

## **Sex and Relationship Education Conference, October 29, 2019**

A mandatory Relationship Education for Primary Schools and Sex and Relationship Education for Secondary Schools comes into force in the UK in September 2020 ([Department of Education 2019](#)).

Primary schools are encouraged to cover LGBT content in age appropriate ways; secondary schools *must* include LGBT content

In this presentation I will first explore the Dept of Education's rationale for the new curricula. I will then go onto critically examine it. My critique will look at the 'truths' of transgenderism, and the power of lobby groups to construct those truths and the new ethics of the classroom. I argue the school is now being asked to conspire in the invention of the 'transgender child' with appalling consequences for children

1. The Department of Education guidance for schools about teaching the new curricula state that the regulations are founded on and determined by the [Equality Act 2010](#)
2. The Act places specific duties on service providers and public bodies to consider the needs of particular groups of people who share protected characteristics: sex, sexual orientation and, for the first time protected by law 'gender reassignment'.
3. The Equality Act states that:  
'To be protected from gender reassignment discrimination, you do not need to have undergone any specific treatment or surgery to change from your birth sex to your preferred gender. This is because changing your physiological or other gender attributes is a personal process rather than a medical one.'

4. In 2014 Department of Education issued specific guidance about The Equality Act 2010 and Schools ([Department of Education, 2014](#)). This states that it became unlawful for schools to treat pupils less favourably because of their gender reassignment. In order to be protected under the Act, a pupil will not necessarily have to be undertaking a medical procedure to change their sex but must be taking steps to live in the opposite gender or proposing to do so.
5. The guidance directs the educationalist to a glossary of terminology on the GIRES website. Trans people ‘have a gender identity which differs from that of their (assigned) birth sex’. Let me explain: The biological sex of the child is no longer acknowledged as an empirical fact, it is ‘assigned’ by society (a boy might be truly a girl for example); on the other hand, ‘gender identity’ is a pre-social, ‘born’ property, akin to a soul. The ‘validity’ of this ‘truth’ is attested by the child because of his deeply felt internal sense of ‘femininity’
6. Notably the Dept of Ed guidance 2014 states that in single-sex classes ‘Pupils undergoing gender reassignment should be allowed to attend the single sex class that accords with the gender role in which they identify’.
7. The current 2019 DoE guidance about the new curricula says: The new subjects “represent a huge opportunity to help our children and young people develop ... personal attributes including kindness, integrity, generosity, and honesty”. They support children “in their own and others’ wellbeing and “help young people to become successful and happy adults who make a meaningful contribution to society”
8. Respecting the rights of the ‘transgender child’, and fostering tolerance and social inclusion, is based on the same principle of non-discrimination as non-discrimination of same-sex attracted children. In the new narrative of ‘gender identity’, schools have a role in eradicating transphobia.
9. These are laudable values. However, I argue the assertion that the new curricula move children forward to a more equal, healthy, and tolerant society is a chimera.

10. Although there is potential for the new curricula to genuinely promote children's rights by acknowledging (in age appropriate ways) the validity of same-sex relationships for example, there are a number of issues with regard to gender reassignment as a protected characteristic with which we should be critically concerned
11. Other speakers will specifically address some of these problems with regard e.g. to safeguarding children and the breach of girls' sex-based rights. Here I discuss the new language of sex and gender which has been developed by lobby groups and which is still evolving.
12. The theory and concepts of transgenderism have performed a lot of philosophical and ideological work in shaping societal values and sensibilities.
13. For example, this language justifies that a 'transwoman' is 'real': not that he is a male human being who has a right to identify as female, but that he really IS a woman and has been since birth i.e. he was born female. In this narrative the transwoman or transman can't help being trans - it isn't a social/psychological phenomenon, as in earlier psychotherapeutic model of transgenderism (now outlawed in 2017 by the [Memorandum of Understanding](#) against conversion therapy which the NHS has signed up to). He IS a woman, a fact for which he is not responsible, and which it is transphobic to even question.
14. Let us see how this state of affairs gets played out in gender medicine.  
Dr James Barratt, Lead Clinician at the NHS Gender Identity Clinic (GIC) for adults [argues](#) that binary sex in the human mammal is 'less than common sense'. The empirical examples he gives to justify his claim are shameful coming out of the mouth of someone who describes himself as a "practitioner scientist". His examples are the reproductive variations in plants, molluscs, some insects and amphibians, reptiles and fish!

With regard to the concept of inherent gender identity he immediately moves to a social justice footing, equating homosexuality with transgender identity, and the social progress of allowing, in both groups equally, the expression of the ‘true self’.

15. This alignment of homosexuality with transgenderism, presenting LGBT as one homogenous group with the same ethical concerns and political interests, has been a strategic move for the T lobbyists which has grave consequences for women and girls
16. Secondly, with regard to the conceptual reversal of sex and gender – sex as socially constructed, ‘gender identity’ as inherent – such views, when percolated through the culture, have political and ethical consequences for ALL children. The claim that an adult man (or woman) was born in the wrong body positively *requires* the *invention* of the existential ‘transgender child’
17. In the Book [\*Inventing Transgender Children and Young People\*](#) (Moore and Brunskell-Evans, 2019), I explore the role of the Tavistock NHS Gender Identity Development Services (GIDS) in inventing the ‘transgender child’ and the serious safeguarding issues, both social and medical, which have emerged as a consequence
18. The Tavistock service has at its core the redefinition of sex and of gender defined by transgender theory and activism. It also has close relationships with influential lobby groups (Mermaids, GIRES, Gendered Intelligence)
19. A Consultant Clinical Psychologist at the clinic, Dr Sarah Davidson, [says](#) that when The Equality Act recognised gender reassignment this was a “seismic change”. “To be able to self-define [as trans, non-binary, pan-gender, gender fluid] rather than be defined by the powerful authorities ... has huge implications for .... schools, who are socialising agents. They must respond to that shift in viewpoint”.  
  
“Trans students are at risk of having higher levels of bullying and stigma that need to be addressed at the systemic and structural level, not at an individual level.”

For example, “Gendered Intelligence’, and ... Allsorts in Brighton ... are trying to work with school to enable people ...to have the education opportunities they should have”.

“By challenging the heteronormativity of the dominant world view and providing alternative voices and experiences ... it’s much more enabling for a wide group of people. That’s progress”.

20. Davidson’s ‘truth’ of ‘gender identity’ bears no relationship to biological fact or progressive values. Far from challenging heteronormativity, orthodox ideas about gender are reproduced. Simply put, a child with a boy’s body can have been born with a ‘pink brain’
21. The invention of the ‘transgender child’ results in the abuse of children who, as a result of puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones, have their rights breached to physical health and bodily integrity. They face the near certainty of life-long medical problems, including the reduction of adult sexual pleasure often replaced by pain, and of course sterility. Moreover, the Tavistock deems some children capable of giving full, free and informed consent to set upon a life-course with such permanent consequences despite the fact that they are developmentally incompetent to do so. Gender confused children are thus also deprived of their right to adult care, protection and oversight.
22. The invention of the ‘transgender child’ also contributes to the abuse of the rights of *all* children and young people: the rights to factual knowledge of human biology, to social conditions compatible with mental health, including freedom from the current confusion arising from the adult obsession with ‘gender identity’. Children are not freed from gender stereotypes but bound ever closer to traditional ideas of what it is to be a girl or a boy, a woman or a man.
23. In conclusion, Peter Tatchell, the UK doyen of gay rights activism, appeared on ITV’s This Morning in March to talk about some parents’ objections to the new Relationship Education for primary school children. He argued that trans inclusivity should be promoted the earliest stage possible. He said: “The curriculum is pure”.

In this narrative there are only two positions: His version of liberalism; sexually repressed bigotry or religious fundamentalism.

24. We must mobilise to intervene into this binary narrative
25. The new curriculum is anything but innocent. It helps mobilise profound injustices right under our very noses, as demonstrated above.
26. Teachers, educationalists, educational policy makers are *not* just being asked to nurture all children and to teach tolerance, they are in effect being induced to legally comply in the *co-creation*, with medicine and trans lobby groups, of the ‘transgender child’.
27. I have come to the conclusion that if there is social and intuitional pressure NOT to say something it is probably the very thing that needs saying: in my own experience, whether that pressure comes, irony of ironies, from the WEP; whether it comes from individuals (“uncut sisters”) in balaclavas and masks physically blocking, with their male bodies, my taking up a speaking engagement, while screaming at me I’m a Nazi; or whether it comes from a legal firm representing the Tavistock wanting a pre-publication copy of the book to make sure it “contributes to the debate in a fair, accurate and positive manner” with regard to the Tavistock’s “evidence based medicine and good clinical practice”.
28. It is imperative for progressive groups and organisations inside and outside of gender medicine and education to collectively challenge the narrative of the ‘transgender child’ despite the ferocious political backlash it will inevitably entail, including accusations of transphobia. The ‘transgender child’ is a fabrication, a figment. If we all join together, we can turn the tide of this mounting injustice – this ‘madness’ – being even further perpetrated on children and their bodies not only by gender medicine but by the education system in the guise of progressivism.

