Call for input to a thematic report: Gender, sexual orientation and gender identity

Has the State adopted, in public policy, legislation or jurisprudence, working definitions of gender and related concepts (for example gender theory, gender-based approaches, gender perspective, gender mainstreaming) aiming to address violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity? If so, please give examples, with commentary as needed to explain context, scope and application.

1. if that is the case, has the State carried out evaluations, assessments or evidence-gathering about the impact of the implementation of such actions and, if so, what are the main trends identified?
2. if that is not the case, please provide information as to the reasons.

Firstly there is no reason why they should, and this “survey” is clearly intended to give the impression that “gender theory” is the norm that we should be aiming for and heading towards.

We already have “working definitions” of gender: they have worked for thousands of years! As society has developed, and the male is no longer the fighter/forager/hunter, we have been very slow in recognising the true place and value of the female, but western democratic societies (and others) are on the road towards correcting this. In the workplace females are rightly becoming recognised as the equal of males and an increasing number are reaching managerial and executive positions; and similar (but slower) progress is apparent in politics. There remains plenty of progress yet to be made but we are moving in the right direction. The biological fact remains though that it is the female who has babies, and it is nearly always the female who is better at caring for children, especially at the youngest ages. In this area of so-called “Equality” children deserve as much consideration as adults, and this work is as important as any other.

The premise is that you are the ones in charge, and entitled to order others to adopt theories that you are telling us are normal and sensible. They are anything but. This situation is exacerbated by the attempt to ban so-called “conversion therapy” – so you are calling for a one-way street, for youngsters who don’t fully understand the processes or their dangers to be flooded with your ideologies, encouraged to consider transgender changes, but not have a way back.

So-called “gender theory” is a dangerous load of nonsense and should be identified as such: moreover, it is causing huge inequalities, embarrassment, and potential danger, especially in sporting activities. Tens (possibly hundreds) of thousands of (biologically) female athletes may have to face the prospect of being beaten by (biological) males with stronger muscles and body structure, full of testosterone, posing as females: their lifelong hopes and ambitions, backed by years of intensive training, brought to nothing by a male cheat, pretending to be a woman. Imagine a failing, (biological) male rugby team deciding one year that the only way to win games would be for each member of the team to identify as a female – for one day a week of course – and play against a team of (biologically) female players. At the end of the season they would win their league, leaving behind a trail of broken bones, and possibly a death or two. That’s why I refer to it all as dangerous and nonsense, and it is leading to the exact opposite of what it claims. Ironically, and sadly, your claims for greater equality would achieve gross inequality.

As far as I am aware the rate of real transgenders is about one in ten thousand, and of course they should be treated with compassion and care, and as equals: forcing transgender ideas on the other 9,999 makes no sense whatever, and I am convinced that pushing these ideas on young children is a total disgrace. Certainly we should treat these real cases with understanding, compassion, and appropriate treatment: but attempting to bolster their numbers by trying to persuade youngsters that they could be transgender is scandalous.

I hope that this survey is also being directed at the Muslim communities as I would be very interested to hear their opinions.

Has the State ratified, signed, or adhered regional or international human rights treaties, declarations, programs or policies or any other international instruments aiming to address violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity that involve the implementation of a gender framework (for example gender theory, gender-based approaches, gender perspective, gender mainstreaming)?

a) if that is the case, has the State carried out evaluations, assessments or evidence-gathering about the impact of the implementation of such actions and, if so, what are the main trends identified?

b) if that is not the case, please provide information as to the reasons.

We don’t want violence or discrimination against any section of the population: to throw in, hello, it’s gender theory again, is naughty, and you are discriminating against those who would provide an escape route from transgenderism. We do know though, that there are some individuals who are using this gender theory nonsense to their own advantage, and this certainly needs to be identified and resolved in a decent manner. “Human rights” is a many-headed beast which should be handled thoroughly but sensibly and with care, as it can be used to try to justify some questionable ideas and activities that have little or nothing to do with human rights. As I have already shown, one person’s “human rights” can be a decrease or withdrawal of “human rights” for many others; and a recent tendency has been to boost the “human rights” of tiny minorities **at the expense of** the “human rights” of the majority.

What kinds of information and data are collected by States to identify forms of violence and discrimination faced by people based on sexual orientation and gender identity? Is the data designed to capture causes and patterns of violence and discrimination against lesbians, gay men, bisexual women, bisexual men, trans women, trans men, and gender diverse persons?

1. does this data collection take an intersectional approach (for example, connecting an individual’s multiple social categories to enable more precise analysis (e.g. collecting data about LGBT persons by identities such as race, age, national status and ethnicity)?
2. does the data include information on the relationship between victims and perpetrators?

That’s almost a fair question, although discrimination against **all** minorities (particularly the ones listed below) should be collected, analysed, and opposed. In the past homosexuals were treated cruelly and unfairly in this country and I applaud the improvements made here: my opinion is that gays and lesbians are a natural and intended part of creation (but not gay marriages). I also applaud the efforts made to remove any stigma attached to the tiny minority of true transgenders, and to help and support them. I doubt whether Muslims would agree with much of this, so in order to maintain the “human rights” of all you would need to agree the ways forward with our Muslim communities: there are more Muslims than transgenders in this country, they also have “human rights”, and democracy dictates that, while consideration should be given to the many minority viewpoints, actions should accord with the majority views. You know this of course.

Currently the main discrimination appears to be against:

1. ethnic minorities, although a lot of effort has been made to change this, and it is improving.
2. the Christian community who are charged with “hate speech” and even attacked physically or financially whenever they try to explain their views. This appears to be worsening, so maybe that’s an area that you should consider for a survey such as this one.
3. the L, G, and B groups still, I would think, for being different, but decreasing hopefully, and a lot less than the bad old days.

These groups have “human rights” too!

Is comprehensive sexuality education taught in schools?

1. if yes, please provide information as to the respective programs. Please provide examples (e.g. copies of curricula, citations to polices).
2. if not, are there efforts deployed by the State to establish and promote comprehensive sexual education, which incorporates diverse sexual orientation and gender identity perspectives? What have been the obstacles to adopt such policies or programs? Also, is the State adopting any alternative measures?

By “comprehensive sexuality” I’m guessing that you mean your own distorted and dangerous ideas, coming out of a tiny minority with a loud voice, and throwing shame and anger on anyone who opposes them. It seems that our so-called “democratic” countries are bowing to extreme pressure from small but loud minorities, and that our youngsters are being put at danger of doubts, insecurities, and dangerous (and maybe irreversible) decisions before they are old enough to understand the risks.

Are there examples where the concept of gender has been used in religious narratives or narratives of tradition, traditional values or protection of the family to hinder the adoption of legislative or policy measures aimed at addressing or eradicating violence and discrimination based on sex, gender, sexual orientation and gender identity?

You will be aware that **your** modern ideas are aimed against traditional/religious views that have been in force for millennia, and you appear here to be aiming to prevent all religious/traditional views to be aired. So, this is intended to be a ban on freedom of speech, and a ban on Christian ideas that have held our society together for many centuries. I can only hope that the wider population recognise your views and plans for the misleading, undemocratic, and dangerous process that it is. As I’ve emphasised before, “human rights” apply to all groups, and in a democratic society you should not be attempting to silence the views of any group. If you do, then we have to conclude that your ideas of “human rights” are wrong, and therefore dismiss your arguments. You can’t have it both ways!

Are there examples where a concept of gender has been used in religious, traditional, or indigenous narratives or values in a manner which promotes the acceptance of persons with diverse sexual orientations or gender identity, or protects LGBT individuals from violence and discrimination as well as covering a wider range of persons (for relevant examples, see para. 3 of the Independent Expert’s Report to the 73rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly)?

We don’t want violence or discrimination against anyone for their beliefs: but **you** are clearly discriminating against Christians, Jews, Muslims, and other groups with more traditional views. You are the ones who are displaying the discrimination!

Are there examples in which narratives or “gender ideology,” “genderism” or other gender-related concepts have been used to introduce regressive measures, in particular but not limited to LGBT persons or communities?

“Regressive”? You mean ones that don’t agree with your agenda? This appears to be a ban on freedom of speech. I am of the firm belief that your intentions/ambitions are the regressive ones, and would have serious long-term implications for our society, and dangers for many.

Are there initiatives taken by States in connection with the right to freedom of religion, belief or conscience (including the figure of conscientious objection) that have had the practical impact of limiting the enjoyment of human rights (including sexual and reproductive rights) of LGBT persons?

The “enjoyment of human rights” – where you are inventing the new meaning of “human rights”? Be aware that you are attempting to change the morality of democratic countries, suppressing and destroying the wisdom of perhaps 4,000 years. The reverse of your question is more like the truth. Who are you to decide on our behalf what the “sexual and reproductive rights” are – and what about the sexual and reproductive wrongs?

Have there been public expressions or statements by political and/or religious leaders that have led to indefinite extension, modification or suppression of actions, activities, projects, public policies or application of gender frameworks?

Freedom of speech is another casualty then. You appear to be wanting to act as a dictatorship! If I disagree with your distortions and bending of morality, then I should be free to express my opinions: I believe that it is one of my human rights. You do not have the sole right of determining for the rest of us what should be considered “right” and “wrong” (based on a tiny minority of influential people over a few recent years), applying the pressure such as this survey contains; and certainly not to suppress the rights of religious leaders and adherents to express their own views.

Who are main actors who argue that the defenders of human rights of LGBT individuals are furthering a so-called “gender ideology”? What are their main arguments? Have they been effective in regressing the human rights of LGBT individuals? Have their strategies directly or indirectly also impacted on the human rights of women and girls?

**You** are the ones who are pursuing a new approach to “sexual orientation and gender identity” – you admit it in your first question. But your question is surely an insidious one: what are you going to do with the names that you receive from this question? Could it possibly be a hate campaign? Once again, as in the case of “Equality”, “human rights” – which in this survey appears to mean what ***you*** want it to mean, works both ways, and your “human rights” restricts the “human rights” of a greater majority, **especially** women and girls.

Can you provide examples of coalitions working together on resisting attacks on gender ideology? Please share examples of feminist and LGBT and other groups working together and with what kinds of frameworks, arguments and results?

No.

What policies, programs and/or practices has the State adopted to meet Sustainable Development Goals 5 (gender equality) and 10 (reduced inequalities)? Do these rely on gender frameworks inclusive to diverse sexual orientations and gender identities and/or aiming to address violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity? Please identify relevant examples.

I don’t know the answer to your question, but I shall be sending this questionnaire with my replies to my MP, warning him about the dangers to freedom of speech, ruined youngsters’ lives, invasive questions, the country’s moral code, the “human rights” and equality of the majority, and democracy in general. I hope that your “Independent Expert” is indeed independent, but I don’t have much hope. And remember: one person’s “gender equality” is another person’s gender inequality; one person’s “human rights” is another person’s reduction in “human rights”, and it seems much fairer and more sensible to preserve and improve “gender equality” and “equality” in general for the majority. You are attempting the opposite.