

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

Susan Gilchrist

10 February 2026

Extra

SuT0307c

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 (EHRC), 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 presumption that gender identity develops through the action of cognition and sexual motives alone also leads to a false “*gender ideology*” being imposed on transgender people, which alleges that these people can “*choose, change or deny biological sex*”. The claim that transgender people sometimes make that “*they are born into the wrong body*” does not question the reality and

immutability of biology. Instead, it refers to the gender incongruences that emerge before we can consciously be aware of them: And in place of challenging biology, transgender people look for the variations, in physiology which may trigger the direction development takes. So, these senses of discord can be felt to have been present from the beginning of life. My concern over these matters led me from 2011 to conduct an examination into early development, which concentrates on the period from birth to the ages of three to four years. It begins by using the work of René Girard; an anthropologist, in the 1950s, Richard Dawkins; an evolutionary biologist, in the 1970s, also Vittorio Gallese, a neurologist in the 1990s, although this study has been kept up to date and the work of many others has been used. Far from ignoring this early period. It is shown that early development is propelled by an innate overwhelming force, which dominates from birth and gradually comes under control as the powers of cognition come into increasing effect. And were core elements of personality and identity coalesce from fragmented thought during a unique period of neural development, around the age of thirteen months to two years. By mapping how development takes place during the first three to four years of life I show how the psychological and physiological aspects of brain development can act pro-actively together to form a finely tuned system in which the maximum amounts of individuality, possessiveness, intelligence, and inquisitiveness, together with the minimum degrees of energy expenditure are generated. Where the variation in human physiology and other factors leads to a wide range of stable long-term core or foundational gender identities for everyone being created, including incongruent identities, without any obvious cause: This accords with the scientific consensus adopted by the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions who consider transgender conditions to be *"naturally expected variations of the human condition, intrinsic to the personality created, arising very early in life, and cannot be changed either by the individual concerned or by the predations of others in subsequent life"*: And it is this scientific consensus, which has been gathered over the many years of research, social, experiential, clinical and medical evidence: which justifies treating transgender conditions as personality variations and searches of coherence of identity which involve no danger to others, and give a sense of belonging and fulfilment of life.

This is in place of those who ignore the impact of these early and pre-cognitive development processes and try to enforce a diagnosis on transgender people which alleges that they are personality disruptions, and as perversions, paraphilias of the gender role, driven by motives of desire, behaviour, and sex. Instead of using this study solely to focus on transgender conditions, I have used these conditions as case studies to get greater insights into how personalities and identities for all of us are created. And until the concept of cognition is recast; from one which provides the driving force which propels early development: into one which creates order out of disorder, I conclude that many people will continue to come under attack. There are still many psychologists, psychiatrists, sociologists, educationalists who continue to presume that cognition is the primary organising force which drives development forward and ignore these earlier effects. In 2020 the UK Government commissioned Dr Hilary Cass to conduct a review on the pathways for the treatment and management of transgender children. By adopting a frame of reference for her report which excludes consideration of the major transformations and changes during the first three years; with her throwaway remark that the work of Kohlberg in 1966 *"still resonates today"*: leads me to conclude that Cass considers all relevant development to be confined to the gender role, and to cognitive processes alone. Which is the same as other practitioners at Kohlberg's time. In a separate critique of the Cass report I further conclude that this leads to timescales for development that are longer than any of the psychodynamic theories would predict: And that the neural transformations and changes ... which Cass recognises do exist, are considered by her to have minimal influence before puberty comes into effect: Cass rightly points out that caution in social transition is needed because of its impact on the social pathway it sets, and that there are deficiencies in current studies. That is pointed out in the Oxford University investigations which she commissioned. And I also believe that an amount of caution is needed because of the bipolar nature of these conflicts. But I conclude that her statement that the research which explains the development of transgender conditions is *"remarkably weak"*, is because her report misdiagnoses transgender conditions; by forcing a regression to traditional values, because the whole of pre-cognitive development is ignored, and that she is looking in the wrong place for the evidence she requires. The Cass report has been internationally criticised by Professional Institutions for its disregard of pre-pubertal influences and inconsistencies in its approach. Cass argues that more research is urgently required: and she emphasises the importance of endocrinal, or hormonal, effects, and reduced muscle strength. In my own work I suggest it is these: rather than a genetic switch has the greater effect. Cass does point out the danger of following ideologies and extremes on both sides: But this conflict is largely a battle between those who consider gender identity to be a core element of the personality that is created: Against those who pursue the argument that transgender conditions are *"perversions, paraphilias, disruptions or deviations of the gender role, driven by motives of sex"*. And the reliance; by Cass on cognition, means she must endorse the latter approach.

Cass does not claim to diagnose transgender conditions, but her examination requires it. And in a detailed analysis I conclude that the whole of her report represents a restatement of traditional values, which does not address the issues involved. While I do not doubt Cass's sincerity and intention I believe that her failure to provide a truly independent and objective review has had a major impact on all future developments: And that is why I have called for a judicial review of the Cass report in an earlier paper. The Supreme Court also fails to address these advances, and it comes to a similar conclusion, with its endorsement of a corresponding cognitive and sex based approach: So that its own disregard of pre-cognitive development; and its dismissal of the advances in research and the clinical, medical and experiential evidence which has become available: has led to the dismissal of its judgement and analysis by whole swathes of expert opinion as *"unfounded, transgender exclusive and incorrect"*. So that the result of ignoring all pre-cognitive development and the neural and cognitive transformations during the first three years of life: by Cass, by the Court and others, and this reliance on cognition and sexual motives alone, does not just misdiagnose transgender conditions as dangers to others because they are understood to be driven by motives of desire behaviour and sex: It dismisses the scientific, social and experiential consensus which shows that transgender conditions are internally focussed searches for coherence of identity; with no harm to others, which seeks belonging and fulfilment of life. While I do not presume to judge the Court's intention: Its use of the criterion of *"biological sex"* to deny the legitimacy any form of gender and sexually variant behaviour, regardless of purpose, when all other aspects of gender is determined by the *"performance of gender"*, is strongly redolent of a traditional Christian teaching: Which dates only from the 12th Century, where all gender and sexually variant behaviour; also regardless of purpose, are condemned as intrinsically disordered acts of grave depravity; which pursue immoral or inappropriate sex.

This should not always be considered as a conflict between enemies. The word *"paraphilia"* is used to replace the word *"perversion"*, because it is without the negative connotations that the word *"perversion"* implies. A popular explanation of male to female transsexuality is the claim that these conditions are paraphilias of (male) homosexuality: with no threat to others, because the love for the other is turned inwards towards themselves (*Autogynephilic transsexuality*). It is natural for people to question their gender, and for many, the questioning resolves itself. But for a minority it does not. Cass and gender-critical groups claim that many

who do not transition, turn out to be homosexual men: But as wide a range of sexualities are found within the transgender population as are found in the rest of society: And when gender and sexuality are in conflict, it is invariably gender that wins out. Extreme trauma often arises from the battles that take place, and when the motives, methods of management and timescales differ to the extent that what one group considers an approach of compassion and concern, is instead considered to be one of recruitment and coercion by the other; it is essential to get the diagnosis correct. There should be no magic needed for correctly managing transgender conditions: for the different methods required for treating personality disruptions and personality variations are well known; used in many other circumstances, where methods involving acceptance and those akin to compulsions may be required, when a diagnosis of personality variations is made. Since the behaviours are also so different it should be easy for anyone who is so minded; to tell the two conditions apart. Anyone or any group who totally ignores the impact of the first three years by defining transgender condition as *“perversions, paraphilias, or disruptions of the gender role”* must also dismiss the trauma that transgender people face. This dismissal creates a great deal of anger for transgender people: And major harm can be created when the diagnosis is incorrect. However, the situation has been made more difficult because these neural and cognitive transformations all take place before we can be consciously aware of them. As a small and often hidden minority, transgender people are vulnerable to what others say about them. Transgender people can additionally be likened to immigrants or emigrants who cross a notional binary gender divide. For some this can be a coming home to being themselves. For others the strength of the transgender intrusions may interpreted as an attack on women’s identities safety and lives. And for most people it is natural to assume that gender identity should always be congruent with biological sex. This has now led to a worldwide regression against the acceptance of transgender people: It has been adopted by populist governments who take a *“woke”* approach. Which is now seen in the United States of America but is also being applied against all gender and sexually variant people in many parts of the world.

The horrendous male discrimination, suppression, abuse, and violence against women can never be minimised, and the fear of all males as predators or attackers that this creates must always be recognised. But there cannot be any justification for a Court enforcing a diagnosis on transgender people which relies on ignoring all pre-cognitive development, and the major transformations and changes, which have been shown to take place during the first three years of life ... Without being able to prove they are correct. Most modern definitions of gender divide it into two components. The first concerns the development of the *“Core Gender Identity”*. It involves the process of *“separating the self from the other”* and creates a deep-seated sense of belonging without any behavioural implications, which involves the search for coherence of identity and not drives of sex. The second is the *“Gender Role Identity”*, which requires a certain level of self-awareness and cognition to have developed: to be able to respond to what others, society, and the environment expects: where either or both usually; but need not always be congruent with biological sex. This separation of gender and sexuality is experienced in the transgender communities. Because of this, as wide a range of sexualities; and respect for sexualities, are found within these communities as that in the wider population. The 2004 Gender Recognition Act considers transgender, non-binary and consistent gender identities to be personality variations and human rights through their *“the performance of gender”*: and lesbian, gay, bisexual and heterosexual identities, through *“the performance of love and sex”*. The right of privacy which protects *“the physiology of sex”* is also a human right. So that the 2004 Gender Recognition Act and the 2010 Equality Act, gives access to spaces and services on the correct balance between these three independent rights

The Gender Recognition Act also recognises that *“men, women, male, and female”* are used interchangeably: And it defines the term *“legal sex”* to ensure that interpretation is always made in the context which is correct. Also, where the distinction needs to be made on an individual basis it is only necessary to use the terms *“men”* and *“women”* to describe their performances of gender; and the terms *“male”* and *“female”* to describe the physiology of sex. I believe that this would be acceptable to many transgender people. That separation and independence of gender from sex gives permission for lesbian and gay groups to exclude transgender people from membership; and vice versa, for proportionate and justified reasons. It permits transgender groups to exclude lesbian and gay people from its membership, provided equivalent proportionate reasons apply. And it permits the provision of single-sex groups in women’s refuges, swimming groups, changing rooms, cultural groups, clubs etc on the grounds of the protection of privacy and the *“physiology of sex”*: While also recognising that transgender people should always be treated as members of the gender they identify; with unless exemption is granted on an objectively justified basis. It furthermore requires that transgender women are included by default in the category of *“women”*: because their shared *“performances of gender”* are both human rights. And vice-versa for men. It might be argued that when rights are in conflict, then any policy is a permission. But I consider these arguments are about the removal of a right: And no whole group should ever be held to ransom because one person objects.

Lord Hodge has stated that, while the Supreme Court requires that single-sex facilities must always be available, it does not mandate how this should be implemented. That may include the provision of individual cubicles or other facilities for anyone who feels uncomfortable; or has an alternative need to use them. But I conclude there should be no grounds for automatic exclusion of transgender women from any club, service, facility, or communal space when clothes or surgery hide the differences that arise: That can give appropriate access to toilets. It also maximises the inclusion of transgender people in everyday life and it gives the protections where required. However, adopting gender-critical ideology which reduces transgender conditions to perversions, paraphilias or disruptions of sex destroys all these rights. And that enforces the total exclusion which the Court now applies directly to the interpretation of the 2010 Equality Act. I conclude that the similar act of the Supreme Court in identifying transgender conditions as paraphilias, perversions, or disruptions of the gender role; driven by motives of desire, behaviour or sex, destroys this inclusion as a human right, by turning it into a permission: It causes great harm to transgender people, since it implies that transgender women are as great a danger as all males are in public and private spaces. It invalidates the operation and intention of the 2004 Gender Recognition Act. And it removes the protection of transgender identities and their privacies as human rights. I also presume that the judgement of the High Court on the 13th February 2026 can only be lawful, if the expression of transgender identities is treated as a permission under this Court judgement, instead of a right. And that the recent High Court Judgement is inconsistent because it applies the principles of maximising inclusion to public areas, but not to workplace rights.

This is a much broader issue than the judgement of the Supreme Court. In view of the toxic nature of the dispute over transgender issues, it should be expected that people *“at a distance”* would be appointed for equality purposes, and to conduct independent reviews. Nevertheless, the head of the EHRC until the 1st December 2025 was Baroness Kishwer Falkner, who is a strong advocate of a *“radical gender-critical”* approach. She was appointed by the UK Government in December 2020, under the then premiership of Liss Truss. The Cass Report, which was commissioned in Autumn 2020, under the same Conservative Government, has been criticised internationally for its regressive approach, as it is in my own. And the continued total reliance on a radical

gender-critical ideology by Stock, Rippon, Sullivan and others: which presumes that cognition and sexual motives alone drive development forward: means that the current advances continue to be denied. In February 2024, a UK Government sponsored review, led by Professor Alice Sullivan, was asked to examine how public bodies collect data on sex and gender. And her emphasis on sex; with the relative disregard of gender is a feature of her report. Therefore, a question that has to be asked: is about why Professor Sullivan was commissioned to conduct an *"independent review"*, when she is known to be prominently involved in *"Sex matters"*, and is a strong advocate of a *radical gender-critical* approach. On the 4th August 2025 it was announced that Dr. Mary-Ann Stephenson would be appointed as the new Chair of the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC). She assumed her role on December 1, 2025. Her appointment was subject to review by the Parliamentary Women and Equalities committee and the House of Lords Joint Committee on Human Rights. This Government has gone ahead with this appointment, despite the fact that, Sarah Owen and David Alton, the Chairs of both Committees have since written to the equalities minister Bridget Phillipson stating *"However, it is with regret that we do not feel we can endorse her appointment to the role at this time"*. Where a significant concern by the Committees was over transgender matters, and her advocacy of a radical gender-critical campaigner. In July 2025 the UK Government Department for Science, Innovation and Technology published a report on *"Independent review of data, statistics and research on sex and gender"*, in universities and academia, authored by Professor Alice Sullivan. Again, it is astonishing that a key campaigner for *"Sex Matters"* was asked to conduct an independent review. In all of this work I find that there is no evidence of the viewpoints of the World Authorities and Professional Institutions being properly considered. Also, there can only be one answer when only one option is considered. And this is despite the international criticisms, and the many concerns that these bodies and many other groups have raised. While I do not dispute the integrity of Cass, Sullivan, Rippon, Stock and others, in their approach to their work, it is surely not appropriate for any Government or Commission to fail to ensure that truly independent reviews are conducted: Which do not sufficiently test the reliability of the evidence presented; and without any proper justification: dismiss a diagnosis which considers transgender conditions to be searches for coherence of identity, belonging, and fulfilment of life: with no harm to others. And instead, imposes a diagnosis which destroys the legitimacy of transgender identities, by presenting them as perversions, paraphilias or disruptions of (male) homosexuality or the gender role; driven by motives of behaviour, desire and sex, where transgender women are considered to be as great a danger to women as all men in public and private spaces. And where the major pre-cognitive and transformational changes in the first three to four years of life are denied.

The Court makes it clear that its decisions and interpretations can only be applied to the 2010 Equality Act. Which means that the diagnosis can be challenged in other areas, such as for puberty blockers. Where an accurately argued Court hearing might find the correct approach. No diagnosis can be bounded by legislation. The Court states that transgender people are as equally protected under the characteristic of *"gender reassignment"* as lesbian and gay people are under the characteristic of *"sexual orientation"*: but protection is not the same as a right. It should have been expected that the Court would have considered it essential to conduct a full comparison between the understanding of the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions, who consider gender and sexual identities to be independently functioning core elements of the personality that is created. Against the gender-critical approaches that are adopted by of the EHRC and like-minded groups: And that it would have accepted the representations of the *"Good Law Project"* and others. But I find no evidence of this. Or any explanation of why the Court accepted an ideology, which totally ignores pre-cognitive development and the neural transformations and changes during the first three years of life, without confirming that it is correct: Particularly when; in this study, I show that what happens during this period has a crucial effect. No approach can be valid if testing and experiential evidence does not support it. And I question why the Court has failed to critically examine the attempts by *"Sex matters"* and other groups who impose a diagnosis which alleges that transgender conditions are sexually motivated perversions or disruptions of male homosexuality, or of the gender role. When this is strongly opposed by transgender people: Because it does not match in any way the reality of transgender experiences; since their search for coherence of identity, not drives of sex. I conclude that all of these failures are manifestations of the gender-critical ideology adopted by Cass, Sullivan, Stock, Rippon and others, which are expressed in the diagnosis adopted by the Supreme Court, where *"inspection of the genitals at birth is sufficient to determine the appropriateness of all future gendered and sexual behaviour"*: with the argument that, *"unless some sexually motivated perversion or disruption occurs, gender identity should always be congruent with biological sex"*.

Transgender and all gender and sexually variant people are vulnerable because all of these processes happen before we can consciously be aware of them, and whenever they are dismissed or ignored, it is natural for most people to presume that this statement by the Court is correct. In addition, we cannot develop any sense of gender before we have contact with others, for gender identity depends on recognising difference, and it is therefore a consequent effect. The ability to recognise this difference through the experiential, clinical and medical evidence now available has led to the modern understanding of gender, which divides into two components: The first is the core gender identity; which is an inner sense of belonging without behavioural implications: And the second is the gender role identity which uses cognition to read the expectations of others and to respond to what others expect. It is also well known that either; or both of these elements, usually, but need not always be congruent with the expectations of *"biological sex"*. However, none of the social learning and psychodynamic theories used today are able to explain what happens during this early pre-cognitive period, because they rely on cognition to explain their effects. Freud recognised that some strong innate force drives development forward, but he too relied on cognition for his explanations: So, he treated what happened during this early period as unknown; and he presumed that the driving forces are motives of sex. Gender-critical groups specifically deny that anything of significance exists. That leads to the source of the present dispute, between those who recognise that transgender condition are searches for coherence of identity, and those who presume they are drives of sex. And it creates the disagreement between those who ignore these pre-cognitive development processes and presume that cognition and sexual motives alone drive development forward: And against those who recast cognition into a process that creates order out of disorder: and acknowledges the impact of these pre-cognitive effects. Moreover, when the motives, timescales and methods of management of these two approaches differ to the extent that what one side considers to be those of compassion and concern, are almost inevitably regarded as recruitment, grooming, capture, and coercion by the other, it is essential to get the diagnosis correct. There is also a dispute in neurology between those cognitive neurologists and allies, including Cass, Sullivan, Stock, Rippon, and others who rely on cognition for their answers: Against behaviourist neurologists and others, who consider the pre-cognitive effects. This is why in my own examination I have used the work of behaviourist neurologists and others including Girard, Gallese, Dawkins and others which show that the core elements of personality and identity coalesce from fragmented thought during a unique period of neural development, around the age of thirteen months to two years. A different endpoint is reached for every individual. So that transgender identities are as firmly held as they are for every person whose gender identity aligns with biological sex. Aggression follows the same pattern; and it is now well established that, although on average there are significant differences in male and

female behavioural patterns, considerable overlap occurs: Therefore, the search for coherence of identity is the same for everyone, regardless of sex. And it means that, transgender women must be considered as women, because they share in the same “performances of gender” from early in life. This means that transgender women are of no greater threat to other women in public and private places, despite the many allegations that are made: And that issue is addressed in my other work. This is why I confirm that the scientific consensus adopted by the Professional Institutions and World Authorities, who recognise that transgender conditions are searches for coherence of identity and fulfilment of life is the correct approach.

I find no support in neurology for the type of gender-critical approach which the Supreme Court now endorses: Almost every study or handbook shows that the core elements of gender and sexual identities develop independently from a single complex, very early in life. Investigators such as Joel, Swaab and others state that, because discrete gender differentiated neural pathways cannot be found, it should not be assumed that none exists. The theory of “autogynephilic transsexuality”, which presumes that transgender conditions are sublimated sexual perversions of (male) homosexuality of the gender role was first put forward in 1989. The one clinic that promoted it was eventually shut down. And even at the time it was being promoted it was being questioned as incorrect and out of date. The recent claim by Cass that those who do not transition mostly become homosexual men, signals that the belief in autogynephilic transsexuality is still in effect. Although I have only had to use the work of pioneers such as Dawkins, Girard and Gallese for this analysis, it has been kept up to date. Recent work at Stanford University has uncovered a previously unknown “Who am I” network in the brain, as well as the well-studied “What makes me, me” network. And in combination with this work, that might give a better understanding of how personalities and identities for all of us are formed

What is important is the perceptions that are created: For this issue is not directly about male abuse: It is about where transgender people fit in. And instead of the much smaller number of people who attack transgender women as being a threat to women’s identities and lives: there are many more who welcome them instead. It is also why some of the strongest attacks on radical gender-critical groups come from many in the feminist movements: Who recognise that transgender conditions are searches for coherence of identity and not drives of sex, that they do not threaten women or children, who recognise the many contributions that transgender women make; and have made in the fight for women’s rights: And who consider transgender people to be true allies in a common cause. This is not a minor conflict. The public recognition that transgender conditions are searches for coherence of identity and not drives of sex, has led to an overwhelming endorsement of the lives of transgender people, to the extent that: when Penny Mordaunt; then the United Kingdom Equalities Minister launched the consultation on reforming the 2004 Gender Recognition Act in 2018, she declared that “*Transgender Women are Women. That is the starting point of the consultation*”. And when she again said in a United Kingdom Parliamentary debate on the 1 March 2021, that “*Transgender men are men, and transgender women are women*”, she was simply using the definition of the feminist pioneers to describe how men and women relate to each other, independently of biological sex. The 2010 Equality Act and the notes accompanying the Act have confirmed the previous practices of allowing transgender people to socially self-identify their gender and have recognised its enforcement as a human right. Until now, the Courts have sought to maximise the inclusion of transgender people without any concerns in everyday life: By recognising that transgender identities are core elements of the personality that is created, and as personality variations and human rights. That has changed with the Supreme Court’s decision; by the adoption of a policy, which I conclude, ignores all pre-cognitive development and turns the legal perception of transgender conditions from ones which; for many years, have considered them to be internally focussed searches for belonging; coherence of identity; with no harm to others, and fulfilment of life, into one which promotes caution and exclusion and treats them as threats to women and children’s identities, safety and lives.

No change can be justified on the dismissal of any element without proof it is correct. What has changed as the result of this Court decision; is the disregard of pre-cognitive development, including the impacts of the neural transformations and cognitive changes during the first three or four years of life. It has transformed the understanding of transgender conditions from a deep-seated search for coherence of identity and a core element of the personality that is created: Into mere perversions, paraphilias or disruptions of the gender role driven by sublimated motives of desire, behaviour or sex: And this identification with unidentified motives of sex gives many openings for fears to be created, and scopes for attack. It imposes a doctrine of gender complementarity on the whole of society and attacks the inclusive society we have come to expect. These failures in understanding have the capacity to set the clock back by many years for everyone who has a variant or non-binary gender or sexual identity. And recognition is now attacked as a “woke” approach. Today this is very damaging for transgender people, because they are seen to be the threat: Furthermore, it determines the natures of the social and medical protocols and procedures that can be legally applied: I conclude that the Court does not seek to change the law. It aims to change the perception: And all of this is based on an ideology which totally ignores what happens during the first three to four years of life: Which has no support in neuroscience: And it relies on a diagnosis that has been condemned by whole swathes of expert opinion and by many others, as “*unfounded, transgender exclusive and incorrect*”, The Supreme Court states that any acts of exclusion must only be made on a justified and proportionate basis. But what is justified and proportionate depends on transgender conditions being seen as dangers to others, because they are identified as perversions, paraphilias, or disruptions of sex: Or if they are the incongruences of gender which have enabled many thousands of transgender women to integrate fully into society, to be welcomed as the women they say they are, where they offer no dangers to women and children, where many are recognised as allies in the fights for women’s rights, and who are able to live a full and contented life.

The Supreme Court’s role in this situation is to interpret the laws and acts of Parliament: And to hold Government and statutory bodies into account, for the legality and legitimacy of their actions. I conclude that the Court has tried to impose interpretations on the 2010 Equality Act and the 2004 Gender Recognition act: Which were not intended by Parliament or by the drafters of these acts. But accord with the demands and expectations of the UK Government and the United Kingdom Equality and Human Rights Commission: And in place of attempting to challenge their interpretations, I conclude that the Court has acted to reinforce them. No Court Judgement can be safe if it does if it does not consider all of these issues. Therefore, I advocate that it be set aside until a new or revised Court Judgement: Which includes a full examination of Government and EHRC actions: A full assessment of the scientific and experiential information now available, and complete comparison of transgender conditions: both as a personality variations in accordance with the scientific consensus adopted by the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions: And as personality disruptions; in line with various feminist and traditional religious approaches, and those of others: is applied

The full version of this summary and introduction is available at <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransIntroExtra.pdf>
See also any documents which follow, and on my website <https://tgdr.co.uk/articles/bibliography.htm> © Susan Gilchrist 2026

+++++

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

+++++

Summaries and overviews

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

Susan Gilchrist

SuT0206a

256P

<https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransDiagnosis.pdf>

19 January 2026

1:0 Introduction

For many centuries the behaviour of all gender and sexually variant people; including transgender people, has been condemned; regardless of purpose, as intrinsically disordered acts of grave depravity, and be illicit or immoral drives of sex. Where extreme penalties were imposed; and are still imposed in many parts of the world, on everyone who engages in, or endorses such acts. Traditional social learning and psychodynamic theories presume that the organising forces of cognition provide the explanations. However, advances in understanding show that the powers of cognition do not come into a sufficiently controlling effect until about the age of three years. Freud regarded this early period as a time of swirling emotions where nothing substantive occurs. But gender-critical groups, who maintain an ideology: which considers that cognition and sexual motives alone drive the development of gender identities forward: must specifically decide that nothing of significance takes place during this early period. I use the word *“transsexual”*, only because I need to in this account; and with great reluctance, because these are matters of gender instead of sex. And indeed, many religious groups and others have attempted over many years to *“Cure”* transsexuality and homosexuality: by treating them as misdirected or sublimated perversions of sex. The harm created by this practice is now universally condemned as being clinically wrong, harmful and incorrect. There is also a parallel dispute between cognitive neuroscientists and others who believe that cognition and sexual motives drive development forward, and behaviourist neuroscientists who examine how basic brain functions are formed. My concern over these matters led me from 2011 to conduct an examination into early development, which concentrates on the period from birth to the ages of three to four years. I show that, far from adopting an ideology which denies that anything significant occurs, what happens is of crucial importance instead. The study confirms the scientific consensus now adopted by the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions: Which assert that both gender and sexual identities have equal status as independently functioning core elements of the personality that is created, which coalesce and combine with others to form a coherence and continuity of identity from very early in life. It rejects the viewpoint of others, who ignore the impacts of these early processes, and, instead of a search for coherence of identity, reduce transgender conditions to *“perversions, paraphilias or disruptions”* driven by desires for a role or the attractions of sex. In this document I examine the nature of this dispute, and how the core; or foundational elements of gender identity come to be formed. It uses the work of René Girard; an anthropologist, in the 1950s and Richard Dawkins; an evolutionary biologist, in the 1970s. Another major influence from the 1990s. is Vittorio Gallese,

a neurologist. However, the study has been kept up to date, and the work of many others, including Schore, Garrels, Hood, Mitchell, Baron-Cohen, Wrangham, Fordor, and Goldman is also used.

In section 2 of the paper, I explain how early development proceeds, where the work of the behaviourist neuroscientists is used. This confirms the understanding of the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions, who consider both gender and sexual identities to be independently functioning core elements of the personality that is created. Where both are personality variations and their expressions are human rights. That is compared with the approaches of gender-critical groups and others in section 3, who argue that gender identities develop through cognition and sexual motives alone, so the pre-cognitive development is ignored. Prior to 2020 the United Kingdom Equalities and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) had adopted an approach, which then endorsed the scientific consensus adopted by the World Authorities. Since 2020 the Commission has endorsed the views of the gender-critical groups. The resets caused by this change are described in section 4 and 5. The actions of the Government and EHRC since that time are described in section 6. Section 7 returns to the neuroscience involved in early development. In section 8 the Court judgement is considered: So that transgender women, by default, must now be treated as men, for access to all spaces, services, clubs and societies governed by the 2010 Equality Act. And where, instead of treating transgender conditions as personality variations, searches for coherence of identity and fulfilment of life: transgender conditions are to be misdiagnosed as personality disruptions, driven by motives of desire, behaviour and sex. And why the Court also reduces the expression of transgender conditions to a permission, instead of treating it as a human right. Including the harms that are predicted; because the Court imposes a diagnosis which this study considers incorrect. In section 9 some conclusions and recommendations are offered

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.)

Transgender Misdiagnoses and Human Rights

Susan Gilchrist

SuS1124b

256P

<https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransRights.pdf>

24 October 2025

This paper examines the intense conflict arising from the recent United Kingdom Supreme Court Decision, which; in April 2025, ruled that the term “sex” in the Equality Act 2010 refers to biological sex at birth, not gender identity. Thus, a transgender woman is not considered a woman for the purposes of the Act, and a trans man is not considered a man. It also dismisses the provision in the 2004 Gender Recognition Act which identifies transgender people by their *“performance of gender”*. And instead of allowing people to use spaces and services separately assigned to men and women through their *performance of gender*, it now requires them to use spaces and services according to the sex assigned to them at birth: which the Court defines as *“biological sex”*. This reflects the intense dispute between mainly gender-critical feminist groups who consider transgender conditions to be *“perversions, paraphilias, or disruptions of the gender role”*, where transgender women are considered to be as great a danger to women as all males in women’s spaces and services. Against the approach of the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions who consider both gender and sexual identities to be core, or foundational elements of personality that is created. Instead of motives of sex these involve the search for a coherence of identity and separation of the self from the other. With no awareness of sex or biology transgender and natal women start from a common base. Identity depends on interactions experienced, and transgender women are shown to be of no greater danger to women, than other women, in women’s spaces and services. From 1975 to now, transgender people have been able to socially self-identify their gender in roles that conform to their *“performance of gender”* and integrate invisibly into society; with no problems encountered. And the 2010 Equalities Act has affirmed this inclusive approach.

But, by adopting a *“gender-critical ideology”* which states that cognition and sexual motives alone drive development forward *“gender-critical”* groups impose a false *“gender ideology”* on transgender people, by arguing that they believe they can *“choose, change or deny biological sex”*: reducing gender identity to a nebulous collectively created concept, involving only the gender role and all pre-cognitive development is ignored. The decision of the Supreme Court to adopt an ideology which declares that *“inspection of the genitals at birth is sufficient to determine the appropriateness of all future gendered and sexual behaviour”*: as well as the argument that, *“unless some sexually motivated perversion or disruption occurs, gender identity should always be congruent with biological sex”*: totally ignores the impacts of the massive neural and cognitive changes during the first three to four years of life. And in place of a coherence of identity, it imposes motives of sex. This has been condemned by whole swathes of expert opinion; and by many others, as *“totally unfounded, transgender exclusive and incorrect”*. All of the standard social learning and psychodynamic theories rely on cognition for their explanations and there is a conflict in neurology between behaviourist neurologists and adherents of cognitive neurology, including Rippon, Cass, Sullivan, Stock and others: who similarly dismiss pre-cognitive development in their work. However, in addition to the results of clinical medical and experiential evidence dating from the 1960s onwards, there is a whole raft of studies on early development which also date from the 1960s, involving Girard, Dawkins, Gallese, and many others, all of which are either totally dismissed or ignored. These concerns led me to conduct my own study, which uses this previously unused work of neurologists, anthropologists, and others, into how development from birth, particularly early and pre-cognitive development, proceeds. This shows that; far from of early development being a passive and reactive process, it is instead driven by strong, innate and pro-active forces, which dominate from birth and only gradually come under control as the organising powers of cognition come into greater effect. The results also agree with the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions. They

show that transgender conditions are core elements of the personality that is created: They also search for a coherence of identity and fulfilment of life. And they are not personality disruptions driven by motives of sex.

No judgement by any Court or EHRC advice can valid, if it enforces a diagnosis of transgender conditions which is seen to be so harmfully incorrect. It should be expected that the Supreme Court would have taken account of all these concerns. But the Court, by its own admission relied entirely on the views of “*Sex matters*” and other gender-critical groups: Examining the judgement and the sources used by the Court reveals that the views of World Authorities and Professional institutions were dismissed as incorrect or unreliable, without being properly examined: The Court’s rejection of the intervention of the “*Good Law Project*”; without giving any reason also meant that expert opinion, which would have provided a transgender counterpoint to the arguments was denied. The Supreme Court judgement does provide two gateways which in other circumstances, do allow men and women to be identified in the terms of “*their performance of gender*” and the “*their performance of sex*”. But the Court makes it clear that the sole gateway for deciding how men and women are treated for the 2010 Equality Act is by the “*biological sex assigned to them at birth*”.

Transgender identities are expressed through “*performance of gender*” they do not involve “*changing, choosing, or denying biological sex*”: and the Court’s decision to exclude transgender women from the social category of “*women*” by removing the right of “*performance of gender*” as a personality variation and a human right; or cultural diversity, because of the perceived dangers of sex, has a very damaging effect

The Court’s present argument not only ignores the major neural and cognitive transformations in early development. It is also condemned by swathes of expert opinion as being “*unfounded, transgender exclusive and incorrect*”. It transforms an approach that had maximised the inclusion of transgender people in everyday life into one which focusses on danger and exclusion instead. And it misdiagnoses transgender conditions as drives of sex. Because of this: there should be no change to the present inclusive approach. But there are also concerns about infringements of human rights in Government actions, and in the independence of United Kingdom Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC). These are examined in this account.

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

Actions of the United Kingdom Supreme Court and the Diagnosis of Transgender Conditions¹

Susan Gilchrist

SuS1219d

256P

<https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransActions.pdf>

11 September 2025

1:0 Introduction

Transgender conditions are the subject of an intense dispute between two groups. The first is the scientific consensus, adopted by the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions; who consider *Gender Identities*: which are measured in terms of social relationships and searches for coherence of identity in society, and *Sexual Identities*: which are measured in terms of sexual attractions and orientation; by relying on interaction with others, and allegiances previously created. Both are personality variations and are foundational; or core, elements of the personality that is created. They are independent of each other, although both develop together as part of a single complex very early in life: Our gender identities depend on the natures of our interactions with others; and with no knowledge of sex, we all start from the same base. Transgender women and natal women form gender identities in similar ways; through their searches for coherence of identity, with the ability to live lives that are true to themselves; and from their shared “*performances of gender*”, which is not the drives of sex: That understanding is encompassed in the present scientific consensus adopted by the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions who consider transgender conditions to be “*naturally expected variations of the human condition, intrinsic to the personality created, arising very early in life, and cannot be changed either by the individual concerned or by the predations of others in subsequent life*”. Therefore, transgender women do not offer any greater threat to women than all women, in women’s spaces and services, since these personality variations, or incongruences of gender, form as part of social interactions and the separation of the self from the other very early in life

The second is the approach adopted by certain gender-critical feminists and other groups, which decrease the diagnosis of transgender conditions to “*perversions, paraphilias and disruptions of the gender role*”. Therefore, by imposing an assumed “*gender ideology*” on transgender people, which alleges that “*transgender people believe they can choose, change or deny biological sex*”, these groups reduce the concept of gender identity, to a nebulous socially created concept associated only with the gender role. This means that all women and children are understood to come under direct threat: For it imposes motives of drives of sex on transgender conditions instead of coherence of identity. This is also a conflict with a feminist agenda behind it: between those feminists who see the journey transgender people make to be an attack on the binary notions of gender and sex: Where, no man can ever become a true feminist, and no man can ever be identified as a woman, because biology or social conditioning means they will always be seen to seek power over women, and threaten women’s identities, safety, and lives ... Against others, who are instead happy to accept male-to-female transsexuals who make this journey, as the women they say they are; because that is the way in

which they interact with society, and they are seen to be true allies in the feminist cause. So that; instead of an internal search for coherence of identity, transgender women are considered to constitute as great a threat as all males in women's spaces and services. And this misdiagnosis of transgender conditions as personality disruptions; driven by desires for a role or the attractions of sex, gives the substance for the fears, scapegoating, and past centuries of attacks.

None of us can have any awareness or sense of gender or other identity at birth, because they rely on relationship with others. In my own study I show that, instead of early development being a passive or reactive process, it is instead propelled by strong, innate and self-reinforcing processes. These dominate from birth, and only gradually come under control as the organising powers of cognition come into greater effect. The most modern definitions of gender identity divide it into two components: The first to be formed is *the "Core Gender Identity"*, which relies on cognition and sexual motives alone to drive development forward". It involves the creation of a coherence of identity, the ability to separate the self from the other, and it must be in place before the "*Gender Role Identity*" is created. This relies on cognition and a sufficient sense of self-awareness to build expectations and respond to what society expects. And where either or both usually, but not always align with the expectations of "*biological sex*". Therefore, the gender role identity must act as an overlay on the gender role identity, which has previously been created. However, these matters remain of considerable dispute. The same concerns also led me from 2011 to conduct a study, which employs the pioneering work of anthropologists and neuroscientists, including Girard, Gallese, Dawkins and others; from the 1960s onwards, where I use transgender experiences as case studies to examine how during this early period, personalities and identities for all of us are formed. This is accompanied by further studies on early neural development, which has continued to the present date². The core gender identity must also be managed as a personality variation, because its destruction would attack the foundations of self-identity that has been created: And that would leave a vacuum in its place. Whereas disturbances to the gender role identity must be managed as personality disruptions since the motives are those of desire or sex, and there is always the possibility of returning to an original path. Attempts to manage personality variations as personality disruptions, can cause great harm, since the motives, timescales and methods of management differ to the extent that what one side considers to be those of compassion and concern, are almost inevitably regarded as recruitment, grooming, capture, and coercion by the other. It is additionally essential to get the diagnosis correct because the time when transgender children and their parents most need help to manage these conditions occurs from early childhood, not from later time in life.

What most people think of as "*gender*" in their everyday lives is therefore a combination of the core gender identity and the gender role identity. Where one is overlaid on the other. And where either or both need not always align with the expectations of biological sex. The term "*gender expression*" is often used to describe this: and it can vary significantly with circumstances and time. We are rarely aware of separate existence, strength or importance of the core gender identity; unless some disturbance or incongruence occurs since it is part of the pre-cognitive development processes; and is therefore hidden from our lives. Freud could not explain it since his theories relied on cognition, but gender-critical groups actively deny that anything of significance occurs. Although gender-critical groups continue to recognise that sexual identities are core elements of personality, they reduce gender identity, measured by the search for a coherence of identity, to a "*nebulous collectively created concept associated with the gender role*". This denies the scientific consensus adopted by the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions, who recognise that both gender and sexual identities are equal but independent core elements of the personality that is created. Both sets of denials are encountered in the many attacks on websites, popular literature and elsewhere: where the influence of pre-cognitive development is dismissed as merely as the work of transgender activists³, with claims that their expertise is not based on credible science: And where attacks are made on the integrity of those groups and people who support these views.

However, the development of gender identity is a combined process where the gender role identity is an overlay on the core gender identity which is the first to be created. By adopting a gender-critical ideology which ignores the existence or impact of the core gender identity; and relies on cognition and sexual motives alone to drive development forward, gender-critical groups must define transgender conditions as to "*perversions, paraphilias and disruptions of the gender role*". They may be able to tell us many things about how the gender role identity develops; how perversions and disruptions are formed, and how they are driven by motives of sex. But they cannot tell anything about earlier development and how the core gender identity is created ... because their ideology denies it. So, instead of recognising that gender identities develop through a search for coherence of identity, they must be driven by drives of sex. Our gender identities depend on the natures of our interactions with others; and with no knowledge of sex, we all start from the same base: It is this commonality in early development, which allows transgender women and children; in a shared process with all other women and children, to experience the same "*performances of gender*" in early life. And to find that transgender conditions are motivated by searches for coherence of identity, instead of drives of sex. Therefore, there is no justification for any gender-critical approach, which uses any ideology to deny the existence or impact of the core gender identity: And in so doing, to enforce a false diagnosis on transgender people, which determines that these conditions are perversions, paraphilias or disruptions of the gender role; driven by desires for a role, or the motives of sex. And no group who uses any ideology to ignore virtually all the advances in the understandings in neurology and cognition since the 1960s; together with the experiential, clinical, and medical evidence now available, can justify the actions it takes. Therefore, I conclude that the actions of the present United Kingdom Equality and Human Rights Commissions; including both present and previous United Kingdom Governments, are built on the false premise that transgender conditions are personality disruptions driven by desires for a role or the attractions of sex, instead of the search for a coherence of identity and the "*performances of gender*", which have enabled transgender women; with women; and as women, to merge completely into society as women, living normal everyday lives.

The recognition that transgender conditions are searches for coherence of identity, not drives of sex, has existed for many years. However, that was overturned in April 2025 the United Kingdom Supreme Court ruled that, under the Equality Act 2010, transgender women must be "*considered as men*", and the term "*women*" must be confined to biological sex, which sided with the viewpoint of gender-critical groups and others. This changes an approach from one which had sought; without problems for years to maximise the inclusion of transgender people in everyday life, now focusses on exclusion instead. It had also previously been understood that all interpretations of the 2010 Equality Act should be based on "*the performance of gender*". But in another reversal: That is specifically denied by the Supreme Court Judgement which now declares that all interpretations of the 2010 Equality Act must be based on "*the biology of sex*". This defines a gender complementarity, where equal and opposite stereotypes are cre-

ated, where there is no place left for non-binary identities, and no acceptance of departures from stereotypes of behaviour determined by the expectations of biological sex. This change has set the knowledge of transgender conditions back by many years: For instead of understanding these conditions to be driven by searches for coherence of identity, which enabled transgender people to live in harmony with others in ways that are true to themselves in society. They are now deemed to be driven by desires for a role and motives of sex. Therefore, the Court now identifies transgender conditions as “perversions, paraphilias or disruptions of the gender role”, with perceived threats to women and children because of the presumed motives of sex: and the additional identification with the existence of some unnamed perversion or disruption, creates plenty of opportunities for incrimination and attacks.

When the conflict differ to the extent that one group considers transgender conditions to be inwardly focussed searches for coherence of identity, where no threats to others are involved, against a opposing group who understand transgender conditions to be personality disruptions driven by motives of desire and sex: And when the second of these overlays the first, it is essential to get the diagnosis correct. However, the Court’s adoption of a gender-critical approach, which presumes that cognition and sexual motives alone drive development forward, fail to do this. One of the United Kingdom Equality and Human Rights Commission. Akua Reinsdorf; one of the EHRC Commissioners has argued that this readjustment is needed because transgender people have been lied to for years, by those who support the viewpoints of the World Authorities and Professional Institutions: who see transgender identities as searches for coherence of identity; which is expressed in the “performance of gender”, instead of drives of sex⁴. The Court has concluded that transgender women are as equally protected from discrimination under the protected characteristic of “gender reassignment” as lesbian and gay people are under the protected characteristic of “sexual orientation”. But protection from discrimination is not the same as the protection of human rights. Lord Hodge, one of the Supreme Court Judges has said that he expected outrage from transgender people because “something they thought they had was being taken away from them”⁵: What is being taken away from transgender people is their reliance on the viewpoint of the World Authorities and Professional Institutions, who recognise that gender identities are core elements of the personality that is created: And the adoption of that requires in absolute terms, the full expression of this human right.

If any Court; or any organisation, is aware that the decisions it makes is likely to cause outrage, it should be absolutely essential for it to understand what it is attacking, before it makes its attack. And it is important to get the diagnosis correct. But that autonomy has been taken away by a Supreme Court judgement which; by the Court’s own admission, relies entirely on the views of “Sex matters” and other gender-critical groups. An examining the judgement and the references cited by the Court reveals that the views of world Authorities and Professional institutions were not considered in any meaningful way: The Court’s refusal to accept the intervention of the “Good Law Project” 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.

In place of an approach which had sought with no problems for many years to maximise the inclusion of transgender people in everyday it now focusses on exclusion instead⁶. This approach dismisses the impact of the key neural transformations and changes in pre-cognitive and early development. It makes the mistake that considering sexual motives and cognition alone drive development forward. It destroys the legitimacy of transgender identities as searches of coherence of identity, by representing these as drives of sex. Therefore, transgender conditions are misdiagnosed as personality disruptions instead of personality variations, with dangers to others. And anything which further excludes an already vilified group, from everyday life, has very damaging results. The total adoption of a gender-critical ideology, which presumes that cognition and sexual motives alone drive development forward; has also been universally condemned by expert opinion, as being unfounded, transgender exclusive and totally incorrect⁷. I conclude that no judgement by any court, which dismisses or ignores any part or all of this material can have any validity, and it should be challenged or withdrawn with immediate effect. Transgender conditions are incongruences or variations of the core gender identity. The gender role identity is not directly affected. I conclude that the proposed EHRC Advice on the provision of spaces and services for transgender people, which is presently being laid before Parliament is invalid because it is based on a diagnosis that is incorrect. And this too should be withdrawn, with immediate effect. Each of these topics are considered in more detail in the following sections of this document. These reversals have created major problems for transgender people. The consequences of the changes are examined in this account, as well as the issues of human rights.

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)

+++++

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)

Gilchrist, S. (2026): “*The Effects 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-TransIntroOverview.pdf> (Text 1 page)

Gilchrist, S. (2026): “*The Effects 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-TransIntroOverview.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-WhatIsAWoman.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

¹ Cite this document as: 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> This article also serves as an introduction to 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> .

² Further early studies on early neural development

³ See section 2:5 *Feminist Disagreements* in Gilchrist, S. (2021a): "Gender Identity, Feminism, and Transgender People": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/2pred50P-GenderIdentityAndTrans.pdf>

⁴ Reinsdorf, Akua (2025): "Trans people 'lied to over their rights to enter female-only spaces'" Telegraph 06 June 2025: Reinsdorf, Akua (2025)

"EHRC commissioner calls for 'period of correction' on trans rights after legal ruling" Guardian 6 June 2025

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/politics/2025/06/06/trans-people-lied-to-rights-female-only-spaces-bathrooms/> <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2025/jun/06/ehrc-commissioner-calls-for-trans-people-to-accept-reduced-rights-after-years-of-lies#:~:text=An%20earlier%20version%20summarised%20the,published%20on%208%20June%202025.>

⁵ See section 4 of this document.

⁶ 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/255P-TransVerdictOverview.pdf> .

Gilchrist, S: (2025) "Judgement of the United Kingdom Supreme Court and the Diagnosis of Transgender Conditions": <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/255P-6TransJudgement.pdf> .

⁷ See section 18:0 *Feminist Issues and Decisions of the Supreme Court* in 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/255P-TransVerdict.pdf> . The Royal College of Psychiatrists responded to the Supreme Court judgment and its implications via its input into a consultation on the Equality and Human Rights Commission's (EHRC) updated Code of Practice. Its primary concerns centre on the risk of deepening mental health inequalities for trans and non-binary individuals. It is extremely concerned that the updated legal definition of sex, following the ruling, will significantly harm the mental health of trans and non-binary people and could put lives at risk. It notes that trans and non-binary people already face higher rates of mental illness, self-harm, and suicide compared to the general population, and the ruling risks exacerbating this. The BMA Resident Doctors Association stated: "This meeting condemns the Supreme Court ruling defining the term 'woman' with respect to the Equality Act as being based on 'biological sex', which they refer to as a person who 'was at birth of the female sex', as reductive, trans and intersex-exclusionary and biologically nonsensical. We recognize as doctors that sex and gender are complex and multifaceted aspects of the human condition and attempting to impose a rigid binary has no basis in science or medicine while being actively harmful to transgender and gender diverse people. It reiterates the BMA's position on affirming the rights of transgender and non-binary individuals to live their lives with dignity, having their identity respected. Reminds the Supreme Court of the existence of intersex people and reaffirms their right to exist in the gender identity that matches their sense of self, regardless of whether this matches any identity assigned to them at birth. Condemns scientifically illiterate rulings from the Supreme Court, made without consulting relevant experts and stakeholders, that will cause real-world harm to the trans, non-binary and intersex communities in this country. Commits to strive for better access to necessary health services for trans, non-binary and gender-diverse people. For letters, see also: London Economic (2025) "Biologists tell government to restore trans people's access to public spaces after Supreme Court ruling" <https://www.the-londoneconomic.com/news/biologists-tell-government-to-restore-trans-peoples-access-to-public-spaces-after-supreme-court-ruling-392997/>: Airtable (2025) "An open letter to the Equality and Human Rights Commission from the Culture Sector, April 2025" <https://airtable.com/appJtTpDvAuS-GrX37/pagqNlqDLD38RXblt/form> For more on management see: Gilchrist, S. (2024): "Why the Present United Kingdom Government Advice on Transgender Children Must be Challenged": <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/040B-GovAdviceTransChildren.pdf> And for a specialist overview: see: "the essence of the court's decision is (in broad purposes) as follows: a) the Gender Recognition Act 2004 states that a person with a GRC [gender recognition certificate] is to be treated as the sex stated in the GRC "for all purposes" unless a statute provides otherwise; b) although the Equality Act 2010 doesn't explicitly state otherwise, it contains various references to the word "woman" in contexts where it makes more sense if it is read as "biological woman"; Thus, c) the Equality Act therefore rebuts the presumption in the Gender Recognition Act and, for its purposes, "woman" means "biological" ("cis") woman. Therefore, by statute, the 2018 act must be read as excluding trans women from the class of "women". However, that argument can only make sense if you consider the definition of "woman" to be that of "someone who was at birth a member of the female sex". The court acknowledged that, should a trans woman be discriminated against because someone thinks she is a cis woman, then she will still be entitled to make a claim for sex discrimination in the same way as a cis woman. But if someone recognises a trans woman is a trans woman, no such protection applies". Although the appeal was made only in the context of public boards, the Court extended it to consider access to all same sex allocated services and spaces. Thus, the effect of the Court's decision is to introduce a statute which means that in no circumstances, can trans women call themselves women, and in no circumstances can trans men call themselves men. Therefore, trans women and men can be excluded by default from all same sex allocated spaces, and public boards on the grounds of appearance and of identity alone, regardless of the capabilities they may be seen to provide. The right to offend is also a basic human right, although nobody should wish to apply it at any time. At first sight, imposing exclusions entirely on the grounds of physicality or identity; with the unequal treatment of natal women and trans women seems to be a breach of all international conventions on human rights. See also Gilchrist, S. (2022): "No Blacks, No Irish, No Homosexuals, No Transgender People": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/252P-NoBlacks.pdf>