

# 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

Susan Gilchrist

10 February 2026

Full

SuT0307b

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 12<sup>th</sup> 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 13<sup>th</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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

+++++

**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](http://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](http://www.tgdr.co.uk) Contact at: [sgen4144@gmail.com](mailto:sgen4144@gmail.com)

© Susan Gilchrist 2025