

Ms Helen Horton
Chair, Amnesty International UK Selection Board

Mr Sandy Ruthven MBE
Chair, Amnesty International UK Charitable Trust

By email from info@forwomen.scot

12 July 2026

Dear Ms Horton and Mr Ruthven,

We notice that in the report *A Growing Threat: the Anti-Rights Movement in the UK* published on 8th July by Amnesty International UK, we are listed on page 20 as an “anti-rights organisation”. Although this report has now been withdrawn for review, it is still being widely referenced online and, along with the report *Like a Snowball: the Growth and Impact of the Gender Critical Movement in the UK* published on 21st May, is contributing to reputational harm.

We note this characterisation of us was not raised before the Supreme Court judges when Amnesty International UK intervened against our case on women’s rights, where the court ruled in our favour that “woman”, “man”, and “sex” are biological terms in the Equality Act 2010. The court rejected your arguments that European Convention Rights required that the UK allow people to change “sex” for the purposes of the Equality Act and allow male individuals with Gender Recognition Certificates (and only those individuals) access to services provided for women.

In the ruling, the Judges found that adopting the certificated sex interpretation advanced by your organisation would:

- Cut across the definitions of “man” and “woman” and thus the protected characteristic of sex in an incoherent way, causing confusion and impracticability in the operation of provisions relating to single sex services, spaces, associations, and charities.
- Create two sub-groups within those who share the protected characteristic of gender reassignment, giving trans people who possess a GRC greater rights than those who do not.
- Remove protections (eg maternity rights) for transmen who had a GRC.
- Weaken the protections given to those with the protected characteristic of sexual orientation for example by interfering with their ability to have lesbian-only spaces and associations.

It is clear, therefore, that the Judges felt a certificated sex interpretation would negatively impact the rights of those covered by the protected characteristics of sex, gender

reassignment, and sexual orientation. On page 2 of your report, however, you claim that the ruling has contributed to a “significant decline in protections for LGBT+ rights” with no reference to the fact that the Judges considered lesbian, gay and bisexual rights as well as the rights of those covered by gender reassignment and concluded that a certificated sex interpretation would be hugely damaging to these groups.

On page 3 of the report, you say that “An organised anti-rights movement targeting the rights of women and LGBT+ people is growing in the UK. Over 60% of the organisations mapped have emerged since 2017, the vast majority gender critical organisations.” On page 20, you identify us as a “gender critical” organisation. As Gay Men’s Network has pointed out, you define “anti-rights” groups as:

- A desire to restrict or undermine human rights.
- A political outlook informed by misogyny and homophobia.

In response, we would say:

- FWS was established to protect the Human Rights of women and we have been vindicated in court on three occasions.
- Our outlook is informed by second wave feminism and lesbian rights.

Please set out, by specific reference to our work and UK equality law, your reasoning for claiming that we have targeted the rights of women and LGBT people and your justification for the attempts to tie FWS and other groups to US actors and “anti-abortion” groups. We consider this malicious and defamatory.

On page 5, you say that “Anti-rights actors seek a society in which women and men have fixed and distinct roles, based on what they view as ‘natural’ and ‘traditional’” and they portray gender identity ideology “as an attack on national traditions, family structures, marriage and religious freedom”. Can you provide evidence, with reference to our published work, where we have ever made such claims which are diametrically opposed to everything we stand for?

We were made aware of a Bellingcat podcast in which the author of this report was interviewed in February of this year. It is clear that she had preconceived the outcome of the report. It was also apparent that she had no evidence of any links tying women’s rights groups to the “far right”, although supposed connections were repeatedly intimated, most egregiously in the suggestion that there were “similarities” between the “structure of funding” of women’s rights organisations and the “far right”. We consider this malicious and defamatory.

She also said that Amnesty UK are proposing to “investigate” how women are able to win Tribunals relating to sex discrimination and harassment “it will be looking at the money that goes into those cases and how those cases are kind of framed, how they are represented, how they are won.” We consider that this is an unwarranted assault on an independent judiciary and would like clarity on which women your organisation intends to pursue.

We note that your primary charitable object is to promote human rights. Women also have human rights. We recently won a case in Scotland to protect the human rights of incarcerated women in Scotland. The old Amnesty would have taken that case rather than attack the women who brought it.

We now ask that you apologise to FWS for the malicious characterisation of our organisation in your report and remove the *Like a Snowball* report. We will, naturally, reserve our options to take further measures if necessary.

We would be grateful for your early response.

Yours sincerely,

Trina Budge, Marion Calder and Susan Smith
Directors, For Women Scotland

Winner of the Emma Humphreys Memorial Prize Legal Award 2025.
Political Campaigner of the Year Herald Award 2025.

Judicial Review successes:

- *Feb 2022, Court of Session*
Claiming the protected characteristic of “gender reassignment” does not have the effect of changing an individual’s sex for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010.
[*FWS v Scottish Ministers \[2022\] CSIH 4*](#)
- *Apr 2025, UK Supreme Court*
The term “sex” in the Equality Act 2010 refers, and has always referred, to and only to biological sex. A gender recognition certificate does not have the effect of changing an individual’s sex for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010.
[*FWS v Scottish Ministers \[2025\] UKSC 16*](#)
- *Jun 2026, Court of Session*
Placing a male prisoner claiming the protected characteristic of “gender reassignment” in the female prison estate is unlawful.
[*FWS v Scottish Ministers \[2026\] CSOH 59*](#)