender's ability to muster human stupidity in its defence. This is especially the case as Steel is well-known as a campaigner against injustice. In particular, with seven other women she was instrumental in exposing the deceptive behaviour of the Metropolitan Police officers who had sexual relationships with women in the left-wing activist groups they were spying on ('spycops'). She should have been a hero to the LJN; instead, not only was she hounded out, she was left without transport after her eviction and had to walk alone across the moors (Bartosch, 2019b).

Social media—Twitter

As mentioned above, social media are among the worst offenders. Twitter is particularly notorious for suspending or deleting the accounts of people who fail to

toe the transgender line. Below are some examples of occasions when people have had their Twitter accounts suspended, either temporally or permanently, because they voiced an opinion, or simply told the truth, that contradicted the trans narrative. This is by no means an exhaustive list, and it would seem that this kind of thing no longer happens since Elon Musk bought Twitter and renamed it 'X'. But although Twitter might be accommodating of non-mainstream opinion at the moment (including some that would never be voiced if we lived in a sane society, e.g. Trump and other extremist right-wing opinion), who knows how long that will last, especially as other social media continue to censor criticism of transgender.

'Hateful conduct' was the handy catch-all phrase. It was defined by Twitter as

against our rules to promote violence against or directly attack or threaten other people on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, religious affiliation, age, disability, or disease (Dubar, 2019).

This list is similar to the usual list of categories of persons who must not be treated unequally or discriminated against because they belong to that category. Amnesty International for example, has a similar list, with the marked difference that Amnesty's list is about treating people in those categories equally, not about abstaining from promoting violence or directly attacking or threatening them. It also includes 'sex' and 'sex characteristics' along with 'gender'.²⁹ (That doesn't mean that Amnesty is a friend to women. They are as trans-captured as any other malestream institution).

Twitter's list, however, and similar lists on other social media platforms, is nothing but a thin ideological mask covering up the fact that what they term 'hateful conduct' is no such thing, but rather, attempts to publicise the havoc being wreaked by the social acceptance of the transgender agenda. Twitter's 'hateful conduct' policy, therefore, was nothing less than censorship of vitally important information that citizens of a democratic society ought to have access to.

Examples

Canadian feminist, Meghan Murphy, is perhaps the best known example (because of her high profile—her blog, *Feminist Current*, received over 10,000 visitors a day in 2016) (Megarry, 2020: 172). She was locked out of her Twitter account for the first time in August 2018 because, she was told, she had “violated [Twitter's] rules against hateful conduct” (Murphy, 2018). Murphy's supposed 'hateful conduct' involved tweets that named 'Lisa' Kreut, a man claiming to be a 'woman' (original name Ryan), as the person who had tried to get *Feminist Current's* advertisers to withdraw their funding. He also tried to get Vancouver Rape Relief banned from the 2016 British Columbia Federation of Labour Convention. Rationally speaking (i.e. *not* from the point of view of a brainless ideology), it was Kreut's conduct that was hateful, not Murphy's. Nonetheless, it was Murphy who was punished for daring to expose what this man had done. (For more about Kreut, see below). She was told she had to remove the four tweets referring to him if she wanted access to her account. She did so, and then tweeted, “Hi @Twitter, I'm a journalist. Am I no longer permitted to report facts on your platform?” Twitter's reply was a 12-hour suspension. When she appealed this, she received no reply.

²⁹ <https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/discrimination/>

On 15 November, her account was locked again, this time because of tweets saying, “Women aren’t men” and “How are transwomen not men? What is the difference between a man and a transwoman?” She deleted those tweets too because she wanted access to her account, but tweeted “This is fucking bullshit, @twitter. I’m not allowed to say that men aren’t women or ask questions about the notion of transgenderism at all anymore? That a multi-billion dollar company is censoring basic facts and silencing people who ask questions about this dogma is insane”. On 19 November her account was locked again with a demand that she delete that tweet (Murphy, 2018). In the meantime, Twitter had expanded its ‘hateful conduct’ policy to include ‘deadnaming’ (i.e. using someone’s, usually a man’s, original name), and ‘misgendering’ (i.e. using the correctly gendered pronouns to refer to those claiming to be the opposite sex). This policy change was retrospectively applied to Murphy’s tweets (Robertson, 2019; Vigo, 2020; Whelan, 2018).

But the tweet that got her a permanent ban was, “Yeeeah it’s him”. This was a reference to ‘Jessica’ Yaniv (originally Jonathan) in response to someone asking if an image was a picture of Yaniv (Robertson, 2019). (See ‘The trans lobby’s appeal to “rights”’ chapter for a discussion of Yaniv and his vicious hounding of immigrant women and his paedophilic fascination with young girls). Yaniv was ecstatic. At a council meeting on 8 December, he boasted that he was instrumental in getting Murphy permanently banned from Twitter, and feminist blogs like *Gender Trender* banned from WordPress (Shaw, 2019). Murphy did not take the ban lying down. She brought a lawsuit in the California court in San Francisco County on 11 February 2019 (Robertson, 2019), which failed, and then again in the court of appeals in California (Vigo, 2020), which also failed. Her Twitter ban remained in place until Twitter was bought by Elon Musk and Joe Rogan³⁰ (see also: Emmons, 2022). It was reinstated on 21 November 2022 (along with Donald Trump among others). It would seem that these two men are immune to the transgender lure (however questionable their opinions and actions in other contexts might be).

For a further discussion of Twitter’s treatment of Meghan Murphy, see: Russell, 2018.

‘Lisa’ Kreut, who also goes by the names of SadistHailey and Hailey Heartless on Twitter, is a pornography addict and sexual fetishist who persistently harasses women and girls. Many women have complained to Twitter (to no avail) about his sexual propositioning of women and his soliciting for his particular brand of sexual sadism and humiliation. He has also been known to intervene in discussions about the psychological health of teenage girls. Twitter has responded by banning those who try and publicly criticise what he is doing (e.g. organising the harassment of women on Twitter and elsewhere), even for using his original name (the ‘deadnaming’ offence). As WoLF commented

This is [a] man whose public, known behavior towards women is appalling by most people’s standards, who openly solicits for commercial sex using the platform, and whose feelings and grudges have also been weaponized, with the Twitter moderation team’s willful encouragement, to control the political and public health conversation about the rights and safety of women and girls in several countries (WoLF, 2019).

³⁰ <https://www.feministcurrent.com/2022/11/21/whats-current-meghan-murphy-reinstated-to-twitter-four-years-after-deplatforming/>

That Twitter should leap to the defence of such a man is yet one more example of how a male supremacist society operates: give absolute preference to men's sexual desires, no matter how evil, while absolutely ignoring the harmful consequences for females.

Meghan Murphy is not, of course, the only trans critic to run afoul of Twitter's embrace of transgender.

International law expert, Alessandra Asteriti, for example, was suspended from Twitter indefinitely for a tweet saying, 'Reminder that in 2015 300,000 women died in childbirth around the world. What is it going to take to stop this trans madness?' Of course, she had been tweeting her trans-critical beliefs for some time, e.g. 'I believe the penis is a male organ and the claim that transwomen are born in the wrong body and *at the same time* that the penis is female is the height of absurdity' (Asteriti, 2019—original emphasis). But it would seem that the tweet about maternal mortality, or perhaps calling trans 'madness', was the last straw for Twitter.

Holly Lawford-Smith, a philosopher at the University of Melbourne, was temporarily suspended in December 2018 because she used a male pronoun to refer to the man who had been attempting to get her fired. She was suspended again in May 2019 for saying that a 'transwoman' was male, and then was permanently banned on 2 June for the usual meaningless 'hateful conduct' twaddle. Lawford-Smith suggested that it 'apparently means having opinions while female' (Lawford-Smith, 2019, 2020).

On 20 March 2019 Jo Bartosch was finally and permanently banned from Twitter because she called a man 'a man' and hence failed to respect his 'gender identity', 'hateful conduct' again according to Twitter (Bartosch, 2019a). Twitter's moderators (or algorithms) didn't care that she had been baited by a man who himself was engaging in hateful conduct, not to mention anti-Semitism, by claiming to be as oppressed as the Jews were under Nazism. The tweet that got her banned, which she admitted was 'deliberately and unashamedly rude', was

Thought this sounded like a dude... #shocked I tell you! Abusive, narcissistic man who's found a way to be misogynist online while still claiming to be progressive. Same shit, different arsehole (Bartosch, 2019a).

In July 2019, Roger Dubar was permanently banned from Twitter, 'hateful conduct' again. He was given the above list of categories of persons who shouldn't be subjected to violence or attacked or threatened. He said that none of his tweets attacked anyone in those categories, or anyone at all, although he did criticise the 'gender ideology that believes it is tantamount to hate speech to talk about biological reality'. He noted, too, that 'sex' did not appear in that list of protected categories. 'Abusing women over their biology is, apparently, okay', he said (Dubar, 2019).

In April 2019, intersex/DSD advocate, Claire Graham, was permanently banned for a tweet that said:

If it's not a mental health condition [i.e. transgender], explain to me the self-harm and suicide stats you peddle. Tell me why we're medicalising children, if they are not unwell. Explain all that to me, because I do not understand.³¹

³¹ <https://twitter.com/transgendertrd/status/1122454746160345088>

Denise Thompson

She appealed the decision and her account was reinstated. Two weeks later, however, she found her account was unavailable, although she had received no notification. She was told she had been “managing multiple accounts for abuse purposes”. Again she appealed, saying that she did not have multiple accounts, but the only response she got was an instantaneous automatic pingback saying the same thing. In July she put in a complaint to the Better Business Bureau (Graham, 2019a), and received a response on 9 August: “The Better Business Bureau has received your rejection of the business’s offer [?] and it [sic] currently reviewing it. There is no action for you to take at this time. We will contact you when we next require your input” (Graham, 2019b). I’ve been unable to find any outcome of this complaint.

Graham Linehan was permanently banned from Twitter in June 2020. His ‘offence’ was the usual spurious ‘hateful conduct’ that is no such thing. In this instance, it involved a tweet saying, “men aren’t women tho”, in response to the Women’s Institute wishing their transgender members a happy Pride. He got an email from Twitter telling him that ‘hateful conduct’ would not be tolerated, which was clearly a lie given that thousands of examples of the horrific abuse of women critics of transgender, even J. K. Rowling, are never removed from Twitter. It’s true that Linehan tends to be impolite when he sees injustice happening. As Kathleen Stock noted,

He doesn’t put things sensitively, he’s [pissed] people off, but he’s also done his best to stick up for women against encroaching trans activism. For which he has paid disproportionately (Hayton, 2020).

Another man whose account was permanently suspended is Robert Jessel. His ‘offence’ was re-posting a photo of a young woman with a double mastectomy taken from her own blog. (He doesn’t say when this happened, but his *Critic* article is dated January 2022). His post was in response to another one saying that the LGB Alliance wanted to deny trans people ‘healthcare’. It was meant as an example of the kind of ‘healthcare’ transgender was advocating and that the LGB Alliance was criticising. By posting the photo, he was supposedly ‘wishing or hoping that someone experiences physical harm’ (Jessel, 2022). The reason Twitter gave for the ban simply didn’t make any sense. It was a mishmash of false transgender insult—accusing him of “engaging in targeted harassment”—and acknowledgement of the truth of the matter, i.e. that double mastectomies of healthy young breasts are physically harmful. As he himself noted,

[y]ou’ll go mad trying to read rhyme or reason into Twitter’s decision-making: you just have to accept that there are certain subjects where it wants to restrict thought and debate, and that some groups of people—men, of course, but especially those who pretend to be women—are much more equal than others (Jessel, 2022).

In May 2023, two Australian women, Jasmine Sussex and Leah Whiston of Standing for Women Queensland, were informed by Twitter that they (Twitter) had ‘received ... a legal request from an authorized entity (such as law enforcement or a government agency) to remove content from their account ... claim[ing] that the following Tweet(s), is in violation of Australian law’. The women were also informed that the content of their tweets would be withheld in Australia (Slatz, 2023). The tweets in question criticised a transgender man who claimed to be breast-feeding his baby son, an activity that Sussex said she and “most Australians consider to be a cruel and medically dangerous experiment on newborn babies”. The women weren’t told

what Australian law they were breaking, nor what the official entity was that had complained to Twitter. However, Sussex said she suspected that it was the eSafety Commissioner, the Australian government entity supposedly dedicated to combatting ‘cyber abuse’, but which already had a reputation for censoring trans-critical content. She had contacted them with a Freedom of Information request, but she didn’t expect to hear from them any time soon (Slatz, 2023).

Other instances of supposed ‘hateful conduct’ given as reasons for Twitter bans include:

- for tweeting Yaniv’s real name, temporary suspension (Ray, 2018. *Medium* has deleted this article, as the author predicted it would);
- for tweeting ‘the murder rate of trans victims is actually lower than that for the cis population’ (on the 2019 ‘annual Transgender Day of Remembrance’)—reinstated after the tweet was deleted (Richardson, 2019);
- for tweeting that men pretending to be lesbians is a form of rape culture, permanent ban (Wyatt, 2022); and
- for saying ‘Aimee Challenor is a man’ (plus many trans-critical posts over the years), permanent ban (Yardley, 2018).

Trans violence on Twitter

But while Twitter was extraordinarily efficient in banning any criticism of transgender, they were grossly incompetent in banning tweets that actually did promote violence and attack and threaten, usually women, but also men who dared to challenge transgender.

For a plethora of violent tweets against women posted by trans activists, none of them banned by Twitter, see: Bailey, 2019; Gluck, 2022; Goldberg, 2014; Moore, 2020; Ray, 2018; Women and Girls in Scotland, 2019: 9;

for a number of vicious although not physically threatening tweets, some of them from women, directed towards a man after he published an article discussing ‘10 trans myths and the antidotes to them’, see: Chase, 2023

The powers-that-be are deliberately oblivious. The UK All Parliamentary Group on Hate Crime (APPG, 2019), for example, were well aware of what was going on but they argued it away, in part with the spurious equality of the ‘both sides’ ploy. They acknowledged that they received several Twitter submissions that contained threats and encouragements of violence against so-called ‘terfs’. But they didn’t say the tweets actually *were* hate speech, they said ‘it can easily be argued that this constitutes hate speech’. They also said that ‘there are trans activists and their supporters who are reporting similar attacks’. But this is a lie, the Parliamentary Group were far too trusting of the trans activists’ claims. Transgender’s critics do not send hateful messages to transgender’s supporters. The critics criticise and disagree, they don’t insult and threaten violence.

The Parliamentary Group also gave the authorities an excuse not to do anything about the misogynist hate speech on Twitter. ‘[I]t would be difficult to successfully report this as hate speech’, they said, ‘as it is not completely clear if the abuse refers to lesbians (sexuality is a category of hate crime) or women (sex is a protected

characteristic under the Equality Act 2010 but not a hate crime category under the Criminal Justice Act 2003' (APPG, 2019: 26). But it's not only women who are attacked, although the most frightening attacks are reserved for women. Moreover, the 'difficulty' is malestream society's refusal to penalise misogyny. 'Sex' (i.e. women) has not been included among the categories of hate crime, and hence it is not one of the 'monitored strands of hate crime' in the College of Policing's *Hate Crime Operational Guidance* (HCOG). So hatred directed towards women is not penalised by the law in the UK (or anywhere else for that matter). Like every malestream institution, the Parliamentary Group bent over backwards to deny the seriousness of the attacks on women. They couldn't deny that women were being attacked on Twitter, but they argued it away by assuming some kind of 'equality' between transgender's lies and attempts to expose those lies.

In 2014, the boss of Twitter UK had promised 'to do better' in the aftermath of a court case where two people, one of them a woman, were convicted and jailed for sending 'messages which were menacing in character' on Twitter (BBC, 2014). The case involved a complaint by Caroline Criado-Perez, who was being abused as a result of her campaign to retain a woman on UK banknotes after it was announced that the only woman on any banknote, Elizabeth Fry on the £5 note, would be replaced by Winston Churchill. These two people were not the only ones responsible for the abuse. In just one weekend, the rape and death threats against Criado-Perez gathered by the police filled 300 A4 pages (Blunden, 2015). The Twitter boss said they would introduce an in-tweet 'report abuse' button and do more to tackle abusive behaviour (BBC, 2014).

It would seem, though, that this didn't happen, or it was simply ineffectual. In 2019, Twitter was allowing #punchaterf as a trending hashtag, and trans activists were still attacking 'terfs' as 'cunts' or 'bigoted pieces of shit' (Lane, 2019). Complaints about rape and death threats, or about being told to commit suicide, or graphics depicting violence against 'terfs', were invariably greeted with the statement that these posts didn't violate their 'community standards' (WoLF, 2019). Clearly, Twitter's 'community' excluded women as full human beings in their own right, while their 'standards' were those of a male supremacist company of adolescent men of any age with its terrifying misogyny and rampant male sexual fetishism. This is not a community of ordinary decent people who can recognise the danger to women and reject harmful rubbish. Perhaps things have changed now that Twitter is X and under different management, but that vile company of men is still with us and it is among the first to flourish when the dampening effects of regulation are removed.

Social media—Facebook

Twitter is not the only online resource to display the 'community standards' of misogynist adolescent males competing with each other to demonstrate who has the most contempt for women. As Jessica Megarry reminded us in her extensive critique of the limitations of social media for feminism, 'there is *no* space on social media where women are truly autonomous' (Megarry, 2020: 165—original emphasis).

Facebook's origin shows where those 'community standards' came from. It was originally designed as a platform for male undergraduates to share and comment on images of women as objects of sexual consumption (Megarry, 2020: 141; Phillips 2007). These are the 'standards' that still prevail today. As one commentator noted, 'It's a cliché of Silicon Valley that tech campuses are stocked with infantilizing perks

and free food' (van Zuylen-Wood, 2019). Although Facebook is no longer confined to male undergraduates, misogyny and male infantilism are global.

Like Twitter, Facebook has 'community standards' that are approving of, or at least oblivious to, violence against women. To take just one example, in December 2019, a trans activist group calling themselves the 'Trans Army' posted a cartoon of a person with long pink and blue hair, decorative handcuffs and a transgender tattoo, holding up a book with the title, *How to Kill Transphobic Fuckers*. A number of users reported this to Facebook as a violent threat, but Facebook refused to remove it. One man who complained received a notification advising him to "consider using Facebook to speak out and educate the community around you. Counter-speech in the form of accurate information and alternative viewpoints can help create a safer and more respectful environment". But as another man pointed out, "the only problem ... here [is] that 'counterspeech' will be banned instantly!" (Shaw, 2020).

Again like Twitter, Facebook censors trans-critical content. Its 'hate speech' policy (updated on 19 December 2019) prohibits 'statements denying existence' on the grounds of 'gender identity', listing over 50 'gender identities' (including 'Other' and anything anyone cares to make up) that must not be denied (Parker, 2020). 'Statements denying existence' were defined as 'including but not limited to: "[protected characteristic(s) or quasi-protected characteristic] do not exist", "no such thing as [protected characteristic(s) [sic] or quasi-protected characteristic]".³² Its 'protected characteristics' are similar to Twitter's (and Amnesty's—see above) (with the exception that Facebook includes 'sex' and Twitter doesn't, and Twitter includes 'age' and Facebook doesn't). But both include 'gender identity'. So statements to the effect that "'gender identity' doesn't exist", or 'there's no such thing as "trans women"' get people banned from the platform. Facebook has demonstrated over and over again that it is not interested in 'accurate information and alternative viewpoints' when it comes to transgender. Its policy is to ban the truth, at least in the transgender context.

Posie Parker has been banned from Facebook, not surprisingly given her intransigent resistance to the transgender agenda and its consequence for women and girls, although she was not informed that she had breached any 'community standards'. She found out she was banned when she couldn't log on. She had had no warning. "It just disappeared", she said, along with all the content she had accumulated over the years (Williams, 2020).

For places, online and otherwise, Posie Parker (aka Kellie-Jay Keen) is banned from, see: <https://twitter.com/ThePosieParker/status/1720924818206310790>;

For an extended account of the vilification strategies against Posie Parker, see: Craft, 2023;

for a detailed discussion by Facebook executives of how to decide what content is allowed and what isn't, without coming to any definite conclusions, see: van Zuylen-Wood, 2019;

for criticisms of both Twitter and Facebook, see: WoLF, 2019.

³² <https://transparency.fb.com/en-gb/policies/community-standards/hate-speech/>

Social media—Wordpress

Wordpress is another online resource that debars transgender's critics from its platform. On 16 November 2018, it deleted the blog sites, Gender Trender, TransgenderTropes101 and RadfemReview (among others), all of them run by women critical of transgenderism, without warning and without any time to preserve any of the material on the sites (Gallus Mag, 2018). Gallus Mag of Gender Trender said she had copies of most of what she had published over the eight years the blog had been in existence. But she didn't have copies of the posts that had been contributed by others, nor of the comments others had written in response to the posts. She apologised to those whose work had also been lost, saying, 'I'm sorry I wasn't able to effectively safeguard your important work and contributions against the censorial power of the misogynist men running Automatic/WordPress.com who lack all ethics' (Gallus Mag, 2018). WordPress told her that she could "download your content and take it elsewhere [by using] the export tool below for a limited time", but this was a lie. It was not possible to transfer the site. Only live sites can be transferred and Gender Trender was no longer live because WordPress had already taken it offline.

Gallus Mag said that she believed that this WordPress policy was

a guise to censor lesbian and feminist authors who are critical of "gender identity" ideology, specifically those who investigate or critique the actors behind various political or judicial campaigns to limit the rights of women ... [that it] is a direct result of GenderTrender's exposure of Jonathan Yaniv ... as an alleged sexual predator ... [that it] is a ruse to justify the specific targeted censorship of certain popular long running lesbian and feminist blogs who critique the ingrained (and sometimes criminal!) misogyny of the transgender movement ... [that it] is an organized, intentional initiative by WordPress.com to eliminate lesbian and feminist criticism and exposure of the epidemic harassment, predation, and sex-specific terrorism of male bodied people upon female bodied people (Gallus Mag, 2018).

While this is undoubtedly correct, men aren't allowed to criticise trans either, although they are not as savagely treated. William Ray, a Canadian journalist, was also censored by WordPress. Like Meghan Murphy, he had criticised Ryan/Lisa Kreut by name for trying to get *PLoS One* to delete Lisa Littman's ROGD paper. Ray's whole article, called 'Stand with women: time for men to join the fight against the worldwide assault on the rights of women and children', wasn't deleted, nor his whole account. The email he received only mentioned his references to Kreut, which WordPress described as "the malicious publication of private details related to gender identity, including former names", and which they said had been "hidden ... from public view". Around the same time he received what he called 'WordPress.com's Ministry of Truth missive' he was suspended from Twitter, again for the 'offence' of using a 'former name', this time of Jonathan Yaniv. He admitted that he did tweet his name in conjunction with 'pedophile' because of his (Yaniv's) publicly expressed prurient interest in 10-year-old girls (Ray, 2018).

Social media—Medium

The blogging platform, *Medium*, has also been trans-captured. For example, an attempt to find Maya Forstater's 2022 press statement on *Medium* about her win in the

employment tribunal³³ leads to the following ‘error message’: ‘Error 410: This account is under investigation or was found in violation of the Medium Rules’.

Again, Sue Donym published a number of articles de-bunking trans ‘statistics’ on *Medium*, only to find early in 2020 that they had all been deleted on the grounds that they were ‘hate speech’. In response, Donym commented on her Substack account:

presenting a well argued case against prevailing orthodoxy [should not] be described as “hate speech” ... How is quoting scientific papers, at length, and pointing out the homophobic intentions and poor quality research within [those papers] “hate speech”? Or discussing the research of noted sexologist Ray Blanchard? Or God forbid, pointing out that lesbians don’t have penises? Is that hate speech now? What about pointing out that homosexual people have no major platforms that accept honest discussion of our lives as exclusively same sex attracted individuals? Is that hate speech? (Donym, 2020).

Medium advertises itself as ‘[a] living network of curious minds. Anyone can write on Medium ... You’ll find pieces by independent writers from around the globe’³⁴—but not, it would seem, writers independent of the trans agenda. *Medium*, along with innumerable institutions ‘from around the globe’, has wholeheartedly bought into the trans narrative that insists that disagreement is ‘hatred’: **‘Hateful content** We do not allow content that constitutes or promotes violence, harassment, or hatred against people based on characteristics like ... gender, or gender identity’.³⁵ So much for the platform’s vaunted ‘curiosity’, which does not allow any scrutiny of the transgender cause.

Holly Lawford-Smith and Sarah Phillimore have also been censored by *Medium*. Lawford-Smith had been using *Medium* since October 2018. As an academic, she had posted 35 essays related to her research during that time. Her account was suspended in November 2020, supposedly for ‘hate speech’. Typically, she was not told what it was about her writings that was ‘hateful’, but she has been and continues to be outspoken in her criticism of the transgender agenda (Lawford-Smith, 2020).

Phillimore had set up a *Medium* account specifically to publish her thoughts on issues around sex and gender. There were no problems until she posted a summary of a Zoom meeting discussing the Gender Recognition Act on 25 June 2020. On 26 June, *Medium* informed her that her account was suspended because it was “in violation of site policies”. Again typically, she was not told what it was about her account that had ‘violated’ *Medium*’s policies, but she assumed it was the GRA discussion, given that the suspension happened so quickly after she had posted it. She set up another *Medium* account, paying the required \$50 to do so. That account was immediately placed ‘under investigation’ and she received a lengthy email signed by *Medium*’s CEO, telling outright lies, e.g. “Medium is creating ... a new information ecosystem—one that is open for everyone to participate in ... One that rewards quality over quantity. One that supports nuance, complexity, and substantive storytelling that wouldn’t be possible anywhere else”. She was invited to “feel free to reply to this email to share

³³ at: <https://mforstater.medium.com/press-statement-maya-forstater-victory-in-employment-tribunal-a-win-for-free-speech-and-99365009baa1>

³⁴ <https://medium.com/about?autoplay=1&source=home>

³⁵ <https://policy.medium.com/medium-rules-30e5502c4eb4>

your thoughts”, so she took the opportunity to do just that, while also asking for her \$50 back. She received no reply, and she hadn’t got her \$50 back by 1 July (Phillimore, 2020).

Social media—other

Other online resources that show signs of trans capture are Zoom and Etsy. Graham Linehan (2021) reported that Kellie-Jay Keen (‘Posie Parker’) was contacted by Zoom and told that she was promoting hate; and a woman’s decorative designs relating to detransitioning, including her hand-drawn salamander art, were deleted from the e-commerce platform, Etsy, for “glorifying hatred or violence” (Buttons, 2023). Tumblr, along with YouTube, is probably responsible for more teenagers turning ‘trans’ than nearly any other medium (Marchiano, 2019), and Tumblr, YouTube, Instagram, Tik Tok and reddit are all complicit in the bullying of dissenting voices and in the creation of the ‘transgender’ child (Littman, 2018)

However, Tumblr does provide space for submissions from ‘de-identified and detransitioned people’ (Anonymous, 2019: 174),³⁶ and reddit does allow posts about gender detransition (Anonymous, 2019: 174).³⁷ As far as I know, Unherd, Substack, Quillette and Spiked do not ban trans-critical content, so cyberspace is not wholly captured by transgender.

For a detailed critique of Tumblr, see: Helena, 2019;
for YouTube, see: Lewis, 2019;
for the influence of social media in general, see: Littman, 2018; Marchiano, 2017;
for a detailed critique of social media, and an examination of the ‘the extent to which social media is, or is not, compatible with organising for women’s liberation’, see: Megarry, 2020.

Other media

Transgender’s influence on the means of mass communication and information is not confined to social media. It has also co-opted other media—newspapers, broadcasters, book publishers. Below are a few examples.

The Guardian, with its left-wing reputation, has by and large supported the transgender cause, although often in a ‘balanced’, ‘both sides’ way without obviously coming down on one side or the other, e.g. ‘both sides claim they feel unsafe’ (Fazackerley, 2020). At the same time, the trans-critical position is subtly undermined, e.g. ‘The [transgender] issue is both highly sensitive and legally complex’ (Bowcott, 2019). It’s not, of course. The only ‘sensitivities’ are those of men wanting their sexual fetishes to be socially acceptable, and the fact that men can be ‘women’ is an outright lie is not at all complex.

Sometimes, though, what *The Guardian* has published under the transgender banner is nothing less than scandalous. There are the cutesy stories about ‘trans’ children who are portrayed as deliriously happy with their new ‘gender’ (Kleman, 2015; Thomas, 2018); there are articles by ‘transgender’ adults with a tenuous relationship to the truth (Duck-Chong, 2018; Whittle, 2010); and there was the article lying about the women-

³⁶ <https://www.tumblr.com/belljars/173320325891/passing-tips-from-gender-youth-group>

³⁷ <https://www.reddit.com/r/detrans/>

only-spa incident in Los Angeles (Becket and Levin, 2021) (see the ‘Violence’ section in the next chapter), and the failure to print a retraction when it was found to be a lie (Bartosch, 2021c). There is also the ongoing support for Owen Jones, whose staunch commitment to transgender is published (e.g. Jones, 2017, 2022), while his misogyny and bullying tactics are ignored (Moore, 2022).

There is also anecdotal evidence of staff being intimidated into remaining silent about any criticism of transgender. Suzanne Moore, for example, resigned from *The Guardian* in late 2020 because the paper did not support her against complaints by trans activists and their sympathisers. She had spent months trying to write something about the ‘trans debate’ in her column, but every time she said something about ‘female experience belonging to people with female bodies’, it was deleted by the sub-editors. She was told that “[i]t didn’t really add to the argument”, or that it was a “distraction” from the argument. She did finally get to write a piece on trans issues that was published, only to find that 338 of her colleagues wrote a letter to the editor complaining that the paper was “hostile to trans rights and trans employees”. She wasn’t named in the letter, but it was clearly her column that the letter was referring to when it complained about “the Guardian’s repeated decision to publish anti-trans views”. Since the paper did not repeatedly publish anti-trans views, as Moore’s experience demonstrated only too well, the 338 signatories had signed their names to a lie. She expected the editors to support her, or to issue a public statement, but they did neither. “[O]n this issue the *Guardian* has run scared”, she said, ‘partly because of *Guardian US* sensitivities, and partly because the paper receives sponsorship from the Open Society foundation, which promotes trans rights’ (Moore, 2020).

The Melbourne newspaper, *The Age*, with similar left-wing credentials to *The Guardian*, is similarly trans-captured. In June 2023, Julie Szego was sacked for, as she put it, ‘one issue: gender-identity politics, the trans debate—or severe lack thereof’ (Szego, 2023b). She was dismissed because of remarks she made when she published on her Substack the article on ‘youth gender transition’ that had been commissioned by one editor and then rejected by another (i.e. Szego, 2023a). She said that she would be writing ‘gender-identity politics more broadly’ on this site, “without the copy being rendered unreadable by a committee of woke journalists redacting words they deem incendiary, such as ‘male’”. The editor who had rejected her commissioned article took umbrage at this and told her that they wouldn’t “be commissioning further columns from you”, because “[o]bviously we can’t have our columnists publicly disparaging the publication like that” (Szego, 2023b).

Earlier, after the Let Women Speak event in Melbourne in March, Szego had proposed an op-ed piece about what she believed was a huge story. It would have argued that Premier Andrews had slurred the women as hateful bigots and aligned them with the neo-Nazis who had gate-crashed the event, when he tweeted “Anti-trans activists gathered to spread hate. And on the steps of our Parliament, some of them performed a Nazi salute”. The editor’s response to her proposal was “Well, that’s your interpretation”, implying that there could be other, equally valid interpretations of what Andrews said, although none were suggested. This is a typical tactic of denial—trivialise what is said as just a matter of opinion, instead of addressing the content. Szego was also told that “[t]here were too many holes. The timing was wrong. I had glossed over “the Nazis” appearance’. But the worst thing about her piece, according to the editor, was that she had “these... paragraphs of Terf rhetoric”. It is true that *The Age* had published what she viewed as a very fair report

immediately after the event (Szego, 2023b). But once the political circus had begun, with its false but influential accusations of collaboration with the Nazis, the paper had to fall in line. The truth stands no chance against powerful organs of managed consent.

For the *Sunday Observer's* removal of Julie Burchill's defence of Suzanne Moore's throw-away remark about 'Brazilian transsexuals', see: Campbell, 2013;

for the failure of the BBC to cover the reactions to J. K. Rowling's tweet about 'People who menstruate', despite the fact that it was picked up by media around the world, see: Forstater, 2020;

for the failure of the Canadian media to report on the Yaniv case, see: Murphy, 2019;

for the *Morning Star's* cancellation of the contract of cartoonist, Stella Perrett, after a complaint by trans activists, see: <https://www.faircop.org.uk/case-studies/stella-perrett/>; Peak Trans, 2020;

for the failure of the ABC, Australia's national public broadcaster, to cover the closure of GIDS, see: <https://www.abc.net.au/mediawatch/episodes/tavis/14020382>.

Book publishers are another form of influential media, and there is evidence of trans capture there too. In June 2019, for example, BBC Books, an imprint of Ebury Publishing, refused to include in its anthology, *Doctor Who: The Target Storybook*, a piece they had commissioned from award-winning *Doctor Who* writer, Gareth Roberts (echoes of the treatment meted out to Graham Linehan!). He had been vocal about his disagreement with the transgender agenda, and the trans lobby objected to his piece's inclusion, especially one of the other contributors, who threatened to withdraw their³⁸ own piece if Roberts' was included. Although this person insulted Roberts by referring to him as "an awful human being" and a "bigot" with "transphobic views" (Dawson, 2019), the BBC is too trans-addled to be able to see this as the ideological claptrap it is.

Trans-addled, too, is Working Partners, the publisher who fired bestselling children's author, Gillian Philip (aka Erin Hunter), after she changed her Twitter hashtag to #IStandWithJKRowling.³⁹ As one of her defenders tweeted: 'This is how fascism started. Follow the mob rule. Pathetic'. Then there are the publishers who rejected *Time to Think*, by the BBC *Newsnight* journalist, Helen Barnes. She said that the book had been turned down by every major British publisher, although their reactions weren't particularly negative. Some of them said that it was "a really important story... You've got to tell it, just not with us ... [because] it would be too difficult among [our] team and [our] junior members of staff". The publisher who did eventually publish it, Swift Press, told her that they had had difficulty finding anyone to copy-edit it or design the cover (Arenas, 2020; Lloyd, 2023).

Another media company to be trans-captured (although not a publisher), the Tobias Literary Agency in New York, fired Sasha White, one of its staff members, for

³⁸ The name given to this person is 'Susie', but that could be a man, given the trans male propensity to adopt feminine names.

³⁹ <https://boundingintocomics.com/2020/07/08/childrens-author-gillian-philip-fired-by-publisher-after-tweeting-support-for-j-k-rowling/>

comments it deemed ‘anti-trans’. Her comment on Twitter was “Gender non-conformity is wonderful, denying biological sex not so”, ending with a hashtag in support of J. K. Rowling. It was the second clause that got her fired, although she had been tweeting trans-critical comments for some time. The agency was responding to the usual trans lobby’s whinging, e.g. “I am disgusted by the FILTH I read. It terrifies me to think this person has the power to gatekeep trans authors” (Smith, 2020). No examples of the supposed ‘filth’ were given but, as usual, none were necessary. Trans demands are obeyed instantaneously, with no time for reflection or debate. The agency issued the usual obligatory apology “for the content that was posted from said account. It’s not representative of this agency”, then switched its Twitter to private so that it would not be subjected to any of the many objections raised about its action.

Discussion

The trans lobby’s power to censor disagreement is extraordinary. It has somehow convinced organisation after organisation of the rightness of its cause, despite its absurdity and the atrocious consequences for women. The interesting question here is not so much the transgender desire to censor disagreement. Given that there is no rational case for transgenderism, censorship is a logical requirement. The more interesting question is why so many institutions do its bidding. That question was discussed at length in the ‘Explaining transgender’ chapters, but the short answer once again is male supremacy. Transgender has been so successful because it is something men want. Indeed, its enormous success is the clearest indication that it *is* something men want.

And yet, like everything men want at women’s expense, indeed, at the expense of their own humanity, trans-friendly censorship wallows in stupidity. It is sheer stupidity to insist that using the original name of a man claiming to be a ‘woman’, or saying that ‘transwomen’ are men, or using masculine pronouns to refer to men claiming to be ‘women’, or otherwise refuting transgender’s lies, are equivalent to Twitter’s ‘hateful conduct’, i.e. ‘promoting violence against or directly attacking or threatening other people’, or ‘glorifying hatred or violence’. But then, domination demands stupidity of its loyal adherents.

The censorship of trans-critical commentary has not gone unchallenged. Although efficient, it is not monolithic and there are still public media venues prepared to publish the truth about transgender.

For a master list of 61 incidents of censorship of disagreement with transgender ideology between 2017 and 2020, see: Bilek, 2020;

for a list of 227 occasions when someone was cancelled, silenced or otherwise censored for disagreeing with transgender ideology, with hyperlinks to the relevant sources, see: Peak Trans, 2023;

for Senator Clare Chandler’s objection to the Labor Government’s proposed draft bill targeting misinformation and disinformation online, on the grounds that it was ‘policing our speech’, giving the example of her own experience with the Tasmanian Anti-Discrimination Commissioner, see: Chandler, 2023;

for an account of the suppression of an article published in the hospitality blog, *Propel Opinion*, which argued that ‘sex is binary, not a spectrum; that human beings cannot change their sex ... that “intersex” is not a third sex; and that a woman is an adult

human female’, the sacking of the author, and the issuing of the an abject apology to the trans lobby, after the usual frenzied transgender reactions and the threat of the withdrawal of corporate sponsorship, see: Chase, 2023;

for Twitter’s censorship policies as trans rights totalitarianism, see: Jones, 2018;

for a discussion of the ‘questionable impartiality’ of the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency, its commitment to the transgender cause, and its suspension in August 2019 of a doctor in response to complaints (although not from his patients) about his public criticisms of transgender, see: Lane, 2023 (his suspension was upheld by the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal on 27 March 2020,⁴⁰ while the AHPRA hearing was still pending in October 2023);

for a list of women ‘who have been sacked, banned, no-platformed, expelled, threatened with violence including rape, attacked and/or vilified for speaking out about their views on women’s sex-based rights’, see: MacGregor, 2023;

for a discussion of Facebook and Twitter as ‘faceless tech giants’ who censor content while ignoring rules and conventions designed to protect freedom of speech, see: Vigo, 2018;

for a discussion of Google, Twitter and Facebook lobbying to get legal immunity by invoking ‘free expression’ for their users while also policing the content of its own platforms, see: Vigo, 2020;

for his own experience of being cancelled because of his opposition to transgender’s obliteration of biology, see: Wright, 2023.

⁴⁰ <https://www.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/viewdoc/au/cases/vic/VCAT/2020/405.html>

References

- 4th Wave Now (2015) 'UK's "Gendered Intelligence" has been indoctrinating students for the last 7 years, *Daily Mail* "can reveal" 4th Wave Now 3 November – <https://4thwavenow.com/2015/11/03/uks-gendered-intelligence-has-been-indoctrinating-students-for-the-last-7-years-daily-mail-can-reveal/>
- ACLU (2017) *Know Your Rights: A Guide for Transgender and Gender Nonconforming Students* American Civil Liberties Union, July – <https://www.aclu.org/other/know-your-rights-guide-trans-and-gender-nonconforming-students>
- AHRC (2019) *Older Women's Risk of Homelessness: Background Paper—Exploring a Growing Problem* Australian Human Rights Commission, April – <https://humanrights.gov.au/our-work/age-discrimination/publications/older-womens-risk-homelessness-background-paper-2019>
- Anonymous (2019) 'Our voices our selves—amplifying the voices of detransitioned women', in Moore and Brunskell-Evans, eds, pp.167-174
- Anderson, Ryan T. (2018) *When Harry Became Sally: Responding to the Transgender Moment* New York and London: Encounter Books
- APPG (2019) *How Do We Build Community Cohesion When Hate Crime Is on the Rise?* The All Party Parliamentary Group on Hate Crime – <http://www.appghatecrime.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/APPG%20on%20Hate%20Crime%20Report%20Hate%20Crime%20and%20Community%20Cohesion.pdf>
- Arenas, Jorge (2020) 'Children's author Gillian Philip fired by publisher after tweeting support for J.K. Rowling' *Bounding into Comics* 8 July – <https://boundingintocomics.com/2020/07/08/childrens-author-gillian-philip-fired-by-publisher-after-tweeting-support-for-j-k-rowling/>
- Artemisia (2017) 'Should Mermaids be permitted to influence UK public policy on "trans kids"?' 4th Wave Now 21 October – <https://4thwavenow.com/tag/transgender-equality-inquiry/>
- Artemisia (2019) 'Susie Green, under-18 SRS, and Thai law' 4th Wave Now 24 April – <https://4thwavenow.com/tag/norman-spack/>
- Asteriti, Alessandra (2019) 'Socialist, feminist women are being purged from twitter for expressing the "wrong" opinions. Professor Alessandra Asteriti tells her story.' *Uncommon Ground* 4 June – <https://uncommongroundmedia.com/woman-twitter-alessandra-asteriti/>
- Bailey, Allison (2019) 'Response to complaint from Stonewall' 21 November – <https://allisonbailey.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/PH-Bundle-pp-350-381-Response-to-Stonewall-Complaint.pdf>
- Bannerman, Lucy (2022) 'Trustee of the transgender charity Mermaids quits after speech to paedophile aid group' *The Times* 4 October
- Bartosch, Jo (2019a) 'Twitter's war on outspoken women' *Spiked-online* 21 March – <https://www.spiked-online.com/2019/03/21/twitters-war-on-outspoken-women/>
- Bartosch, Jo (2019b) 'Those involved in progressive politics need to commit to ensuring women's voices are heard' *Morning Star* 27 June – <https://morningstaronline.co.uk/article/f/womens-voices-are-heard>

- Bartosch, Josephine (2021a) ‘Stonewall is finally paying the price for turning its back on gay men and lesbians’ *The Telegraph* 24 May
- Bartosch, Josephine (2021b) ‘Stonewall came tumbling down’ *The Critic* 31 August – <https://thecritic.co.uk/stonewall-came-tumbling-down/>
- Bartosch, Josephine (2021c) ‘Wheesht Spa: The Guardian would prefer it if women kept their mouths shut’ *The Guardian* 6 September – <https://thecritic.co.uk/wheesht-spa/>
- Bartosch, Jo (2022) ‘Trans ideology has spread far beyond Mermaids’ *Spiked* 10 October – <https://www.spiked-online.com/2022/10/10/trans-ideology-has-spread-far-beyond-mermaids/>
- BBC (2014) ‘Two guilty over abusive tweets to Caroline Criado-Perez’ *BBC News* 7 January – <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-25641941>
- Becket, Lois and Sam Levin (2021) ‘Dozens arrested in Los Angeles as anti-trans protest outside spa turns violent’ *The Guardian* 18 July – <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2021/jul/18/dozens-arrested-in-los-angeles-as-anti-trans-protest-outside-spa-turns-violent>
- Beeman, Genny (2014) ‘Transgender history in the United States’, in Laura Erickson-Schroth, ed., *Trans Bodies, Trans Selves* Oxford University Press
- Biggs, Michael (2018) ‘How queer theory became university policy’ *Conatus News* 24 November – <https://off-guardian.org/2018/11/25/how-queer-theory-became-university-policy/>
- Biggs, Michael (2019) ‘Tavistock’s experimentation with puberty blockers: scrutinizing the evidence’ *Transgender Trend* 5 March – <https://www.transgendertrend.com/tavistock-experiment-puberty-blockers/>
- Biggs, Michael (2020a) *The Tavistock’s Experimentation with Puberty Blockers* *Transgender Trend*, 18 December – <https://www.transgendertrend.com/product/the-tavistocks-experimentation-with-puberty-blockers/>
- Biggs, Michael (2020b) ‘LGBT facts and figures’ *Oxford University* – https://users.ox.ac.uk/~sfos0060/LGBT_figures.shtml
- Bilek, Jennifer (2018) ‘Transgenderism is just big business dressed up in pretend civil rights clothes’ *The Federalist* 5 July – <http://thefederalist.com/2018/07/05/transgenderism-just-big-business-dressed-pretend-civil-rights-clothes/>
- Bilek, Jennifer (2020) ‘Transgenderism, big tech and censorship’ *The 11th Hour* 15 August – <https://www.the11thhourblog.com/post/transgenderism-big-tech-and-censorship>
- Blunden, Mark (2015) ‘Caroline Criado-Perez: How I won my banknote battle ... and defied rape threat trolls’ *The Standard* 27 November – <https://www.standard.co.uk/news/london/caroline-criadoperez-how-i-won-my-banknote-battle-and-defied-rape-threat-trolls-a3123956.html>
- Bowcott, Owen (2019) ‘Police transgender rules breach right to free speech, court told’ *The Guardian* 21 November – <https://amp.theguardian.com/society/2019/nov/20/police-transgender-rules-breach-right-to-free-speech-court-told>
- Brunskell-Evans, Heather (2019) ‘The medico-legal “making” of “the transgender child”’ *Medical Law Review* 27(4): 640-57 – <https://academic.oup.com/medlaw/article/27/4/640/5522968?guestAccessKey=c4cea162-98bf-4c84-bcae-367c4e763f7c>

- Brunskell-Evans, Heather (2020) 'Investigating the Tavistock: whom can we trust?' *Savage Minds* 27 September – <https://savageminds.substack.com/p/the-care-quality-commission>
- Brunskell-Evans, Heather (2021) 'Gendered "Intelligence" at the Court of Appeal' *Savage Minds* 29 May – <https://savageminds.substack.com/p/gendered-intelligence-at-the-court>
- Brunskell-Evans, Heather (2022) 'Britain's Gendered Intelligence' *Savage Minds* 17 November – <https://savageminds.substack.com/p/britains-gendered-intelligence>
- Buttons, Christina (2023) 'Etsy equates "detransitioner awareness" designs with hatred' *Reality's Last Stand* 29 July – <https://www.realityslaststand.com/p/etsy-equates-detransitioner-awareness>
- Campbell, Delilah (2013) 'Who owns gender?' *Trouble & Strife* 9 May – <http://www.troubleandstrife.org/new-articles/who-owns-gender/>
- Chandler, Claire (2023) 'Why are governments spending so much money policing our speech?' *Spectator Australia* 29 August – <https://www.spectator.com.au/2023/08/why-are-governments-spending-so-much-money-policing-our-speech/>
- Charlesworth, Shelley (2021) 'Captured! The full story behind the Memorandum of Understanding on Conversion Therapy: how UK professional counselling bodies were hijacked by an unaccountable activist network', *Transgender Trend*, 18 January – <https://www.transgendertrend.com/product/captured-the-full-story-behind-the-memorandum-of-understanding-on-conversion-therapy/>
- Chase, Paul (2023) 'Beware the Gender Borg: a cautionary tale' *Sex Matters* 11 January – <https://sex-matters.org/posts/updates/beware-the-gender-borg-a-cautionary-tale/>
- Courea, Eleni (2021) 'Liz Truss urges official withdrawal from Stonewall diversity scheme' *The Times* 31 May
- Craft, Nikki (2023) 'On the vilification strategies against Posie Parker' – https://www.facebook.com/groups/754772372186951/?multi_permaLinks=957177115279808%2C956997091964477¬if_id=1679822248685062¬if_t=group_activity&ref=notif
- Cross, Julie (2022a) 'ACON is giving advice to Prime Minister's Office, ABC, government departments, universities, police' *The Daily Telegraph* 24 August – <https://archive.ph/snW8h>
- Cross, Julie (2022b) 'Not easy to score AWEI points as ABC gay pride support falls flat' *The Daily telegraph* 24 August – <https://archive.ph/cSvLv>
- Cunningham, Naomi (2021) 'Legal risks for Stonewall members' *Legal Feminist* 6 June – <https://legalfeminist.org.uk/2021/06/06/legal-risks-for-stonewall-members/>
- Dawson, Tim (2019) 'Transphobia has no place in the Whoniverse' *spiked* 5 June – <https://www.spiked-online.com/2019/06/05/transphobia-has-no-place-in-the-whoniverse/>
- Dixon, Hayley (2022) 'Trans charity faces watchdog scrutiny amid child chest-binding revelations' *The Telegraph* 26 September – <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2022/09/26/trans-charity-faces-watchdog-scrutiny-amid-child-chest-binding/>

- Donym, Sue (2018) 'Inauthentic selves: the modern LGBTQ+ movement is run by philanthropic astroturf and based on junk science' *Medium* 6 August – <https://suedonym.substack.com/p/inauthentic-selves-the-modern-lgbtq>
- Donym, Sue (2020) 'I got banned' *suedonym.substack* 30 January – <https://suedonym.substack.com/p/i-got-banned>
- Dubar, Roger (2019) 'I'm with the banned: Twitter in the time of gender fascism' *Uncommon Ground* 14 August – <https://uncommongroundmedia.com/im-with-the-banned-twitter-in-the-time-of-gender-fascism/>
- Duck-Chong, Liz (2018) "'Rapid-onset gender dysphoria" is a poisonous lie used to discredit trans people' *The Guardian* 22 October – <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/oct/22/rapid-onset-gender-dysphoria-is-a-poisonous-lie-used-to-discredit-trans-people>
- Emmons, Libby (2022) 'BREAKING: Meghan Murphy's Twitter account RESTORED as free speech makes a comeback under Elon Musk' *The Post Millennial* 21 November – <https://thepostmillennial.com/breaking-meghan-murphys-twitter-account-restored-as-free-speech-makes-a-comeback-under-elon-musk>
- 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>
- First-tier Tribunal (2023) 'Between Mermaids and (1) the Charity Commission for England & Wales, (2) LGB Alliance' 6 July – <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Mermaids-v-Charity-Commission-judgment-060723.pdf>
- Forstater, Maya (2020) 'When "Balance!" sounds like "Silence!"' *Hiya Maya* – <https://hiyamaya.net/2020/06/23/when-balance-sounds-like-silence/amp/>
- Furness, Hannah (2019) 'Prince Harry shows support for transgender children as controversial charity invited to mental health talks' *The Telegraph* 23 April – <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/royal-family/2019/04/23/prince-harry-shows-support-transgender-children-controversial/>
- Gallus Mag (2018) 'WordPress censors GenderTrender; Gallus Mag responds' *4th Wave Now* 6 December – <https://4thwavenow.com/2018/11/17/wordpress-dumps-gendertrender-gallus-mag-responds/>
- GATE (2022) 'Form 990: return of organization exempt from income tax, 2021' Global Action for Trans Equality Inc. – <https://gate.ngo/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/2021-990-Final.pdf>
- GATE (2023) *Annual Report 2022* Global Action for Trans Equality Inc. – <https://gate.ngo/2022-annual-report/>
- Gentleman, Amelia (2022) 'Head of trans children charity Mermaids resigns after six years' *The Guardian* 26 November – <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2022/nov/25/head-of-trans-children-charity-mermaids-resigns-after-six-years>
- Gillan, Audrey (2003) 'Section 28 ... gone but not forgotten'. *The Guardian* 17 November – <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2003/nov/17/uk.gayrights>
- Gilligan, Andrew (2018a) 'Child sex-change charity Mermaids handed £500,000 by national lottery' *The Sunday Times* 16 December –

- <https://www.peaktrans.org/child-sex-change-charity-mermaids-handed-500000-by-national-lottery-andrew-gilligan-the-times-16-12-18/>
- Gilligan, Andrew (2018b) 'Lottery thousands pay for former trans stripper to sway public opinion' *The Sunday Times* 23 December
- Gluck, Genevieve (2022) 'Feminists attacked by trans activists during IWD protests' *Women's Voices* 10 March – <https://genevievegluck.substack.com/p/feminists-attacked-by-trans-activists>
- Goldberg, Michelle (2014) 'What is a woman?' *The New Yorker* 4 August – <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/08/04/woman-2>
- GPP (2020) *Global Resources Report: Government and Philanthropic Support for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex Communities 2017/2018* Funders for LGBTQ Issues/Global Philanthropy Project, May – https://globalresourcesreport.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/GRR_2017-2018_Color.pdf
- Graham, Claire (2019a) 'A tale of Twitter' *MRKH Voice* 27 July – <https://mrkhvoice.nfshost.com/index.php/2019/07/27/a-tale-of-twitter/>
- Graham, Claire (2019b) 'Twitter update' *MRKH Voice* 9 August – <https://mrkhvoice.com/index.php/2019/08/09/twitter-update/>
- 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
- Hamilton, Jamie and Jonathan Ames (2021) 'Stonewall suffers fresh setback in trans advice row' *The Times* 28 May
- Hayton, Debbie (2020) 'The silencing of Graham Linehan' *The Spectator* 29 June
- Helena (2019) 'Tumblr—a call-out post' *4th Wave Now* 20 March – <https://4thwavenow.com/2019/03/20/tumblr-a-call-out-post/>
- Helyar, S., A. Hill and L. Griffin (2021) 'Nurses request that health and nursing organisations withdraw from Stonewall's Diversity Championship Scheme' *La Scapigliata* 28 August – <https://lascapigliata8.wordpress.com/institutional-capture/nurses-request-that-health-and-nursing-organisations-withdraw-from-stonewalls-diversity-championship-scheme/>
- HRC (2020) 'Return of organization exempt from income tax: 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2020' *Human Rights Campaign* 2 September – <https://hrc-prod-requests.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/HRC-990-FY20.pdf>
- 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) 'Transgender activism' *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 1(3): 55-74
- Jessel, Rob (2022) 'Banned for speaking out against medical mutilation' *The Critic* 20 January – <https://thecritic.co.uk/banned-for-speaking-out-against-medical-mutilation/>
- Jones, Jane Clare (2018) 'Twitter, trans rights totalitarianism, and the erasure of sex' *Jane Clare Jones* 26 September –

- <https://janeclarejones.com/2018/09/26/twitter-trans-rights-totalitarianism-and-the-erasure-of-sex/>
- 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/>
- Jones, Owen (2017) ‘Anti-trans zealots, know this: history will judge you’ *The Guardian* 15 December – <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/dec/15/trans-backlash-anti-gay-zealotry-section-28-homophobia>
- Jones, Owen (2022) ‘This terrifying backslide on LGBTQ rights is a threat to women’s rights too’ *The Guardian* 5 July – <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2022/jul/05/lgbtq-womens-rights-abortion-unite>
- Joyce, Helen (2019) ‘Meet the gay activists who’ve had enough of Britain’s ultra-woke homophobes’ *Quillette* 4 November – <https://quillette.com/2019/11/04/meet-the-gay-activists-whove-had-enough-of-britains-ultra-woke-homophobes/>
- Kearns, Madeleine (2018) ‘How parents are being shut out of the transgender debate’ *The Spectator* 6 October – <https://www.spectator.co.uk/2018/10/how-parents-are-being-shut-out-of-the-transgender-debate/>
- Kleeman, Jenny (2015) ‘Transgender children: “This is who he is – I have to respect that”’ *The Guardian* 12 September – <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/sep/12/transgender-children-have-to-respect-who-he-is>
- Kowalski, Kit (2022a) ‘Pride in Diversity and the taxpayer’s dollar’ *Lady Kit Kowalski* 25 January – <https://ladykitkowalski.wordpress.com/2022/01/25/pride-in-diversity-and-the-taxpayers-dollar/>
- Kowalski, Kit (2022b) ‘Australian media’s pro bono work for ACON Pride in Diversity Leaderboard Scheme—Part 1—ABC’ *Lady Kit Kowalski* 10 March – <https://ladykitkowalski.wordpress.com/2022/03/10/australian-medias-pro-bono-work-for-acon-pride-in-diversity-leaderboard-scheme-part-1-abc/>
- Lane, Bernard (2019) ‘The balls now in feminists’ court’ *The Australian* 27 July
- Lane, Bernard (2023) ‘Silencer’ *Gender Clinic News* 3 October – <https://www.genderclinicnews.com/p/silencer>
- Lawford-Smith, Holly (2019) ‘Academic mobbing needs to be challenged, both inside and outside the institution’ *Feminist Current* 26 June -- <https://www.feministcurrent.com/2019/06/26/academic-mobbing-needs-to-be-challenged-both-inside-and-outside-the-institution/>
- Lawford-Smith, Holly (2020) ‘The digital deplatforming of a gender-critical feminist’ *Areo* 23 November – <https://areomagazine.com/2020/11/23/the-digital-deplatforming-of-a-gender-critical-feminist/>
- Lewis, Elin (2019) ‘Transmission of transition via YouTube’, in Moore and Brunskell-Evans, eds, pp.180-98
- Linehan, Graham (2021) ‘Stand up for Kellie-Jay’ *The Glinner Update* 23 February – <https://grahamlinehan.substack.com/p/stand-up-for-posie>
- Littman, Lisa (2018) ‘Parent reports of adolescents and young adults perceived to show signs of a rapid onset of gender dysphoria’ *PLoS ONE* 13(8) – <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0202330>

- Lloyd, Will (2023) 'Hannah Barnes: inside the collapse of the Tavistock gender clinic' *The New Statesman* 15 February – <https://www.newstatesman.com/encounter/2023/02/hannah-barnes-inside-collapse-tavistock-gender-clinic-lgbtq-transgender-nhs>
- Macaskill, Mark (2021) 'Warnings that organisations' policy could breach laws on trans rights' *The Sunday Times* 23 May
- MacGregor, Isla (2023) 'Freedom of speech for women is under dire threat in Australia' *Free Speech Alliance Australia* 9 March – <https://www.facebook.com/groups/2487292944741394/permalink/2861530593984292/>
- MailOnline Reporter (2018) 'National Lottery is accused of breaking political donation rules after giving £500,000 grant to transgender lobby group including thousands to help ex-stripper sway public opinion' *Daily Mail* 24 December – <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-6524489/National-Lottery-gives-500-000-grant-transgender-lobbying-group.html>
- Marchiano, Lisa (2017) 'Outbreak: on transgender teens and psychic epidemics' *Psychological Perspectives*, 60: 345-66 – <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/00332925.2017.1350804>
- Marchiano, Lisa (2019) 'Transgender children: the making of a modern hysteria', in Moore and Brunskell-Evans, eds, pp.56-72
- Maslin, Eleanor (2021) 'Lincolnshire Police and Crime Commissioner says "some services can't function in a gender neutral way"' *Lincolnshire Live* 29 August
- Megarry, Jessica (2020) *The Limitations of Social Media Feminism: No Space of Our Own* Palgrave Macmillan
- Mohdin, Aamna (2019) 'National Lottery to give grant to transgender children's group' *The Guardian* 20 February – <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2019/feb/19/national-lottery-to-give-grant-to-transgender-childrens-group>
- Moore, Michele and Heather Brunskell-Evans, eds (2019) *Inventing Transgender Children and Young People* Cambridge Scholars Publishing
- Moore, Suzanne (2020) 'Why I had to leave *The Guardian*' *Unherd* 25 November – <https://unherd.com/2020/11/why-i-had-to-leave-the-guardian/>
- Moore, Suzanne (2022) 'How the Guardian enables Owen Jones' *Unherd* 15 April – <https://unherd.com/2022/04/how-the-guardian-enables-owen-jones/>
- Mothers Grim (2023a) 'All aboard: the Human Rights Campaign and the making of "transgender" industry leaders/PART I' *The 11th Hour* 2 January – <https://www.the11thhourblog.com/post/all-aboard-the-human-rights-campaign-and-the-making-of-transgender-industry-leaders-part-i>
- Mothers Grim (2023b) 'All aboard: the Human Rights Campaign and the making of "transgender" industry leaders/Part II: healthcare institution capture' *The 11th Hour* 8 January – <https://www.the11thhourblog.com/post/all-aboard-the-human-rights-campaign-and-the-making-of-transgender-industry-leaders-part-2>
- Mothers Grim (2023c) 'All aboard: The Human Rights Campaign and the making of "transgender" industry leaders/Part III: healthcare campaign endorsing and funding partners' *The 11th Hour* 16 January – <https://www.the11thhourblog.com/post/all-aboard-the-human-rights-campaign-and-the-making-of-transgender-industry-leaders-part-3>

- Murphy, Meghan (2018) 'Twitter wants me to shut up and the right wants me to join them; I don't think I should have to do either' *Feminist Current* 20 November – <https://www.feministcurrent.com/2018/11/20/twitter-wants-shut-right-wants-join-dont-think-either/>
- Murphy, Meghan (2019) 'Women warned you: Yaniv's human rights case is the inevitable result of gender identity ideology' *Feminist Current* 18 July – <https://www.feministcurrent.com/2019/07/18/women-warned-you-yaniv-human-rights-tribunal-case-is-natural-result-of-gender-identity-ideology/>
- Myers, Fraser (2022) 'Mermaids: is the trans house of cards finally falling?' *Spiked* 8 October – <https://www.spiked-online.com/2022/10/08/mermaids-is-the-trans-house-of-cards-finally-falling/>
- NCTE (2022) 'Form 990: Return of organization exempt from income tax, 2021' National Center for Transgender Equality, 15 November – <https://transequality.org/sites/default/files/NCTE%20Public%20Disclosure%20990%20Copy%2011.15.22.pdf>
- Nicholson, Kate (2022) 'Mermaids: why is the trans charity under the spotlight?' *Huffington Post* 3 November – https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/mermaids-trans-charity-under-spotlight-lgbtq_uk_63441f24e4b08e0e607b07f8
- O'Neill, Brendan (2023) 'When will Jolyon Maugham take the hint?' *The Spectator* 6 July
- Parker, Tom (2020) 'Facebook now says it's "hate speech" to deny that someone's "gender identity" exists' *Reclaim the Net* 10 January – <https://reclaimthenet.org/facebook-bans-denying-existence-gender-identity/>
- Parsons, Vic (2021) 'Judge throws out "unarguable" case alleging Stonewall's "pro-trans bias" influenced Crown Prosecution Service' *Pink News* 13 January – <https://www.pinknews.co.uk/2021/01/13/stonewall-cps-crown-prosecution-service-high-court-case-trans/>
- Peak Trans (2020) 'Morning Star cartoon: You're offended. I'm offended. So what?' *Peak Trans* 25 March – <https://www.peaktrans.org/youre-offended-im-offended-so-what/>
- Peak Trans (2023) 'Silencing' *Peak Trans* – <https://www.peaktrans.org/silencing-critical-voices/#ftoc-heading-2>
- Phillimore, Sarah (2020) 'The latest feminist censored by Medium' *Uncommon Ground* 1 July – <https://uncommongroundmedia.com/sarah-phillimore-the-latest-feminist-censored-by-medium/>
- Phillips, Sarah (2007) 'A brief history of Facebook' *The Guardian* 25 July – <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2007/jul/25/media.newmedia>
- Plummer, Kate (2019) 'Lottery body to proceed with grant to Mermaids after media criticism' *Civil Society News* 20 February – <https://www.civilsociety.co.uk/news/500-000-grant-to-gender-dysphoria-charity-to-go-ahead-says-lottery-body.html>
- Ray, William (2018) 'The tranish inquisition' *Medium* 6 December – <https://medium.com/@williamray/thank-for-making-my-point-perfectly-medium-69d2d4669dc5>
- Read, Carly (2018) 'Trans group gets £500,000 public cash to tell YOU how to think about gender fluidity' *Express* 23 December – <https://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/1063148/national-lottery-funding-stonewall-500k-morgan-page-Aimee-Challenor-david-davis-mermaids>

- Robertson, Julia Diana (2019) 'Twitter's thought police exposed after prominent feminist sues the company for targeted ban' *AfterEllen* 13 February – <https://www.afterellen.com/general-news/569019-twitthers-thought-police-exposed-after-prominent-feminist-sues-the-company-for-targeted-ban#34YBDAhcGFAMK8kK.99>
- Russell, Nicole (2018) 'Twitter permanently bans feminist for writing that "men aren't women"' *The Federalist* 25 November – <http://thefederalist.com/2018/11/25/twitter-permanently-bans-feminist-writing-men-arent-women/>
- Sex Matters (2021) 'Ofcom bows out of the Stonewall Champions scheme – But read the small print' *Sex Matters* 25th August – <https://sex-matters.org/posts/updates/ofcom-leaves-stonewall/>
- Shaw, Diana (2019) 'Man, transgender & trans activist, is called out for years of sexual predation against young girls: Jonathan ("Jessica") Yaniv' *Women Are Human* 28 April – <https://www.womenarehuman.com/male-transgender-trans-activist-called-out-for-years-of-sexual-predation-against-adolescent-girls-jonathan-jessica-yaniv/#men>
- Shaw, Diana (2020) 'Trans org's terroristic threat to murder gender id skeptics does not violate Facebook standards' *Women Are Human* 17 October – <https://www.womenarehuman.com/trans-groups-terroristic-threat-to-murder-gender-id-skeptics-does-not-violate-facebook-standards/>
- Slatz, Anna (2023) 'Two Australian women told they broke the law after criticizing trans-identified male breastfeeding child' *ReduXX* 19 May – <https://reduxx.info/two-australian-women-told-they-broke-the-law-after-criticizing-trans-identified-male-breastfeeding-child/>
- Smith, Katie (2020) 'Literary agency fires agent for terf-y tweets' *Book and Film Globe* 26 August – <https://bookandfilmglobe.com/politics/literary-agency-fires-agent-sasha-white-for-terf-y-tweets/>
- Somerville, Ewan and Gabriella Swerling (2021) 'Stonewall "threatened" to silence gender critical barrister by having her sacked, says judge' *The Telegraph* 1 June
- Stock, Kathleen (2018b) '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>
- Stonewall (2019) 'Trustees' report and financial statements for the year ended 30 September 2019' *Stonewall Equality Limited* – https://www.stonewall.org.uk/sites/default/files/signed_accounts_ye_30_september_2019.pdf
- Szego, Julie (2023a) 'A question of transition' *Szego Unplugged* 4 June – <https://szegounplugged.substack.com/p/a-question-of-transition>
- Szego, Julie (2023b) 'I was sacked for writing about trans censorship' *Unherd* 19 June – <https://unherd.com/2023/06/i-was-sacked-for-writing-about-gender/>
- Tabakoff, Nick (2022) 'Paul Barry watching his back after criticising ABC' *The Australian* 23 October
- Thomas, Kim (2018) 'Schools pulled into row over helping transgender children' *The Guardian* 15 May – <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2018/may/15/transgender-row-teachers-afraid-challenge-breast-binding>
- Transgender Trend (2019a) 'First do no harm: the ethics of transgender healthcare, House of Lords' *Transgender Trend* 22 May –

- <https://www.transgendertrend.com/first-do-no-harm-ethics-transgender-healthcare-house-of-lords/>
- Transgender Trend (2019b) ‘Gendered Intelligence training session for teachers at “Kiss My Genders”’ *Transgender Trend* 14 June – <https://www.transgendertrend.com/gendered-intelligence-training-teachers-kiss-my-genders/>
- Transgender Trend (2020) ‘Keira Bell: the High Court hands down a historic judgment to protect vulnerable children’ *Transgender Trend* 1 December – <https://www.transgendertrend.com/keira-bell-high-court-historic-judgment-protect-vulnerable-children/>
- UK Women and Equalities Committee (2016) *Transgender Equality: Report, Together with Formal Minutes Relating to the Report* Women and Equalities Committee, House of Commons, 14 January – <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201516/cmselect/cmwomeq/390/390.pdf>
- van Zuylen-Wood, Simon (2019) “Men are scum”: inside Facebook’s war on hate speech’ *Vanity Fair* 26 February – <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2019/02/men-are-scum-inside-facebook-war-on-hate-speech>
- Vigo, Julian (2018) ‘Big tech’s threat to freedom of expression’ *Forbes* 28 November – <https://www.forbes.com/sites/julianvigo/2018/11/28/big-techs-threat-to-freedom-of-expression/?sh=25ea196528c9>
- Vigo, Julian (2020) ‘Section 230 and free speech: the tech public square under private ownership’ *Savage Minds* 9 December – <https://savageminds.substack.com/p/section-230-and-free-speech>
- Weakley, Kirsty (2019) ‘Sunday Times criticises Big Lottery Fund grants to transgender projects’ *Civil Society News* 3 January – <https://www.civilsociety.co.uk/news/sunday-times-criticises-big-lottery-fund-grants-to-transgender-projects.html#sthash.6DsVF0E5.dpuf>
- Whelan, Ella (2018) ‘Meghan Murphy and the silencing of women’ *spiked* 28 November – <https://www.spiked-online.com/2018/11/28/meghan-murphy-and-the-silencing-of-women/>
- Whittle, Stephen (2010) ‘A brief history of transgender issues’ *The Guardian* 2 June – <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2010/jun/02/brief-history-transgender-issues>
- Williams, Joanna (2020) *The Corrosive Impact of Transgender Ideology* London: Civitas – <http://civitas.org.uk/content/files/2454-A-The-Corrosive-Impact-of-TI-ppi-110-WEB.pdf>
- WoLF (2019) ‘Petition to Apple and Google, regarding Twitter and Facebook’ *Women’s Liberation Front* – <https://action.womensliberationfront.org/apple-google-app-stores>
- Women and Girls in Scotland (2019) ‘Gender self-identification in Scotland: a Women and Girls discussion paper’ 3 June – https://secureservercdn.net/160.153.137.99/hjn.a49.myftpupload.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/WGS_gender_self_id.pdf
- Wright, Colin (2023) ‘Think cancel culture doesn’t exist? My own “lived experience” says otherwise’ *Reality’s Last Stand* 12 January – <https://www.realityslaststand.com/p/think-cancel-culture-doesnt-exist>

Wright, Oliver (2021) 'Women must be heard on transgender identity, says new equalities chief' *The Times* 15 May

Yardley, Miranda (2018) 'Why I am permanently banned from twitter and why this should make you worry' *Miranda Yardley* 24 May –

<https://mirandayardley.com/en/i-permanently-banned-twitter-make-worry/>

© Denise Thompson 2024