Twitter Thread by Christine Burns MBE
[redacted]

Christine Burns MBE [redacted]
@christineburns

Can young trans activists please remember that most of the trans rights attributed to the Equality Act 2010 (specifically employment and vocational eduction) have been in British law far longer than those mere 11 years. These rights stem form a ruling 25 years ago in 1996.

This is IMPORTANT. I'm not just being picky. The narrative against our rights hinges on the suggestion that they are 'new' or radical, rather than having been largely settled since before some of the detractors were born. Non-discrimination was formally written into the..

..Sex Discrimination Act by regulations in 1999. The only thing not covered at that time was discrimination in the supply of goods and services, owing to a loophole which Labour decided to rely on. Never these, the 1999 regulations covered almost everything lately in contention..

..because reliably protecting employment rights had to include dealing with issues in sex-specific care and in shared sleeping and changing accommodation for staff who sleep in or change at work. The Equality Act 2010 merely burnished protections that had already existed..

..without issue for 12 years in 2010 by carrying forward everything contained in the amended Sex Discrimination Act and other prime non-discrimination acts. Challenges against trans protection in EA2010 — literally pretending they're something new — are based on a lie.

Just to add here: Trans rights to non-discrimination are based in the Sex Discrimination Act 1975. That wasn't an Act about 'sex based rights', because the SDA was designed to protect everyone — men included — from discrimination on the basis of sex except in very specific and..

..exceptional circumstances. It follows that the provisions against sex discrimination in EA2010 are not some women-only legislation. That aspect of EA2010 also protects men and it protects trans people not only form discrimination because they are or are perceived to be..

..trans but also it protects trans women and men from discrimination because of their sex or perceived sex. This isn't something uniquely trans related. BAME people are also multiply protected from either racial or sexual discrimination. Same

with disabled people. And on and on..

..It's really not rocket science for anyone who's actually read the legislation or the guidance rather than falling hook line and sinker for the fantasy notion of what the law does. Can we have debates in Britain on the facts rather than popular fantasies please?

Another addendum: The architects of the SDA 1975 had intended transsexual people to be within the law's protection from the outset. Baroness Summerskill (I think it was) explicitly confirmed that when questioned on the point in Parliamentary Committee. It was lawyers acting..

..for scummy employers (White v British Sugar) who gave rise to a case law interpretation that a trans woman/man wasn't protected if a trans man/woman would have been treated in the same way. This was why the law's interpretation eventually had to be challenged and why specific..

..protection was added in 1999. @threadreaderapp unroll please