

To the United Nations Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI):

I 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. I believe that the very questions and definitions you use illustrate a gross overstepping of your mandate.

I 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.

I denounce all “violence” and unjust “discrimination” regardless but would challenge your definitions for these two terms which go far beyond UN consensus agreements in harmful ways.

The term “gender identity” does not appear in any binding international agreements negotiated by the full body of UN Member States. Every time it has been proposed, it has been rejected by UN Member States because it is too controversial.

I reject your interpretations 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 regarding gender equality were specifically designed to protect sex-based rights, not controversial transgender ideology.

I am greatly concerned that you are 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 polities.

I oppose your efforts 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.

How can we create policies based on characteristics that are subjective, changeable, self-defined and that cannot be measured or quantified? 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.

**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.**

I am disturbed that failure to provide harmful puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones, and transgender surgeries for transgender-identifying persons is now being considered “discrimination.” You have also 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.

I strongly oppose your 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. 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. 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 cannot fight sexism in all these areas if the category of sex is erased and replaced with “gender identity.”

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.

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.

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, I must oppose this term. I 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.”*<sup>1</sup> Therefore, I believe adopting “gender identity policies can hurt people rather than help them.

I strongly oppose your attempt 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 you are blatantly and disrespectfully ignoring.

Considering recent findings from a global study on school based CSE worldwide, I am genuinely concerned by your push for CSE. In fact, the researchers concluded: *“Three decades of research*

---

<sup>1</sup> 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](https://genderidentitywatch.files.wordpress.com/2014/06/paul-mchugh_-transgender-surgery-isnt-the-solution-wsj.pdf)

*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.”<sup>2</sup>*

“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.

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.

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.

I am deeply concerned by your overstepping of your mandate and reject the underlying assumptions upon which this request for input have been made.

To uphold the rights and protections of girls and women I reject the false assumptions regarding gender in your call for input for your upcoming “thematic report.”

I denounce in the strongest terms your 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.

I call upon all UN Member States to censure you for your 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.

Respectfully,

Mrs. Elizabeth Christensen

Daughter, Sister, Girlfriend, Wife, Aunt, Mother, Grandmother, Woman

---

<sup>2</sup> 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