

Kerry Moscogiuri
Chief Executive, Amnesty International UK

Sandy Ruthven MBE
Chair, Amnesty International UK Charitable Trust

Helen Horton
Chair, Amnesty International UK Section

12th July 2026

Dear Ms Moscogiuri, Mr Ruthven and Ms Horton,

We write concerning Amnesty International UK's harmful and erroneous characterisation of Sex Matters and other gender-critical organisations as **"anti-rights"** in two recent reports: *A growing threat: the anti-rights movement in the UK* and *Like a snowball: the growth and impact of the gender critical movement in the UK* by Chiara Capraro.

You may be relieved to learn that since you have taken *the Growing threat* report down we are not planning to sue Amnesty or the author for defamation. We bring cases to clarify the law and because the courtroom is the one place where careful arguments from different positions must be listened to. But organisations should not have to wait to be sued to do the right thing or to engage in constructive dialogue.

The right thing here, we suggest, is to withdraw both reports, to apologise to your gender-critical staff, supporters and members of the public, as well as the individual groups smeared, and to meet with us and others from women's-rights and gay-rights organisations to discuss our common interest in human rights and non-discrimination.

We offered such a meeting to Sacha Deshmukh in 2022, but he said he was too busy.

The Amnesty boards and senior leadership should understand that the arguments you have allowed to be published under Amnesty's name, and which you then had to withdraw hastily for review, are not simply defamatory slurs against organisations working for women's rights, gay rights and evidence-based healthcare. They are an explicit encouragement to donors and the Charity Commission to discriminate unlawfully, and also discriminate against and harass your own gender-critical staff. Furthermore they are contrary to the statutory safeguarding guidance which the schools you seek to work with are obliged to follow, and inconsistent with the objects of the charity.

Sex Matters is a human-rights charity promoting clarity about sex in law, policy and language
sex-matters.org | info@sex-matters.org

Trustees: Emma Hilton (chair), Simon Knapp (treasurer), Michael Biggs, Rebecca Bull, Anya Palmer.
CEO: Maya Forstater

They are indicative of an organisation that either fails to understand or fails to accept the law.

Sex Matters is, like Amnesty International UK Section Charitable Trust, a human-rights charity. We share an almost identical charitable object: to promote human rights as set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (in our case where they relate to biological sex).¹ We sit together as members of Equally Ours because of our common mission to advance people's equality and human rights in the UK. It is simply nonsensical to call us, or other gender-critical groups, "anti rights". Human rights are universal.

As our submissions to the Supreme Court in the *For Women Scotland* case explained (at §58 and §59), removing the direct correspondence between the definition of the protected characteristic of sex and the reality that shapes women's lives would undermine, not protect, human rights:

"A s9(1) GRA reading of 'sex' in the EqA10 would involve an infringement of Article 8 in relation to (at least): (i) the consequential inability to consider the interests of biological women separately from transwomen for the purposes of the public sector equality duty (PSED) and positive action provisions; and (ii) the practical impact on the ability coherently to operate and apply the exceptions for single-sex services/ accommodation and single-characteristic associations in circumstances where the privacy and dignity of women are engaged. In addition, the limits on the exception for single-characteristic associations if a s9(1) GRA reading were applied clearly infringe Article 11.

"Since a s9(1) GRA reading of 'sex' in the EqA10 is not necessary to meet the purposes of the GRA to provide adequate recognition for gender reassignment in UK law, those infringements cannot be justified. Accordingly, s3 HRA requires that such a reading be avoided: 'sex' in the EqA10 must be read as referring to biological sex."²

The UK Supreme Court accepted this argument and rejected Amnesty's contrary submission that clearly defined protection against sex discrimination is inconsistent with human-rights principles. It held that your proposed interpretation would make legal protections against sex discrimination, sexual-orientation discrimination and gender-reassignment discrimination *incoherent* and *unworkable*.

It is hugely disappointing that following the Supreme Court judgment, Amnesty failed to reflect with humility on how it got its legal analysis so badly wrong, and to refocus on addressing the world's human-rights abuses. Amnesty UK is in any case obliged to make sure its own conduct as an employer meets its duties in relation to the Equality Act 2010.

The *Growing threat* report has been removed from your website, and is under review. But the *Like a snowball* report, which also sets out the author's antipathy towards people who hold gender-critical beliefs, remains. It bemoans "the normalisation of all manifestations of GC belief, including misgendering and talking about trans people with reference to their 'biological sex' and trans women as 'biological males'".

¹ sex-matters.org/posts/the-legal-system/why-sex-matters-for-human-rights-our-organisational-framework/

² <https://sex-matters.org/posts/the-legal-system/submission-to-supreme-court-re-for-women-scotland-v-scottish-ministers-from-sex-matters/>

Not only is this an argument against the principle of non-discrimination in respect of freedom of belief, speech and association in general, but it also suggests a hostile, stigmatising environment for your own gender-critical staff.

Allowing individual staff, campaigning teams or activists to use Amnesty's name to launch campaigns that are not based on a solid understanding of human rights and the Equality Act is a reckless approach to governance and reputational, regulatory and legal risk, and a diversion from your mission.

If this is not the work of a rogue team but your institutional position, it places Amnesty International UK at odds with the Equality Act, which refers to people in terms of their sex not their gender identity.

We note you have said in your recent statement that "Amnesty remains committed to researching and campaigning on human rights issues... including the rights of women, LGBTQI and trans people."

You should recognise that your failure to engage with the charities, human-rights organisations and grassroots campaigns that you branded "anti-rights" is a failure of research and a reflection of prejudice.

As the Charity Commission has said: "Demonising and undermining those who think differently is not acceptable behaviour from any charity on our register."

We suggest that you withdraw both reports, clarify your position with regards to the Equality Act, apologise to your gender-critical staff, supporters and the organisations smeared as "anti-rights", and commit to undertake training for staff and trustees on the law, and to meet with gender-critical groups.

Individuals whose personal beliefs cause them to refuse to respect Britain's legal framework concerning discrimination in the workplace (which protects people against sex discrimination, gender-reassignment discrimination, sexual-orientation discrimination and belief discrimination) have a clear and lawful choice: to tender their resignation or be terminated for gross misconduct.

We reiterate our invitation to dialogue. Two charities that share a commitment to human rights ought to be able to discuss how these rights interact without the expense and delay of meeting in a courtroom.

Yours sincerely



Maya Forstater
CEO



Emma Hilton
Chair