

Reflection for the Transgender Day of Remembrance 2025¹

Susan Gilchrist

SuS1129a

27 November 2025

When Samuel came to anoint David as the future King of the Jews, he passed over the seemingly most obvious candidate because the Lord said to Samuel, *“Do not look on his appearance or on the height of his stature, because I have rejected him. For the Lord sees not as man sees, man looks on the outward appearance, but the Lord looks on the heart.”* (1Samuel 16 6-7)

For many years we have understood transgender conditions to be personality variations which search for a coherence of identity; with no harm to others, which has enabled transgender people to find fulfilment in roles that are true to themselves: and be welcomed as the women we say we are in everyday life

Today we have a Court decision which now demands that transgender conditions are personality disruptions, which are seen as threats to others, notably women and children because they are understood to be driven by drives of sex

But transgender people are a small and often hidden minority in the general population. And when many people have to rely on what others say about us, transgender people are vulnerable to attack, particularly when it is natural for most people to presume that, unless some perversion or sexually motivated disruptions occur gender identity must always be congruent with biological sex. In many parts of the world that still applies in full force. And it also applies to many of those whose deaths we remember in this service. Transgender people are also immigrant or emigrant people who dare to cross or challenge a nominal binary gender divide. We may be angry and frustrated by the rejections, misinformation and misdiagnoses that are applied to us. This is a strongly divisive conflict, where one group believes that transgender conditions are searches for coherence of identity. The other considers that they are driven by desires of sex. These two are independent, but we delude ourselves if we ignore the very real concerns over male domination; abuse; and attacks that all women face. This means that our best way of memorialising the deaths we commemorate in this service, is to work to calm the fears, misunderstandings and concerns that create these divides, on both sides.

Today in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America the motives of transgender people; and the understanding of transgender conditions are again coming under the same types of attack. There is an explosion of uninformed abuse and attacks, triggered not least by a Supreme Court Judgement and the United Kingdom Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), which denies any right of transgender women to express their identities; or call themselves *“women”*, through their *“performances of gender”* ... By demanding in law, that all legitimate performances must be congruent with biological sex. Which denies by default, any right to access to the services and spaces, which conform to the gender transgender women identify with: Regardless of behaviour, appearance and purpose; how people present; or how long or how effectively they have transitioned: It requires institutions, including shops, hospitals, schools, and others, to assign transgender people to the services and spaces according to the *“sex that is assigned to them at birth”*, Not just *“biological”* sex. The present United Kingdom Equality and Human Rights Commission in addition states that, clubs, churches, government institutions could now be sued if they fail to put these exclusions into effect. The Court does always require separate facilities to be made available, and demands that proportionate reasons are given, but all of these have the effect of maximising the exclusion of transgender people from everyday life. For what is considered acceptable is very different, when something is treated as harmful, instead of a welcoming act. These same condemnations are why for centuries all gender and sexually variant behaviour, not just transgender people, have been persecuted and condemned, in particular by religious groups, for allegedly engaging in intrinsically disordered behaviour which is always in pursuit of

¹ This reflection is separately available at Gilchrist, S. (2025): *“Reflection for the Transgender Day of Remembrance 2025”* www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/TDOR2025-Reflection-2025. The full liturgy is available at Gilchrist, S. (2025): *“Liturgy for the Transgender Day of Remembrance 2025”* www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/TDOR2025-Liturgy-2025

immoral or inappropriate sex. And in place of identifying transgender conditions as searches for coherence of identity and *“performance of gender”*, with no harm to others, respecting the identity of all natal women: They are identified instead with drives and predations of sex.

Most modern definitions of gender divide it into two components. The first component 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 this is instead measured by motives of behaviour, desire and sex. Transgender conditions are considered to be incongruences of the core gender identity, where transgender and natal women identify with the same *“performances of gender”* from early in life. And these shared commonalities of behaviour and the *“performance of gender”*, has for many years now, justified an approach which has sought without concern, to maximise the inclusion of transgender women in everyday life. However, the existence and impact of the Core Gender identity is totally dismissed or denied by the imposition of a *“Gender Critical”* ideology, adopted by Cass, Sullivan, Rippon, Stock and others: which includes the present United Kingdom Government: Who instead adopt a gender-critical approach, which argues that cognition and sexual motives alone drive development forward: by dismissing the impact of what happens during the first three years: And who now seek to put debilitating measures in place for excluding transgender people from the normal framework of everyday life. Where transgender people must also be seen as a potential danger to women and children, because these conditions are now considered to be perversions or disruptions of the gender role, driven by motives of desire and sex. And it destroys their identification as a human right.

To adopt this approach, the Court must dismiss or deny the experiential evidence which now allows transgender people in many countries to legally self-identify their gender without any problems of abuse, it must discard the modern definitions of gender identity; which divides it into two components; where either or both usually, but need not always be congruent with biological sex: And it must also ignore the impacts of the massive neural and cognitive changes during the earliest years of life by adopting the same *“Gender Critical”* ideology: which presumes that cognition and sexual motives alone drive development forward, and ignores all earlier and pre-cognitive effects. While I do not presume to judge the Court’s intention: Its decision to allow the appropriateness of all other aspects of gender to be determined by the *“performance of gender”*. And at the same time use the criterion of *“biological sex”* to deny the same freedoms of performance or to recognise to any form of gender and sexually variant behaviour, is remarkably redolent of a traditional Christian teaching: Which dates only from the 12th Century, where all forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour; regardless of purpose, are condemned as intrinsically disordered acts of grave depravity which pursue immoral or inappropriate acts. In my own work I show that; far from denying the influence of the pre-cognitive development processes which lead to the development of the Core Gender identity, these are of crucial importance instead. And because the Court adopts a similar *“Gender-Critical”* approach, the conclusions of my own study, which considers transgender conditions to be searches for coherence of identity, are backed up by the whole swathes of expert and other opinion which condemns the Supreme Court decision as totally *“unfounded, transgender exclusive and incorrect”*.

Skip to the last three sections where appropriate

The 1975 Sex discrimination act allowed transgender people to socially self-identify their gender. The 2004 Gender Recognition Act enabled people to use the words *men, women male and female* interchangeably, to describe both gender and sex. Despite the Supreme Court judgement, the accompanying notes to the 2010 Equality Act makes it clear that its aim of the Act is to maximise the inclusion of transgender people in everyday life. In 2018, strong support to allow legal self-identification of gender in the United Kingdom was given by then Conservative Government and the then UK Equalities and Human Rights Commission. All of these groups and organisations, acknowledge the scientific consensus which has been adopted by the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions which recognises that gender and sexual identities are both personality variations: Both are core elements of the personalities that are created: It shows that gender identity is created by an internally focussed search for coherence of identity with no harm to others, and that transgender conditions are *“naturally expected variations of the human condition, which lie within the normal range of development, are 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”*.

We have seen that modern definitions of gender divide it into two components: The core gender identity, which begins the process of separating the self from the other: And the gender role identity, which relies on what society expects. The gender role identity acts as an overlay on the core gender identity that has already been created. Since the core gender identity provides a secure sense of being or belonging, without behavioural implications, I show that this allows all women, including male-to-female transsexuals: acting as women with women, to pursue the same feminist arguments with the same vigour, from a stronger base. Equally for any female-to-male transsexual: acting as men with men, to pursue any equivalent male arguments from a similarly stronger base: This also means that the gender-critical approach, which ignores these pre-cognitive processes is the less effective approach. And since gender identities are measured or expressed through the *“performances of gender”*, and the interactions and behaviours that have already been created, it follows that the *“core gender identity”*, and *“performance of gender”* should determine how people socially interact. Which gives the reasons for adopting a transgender inclusive approach.

However, that level of inclusion has been reduced to one of exclusion, by demanding that *“biological sex”* should instead be the primary standard to determine how people socially interact. Baroness Faulkner, present Chair of the EHRC argues that this is due to *“new research”*: But when this *“new research”* requires the adoption of a gender-critical approach, which presumes that cognition and sexual motives alone drive development forward, and denies or disregards all of the advances in the neurological, physiological, experiential, and psychological advances in the understanding of how all early and precognitive development takes place during the first three to four years of life: which have taken place over the last sixty years. This must be considered a regression instead. My own studies have concentrated on how development takes place during this early period. Using the work of anthropologists and neuroscientists, including Girard, Dawkins, Gallese and others, this shows that instead of early development being driven by passive or receptive processes driven by cognition and sexual motives alone, they are instead driven by strong innate and pro-active processes, powered by possessive imitation, empathy, *“mirror neurons”* and the like, which dominate from birth: And how they only gradually come under control as cognition comes into greater effect. Once development starts in a particular direction; it becomes difficult to stop. Although on average there are significant differences in male and female behavioural patterns, with men more prone to engage in physical violence; considerable overlap occurs. So, both gender and sexual identities are core elements of the personality that is created. And it also may be expected that a range of gender and sexually variant conditions will be created. Open almost any handbook on sexuality and psychiatry and it will also show that both gender and sexual identities form as from a single complex very early in life.

This confirms the conclusions of the World Authorities and Professional Medical Institutions that both gender and sexual identities are core elements of the personality that is created, that transgender conditions are personality variations and not personality disruptions, and are *“naturally expected variations of the human condition, which lie within the normal range of development, are 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”*. The Supreme Court also denies these advances by adopting a gender-critical ideology by deciding that *“inspection of the genitals at birth is sufficient to determine the appropriateness of all future gender behaviour and that unless some unnamed sexual perversion occurs, gender identity must be congruent with biological sex*. Far from denying these early and pre-cognitive aspects of early development, I show that they are of crucial importance instead. And the same dismissal is condemned by whole swathes of expert opinion as being *“unfounded, transgender exclusive and incorrect”*. Therefore, I conclude that there is no justification any form of gender-critical approach which seeks to reduce gender identity to a nebulous concept which is confined to the gender role: and tries to enforce a diagnosis on transgender conditions which presumes that these are driven by motives of sex: And there is no justification for any Government, institution or otherwise, to unilaterally enforce a gender-critical approach. The presumption that transgender conditions are the result of some unnamed perversion or disruption of the gender role, leaves plenty opportunities for unsupported allegations and attacks. For all of these reasons, I conclude that the judgement of the Supreme Court must be set aside; or revisited for it is essential to get the diagnosis correct.

The adoption of a gender-critical ideology, which demands that cognition and sexual motives alone drive development forward, is not just a regression of permissions or actions. It creates a fundamental misdiagnosis of transgender conditions as perversions or disruptions of the gender role, where threats to women and children’s safety and identity are created ... Instead of the recognition that transgender conditions are

searches are personality variations: Which means that transgender rights are also human rights' They are also searches for coherence of identity, which creates the ability for transgender people to live harmoniously in society in roles that are true to their own identities, with no threats to others: To fully integrate and be accepted as the women they say they are in everyday life.

Continue

No court judgement can be valid if it denies the advances in research and experiential evidence gained over the last 60 years, to justify its results. Therefore, there should not have been any change to the previous inclusive approach, which diagnoses transgender conditions as searches for a coherence of identity: with no threats to others: Where a great many people welcome them into society, because they are recognised as incongruence of the core gender identity, in place of the drives of sex. But nobody should seek to deny, mitigate or diminish the centuries of horrendous discrimination, violence and abuse that all women have faced. It was Jesus who crossed the social barriers of Jewish society, to support the prisoners and those rejected by society. And for every gender-critical feminist who condemns transgender people as dangers to women and children because transgender conditions are seen as perversions or disruptions. There are many others who recognise that transgender conditions are searches for coherence of identity, who accept transgender women as the women they say they are: who do not threaten others and see them as true allies in the fight for women's rights.

It is absolutely right that we should seek justice and condemn this misdiagnosis of transgender conditions. That has been the focus of my own work, and a supplementary list of papers, which describe it, is given at the end of this document. But it is this misinformation and the fears on both sides that divide. No rational or objective arguments will succeed: When it is these fears from within us that release the monsters inside. And, however great the hurt, we do not release these fears by simply attacking and condemning the other side: *"For the Lord sees not as man sees, man looks on the outward appearance, but the Lord looks on the heart."* And if we are not prepared to acknowledge and recognise our own complicities in these disputes: And find ways to look into the hearts of our opponents, so that we can recognise the fears and concerns which drive them. Also, as we must look into the hearts of our allies. Just as all of these must be able to understand what we hold in our hearts: We shall simply continue the fight.

As we recognise and remember all those transgender people who have been murdered or taken their own lives during the previous year, just for trying to live lives in ways which are true to themselves we should ask ourselves what we can do to ensure that their deaths have their compensation in our attempts to build a welcome and inclusive life where every person is valued in their own right.

© Susan Gilchrist 2025

Supplementary Documents

This is one of a series of documents: These are:

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. (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> (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> (2 pages)

Gilchrist, S. (2025): *"Reflection for the Transgender Day of Remembrance 2025"*

First Issued: 26 November 2025. Last update: 26 November 2025

Printed: 01/12/2025 15:18

Access via: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/bibliography.htm>

spap4144@gmail.com

4

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> (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> .

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> .

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

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

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

Gilchrist, S. (2025): *"Transgender Misdiagnoses and Human Rights: Summary"*: <https://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/256P-TransRightsSummary.pdf>

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

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>

See Also:

Gilchrist, S. (2025): *"Reflection for the Transgender Day of Remembrance 2025"* www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/TDOR2025-Reflection-2025.

Gilchrist, S. (2025): *"Liturgy for the Transgender Day of Remembrance 2025"* www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/TDOR2025-Liturgy-2025

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

For other documents go to the bibliography tab on www.tgdr.co.uk

© Susan Gilchrist 2025