



የኢትዮጵያ ካቶሊካዊት ቤተክርስቲያን የጳጳሳት ጉባኤ
ጠቅላይ ጽ/ቤት
Catholic Bishops' Conference of Ethiopia (CBCE)
General Secretariat/ECS
አዲስ አበባ፣ ኢትዮጵያ Addis Ababa - Ethiopia

☎ (251) 11-155 03 00
Tel fax (251)11-155 31 13
☒ 2454

E-Mail: CBCE@cbce-gs.org
cbce.ecs@gmail.com
website: www.cbce-gs.org

ቀን 14 March 2021
Date:
ቁጥር CBCE - 27 - 2021
Ref:

Date:- 14 March 2021

To:- UN Independent Expert on SOGI
United Nations
New York

From:- The Catholic Bishops' Conference of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa

Subject:- Submission to UN SOGI Mandate Holder

We, the Catholic Bishops' Conference of Ethiopia make our considered submission to the call in reference.

- We fundamentally disagree with the radical and unscientific transgender ideologies that underpin your request for submissions for your thematic report on Gender, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity. We believe that the very questions and definitions you use illustrate a gross overstepping of your mandate.
- We are deeply disturbed by what appears to be the end goals of the call for inputs to your thematic report on gender, sexual orientation and gender identity. Please consider our following concerns.
- We believe that the leading questions and rhetoric used in your call for submissions demonstrate a clear bias in favor of radical sexual and gender theories and policies, which have been rejected by a large grouping of UN Member States on multiple occasions.
- The SOGI Independent Expert's mandate is to advance the rights of persons to be free from violence or unjust discrimination based on "sexual orientation" or "gender identity," however, your report undermines the very foundation upon which sex-based rights and protections are established.
- We support the protection of all fundamental human rights of all persons regardless of sexual orientation and gender identity. Your report, however, is clearly aimed at, among other things, advancing radical gender theories and ideologies that seek to erase all differences between men and women and undermine the hard-earned gains for women in the area of human rights.

- We denounce all "evidence" and amount "demonstrations" regarding the UN would challenge your definitions for these two terms which go far beyond UN consensus agreements in harmful ways.
- We are concerned by what appears to be an interpretation of consensus beyond the internationally agreed human rights legal framework as well as an erasure of the fundamentality of universality.
- We are deeply concerned that your current and past reports are going well beyond the content and scope of your mandate in harmful ways. Since 2012, the thrust of your work is not in conformity with the principles outlined in UPR Res. 5/12 which require "universality," "impartiality," "objectivity," "non-selective approach" and a "gender perspective" as indicated by States to mean a women's & equal gender perspective and not a transgender perspective.
- The term "gender identity" does not appear in any binding international agreements negotiated by the full body of UN Member States. Even since it has been proposed it has been rejected by UN Member States because it is too controversial.
- We reject your interpretation of the terms "violence" and "discrimination" as encompassing any criticism of radical gender theory or policies that protect women's private spaces.
- The UN social policies with regard to gender equality were specifically designed to protect sex-based rights, not controversial transgender ideology.
- Intersectionality, gender theory and queer theory are akin to religious beliefs and should not be the underpinnings for UN policies nor international law.
- We oppose the SOGI Independent Expert's distorted definition for gender and gender-based terms at the UN to encompass radical and unscientific gender ideology and queer theory.
- The SOGI Independent Expert is attempting to establish as a protected class by force of law the controversial concept of "gender identity" (i.e., transgender identity).
- We are concerned that the Independent Expert on SOGI is actively trying to identify individuals, groups and countries that do not accept his ideology. What does he intend to do with this list? Will it be used to incite reprisals against those who do not accept radical transgender ideology?
- We are greatly concerned that the UN-appointed Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) is now at the forefront of UN efforts to reinterpret the concepts of "gender" and

“gender equality” beyond the longstanding understanding of male and female and equality between the sexes which would erase all sex-based rights and protections for women and girls.

- The terms “gender” and “gender equality” are common terms used throughout the UN system and in multiple UN documents and resolutions adopted by consensus by UN Member States to advance the equality of women and girls and were never intended to advance highly controversial transgender policies.
- We oppose the efforts of the Independent Expert on SOGI to redefine “gender equality” specifically in UN Sustainable Development Goal 5 to encompass special rights based on sexual orientation and gender identity that would supersede women’s rights and then to mainstream these alleged “rights” throughout the 2030 Agenda.
- The Independent Expert on SOGI is redefining retroactively the term “gender” and gender-based terms in UN documents (i.e., resolutions, treaties, UN 2030 Agenda, etc.) to go beyond the longstanding concept of male and female based on biological sex, and instead is incorporating the concept of “gender identity” based on unscientific gender ideology.
- The Independent Expert on SOGI is attempting to mainstream queer theory throughout the UN system and to pressure UN Member States to do the same. His intent is to make all States accountable to his radical concept of a “gender framework” that would mainstream SOGI ideology in all laws and policies.
- The idea that a biological male becomes a girl or woman simply by adopting stereotypical female behavior and dress is regressive and harms girls and women by reinforcing the very stereotypes that have resulted in the harassment, discrimination, and violence against girls and women.
- The idea that a biological male can or should try to become or impersonate a girl or woman if they reject stereotypically male behavior or that a female can or should try to become or impersonate a boy or a man is regressive and can damage those who are gender non-conforming or those who reject male or female stereotyped roles.
- The elective, transgender hormonal or surgical interventions that your transgender gender framework would establish as universal rights are prohibitively expensive and would take critical limited resources away from those in developing countries who require basic support for survival.
- If we were to adopt a “gender identity” policy, how would it be defined? If all gender identities (there are over 112 different gender identities as reported on Tumblr) were protected under a gender identity policy, it would create great controversy among UN Member States.

- While every individual is entitled to basic human rights, imagine the chaos that would ensue if all of the controversial “gender identities” that have been conceptualized are established as part of a protected class. The New York City Commission on Human Rights “gender identity” policy now recognizes 31 genders and already multiple complaints have been filed against individuals or businesses accused of discriminating against these “identities.” If found guilty, these individuals or entities could be forced to pay fines up to \$250,000.¹
- How can we create policies based on characteristics that are subjective, changeable, self-defined and that cannot be measured or quantified? For example, “Adamasgender” is defined as “a gender which refuses to be categorized,” and “Affectugender” is defined as “a gender that is affected by mood swings?” How can governments be expected to regulate policies based on an individual’s internal or individual experience of gender?
- Since both “gender identity” and “gender expression” are based on internal feelings unique to that individual rather than biological realities that can be independently verified, if we adopt a “gender identity” policy, only gender-confused individuals can determine if some policy or action violates the law. There is no other law in the world that functions this way.
- What if additional gender identities emerge after a policy on gender identity is adopted? Will we then be required to recognize any and all gender identities that are put forward?
- Instead of trying to create special protections for people based on their internal perceptions of themselves which can change over time, we should enforce existing laws and policies calling for the elimination of violence against anyone.
- Elective cross-sex cosmetic medical interventions used to change the outward appearance are expensive and often result in lifelong medicalization of those who previously were physically healthy.
- We are disturbed that failure to provide harmful puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones, and transgender surgeries for transgender-identifying persons is now being considered “discrimination.” The Independent Expert on SOGI also has equated hurt feelings and the inability for transgender-identifying persons to access elective cross-sex cosmetic treatments to the profound oppression and hardships girls and woman face such as inability to access educational opportunities, housing, health care and protection from physical and sexual abuse.

¹ The 31 genders recognized by the New York City Commission on Human Rights are: Bi-gendered, Cross-dresser, Drag King, Drag Queen, Femme Queen, Female-to-Male, FTM, Gender Bender, Genderqueer, Male-to-Female, MTF, Non-Op, HIJRA, Pangender, Transsexual/Transsexual, Trans Person, Woman, Man Butch, Two-Spirit, Trans, Agender, Third Sex, Gender Fluid, Non-Binary Transgender, Androgyne, Gender Gifted, Gender Blender, Femme, Person of Transgender Experience, and Androgynous.

- We strongly oppose the Independent SOGI Expert’s attempts to undermine the hard-won advancements of women and girls whose rights and private spaces are being violated by men who identify as women.
- The best estimate on transgender people is that no more than 0.3 percent of the general population identifies as transgender. Yet this proposed “gender identity” policy can negatively affect the majority of the population, but especially women and girls.²
- Where “gender identity” non-discrimination policies are in place, women and girls are being denied their right to privacy in public female spaces, such as bathrooms and showers. Some women and girls have even been sexually assaulted.
- Women cannot opt out of the biological realities that put them at higher risk than men for oppression, sexual harassment, and rape. These differences must be acknowledged and protected.
- Your conception of a “gender framework” which incorporates radical transgender ideology will lead to discrimination, harassment and violence against women and girls as your proposed framework will erase the very rights and protections designed for them.
- In private spaces and sports, bodies matter. For the privacy, safety, and fairness to girls, male and female biological embodiment and realities must be respected.
- Historically as well as currently, women/girls have been exploited for their reproductive capacity. The global reality for many women/girls is that they still suffer under enforced gender roles used as justification to exploit their bodies in practices like female infanticide, FGM, child marriages, trafficking, forced pregnancy, forced sterilizations, surrogacy camps, enforced dress codes, corrective rape, lack of access to certain transportation, lack of access to participation in public and political life, etc. The UN can't fight sexism in all of these areas if the category of sex is erased and replaced with “gender identity.”
- The questions listed in the submission guidance by the Independent Expert on SOGI reveal that the main goal of his upcoming report is to change the world’s commonly held biological understanding of male and female and replace it with the radical concept of “gender identity.” This is the antithesis of the UN’s mandate to provide rights and protections to women and girls.
- Allowing biological males to opt in to the category of “girl” and “woman” by claiming a female identity will erode the many rights and protections currently extended to girls and women by governments worldwide as the categories of women and girls will become utterly meaningless if a man can be considered to be a woman too.

² Gates, G. (2011). *How many people are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender?* The Williams Institute. Retrieved from <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Gates-How-Many-People-LGBT-Apr-2011.pdf>

- Girls and women have been extended special protections and rights because of the disproportionate amount of discrimination, harassment, and violence that girls and women experience—not because they identify as “girls” or “women” but due to the biological reality of being female and the inherent differences between the sexes.
- There is no evidence to support claims that there is an epidemic of violence against biological males who want to appropriate womanhood, yet allowing biological males to opt in to the category of girls and women puts girls and women at an increased risk of harassment and violence.
- Consider the following troubling examples showing how “gender identity” policies put women and children at risk:
 - BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND: A male student wore a mask and wig to gain entry to a women’s bathroom to spy on women and make recordings of a sexual nature.
 - WEST YORKSHIRE, ENGLAND: A biological male inmate with a history of sexual offenses changed his name and dressed as a woman so he could be moved to a female prison where he sexually assaulted four female prisoners.
 - OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON: A 45-year-old man, who self-identified as a woman, used the women’s facilities at the Evergreen State College swimming pool exposing himself to minor girls who also used the college’s swimming pool.
 - PORTLAND, OREGON: A convicted child sex offender claimed to be a transgender woman and wore a dress to access areas where young girls were changing.
 - SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA: A 46-year-old man cross-dressed as a woman to gain access to a women’s dormitory and other female-only facilities to take pictures of women with a cell phone.
 - TORONTO, CANADA: A man claimed to be transgender to stay at a women’s shelter where he then assaulted several women.
 - DECATUR, GEORGIA: Parents of a 5-year-old girl filed a legal complaint claiming a transgender boy sexually assaulted their daughter in her school’s restroom. This boy was a biological male who identifies as “gender fluid” and therefore was allowed use the girls’ restroom under a “gender identity” policy.³
- Gender confusion, previously called “gender identity disorder” and now called “gender dysphoria” can be a serious mental health issue. We also understand that there is an entirely different mental condition called “autogynephilia.” A male who has autogynephilia

experiences intense sexual arousal by cross-dressing as a female or by the thought or image of themselves as female. How will governments be able to determine under a “gender identity” non-discrimination policy whether the man identifying as a female has true “gender dysphoria” or if he has “autogynephilia,” especially with regard to bathroom policies?

- Gender identity protection policies operate under the false assumption that people with gender confusion are better off being encouraged to identify as something other than their biological sex. The website SexChangeRegret.com has multiple testimonies from people who have strongly regretted their cross-sex surgeries and who are desperately trying to reintegrate with their biological sex, despite the altered conditions of their body. Some have even had their genitals or breasts removed and become completely infertile in their attempt to become the opposite sex. This is why Dr. Paul McHugh, University Distinguished Service Professor of Psychiatry at Johns Hopkins Medical School, who once supported and oversaw many cross-sex surgeries, after seeing the end results warned: “...policymakers and the media are doing no favors either to the public or the transgendered by treating their confusions as a right in need of defending rather than as a mental disorder that deserves understanding, treatment and prevention.”
- The American College of Pediatricians (ACPeds) calls “gender dysphoria” a “mental disorder in which an individual experiences distress over a deeply felt desire or belief that he or she is the opposite sex.” When the dysphoria is severe enough to cause a child to insist on amputating their sex organs, without question, this should be considered a mental disorder.
- What these children really need is help in overcoming their disorder, not policies to protect their confused “gender identity” or “identities” or that push them further and further into an opposite-sex identity, putting them at risk for a large array of mental, social, and physical problems throughout their lives.
- This radical gender framework would encourage the medical transitioning of vulnerable children with medical and surgical interventions that have been shown to increase mental distress and cause lifelong physical harms including infertility.
- The “gender framework” proposed by the SOGI expert would indoctrinate children into a belief system through comprehensive sexuality education, something that is fundamentally at odds with the UN’s Charter.
- The American College of Pediatricians (ACPeds) warns: “A number of mental health professionals who have successfully treated gender dysphoria in youth stress that the ‘affirmation’ of children’s gender confusion by allowing them to behave and be treated as the opposite sex reinforces this mental disorder and renders the success of therapy less likely.” What we should be adopting is a policy calling upon medical and mental health professionals and school officials to assist children in resolving their gender dysphoria by

accepting their permanent biological sex, not policies that affirm children in their confusion.

- Most children lose their feelings of gender confusion as they grow older. According to Dr. Paul McHugh, *“When children who reported transgender feelings were tracked without medical or surgical treatment at both Vanderbilt University and London's Portman Clinic, 70%-80% of them spontaneously lost those feelings.”*⁴ However, when children are affirmed in their gender confusion by parents, schools, the community and others, the chance that they will normally outgrow this gender confusion is greatly diminished. Our position is that “gender identity” affirming policies, while well-intentioned, are misguided, because they harm the very children that need our help.
- The head of the Child and Adolescent Gender Identity Clinic in Toronto, Canada, Dr. Kenneth Zucker, one of the leading authorities in the world on gender disorders, has treated over 500 children with gender confusion. Dr. Zucker found that in the vast majority of cases, therapy focused on reducing the psychopathology within the family has resulted in the child’s acceptance of their birth sex.⁵
- According to the World Health Organization’s publication, *“Sexual Health Human Rights and the Law,”* non-discrimination “gender identity” policies would require governments to provide cross-sex hormones and surgeries for children, therefore, we must oppose this term. We agree with Dr. Paul McHugh that “Sex change” is biologically impossible. Dr. McHugh has also stated that *“People who undergo sex-reassignment surgery do not change from men to women or vice versa. Rather, they become feminized men or masculinized women ... encouraging surgical intervention is in reality to collaborate with and promote a mental disorder.”*⁶ Therefore, we believe adopting “gender identity policies can hurt people rather than help them.
- Among the many facts which make it impossible to support “gender identity” policies is the fact that where gender-confusion-affirming policies are adopted, they can serve to encourage cross-sex hormone therapies and surgeries, and we know such interventions cause harm.
- “Sex-change” surgery increases health risks, including suicide rates. A long-term Swedish study following more than 300 sex-change surgery patients for up to 30 years was published in 2011. The study concluded: *“Persons with transsexualism, after sex reassignment, have considerably higher risks for mortality, suicidal behavior, and psychiatric morbidity than the general population.”* The study found suicide rates 10

⁴ McHugh, P. (2014, June 12). Transgender Surgery Isn't the Solution. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from https://genderidentitywatch.files.wordpress.com/2014/06/paul-mchugh_-transgender-surgery-isnt-the-solution-wsj.pdf

⁵ Zucker, K. & Bradley, S. (1995). *Gender Identity Disorder and Psychosexual Problems in Children and Adolescents*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

⁶ McHugh, P. (2014, June 12). Transgender Surgery Isn't the Solution. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from https://genderidentitywatch.files.wordpress.com/2014/06/paul-mchugh_-transgender-surgery-isnt-the-solution-wsj.pdf

years after surgery were nearly 20 times that of the general population.⁷

- After a review in the UK of more than 100 international medical studies of post-operative transgender persons. Christopher Hyde, director of the University of Birmingham's Aggressive Research Intelligence Facility, who conducted the review, warned, *"There's still a large number of people who have the surgery but remain traumatized—often to the point of committing suicide."*⁸
- Cross-sex surgery does not solve underlying mental health problems. Under Dr. McHugh, Johns Hopkins University, the first American medical center to venture into "sex-reassignment" surgery, launched a study in the 1970s comparing the outcomes of transgendered people who had the surgery with the outcomes of those who did not. Dr. McHugh explained that John Hopkins stopped doing "sex-reassignment" surgery since *"producing a 'satisfied' but still troubled patient seemed an inadequate reason for surgically amputating normal organs."*⁹
- Dr. Charles Ihlenfeld, an endocrinologist who worked at the Harry Benjamin gender clinic in the 1970s warned that transsexuals are the only patients who diagnose themselves and prescribe their own treatment. He cautioned against administering gender-change hormones. *"There is too much unhappiness among people who have had the surgery,"* he said. *"Too many of them end as suicides. Even though the physical effects of hormones are largely reversible,"* he pointed out, *"their psychological effects often are not. The very fact that a doctor clears the patient for hormone therapy can act as a self-fulfilling prophecy for that patient. It may signify to him that his fantasy has received confirmation from the medical profession and that there is now no turning back."*¹⁰
- Walt Heyer, a male who underwent gender reassignment surgery lived for eight years as Laura Jensen, a female. (See SexChangeRegret.com.) He then regretted his surgery and now has transitioned back to Walt. Mr. Heyer warns that transgenders' bodies may be permanently disfigured, making it very difficult to live normally. Mr. Heyer says he wishes the surgeons had told him that the severe psychological problems of their other patients were not solved after surgery and that a high number of such patients commit suicide.
- Surgically removing or altering children's genitals could be considered child abuse. Dr. McHugh warned: *"Given that close to 80 percent of such children would abandon their confusion and grow naturally into adult life if untreated, these medical interventions come close to child abuse."*

⁷ Dhejne, C., et al. (2011). Long-Term Follow-Up of Transsexual Persons Undergoing Sex Reassignment Surgery: Cohort Study in Sweden. *PLOS One*, 6. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016885>

⁸ Batty, D. (2004, July 30). Sex changes are not effective, say researchers. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2004/jul/30/health.mentalhealth>

⁹ Ablow, K. (2011, September 2). *Don't Let Your Kids Watch Chaz Bono on 'Dancing With the Stars.'* Fox News. Retrieved from <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2011/09/02/dont-let-your-kids-watch-chaz-bono-on-dancing-with-stars.html>

¹⁰ Oppenheim, G. (1979, January/February). Transition, No. 8. Retrieved from http://lvtgw.jadephonix.org/Info_html/Herbal_G/ginko_b2.htm

- The Independent Expert on SOGI is seeking to implement so-called “comprehensive sexuality education” (CSE) designed to indoctrinate children and mainstream queer theory, an unhealthy belief system that encourages children to disassociate from their biological sex in harmful ways. It should be noted the concepts of “comprehensive sexuality education” and “sexual orientation and gender identity” were specifically rejected from the 2030 Agenda by many UN Member States and that the establishment of this SOGI expert’s mandate is a deliberate attempt to override the positions of States opposed to such and coerce them into accepting SOGI rights. This is a direct assault on the sovereignty of UN Member States and an abuse of the UN system.
- We strongly oppose the attempt by the Independent Expert on SOGI to push harmful and ineffective “comprehensive sexuality education” as a major tool to indoctrinate the world’s children and mainstream radical sexual and gender ideologies into the rising generation.
- The concepts of “comprehensive sexuality education” and “sexual orientation and gender identity” were specifically rejected from the 2030 Agenda by many UN Member States, a fact that the Independent Expert is blatantly and disrespectfully ignoring.
- CSE programs typically contain many, and often all, of 15 program elements listed below that are harmful to children (see more information at StopCSE.org):

15 Common Harmful CSE Elements:

1. Sexualizes children
2. Teaches children how to consent to sex
3. Normalizes anal & oral sex
4. Promotes homosexual/bisexual behavior
5. Promotes sexual pleasure
6. Promotes solo and/or mutual masturbation
7. Promotes condom use in inappropriate ways
8. Promotes early sexual autonomy
9. Fails to establish abstinence as the expected standard
10. Promotes transgender ideology
11. Promotes contraception/abortion to children
12. Promotes peer-to-peer sex ed or sexual rights advocacy
13. Undermines traditional values and beliefs
14. Undermines parents or parental rights

We therefore strongly discourage the SOGI expert to refrain from promoting CSE.

In light of recent findings from a global study on school-based CSE worldwide, we are very concerned by the SOGI expert’s push for CSE. In fact, the researchers concluded: *“Three decades of research indicate that comprehensive sex education has not been an*

effective public health strategy in schools around the world, has shown far more evidence of failure than success, and has produced a concerning number of harmful impacts.”¹¹

- A study released in 2019 on school-based CSE concluded that “Worldwide, 87% of the school-based CSE programs that measured effects at least 12 months post-program failed to produce sustained effects on any key protective outcome for the intended youth population. School-based CSE programs outside the U.S. showed a lack of success similar to those within the U.S., with 89% of non-U.S. and 85% of U.S. programs that measured these effects failing to produce them.”¹²
- Research indicates that comprehensive sex education has not been an effective public health strategy in schools around the world, has shown far more evidence of failure than success, and has produced a concerning number of harmful impacts. (See at SexEdReport.org)
- The 2018 UNESCO *International Guidance on Sexuality Education* teaches children, as part of CSE, “*that each person’s decision to be sexually active is a personal one, which can change over time and should be respected at all times.*” (UN Inter-agency *Guidance*, p. 71). We do not believe sexual promiscuity among youth should be respected and therefore oppose the SOGI expert’s push for CSE.
- “Comprehensive sexuality education” has never been accepted in a binding treaty or major UN consensus document. Member States who have expressed strong objections to CSE should be respected by the SOGI mandate holder.
- The American College of Pediatricians has stated that “*comprehensive sexuality education is a dangerous assault on the health and innocence of children.*” How can the SOGI expert endorse and adopt such a controversial kind of education? (Ample evidence backing this claim can be found at ACPeds.org and at stopcse.org.)
- According to the 2018 UNESCO *International Guidance on Sexuality Education*, “CSE promotes the right to choose when and with whom a person will have any form of intimate or sexual relationship...” (UN Inter-agency *CSE Guidance*, p. 18). In other words, CSE, rather than encouraging children to avoid sex, promotes the right for children to have sex even though studies show that sexually active youth are more likely to experience many negative outcomes including:

Less likely to use contraception
More likely to experience STIs
More concurrent or lifetime partners
More likely to experience pregnancy
Lower educational attainment (and not necessarily linked to pregnancy)
Increased sexual abuse and victimization

¹¹ Weed, S., Ericksen, I. (2019). Institute for Research and Evaluation. *Re-Examining the Evidence for Comprehensive Sex Education in Schools: A Global Research Review*. Retrieved from SexEdReport.org

¹² Weed, S., Ericksen, I. (2019). Institute for Research and Evaluation. *Re-Examining the Evidence for Comprehensive Sex Education in Schools: A Global Research Review*. Retrieved from SexEdReport.org

Decreased general physical and psychological health, including depression
Decreased relationship quality, stability and more likely to divorce
More frequent engagement in other risk behaviors, such as smoking, drinking and drugs
More likely to participate in anti-social or delinquent behavior
Less likely to exercise self-efficacy and self-regulation
Less attachment to parents, school and faith
Less financial net worth and more likely to live in poverty
Early sexual behaviors set a pattern for later ones¹³

We therefore strongly oppose the SOGI expert's attempts to strengthen efforts to implement CSE.

- Article 26.3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that parents have a “prior right” to guide the education of their children. Surely an issue as sensitive as sexuality education should be taught with respect for the rights, duties and responsibilities of parents as enshrined in multiple UN treaties and major UN documents.
- We are deeply concerned that question #4 of the SOGI expert's call for submissions promotes “comprehensive sexuality education,” which has been rejected by many States. More specifically, at the time of the adoption of the UN 2030 Agenda, the African Group stated as part of its reservation (see A/69/PV.101), “*With regard to information and education in the context of sexual and reproductive health services, as referred to under Goal 3 and target 3 ... the African Group does not think that comprehensive sexual education should be included as part of it.*” The SOGI expert's push to find obstacles to CSE, therefore disrespects the African Group position.
- Children who become sexualized through CSE, among other harms, are less likely to be able to form and maintain stable families as adults. (See WarOnChildren.org.)
- “Gender identity” non-discrimination policies are one of the greatest threats to parental rights and are putting children and families at risk everywhere. Consider these troubling developments:
 - CANADA: Canada's most populous province, Ontario, passed a law that could allow the government to remove children from their parents if the parents refuse to affirm their children in the opposite gender.
 - UNITED KINGDOM: Christian Concern in the UK is defending four sets of parents who are challenging actions taken by schools and social workers to enable their children to “transition” from female to male, or vice versa.

¹³ Ascend. (2016). *Policy Priorities: Why Sexual Delay Should be the Goal in Sex Education...And Why Teen Pregnancy Prevention Isn't Enough*. Retrieved from <http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Sexual-Delay-Priorities-1.pdf>

- CHILE: A law was passed allowing children as young as age 14 to identify as the opposite sex if only one parent consents.
 - UNITED STATES: In Minnesota a 16-year-old boy who was not living at home decided he was a girl. His school and medical providers began treatment to change his appearance from male to female without the mother's knowledge or consent. The county government even provided financial support for the boy without informing his mother. The mother's attorney calls this "a parent's worst nightmare."¹⁴
 - UNITED STATES: A 17-year-old girl in Ohio was taken from her parents and placed with her grandparents because her parents would not allow her to take transgender hormones. (Transgender hormones can render the girl infertile for life).¹⁵
 - UNITED STATES: The mother of a 7-year-old Texas boy decided to "transition" him to a girl against the father's wishes and sent him to school dressed as a girl and called him by a girl's name. It became a legal battle, and the jury determined the mother had the right to "change" the child's gender, even though the child had never expressed any interest in "transitioning" to a girl.¹⁶
- The implications and consequences of adopting non-discrimination "gender identity" policies are far reaching with grave consequences for children and the family and ironically, are fraught with negative consequences for the very people they were designed to help.
 - We are deeply concerned by the Independent Expert on SOGI's overstepping of his mandate and reject the underlying assumptions upon which this request for input have been made.
 - In order to uphold the rights and protections of girls and women we reject the false assumptions regarding gender in the Independent Expert on SOGI's call for input for his upcoming "thematic report."
 - The reason girls and women have been extended special protections and rights is because of the disproportionate amount of discrimination, harassment, and violence that girls and women experience—not because they identify as "girls" or "women" but due to the biological reality of being female and the inherent differences between the sexes. Adopting the "gender framework" which is based upon the Independent Expert on SOGI's beliefs is privileging one belief system over others, which is a violation of the UN's mandate to protect individuals' freedom of thought, conscience, and religion.

¹⁴ Thomas More Society. (2017). Thomas More Society Seeks Vindication for De Facto Emancipation of Minor Son. Retrieved from <https://www.thomasmoresociety.org/thomas-more-society-seeks-vindication-for-de-facto-emancipation-of-minor-son/>

¹⁵ O'Neil, T. (2018, February 15). Ohio Christian Parents Lose Custody of 17-Year-Old Daughter for Refusing Her Transgender Drugs. *PJ Media*. Retrieved from <https://pjmedia.com/faith/ohio-christian-parents-lose-custody-of-17-year-old-daughter-for-refusing-her-transgender-drugs/>

¹⁶ Judge who ruled on 7-yr-old's gender 'transition' taken off case. (2019, December 6). Retrieved from <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/breaking-judge-who-ruled-on-7-yr-olds-gender-transition-taken-off-case>

- In order to uphold the rights and protections of girls and women, we reject the false assumptions regarding gender in the Independent Expert on SOGI's call for input for his upcoming "thematic report."
- The Independent Expert on SOGI is attempting to identify political and religious leaders who speak out publicly against "gender ideology." We are concerned that such a list could be used to incite reprisals against people who exercise free expression, speech and religious liberty rights.
- Attempts are being made by UN entities including treaty bodies and special procedures (i.e., Special Rapporteurs, UN Independent Experts and working groups) through ultra vires reports, observations, and recommendations, to redefine "gender" and "gender equality" to encompass controversial concepts related to "gender identity" that run counter to the culture, values, religion, laws and policies of billions of the world's people.
- We declare any and all efforts by unaccountable UN mandate holders to retroactively reinterpret longstanding UN consensus terms or UN agreements related to gender and sex, that have been used in countless UN consensus agreements, resolutions and treaties, undermine the entire collaborative UN negotiation process and international human rights framework with serious implications for all peoples.
- We denounce in the strongest terms the Independent Expert on SOGI's attempts to redefine "gender," "gender equality" and other gender-based terms, especially in the UN 2030 Agenda to encompass radical and harmful concepts and gender ideologies that go beyond the concepts of male and female based on biological sex.
- We denounce Independent Expert on SOGI's most recent call to identify political and religious leaders worldwide who speak out publicly against harmful and unscientific "gender ideology."
- We denounce the Independent Expert on SOGI's actions seeking to identify States that are not implementing harmful "comprehensive sexuality education" designed to indoctrinate children and mainstream radical sexual and gender identities and ideologies into our societies.
- We call upon all UN Member States to reject the past and forthcoming reports issued by the UN Independent Expert on SOGI and to censure him for his aforementioned ultra vires actions that will only serve to denigrate and abolish the many hard-won sex-based rights for women and girls, lead to the destruction of the natural family, and damage children who will receive harmful comprehensive sexuality education designed to indoctrinate them in radical gender and sexual ideologies and queer theories.

Finally as a Church we condemn any kind of discrimination or violence against people based on their gender or any other factor. Every human being has equal dignity which is inherent to his/her nature. This is already in the human rights charter of the UN and does not need any

affirmation. Therefore, it is our moral duty as church to kindly request that your commission should not go against the common good of the human beings.



Fr. Teshome Fikre Woldetensae, Ph. D
Secretary General

