



Challenging Homophobia: Championing Freedom, Faith & Sex-Based Rights

26 October 2026

By email to:

Kerry Moscogiuri, Chief Executive, Amnesty International UK

Sandy Ruthven MBE, Chair, Amnesty International UK Charitable Trust

Helen Horton, Chair, Amnesty International UK Section

Dame Julia Unwin, Chair, Charity Commission

Dr. Mary-Ann Stephenson, Chair, Equality and Human Rights Commission

Dear Amnesty International and related bodies,

We are writing on behalf of LGB Christians. We write in respect of the report published by Amnesty on 8 July 2026 *A Growing Threat*. We have taken legal advice as to the contents of that report, and drafted this letter with legal assistance (privilege in that advice and assistance is not waived).

This Report was unfair, inaccurate and defamatory of LGB Christians and seriously so. The publication of the Report, and its calls to action, were discriminatory in purpose and in effect. The publication was a betrayal of the trust that Amnesty's supporters have invested in it over decades and its reputation as an advocate for human rights. The calls to action based within the report amount, very seriously, to interferences or proposed interferences with the human rights of those individuals and organisations with which it was concerned. We consider that the report was contrary to the rules of good governance and the legal requirements imposed upon charities more generally. We set these concerns out in more detail below.

LGB Christians

LGB Christians is a network of lesbian, gay and bisexual Christians. Its purpose is to defend the rights of same-sex attracted people and those who support us. It is ecumenical and non-party political.

Our focus upon sexual orientation as a matter of same-sex attraction is consistent with mainstream understanding of sexuality (as distinct from gender identity), and reflects the law. Section 12(1) Equality Act 2010 defines sexual orientation in terms of attraction to the same sex, the opposite sex, or to either sex. In *For Women Scotland v Scottish Ministers* [2025] UKSC 16, the Supreme Court unanimously found that “*read fairly, references to sex in this provision can only mean biological sex. People are not sexually oriented towards those in possession of a certificate*” (paragraph 204).

The report: A Growing Threat:

- Introduced the concept of an “anti-rights movement” in its subheading and the first line of its executive summary.
- Alleged that the “movement” was targeting the rights of women and LGBT+ people in the UK (page 1-2).
- Alleged that “*these organisations*” were part of an “*anti-rights ecosystem - a network of groups that work on different issues but share similar goals and often support each other’s efforts to roll back human rights protections*” and drew an explicit connection to the Christian Institute, which it described as “*ultra-conservative*” (page 2).
- Alleged that the “*biggest spenders*” were “*ultra-conservative Christian policy and advocacy groups*” (page 3).
- Alleged that “*anti-rights actors are diverse and often adapt their messages and strategies to different audiences and political contexts*” but went on to identify four “*common characteristics*”. These were “*transnational yet targeted*”; “*eroding existing rights frameworks*”; “*creating alternative frameworks*” and “*fostering moral panic*” (pages 4 – 5).
- Alleged that “*anti-rights actors seek a society in which men and women have fixed and distinct roles, based on what they view as ‘natural’ and ‘traditional’*” (page 5).
- Lists LGB Christians under “*Anti-rights organisations identified*” (pages 17 and 20). 51 organisations were identified in total.

Further, in the Report Amnesty specifically called upon a number of institutions to take action against the organisations identified, which included LGB Christians (pages 15 and 17). Specifically, it called upon the Charity Commission to take steps regarding charity status, and called upon institutional and grant-making donors to “*fund the ongoing monitoring of anti-rights movements and organisations*”.

The imputations of Amnesty's report were unfair, unreliable, inaccurate and moreover defamatory of LGB Christians and seriously so.

We note that Amnesty has made more than one public statement (including, but not limited to, its email to members and supporters) insinuating that the publication of the Report was in some way accidental. We do not accept this characterisation. The report contained the Amnesty logo, and it was uploaded to the website. It followed an earlier report issued in May of this year. It would follow from this that the Report was part of a wider and deliberate programme of activity. We note, in this respect, that the Report followed an earlier publication by Amnesty *Like A Snowball*, which indicated that 51 organisations had been identified. Rather, what was unintended was the *effect* of the Report, which resulted in uproar and widespread (albeit not universal) criticism of Amnesty.

We note the terms of the publication on Amnesty's website which describes itself as an "*apology*". That announcement identified only one of the organisations identified, being Beira's Place, and nor did it apologise for the full suite and extent of allegations made in that report.

Defamation

A Growing Threat imputed that LGB Christians was part of a transnational cabal, working with other Christian ultra-conservative organisations in order to roll back the rights of women and LGBT+ people because it believed that men and women had fixed, traditional roles, that it was doing so by actions which included the erosion of existing rights frameworks and deliberate fostering of moral panic. It imputed that LGB Christians should be subject to ongoing monitoring, and denied charitable status.

This imputation was defamatory and seriously so. It shows conduct contrary to the shared values of our society and obviously so: Amnesty's Report did not present being gender-critical, or working with other organisations as any form of neutral act, nor did it suggest that being "*anti-rights*" (a characterisation which we wholly reject) was in any way either a good or neutral proposition.

Whilst the report was published by Amnesty only for a short time, it was widely circulated during the period in which it was published, and received widespread global coverage particularly on social media such as X. It was in the circumstances highly, and foreseeably, damaging to our organisation. In July 2026, only two weeks after publication of the report and prior to your statement on 31 July 2026, our organisation was refused CIO status by the Charity Commission, fulfilling the very outcome which the report was seeking.

A week after the report was published, Amnesty wrote to its members and Activist supporters. We consider that email to be egregious: the email drew further attention to the controversy and the fact of the report. Amnesty sought to distance itself from the fact of publication, but said nothing to acknowledge that the report's key findings were wrong or improperly reached. It purported to uphold a commitment to the human rights of women and of transgender persons, but said nothing about the rights of gender-critical persons or organisations (who had been disparaged by it) to freedom of thought and expression. The clear inference was that Amnesty was sorry for having embroiled itself in controversy, but did not resile from what had actually been said.

The imputation was false, and – insofar as Amnesty could assert that it had any element of opinion or value-judgment, lacked any, or any sufficient factual basis on which an honest person could hold this position.

LGB Christians is an informal organisation which is gender-critical. It believes in the primacy of sex and human identity, not gender identity, as the basis of sexual orientation. It seeks to bring together those who are Christian and who share those views and our values.

There is nothing in that which is “anti-rights” or arises from any fixed or traditional view as to the roles of men and women. To the contrary: LGB Christians seek to promote the rights of individuals who have been marginalised and discriminated against, and sometimes thrice over, first because they are lesbian, gay or bisexual, second because they are Christian, and third because they do not share views regarding the primacy of gender identity. It barely needs stating that lesbians, gays and bisexual people have been discriminated against in Christian contexts. It is equally true that many Christians are discriminated against or marginalised in other contexts, particularly parts of the lesbian, gay and bisexual communities who viewed Christianity and the Church as discriminatory. And it also should go without saying that those who are gender-critical have also been marginalised and discriminated against in a whole range of situations in recent years.

Our position in relation to transgender people and transphobia is clearly set out on our website under FAQs. We consider that sexual orientation and gender identity are separate issues. That is not controversial as a statement. We focus on the needs of lesbian, gay and bisexual people. We retain concerns regarding and opposition to the medicalisation of children and surgeries upon them: again, this is not controversial and reflects established medical thinking.

Furthermore, and as our FAQs state explicitly, we will not align with “*any organisation that permits or condones homophobia or misogyny and/or does not uphold the nine protected characteristics as defined in law*”. Those characteristics relevantly include gender reassignment, and extend to those proposing to undergo gender reassignment, and perceived to hold that characteristic.

LGB Christians does not retain any attachment to fixed or traditional roles of men and women. Again to the contrary: enabling gay men, lesbians and bisexuals to lead full lives within Christian practice is based on rejecting the proposition that opposite sex relationships are the only ‘normal’ or acceptable ways to live. We do not require that men and women abide by traditional societal roles or presentation. You could not reasonably infer from anything on our website, or in any of our public statements that we do promote fixed or traditional gender roles.

The sole conceivable basis for which LGB Christians has been castigated is the fact that we are a gender-critical organisation. Amnesty’s position has been based on nothing more than a hostile and discriminatory attitude towards us arising from the fact that we hold and manifest protected beliefs. That is neither sufficient, nor is it an honest basis for an opinion or factual allegation made against us in the report.

There was no public interest in publishing the report, and Amnesty cannot assert any reasonable belief in the public interest in circumstances where it has suggested that publication took place because the report ‘slipped through the net’.

Discrimination and human rights

The Report was discriminatory in its purpose and plainly foreseeable effect. The calls to action were calls to other institutions and parties to subject LBG Christians, amongst others, to detriment and thereby to discrimination. The basis of that call to action was, as made clear by the entry for LGB Christians, the fact that it was gender critical. The only possible connection between LGB Christians and the other justifications for discrimination given in the body of the report are those beliefs.

It should not now need stating that gender critical beliefs, that is beliefs in the immutability and significance of biological sex, are protected under the Equality Act 2010.

Moreover, the rights of gender critical people to hold and express their beliefs, and to associate with others who do, engages Articles 9, 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human Rights. LGB Christians moreover seek to hold and express those beliefs and

to associate with others who do *as Christians and in the context of their Christianity*, which is in itself a protected belief.

It is remarkable that Amnesty, of all organisations, should have published anything in these terms. We refer to your website, which purports that *"We believe in [sic] world where everyone enjoys their rights freely, is treated fairly, and lives without fear. Since 1961, we've defended the human rights that protect us all"*. Evidently, and as made clear by omission in Amnesty's communication to its members and supporters, *"everyone"* and *"all"* does not include gender critical people.

Charity governance and regulation

We note that Amnesty International UK describes itself as two organisations: the UK Section (a limited company) and the UK Section Charitable Trust (a charity and a limited company). It appears from your website that the Charitable Trust substantially funds the work of the UK Section. It does not appear that the Charitable Trust makes grants to wholly external organisations at all or to any significant extent. The two entities go by the moniker "Amnesty International", and use the same logo. Whilst they have different boards, they are in practice not readily distinguishable.

The Charitable Trust's objects are set out in its governing document as *"TO PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS (AS SET OUT IN THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS ("UDHR") AND SUBSEQUENT UNITED NATIONS CONVENTIONS AND DECLARATIONS AND IN REGIONAL CODES OF HUMAN RIGHTS WHICH INCORPORATE THE RIGHTS CONTAINED IN THE UDHR AND THOSE SUBSEQUENT CONVENTIONS AND DECLARATIONS) THROUGHOUT THE WORLD BY ALL OR ANY OF THE FOLLOWING MEANS:- (A) MONITORING ABUSES OF HUMAN RIGHTS (B) OBTAINING REDRESS FOR THE VICTIMS OF HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSE; (C) RELIEVING NEED AMONG THE VICTIMS OF HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSE; (D) RESEARCH INTO HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES; (E) EDUCATING THE PUBLIC ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS (F) PROVIDING TECHNICAL ADVICE TO GOVERNMENT AND OTHERS ON HUMAN RIGHTS MATTERS; (G) CONTRIBUTING TO THE SOUND ADMINISTRATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS LAW; (H) COMMENTING ON PROPOSED HUMAN RIGHTS LEGISLATION; (I) RAISING AWARENESS OF HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUES; (J) PROMOTING PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS; (K) PROMOTING RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AMONG INDIVIDUALS AND CORPORATIONS; (L) INTERNATIONAL ADVOCACY OF HUMAN RIGHTS; AND (M) ELIMINATING INFRINGEMENTS OF HUMAN RIGHTS"*.

Amnesty International, and the Charitable Trust, draw on a long and proud history of campaigning against significant human rights abuses, for example its long running

campaign on behalf of prisoners of conscience. Amnesty does not, in its objects or in any of its public literature, seek to distinguish the human rights causes which it espouses from others or to limit its work to particular minority groups. Members of the public who support and donate to Amnesty would and do understand from its objects and its public materials that Amnesty's work is intended to be universal.

Whilst we accept that Amnesty cannot campaign or participate in every single issue which might amount to an infringement of human rights, it is highly troubling that it has not only sought to exclude gender-critical people and their beliefs from the ambit of what it does work on, but to inflict upon them and the organisations which support them the very conduct and detriments which it would in other circumstances impugn.

Most troubling of all, it does not make any or any clear statement to its supporters (or so far as the UK Section is concerned, its members) that it does in fact consider gender-critical persons and the organisations who support them to be unworthy of protection and outside the ambit of its mission. The email to members and supporters emphasised support for particular groups (women and transgender persons) but nothing about how other groups were to be deemed unworthy of support. We consider that Amnesty International's public facing positions as on its website and in that email have adopted a sleight of hand which serves to obscure a much more complex position as to whom it deems worthy of human rights protection, and whom it does not.

We do not consider that this can in any way be squared with the Charitable Trust's objects or public benefit.

Moreover, we are concerned that Amnesty is institutionally and structurally discriminatory against gender-critical organisations such as us. It is quite clear from the terms of its recent communications that the foundational views which lead to the report have not changed.

Current position

We note that the media has reported that Amnesty has referred itself to the Charity Commission, and opened an investigation¹.

Unless Amnesty makes a clear and unequivocal statement from Amnesty confirming that its allegations do not apply, and never did apply, to LGB Christians, the potential for ongoing damage is significant. It is all too easy for members of your organisation speaking carelessly to create the impression that any Christian group is part of this

¹<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2026/jul/16/amnesty-uk-self-reports-to-watchdog-calling-women-centre-anti-rights>

so-called threat from Christian nationalism. It will be all too easy for others to interpret what Amnesty has said in such a way.

Next steps

In order to restore public confidence in it, and to remediate the damage caused to us, we require the following from Amnesty:

- Confirmation that it has not only withdrawn the Report itself, but retracts the allegations in the Report and the defamatory imputations as advanced against LGB Christians, and that it will agree not to repeat the same for an indefinite period;
- A public apology, on terms to be agreed specifically acknowledging that it does not consider LGB Christians to be part of a transnational cabal, or part of any group of so-called ultra conservative Christian organisations.
- An indication from Amnesty as to the steps it will take to make sure that these allegations are not repeated, inadvertently or otherwise.
- Consideration of this letter in the course of Amnesty's internal investigation.
- An in-person meeting, in order that we may discuss the above, and contribute to the internal investigation which is underway.
- We understand that Amnesty has referred itself to the Charity Commission. To that end, and in light of this, we are sending the letter to the Charity Commission, and also the Equality and Human Rights Commission.

We look forward to hearing from you within 14 days of the date of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Canon Mark Bratton, Chair
Richard Kirker, Secretary