



23rd May 2026

Rt Hon Diane Abbott MP,
House of Commons
London SW1A 0AA

Dear Ms Abbott,

Guidance on transgender issues is inhumane and discriminatory

It is with sorrow that I find myself writing to you again about this issue, now that the guidance on transgender issues has been laid before Parliament. I sincerely hope that you will object to this guidance, and will lay out below the reasons why I think it is important that it is rejected.

For all the talk of 'dignity' there is precious little here that suggests the government – and a Labour government, no less – really cares about the dignity of marginalised groups.

It is, in the view of many, very likely that this guidance, if implemented, will place the UK in breach of its obligations to the European Charter of Human Rights; a shocking position to find ourselves in, especially when led by a Prime Minister who helped the defendants in the McLibel trial. This guidance is a capitulation to the gender-critical, who will doubtless still complain that it doesn't go far enough.

Some of those have claimed that transgender people are a problem in a sane world, or that some women being harassed because they might be trans is a price worth paying. But I simply don't believe that this is true. And to continually cite one or two trans offenders as an argument to tar all trans people with the brush of sexual abuse is monstrous.

Regarding access to toilet facilities, even the guidance makes it clear that there is no documentation in the UK that can reasonably be used to determine someone's gender at birth, making it effectively impossible for businesses and other venues to make an accurate determination of whether or not they should allow someone to use a toilet.

The notion that a trans man should be excluded from a men's toilet because they were assigned female at birth, and may also be excluded from a women's toilet because they present as male is monstrous. It effectively creates a class of people who are not permitted to use gendered facilities.

The suggestion that, instead, they should use unisex facilities or a disabled toilet, is nothing short of "separate but equal," which we all know is absolutely nothing of the sort. And in a situation such as a workplace, where someone has been using one toilet for years, suddenly being forced to use a different facility, this is also effectively forcing people to out themselves. With that comes the possibility of further harassment and discrimination. It puts people in a truly awkward situation and also risks the creation of a "urinary leash" whereby people are afraid or unwilling to participate fully in society, because they aren't sure if there will be toilet facilities they can use.

Furthermore, the suggestion that trans people use disabled toilets shows the contempt for both trans and disabled people – something that should surely not be coming from a body tasked with promoting equality. Disabled people often face limitations because of the restricted availability of facilities that they can use. To suggest that they must now compete with another group of people for access is shocking.

Besides this direct impact on disabled people, it is also very likely that an increasing number of women will be discriminated against on the basis that some people fear they may be transgender. Women who have lost their hair, who have small breasts, or have had them removed due to cancer. Women who are much taller than average, or who have features that don't conform to – mostly western – standards of femininity will also be likely to be challenged when simply wanting to use a toilet.

And none of this is likely to make any statistical difference to the safety of women and girls; overwhelmingly, when women and girls suffer violence or sexual assault, it is in the home, and very often by people already known to them.

On the matter of sports and associations, the guidelines place unnecessary restrictions upon teams and other groups, by stating that if they say they are, for instance, a group for men, if they allow trans men to join, they are now a mixed-sex group. This flies in the face of allowing people to live in their acquired gender – something that those with a Gender Recognition Certificate have sworn to do. Yet how can they, when the very government that has issued their GRC now says, essentially, that it counts for nothing?

That, surely, was not the intention when the Equalities Act was passed, and along with many others, I feel that the Supreme Court made a gross error in their interpretation of the legislation; rather than pandering to extremists and attacking trans people on their behalf, the Government should be legislating to bring proper clarity, and genuinely uphold the dignity of trans people. And it certainly shouldn't be dictating to sports teams and social groups whom they should allow to join.

The suggestion that discrimination may be permissible if the presence of a trans person may cause "discomfort" or "distress" is truly shocking. If a Labour government can pass a law that panders so much to bigotry, what precedent does it set? What is to stop a Reform government, or some other right-wing party, from deciding that if the presence of a person of different ethnicity causes "discomfort" it is reasonable to exclude them?

Finally, I would like to note that there has been a massive outpouring of concern from LGBT+ groups and others regarding this guidance, with many stating that they do not support it, and do not intend to abide by it. How can an equality body like the EHRC be effective when so many of those whom it is tasked to protect no longer believe that it is acting in their interests?

I urge you, please, to do everything you can to object to this nonsensical guidance; it is a gross affront to dignity and equality.

Yours sincerely,

