

The Consequences of Misdiagnosing Transgender Conditions as Personality Disruptions Driven by Motives of Desire, Behaviour and Sex: Instead of Personality Variations Driven by a Search for Coherence of Identity and Fulfilment of Life

Susan Gilchrist

10 February 2026

SuT0223a

256P

For many centuries, the practice of homosexuality, transsexuality and all gender and sexually variant behaviour was condemned; regardless of purpose, as intrinsically ordered acts of grave depravity, pursuing illicit, perverted, or inappropriate sex. These condemnations are still enforced in many parts of the world today where severe penalties; sometimes the death penalty applies. Little could change before 1967 in the United Kingdom when consenting same-sex sexual act between adults in private were decriminalised. Since that time a transformation has taken place: From one where all gender and sexually variant behaviour was considered to be intrinsically disordered perversions, which involve desires for a role or the attractions of sex: Into one where people now recognise that these activities are instead about searches for a coherence of identity; and can celebrate them in same-sex marriages and other acts. Where, allowing transgender people to legally self-identify their gender is part of that same rationale. And that has now created a vast amount of clinical, medical, research and social understanding; which is expressed in the scientific consensus adopted by the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions: who consider transgender conditions to be personality variations, core elements of the personality that is created, searches for belonging; with no danger to others, and fulfilment of life: Where their expression is a human right. Many thousands have transitioned without issues of abuse. And that has led to four decades of full acceptance; where society and the Courts, have included transgender people in the category of women. And have always maximised the inclusion of transgender people in everyday life, since the Sex Discrimination Act of 1975

Within six years that has gone from full acceptance of transgender identities as core elements of the personality that is created: To the current adoption by the United Kingdom Supreme Court, together with the UK Government, and the UK Equality and Human Rights Commission, of a diagnosis which relies on the views of gender-critical groups, including “*Sex matters*” and others: Who deny the legitimacy of transgender identities as personality variations; and as core elements of the personality and identity: By reducing them to personality disruptions, and as perversions, paraphilias or disruptions of the gender role; which are driven by motives of desire, behaviour and sex: This relies on Freud: but it specifically dismisses or denies the impacts of the major neural and cognitive transformations and changes during the first three years of life: So that the development of transgender conditions is presumed to take place through sexual motives and cognition alone: The same dismissal is encountered in the Supreme Court’s conclusion: Which determines that “*biological sex*”, instead of the “*performance of gender*”, should be the sole gateway for legal regulation: That transgender women must be considered as “*men*” for the purpose of the 2010 Equality Act: Also that transgender women are no longer permitted to call themselves; or legally be identified as women, for access to social activities, spaces and services, although the word “*trans woman*” may be used: That the correctness of all future gender and sexual behaviour “*can be determined by birth assigned sex*” or by inspection of the genitals at birth”. This exclusion of trans women from the category of “*woman*” transforms an approach, which had previously sought to maximise the inclusion of transgender women in everyday life into one which, by default, excludes them from women’s groups; presumes that transgender women are as great a danger to women as all men in public and private spaces, it imposes caution and it maximises exclusion instead. Where the total failures of the Court, to consider the impact of the major transformations and changes in neural and cognitive capabilities during the first three years of life, is dismissed by whole swathes of expert opinion as being “*unfounded, transgender exclusive and incorrect*”.

Given that this is a toxic conflict between those who consider gender identity to be a core element of the personality that is created, and those who consider it to be a disruption of the gender role, it should have been expected that a detailed comparison of these two approaches would have been undertaken, but it has not. By its own admission, and also in its judgement, the Court adopts the understanding of “*Sex matters*”, that transgender conditions are perversions, paraphilias or disruptions of (male) homosexuality or the gender role: Where the motives are desires for a role or the attractions of sex. The Court Judgement states that transgender women are as equally protected under the protected characteristic of “*gender reassignment*” as lesbian and gay people are under the characteristic of “*sexual orientation*”. And that “*its decision should not be taken a win for either side*”. But these statements can only be correct if both are considered core elements of the personality; or both are seen as the product of sexual drives. I find no evidence in the Court documents to show that the Supreme Court attempted to properly and equitably consider the viewpoints of the World Authorities and Professional Institutions. It does not refer to them in its judgement, and where it may infer these, it identifies them as unreliable and incorrect. The Court’s refusal to accept the intervention of the “*Good Law Project*”; along with at least one other, also meant that expert opinion, which would have provided a counterpoint to the arguments was denied. Without any other expert input the advances in science, clinical, medical, experiential evidence and public understanding since the 1960s are also denied: Lord Hodge, one of the Supreme Court Justices has since said: said that he expected outrage from transgender people since “*something they thought they had was being taken away from them*”. But what has been taken away is of the Court’s own doing: What is taken away from transgender people is their reliance on the viewpoint of the World Authorities and Professional Institutions, who recognise that transgender identities are core elements of the personality that is created, searches for coherence of identity, personality variations; and expressions of human rights ... So that in place of recognising that transgender conditions are personality variations; with no danger to others, the Court defines them as personality disruptions with perils to others, because they are driven by motives of desire, behaviour, or sex: Instead of recognising that the expression of transgender identities, is a human right, it turns it into a permission. In place of accepting that transgender drives and identities are gender incongruences; which search for a coherence of identity; and are core elements of the personality that is created, they are presented instead as mere feelings or beliefs; and reduced to perversions, paraphilias or disruptions of the gender role, and as disturbances of sex.

This is a summary and an introduction. More details are given in the documents which follow, or which can be accessed in an extended version of this document, via <https://www.tqdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransIntroExtra.pdf>

Supporting Information:

There are three documents in particular that are likely to be most useful

Full references and cross references to original sources are given in many of these documents, which have been written with academic peer review in mind.

The first: Gilchrist, S (2026) *“How and Why Transgender Conditions are Misdiagnosed as Personality Disruptions Driven by Motives of Desire, Behaviour and Sex: Instead of Personality Variations Driven by a Search for Coherence of Identity and Fulfilment of Life”*. : <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransDiagnosis.pdf> (10 pages.)

This gives a more detailed description of early development

The Second: Gilchrist, S. (2025): *“Transgender Misdiagnoses and Human Rights”*: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransRights.pdf> (Fully referenced document)

Examines in more detail the human rights element

The Third :Gilchrist, S: (2025) *“Actions of the United Kingdom Supreme Court and the Diagnosis of Transgender Conditions”*: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransActions.pdf> (Fully referenced document)

Is an overall account of how development takes place

Precis of each of these documents follow

And a further list of resource documents is included at the end

Introductions

Gilchrist, S. (2026): *“The Impact and Consequences of Misdiagnosing Transgender Conditions as Personality Disruptions Driven by Motives of Desire, Behaviour and Sex: Instead of Personality Variations Driven by a Search for Coherence of Identity and Fulfilment of Life”*: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransIntroFull.pdf> (Text 3 pages)

Gilchrist, S. (2026): *“The Impact, Notes, and Consequences of Misdiagnosing Transgender Conditions as Personality Disruptions Driven by Motives of Desire, Behaviour and Sex: Instead of Personality Variations Driven by a Search for Coherence of Identity and Fulfilment of Life”*: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransIntroExtra.pdf> (Text 3 pages)

Gilchrist, S. (2026): *“The Consequences of Misdiagnosing Transgender Conditions as Personality Disruptions Driven by Motives of Desire, Behaviour and Sex: Instead of Personality Variations Driven by a Search for Coherence of Identity and Fulfilment of Life”*: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransIntro.pdf> (Text 1 page)

Resource Documents

Full references and cross references to original sources are given in many of these documents which have been written with academic peer review in mind.

Gilchrist, S. (2013d): *“Personality Development and LGB&T People: A New Approach”*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/201P-PersonalityDevelopmentAndLGBTPeople.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2024): *“What is a Woman?”*: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/255P-WhatsAWoman.pdf> . (Text: 15 pages). This is a document I prepared for intervention in advance of the Supreme Court hearing.

Gilchrist, S (2026) *“How and Why Transgender Conditions are Misdiagnosed as Personality Disruptions Driven by Motives of Desire, Behaviour and Sex: Instead of Personality Variations Driven by a Search for Coherence of Identity and Fulfilment of Life”*. : <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransDiagnosis.pdf> (10 pages.)

Gilchrist, S. (2025): *“What Happens when you Misdiagnose Transgender Conditions?”* <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-WhatHappens.pdf> (Text:13 pages).

Gilchrist, S. (2025): “*What Happens when you Misdiagnose Transgender Conditions: Abstract*” <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-WhatHappensAbstract.pdf> (Text 1 page)

Gilchrist, S. (2025): “*Transgender Diagnoses and Issues*” www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransgenderIssues (4 pages)

Gilchrist, S. (2025) “*A Challenge the Supreme Court Decision and the Revised EHRC Guidance for Transgender Access to Spaces and Services*”: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransDamage.pdf> (Text 1 page)

Gilchrist, S. (2025) “*Why the Supreme Court is Mistaken in its Understanding of Transgender Conditions*”: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransMisdiagnosis.pdf> (Text 2 pages)

Gilchrist, S. (2025) “*Why You should Contest the Supreme Court Decision and the Revised EHRC Guidance for Transgender Access to Spaces and Services*”: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransContest.pdf> (Text 2 pages)

Gilchrist, S. (2025) “*Actions of the United Kingdom Supreme Court and the Diagnosis of Transgender Conditions*”: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransActions.pdf>. (Text 20 pages)

Gilchrist, S. (2025) “*Judgement of the United Kingdom Supreme Court and the Diagnosis of Transgender Conditions*”: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransJudgement.pdf>. (Text 31 pages: Draft)

Gilchrist, S. (2025): “*The Misdiagnosis of Transgender Conditions by the Supreme Court*”: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransDevelopment.pdf> (Text 3 pages)

Gilchrist, S. (2025) “*Transgender Misdiagnoses and Human Rights: Overview*” <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransRightsIntro.pdf> (Text 1 page)

Gilchrist, S. (2025) “*Transgender Misdiagnoses and Human Rights: Introduction*” <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransRightsIntro.pdf> (Text 9 pages)

Gilchrist, S. (2025): “*Transgender Misdiagnoses and Human Rights*”: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransRights.pdf> (Text 14 pages)

The following two documents were submitted to The Parliamentary Women and Equalities Select Committee, and the joint Committee of the House of Commons and the House of Lords on Human Rights in June 2025.

Gilchrist, S. (2025) “*Verdict of the United Kingdom Supreme Court: Overview of the Effects of Misdiagnoses and the Independence of the Cass and Sullivan Reports*”: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransVerdictOverview.pdf>. (2 pages)

Gilchrist, S. (2025) “*Verdict of the United Kingdom Supreme Court: The Consequences of Misdiagnoses and the Independence of the United Kingdom Cass and Sullivan Reports*”: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransVerdict.pdf> (50 pages. Draft)

Gilchrist, S. (2022): “*No Blacks, No Irish, No Homosexuals, No Transgender People*”: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/252P-NoBlacks.pdf>

Not all of these documents have been completed: But all have been taken as far as necessary for this study

My full bibliography is available at www.tgdr.co.uk Contact at: sgen4144@gmail.com

© Susan Gilchrist 2025