

Email #1 DATE: 28 May, 2026

Found in Sent - Google Mailbox



Sall Grover

28 May 2026 at 8:44 PM

Op-ed Pitch: My Perspective on the Tickle v Giggle Appeal and ABC's Commitment to Impartiality

To: fang.gavin@abc.net.au

Dear Mr Fang,

As the founder and CEO of Giggle, I am writing to pitch an op-ed on the recent Full Federal Court decision in Giggle v Tickle.

From my perspective as a woman who built a female-only app to create safe online spaces, this judgment raises profound questions about sex-based rights, objective reality, and the future of single-sex services in Australia. It underscores how current interpretations of the law can erase women as a meaningful category in law.

I note your recent Senate Estimates comments emphasising ABC's impartiality and the importance of presenting different perspectives on contentious issues. An op-ed from my viewpoint would contribute meaningfully to that diversity, offering balance on a case of significant public interest.

I'd be happy to deliver a sharp, 800-word piece promptly. Happy to discuss.

Kind regards,

Sall Grover

Email #2 DATE: 29 May, 2026



Gavin Fang

29 May 2026 at 3:06 PM

Re: Op-ed Pitch: My Perspective on the Tickle v Giggle Appeal and ABC's Commitment to Impartiality

To: Sall Grover

Hi Sal,

Thanks for getting in touch.

I've passed your email onto the appropriate editorial team. They make commissioning decisions independent of my role and I can't guarantee they'll take you up on the offer.

However, please feel free to stay in touch with me if it is helpful on any other issues that relate to your work or the broader issues that you have highlighted below. I'm always happy to take on board suggestions or feedback about our work.

Regards

Gavin



Australian
Broadcasting
Corporation

Gavin Fang
Editorial Director,
Australian Broadcasting Corporation



We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the First
Australians
and Traditional Custodians of the lands where we live, learn and work.

Email #3 DATE: 29 May, 2026



Sall Grover

29 May 2026 at 3:41 PM

Re: Op-ed Pitch: My Perspective on the Tickle v Giggle Appeal and ABC's Commitment to Impartiality

To: Gavin Fang

Hi Gavin,

Thank you so much, I really appreciate it.

Have a great weekend.

Kind regards,

Sall Grover

Sent from my iPhone

Email #4 DATE: 8 June, 2026



Sall Grover
Op-ed/no response
To: Gavin Fang

Sent - Google 8 June 2026 at 11:07 AM

Hi Gavin,

I hope this email finds you well.

Since our last correspondence on May 29, I have not had any contact from your colleges regarding a published op-ed by me on the ABC site.

Regardless, I have taken it upon myself to write one for you. My piece is a response to Paula Gerber's piece published on May 18 and the article titled "Commissioner condemns 'retrograde' bid to change male and female definitions in Sex Discrimination Act" published June 5.

That these articles have been published shows an overall interest from ABC readers on the subject. I see no valid reason why response should not also be published.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Sall Grover

—

Trans Rights and Women's Rights: When "Inclusion" Means Exclusion
By Sall Grover

Some readers will find this uncomfortable. Others will dismiss it as unkind. But here is the undeniable biological fact that underpins this entire debate: the only prerequisite to being a "trans woman" is to be male. I cannot be a trans woman, no matter how I feel, because I am female. This is not hatred; it is grammar, biology, and reality meeting in plain English. Paula Gerber and Anna Cody, in their recent contributions to ABC, insist otherwise. They are wrong, and understanding precisely why matters more than ever.

Gerber's piece on the *Giggle v Tickle* judgment celebrates it as a win for both trans rights and women's rights. Cody condemns proposals to restore biological definitions in the Sex Discrimination Act as a "retrograde step." Both treat sex-based rights as negotiable, and both frame disagreement as bigotry rather than a necessary defence of hard-won protections. The truth is simpler and more uncomfortable. Trans women's rights, rights predicated on male bodies identifying into female categories, and women's sex-based rights are in direct conflict. One cannot expand without the other contracting.

Women have fought for single-sex spaces, services, and sports not because we are delicate flowers offended by existence, but because male-pattern violence, strength, and sexual dimorphism make mixed-sex environments risky or unfair for the female sex, either way necessary. This is not theory. It is data from prisons, refugees, change rooms, and sport. Rape victims rebuilding lives in female-only recovery groups should not have to audition their trauma to justify basic dignity. A woman should not need to recount the worst day of her life at the hands of a man simply to say this space is for us. No means no, remember? That principle applied to consent. It applies here too.

The law once understood this. The Sex Discrimination Act once defined "man" and "woman" by reference to biology before those definitions were quietly removed. The full federal court in the *Giggle v Tickle* appeal effectively ruled that a male who identifies as a woman is a woman for the purposes of the Act. In doing so, it admitted the very thing it denies. If you must redefine "woman" to include men, then trans women are not, in the ordinary meaning, women. You cannot have it both ways. Accurate definitions are not bigotry, they are the foundation of coherent law. Without them, female-only spaces become meaningless. Prisons, shelters, sports, and even apps like Giggle become mixed-sex by stealth.

Consider the women who rely on these rights. Survivors of male violence. Women in crisis accommodation. Teenage girls in school change rooms. Female athletes watching records and scholarships evaporate. Muslim and religious women for whom modesty is non-negotiable. Disabled women needing intimate care from their own sex. These are not abstract categories. They are millions of ordinary Australian women who never asked to surrender their boundaries for someone else's identity.

Gerber suggests that excluding males who identify as women risks excluding "unfeminine" lesbians or others who defy stereotypes. This is a sleight of hand. Sex is not a stereotype. It is observable, immutable reality. Lesbians remain female. The solution to rigid gender norms is not to dissolve sex, it is to stop enforcing stereotypes on either sex. Cody claims women have fought "not to be defined only by biology." Yet the women's movement fought precisely because of biology, reproductive capacity, vulnerability to male violence, physical differences. To pretend biology is incidental is to erase the reason single-sex provisions exist.

We are told trans rights are about compassion. But compassion that demands women absorb male bodies into every female category is not kindness, it is entitlement dressed in progressive clothing. Trans-identified people deserve dignity, mental health support, and protection from violence. They do not deserve to rewrite reality or override the sex-based rights of half the population. The idea that disagreement equals hatred has chilled debate for too long. Courts awarding aggravated damages for "misgendering" or courtroom demeanour only deepen the chill.

This issue will not disappear because activists wish it so. Women are noticing. Polling shifts. International reversals, from the UK Supreme Court to growing sporting policy updates including the Olympics, show the tide turning. Australians deserve open conversation, not slogans. We can support distressed individuals without dismantling sex-based protections. We can affirm that trans women are males with an identity while refusing to pretend that identity erases sex.

Women's rights were never guaranteed by feelings or redefinitions. They were won through evidence, courage, and clarity about material reality. To deny that clarity is to admit the emperor has no clothes and, in this case, that the emperor is male. Parliament must act. Define sex clearly. Protect female spaces unapologetically.

The alternative is not inclusion. It is the slow erosion of the very category "woman" until it means nothing at all. And that serves no one.

Sall Grover is the CEO of Giggle and an accidental women's rights campaigner.

Email #5 DATE: 8 June, 2026

Note: presumably, Gavin Fang has forwarded my email to Scott Stephens



Scott Stephens
Response to Paula Gerber's piece
To: Sall Grover

8 June 2026 at 11:55 AM

Good morning Sall,

My sincere apologies for the delay in responding to your email, which Gavin Fang kindly passed on to me last week, or possibly late the week before. The delay isn't because of lack of interest in the possibility of you writing a response to Paula Gerber's earlier piece — which, I should say, wasn't "solicited" or commissioned by the ABC, but was submitted to me for consideration — but simply because I found myself swamped this past week with a series of weighty and relatively unexpected broadcasting/speaking demands. The time I ordinarily set aside for editing, commissioning, responding to requests, etc, was, frankly, blown to bits.

I would be very happy to receive an article from you by way of response to Paula Gerber's article. It will be subject to the same editorial consideration and review that hers was given. And I'd be happy to work with you to see it through to a publishable form.

With my best wishes, and thanks for your patience.

Scott

Scott Stephens
ABC Religion & Ethics Online Editor
Co-host of *The Minefield*, *Radio National*

W: <https://www.abc.net.au/religion>
W: <https://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/theminefield>

Email #6 DATE: 8 June, 2026



Scott Stephens
Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece
To: Sall Grover

8 June 2026 at 11:58 AM

I do apologise, Sall. Is the following your submission for publication? I hadn't seen it until now:

Trans Rights and Women's Rights: When "Inclusion" Means Exclusion
By Sall Grover

Some readers will find this uncomfortable. Others will dismiss it as unkind. But here is the undeniable biological fact that underpins this entire debate: the only prerequisite to being a "trans woman" is to be male. I cannot be a trans woman, no matter how I feel, because I am female. This is not hatred; it is grammar, biology, and reality meeting in plain English. Paula Gerber and Anna Cody, in their recent contributions to ABC, insist otherwise. They are wrong, and understanding precisely why matters more than ever.

Gerber's piece on the *Giggle v Tickle* judgment celebrates it as a win for both trans rights and women's rights. Cody condemns proposals to restore biological definitions in the Sex Discrimination Act as a "retrograde step." Both treat sex-based rights as negotiable, and both frame disagreement as bigotry rather than a necessary defence of hard-won protections. The truth is simpler and more uncomfortable. Trans women's rights, rights predicated on male bodies identifying into female categories, and women's sex-based rights are in direct conflict. One cannot expand without the other contracting.

Women have fought for single-sex spaces, services, and sports not because we are delicate flowers offended by existence, but because male-pattern violence, strength, and sexual dimorphism make mixed-sex environments risky or unfair for the female sex, either way necessary. This is not theory. It is data from prisons, refuges, change rooms, and sport. Rape victims rebuilding lives in female-only recovery groups should not have to audition their trauma to justify basic dignity. A woman should not need to recount the worst day of her life at the hands of a man simply to say this space is for us. No means no, remember? That principle applied to consent. It applies here too.

The law once understood this. The Sex Discrimination Act once defined "man" and "woman" by reference to biology before those definitions were quietly removed. The full federal court in the *Giggle v Tickle* appeal effectively ruled that a male who identifies as a woman is a woman for the purposes of the Act. In doing so, it admitted the very thing it denies. If you must redefine "woman" to include men, then trans women are not, in the ordinary meaning, women. You cannot have it both ways. Accurate definitions are not bigotry, they are the foundation of coherent law. Without them, female-only spaces become meaningless. Prisons, shelters, sports, and even apps like Giggle become mixed-sex by stealth.

Consider the women who rely on these rights. Survivors of male violence. Women in crisis accommodation. Teenage girls in school change rooms. Female athletes watching records and scholarships evaporate. Muslim and religious women for whom modesty is non-negotiable. Disabled women needing intimate care from their own sex. These are not abstract categories. They are millions of ordinary Australian women who never asked to surrender their boundaries for someone else's identity.

Gerber suggests that excluding males who identify as women risks excluding "unfeminine" lesbians or others who defy stereotypes. This is a sleight of hand. Sex is not a stereotype. It is observable, immutable reality. Lesbians remain female. The solution to rigid gender norms is not to dissolve sex, it is to stop enforcing stereotypes on either sex. Cody claims women have fought "not to be defined only by biology." Yet the women's movement fought precisely because of biology, reproductive capacity, vulnerability to male violence, physical differences. To pretend biology is incidental is to erase the reason single-sex provisions exist.

We are told trans rights are about compassion. But compassion that demands women absorb male bodies into every female category is not kindness, it is entitlement dressed in progressive clothing. Trans-identified people deserve dignity, mental health support, and protection from violence. They do not deserve to rewrite reality or override the sex-based rights of half the population. The idea that disagreement equals hatred has chilled debate for too long. Courts awarding aggravated damages for "misgendering" or courtroom demeanour only deepen the chill.

This issue will not disappear because activists wish it so. Women are noticing. Polling shifts. International reversals, from the UK Supreme Court to growing sporting policy updates including the Olympics, show the tide turning. Australians deserve open conversation, not slogans. We can support distressed individuals without dismantling sex-based protections. We can affirm that trans women are males with an identity while refusing to pretend that identity erases sex.

Women's rights were never guaranteed by feelings or redefinitions. They were won through evidence, courage, and clarity about material reality. To deny that clarity is to admit the emperor has no clothes and, in this case, that the emperor is male. Parliament must act. Define sex clearly. Protect female spaces unapologetically.

The alternative is not inclusion. It is the slow erosion of the very category "woman" until it means nothing at all. And that serves no one.

Sall Grover is the CEO of Giggle and an accidental women's rights campaigner.

Email #7 DATE: 8 June, 2026



Sall Grover
Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece
To: Scott Stephens

8 June 2026 at 12:25 PM

Hi Scott,

Thanks so much for getting back to me.

Yes, this is the piece by me.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Emails #8 & 9 DATE: 8 June, 2026



Scott Stephens
Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece
To: Sall Grover

8 June 2026 at 12:42 PM

Wonderful. Thank you. I'll have an edited version back to you as soon as I can.

Best

Scott

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)
[See More from Sall Grover](#)



Sall Grover
Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece
To: Scott Stephens

8 June 2026 at 12:46 PM

Thanks so much, Scott.

Sent from my iPhone

Emails #10 & 11 DATE: 9 June, 2026



Sall Grover
Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece
To: Scott Stephens

Yesterday at 2:16 PM

Hi Scott,

Just following up on this.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

[See More from Scott Stephens](#)



Scott Stephens
Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece
To: Sall Grover

Yesterday at 2:32 PM

Well, I'm still going with it. The piece is causing quite a few editorial headaches — not least because of the direct (causal) connection you draw between access of trans women into women only spaces and the increase in incidents of violence against women. I am aware of the claim, but try as I might I can't find evidence supporting it.

A piece like this, that makes the kind of sweeping or categorical claims that it does, needs also to provide readers sufficient evidence/research to justify those claims so that readers to make some kind of evaluation.

Any research that you drew on that you could send my way, I'd be most grateful.

Scott

Email #12 DATE: 9 June, 2026



Sall Grover

Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece

To: Scott Stephens

Yesterday at 2:47 PM

Hi Scott,

I don't make a connection "between access of trans women into women only spaces and the increase in incidents of violence against women" at all. The claim is about male violence against women, and the prevention of it. That's a big part of why female only spaces exist.

This isn't to say that there hasn't been an increase of male violence against women from letting males into female spaces. The most obvious examples of that are male sex offenders in women's prisons.

I'm happy to expand on the point for total clarity. I am not making a single claim I can't back up.

Kind regards,

Sall

Email #13 DATE: 9 June, 2026



Scott Stephens

Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece

To: Sall Grover

Yesterday at 2:51 PM

I understand, of course. But that's the way the article reads, and that's how many readers will construe it. I've dealt with complaints along these lines for more than a decade. And additional care, in my experience, needs to be taken on this terrain. I'll certainly be coming back to you with requests for links, references, etc.

Thanks for your patience

Scott

Email #14 - part 1 DATE: 9 June, 2026



Sall Grover

Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece

To: Scott Stephens

Yesterday at 3:24 PM

Hi Scott,

I completely understand the kind of complaints this topic tends to attract. I've seen the same pattern many times: people attribute a claim I'm not actually making and the original point gets lost in the noise.

To address your concerns directly, I've added a short clarifying paragraph that explicitly states what the piece is **not** saying. I've also included links to supporting Australian evidence below.

Here are the key references:

- <https://www.smh.com.au/national/victoria/secret-payout-after-sexual-assault-by-trans-murderer-in-women-s-prison-20260206-p5o07c.html>
- https://www.theaustralian.com.au/subscribe/news/1/?sourceCode=TAWEB_WRE170_a&dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.theaustralian.com.au%2Fnation%2Fi-was-sexually-assaulted-by-a-trans-inmate-in-a-womens-prison-says-katie%2Fnews-story%2F0ce8e0b2a5e976315e6935c62c774721&memtype=anonymous&mode=premium&v21=GROUPA-Segment-1-NOSCORE
- <https://www.abs.gov.au/media-centre/media-releases/97-cent-sexual-assault-offenders-are-male>

Below is the updated version of the article with the new paragraph incorporated.

That said, I'm very open to a different approach. The core argument - that sex-based rights and single-sex spaces exist for material, biological reasons - stands perfectly well without any reference to male violence. Women's boundaries don't need to be justified by fear, they are legitimate in their own right. If you'd prefer, I'm happy to rework the piece to remove that element entirely.

Let me know how you'd like to proceed, as I'm keen to get this over the line.

Kind regards,

Sall

Trans Rights and Women's Rights: When "Inclusion" Means Exclusion

By Sall Grover

Email #14 - part 2 DATE: 9 June, 2026

Kind regards,

Sall

Trans Rights and Women's Rights: When "Inclusion" Means Exclusion By Sall Grover

Some readers will find this uncomfortable. Others will dismiss it as unkind. But here is the undeniable biological fact that underpins this entire debate: the only prerequisite to being a "trans woman" is to be male. I cannot be a trans woman, no matter how I feel, because I am female. This is not hatred. It is grammar, biology, and reality meeting in plain English. Paula Gerber and Anna Cody, in their recent contributions to ABC, insist otherwise. They are wrong, and understanding precisely why they are wrong matters more than ever.

Gerber's piece on the *Giggle v Tickle* judgment celebrates it as a win for both trans rights and women's rights. Cody condemns proposals to restore biological definitions in the Sex Discrimination Act as a "retrograde step." Both treat sex-based rights as negotiable, and both frame disagreement as bigotry rather than a necessary defence of hard-won protections.

The truth is simpler and more uncomfortable. Trans women's rights, rights predicated on male bodies identifying into female categories, and women's sex-based rights are in direct conflict. One cannot expand without the other contracting.

Women have fought for single-sex spaces, services, and sports not because we are delicate flowers offended by existence, but because male-pattern violence, strength, and sexual dimorphism make mixed-sex environments risky or unfair for the female sex. This is not theory. It is data from prisons, refuges, change rooms, and sport.

This is not an accusation that trans-identified males are inherently violent. It is a recognition that trans women are biologically male, and that single-sex provisions were created to address well-documented average differences in physical strength and offending patterns between the sexes.

Rape victims rebuilding lives in female-only recovery groups should not have to audition their trauma to justify basic dignity. A woman should not need to recount the worst day of her life at the hands of a man simply to say this space is for us. No means no, remember? That principle applied to consent. It applies here too.

The law once understood this. The Sex Discrimination Act once defined "man" and "woman" by reference to biology before those definitions were quietly removed. The full federal court in the *Giggle v Tickle* appeal effectively ruled that a male who identifies as a woman is a woman for the purposes of the Act. In doing so, it admitted the very thing it denies. If you must redefine "woman" to include men, then trans women are not, in the ordinary meaning, women. You cannot have it both ways. Accurate definitions are not bigotry, they are the foundation of coherent law.

Without them, female-only spaces become meaningless. Prisons, shelters, sports, and even apps like Giggle become mixed-sex by stealth.

Consider the women who rely on these rights. Survivors of male violence. Women in crisis accommodation. Teenage girls in school change rooms. Female athletes watching records and scholarships evaporate. Religious women for whom modesty is non-negotiable. Disabled women needing intimate care from their own sex. These women, particularly the survivors of male violence, depend on female-only recovery spaces because trauma from male-perpetrated abuse often makes the presence of male bodies re-traumatising. Australia's first women-only trauma hospital and specialist programs were established precisely to provide that safe, sex-specific environment for healing. These are not abstract categories. They are ordinary Australian women who never asked to surrender their boundaries for someone else's identity.

Gerber further suggests that excluding males who identify as women risks excluding "unfeminine" lesbians or others who defy stereotypes. This is a sleight of hand. Sex is not a stereotype. It is observable, immutable reality. Lesbians remain female. The solution to rigid gender norms is not to dissolve sex, it is to stop enforcing stereotypes on either sex. Cody claims women have fought "not to be defined only by biology." Yet the women's movement fought precisely because of biology, reproductive capacity, vulnerability to male violence, physical differences. To pretend biology is incidental is to erase the reason single-sex provisions exist.

We are told trans rights are about compassion. But compassion that demands women absorb male bodies into every female category is not kindness, it is entitlement dressed in progressive clothing. Trans-identified people deserve dignity, mental health support, and their own protection from violence. They do not deserve to rewrite reality or override the sex-based rights of half the population. The idea that disagreement equals hatred has chilled debate for too long.

This issue will not disappear because activists wish it so. Australian's are noticing. Polling shifts. International reversals, from the UK Supreme Court to growing sporting policy updates including the Olympics, show the tide turning. Australians deserve open conversation, not slogans. We can support individuals without dismantling sex-based protections. We can affirm that trans women are males with an identity while refusing to pretend that identity erases sex or the category of woman as an adult human female.

Women's rights were never guaranteed by feelings or redefinitions. They were won through evidence, courage, and clarity about material reality. To deny that clarity is to admit the emperor has no clothes and, in this case, that the emperor is male. Parliament must act. Define sex clearly. Protect female spaces unapologetically.

The alternative is not inclusion. It is the slow erosion of the very category "woman" until it means nothing at all. And that serves no one.

Sall Grover is the CEO of Giggle and an accidental women's rights campaigner.

Email #15 DATE: 10 June, 2026



Sall Grover

Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece

To: Scott Stephens

12:27 PM

Hi Scott,

Just following up on this.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #15 DATE: 10 June, 2026



Scott Stephens

Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece

To: Sall Grover

1:00 PM

Hi Sall

You beat me to it. I was just in the middle of finalising my rather long editorials notes regarding your piece. I am happy to send them through to you if you would like a further explanation of my reasoning.

I have spent a great deal of time on your piece over the last three days, trying to find a way to bring your argument up to the kind of editorial standard that the ABC would require to warrant publication. I am acutely conscious of the editorial care that needs to be taken when publishing anything involving trans rights and medical care for trans young people — as you know, this is a topic over which offence is readily taken and mutual suspicion is already high. (Around this time last year, a huge amount of my time was spent responding to complaints over two opposing article on the restrictions of puberty blockers for trans youth by a [philosopher](#) and a [psychiatrist](#).) In this case, I am going to decline to publish your piece. This is not a matter of being averse to featuring a particular viewpoint on ABC Religion & Ethics, but rather the manner in which you make your argument does rise to the standards we would require. If you would like to recommend somebody else who could perhaps offer a response to Paula Gerber's article — and who wasn't directly involved in the court proceedings — I'd be happy to reach out to them.

Thank you for your patience, and for the open and constructive way you've engaged with the editorial process up to this point.

Best wishes

Scott

Email #15 DATE: 10 June, 2026



Sall Grover

Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece

To: Scott Stephens

1:14 PM

Hi Scott,

Can you please send me the editorial standards a piece must meet and I'll ensure the article, and my argument, meets them.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #16 DATE: 10 June, 2026



Scott Stephens

Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece

To: Sall Grover

10 June 2026 at 2:23 PM

If you don't mind a little overlap with the previous email, here is my full email:

Dear Sall,

Thank you for your patience, and for the open and constructive way you've engaged with the editorial process up to this point. As I mentioned in a previous email, I do tend to be a rather "hands on" editor. This is less about imposing any particular point of view on an article that's been submitted to me, than it is making the argument in that article as clear, convincing and well-supported as possible. One of the criteria I always resort to is: Is this article written in such a way that it is likely to be persuasive only to those who are already broadly sympathetic — particularly when the issue is a highly contentious one — or is it the kind of argument that could prove reasonably persuasive to those who are suspicious or unconvinced?

In the case of the latter, in my experience, there is a finely balanced mix of elements that are usually brought to bear: personal experience, tact, appeals to common ground, credible research/evidence, empathy, appropriate concessions to the concerns/fears of others. On the other hand, pieces that make sweeping claims, that are highly emotive or categorical in their use of language, that tend to mischaracterise the position of others, etc., are much more difficult to publish because they tend to appeal to the "already convinced".

I've spent a great deal of time on your piece over the last three days, trying to find a way to bring your argument up to the kind of editorial standard that the ABC would require to warrant publication. I am acutely conscious of the care that needs to be taken when publishing anything involving trans rights and medical care for trans young people — as you know, this is a topic over which offence is readily taken and mutual suspicion is already high. (Around this time last year, a huge amount of my time was spent responding to the fallout from two opposing articles on the restrictions of puberty blockers for trans youth by a [philosopher](#) and a [psychiatrist](#).)

The more I work on your piece, I keep coming up against the same series of editorial problems:

- The language that you use ("biological fact", "truth", "material reality") is categorical in a way that dismisses out of hand opposing viewpoints. I would agree with you that many proponents of trans rights are similarly dismissive of dissent, and I think that's a problem (both editorially and ethically). But this has a high likelihood of alienating and offending the very people I would imagine you are hoping to convince.
- I do not believe you have accurately characterised the positions of Paula Gerber, Anna Coady or the Federal Court — this may simply be the result of brevity, but it is nonetheless problematic to then spend time arguing against a position that could have been framed more generously and accurately.
- As I have already raised with you, your piece does repeatedly draw a connection between access of trans women into single-sex spaces and an increase in violence/danger to women. The unavoidable implication is that trans women are predators, or operating under false or malign pretenses. You haven't provided the kind of evidence that would be required to justify such a serious claim. By bringing into the argument such a delicate and emotionally sensitive space as a recovery group for survivors of sexual assault or hospitals for trauma victims, risks emotively clouding the issues. (Are you suggesting that trans women would illegitimately seek access to such spaces? For what reason?)
- As your piece goes on, you make a number of stark assertions which, in effect, contrast "reality" to "pretense"/"pretending". The lack of supporting evidence — apart a gesture toward certain trends in the US and UK, which are notable and could be drawn on more productively — and the rather condescending tone that is used at precisely the moment when you should be hoping to persuade the unconvinced, are both rhetorically and editorially problematic.
- The final issue involves the fact that you have been a party to two court proceedings, on this very issue — and, if I understand correctly, are planning to appeal to the High Court. It would be very, very unusual for the ABC to publish such a piece from such a party. I could certainly imagine publishing a response to Paula Gerber's article from someone not directly involved in the legal proceedings. (Perhaps you'd like to suggest someone?) But, in this instance, it would feel like you are trying to win your case in the court of public opinion, having failed with the Federal Court. Which then brings me back to the above issues: the piece is not written or argued in such a way as to be convincing to those who aren't already sympathetic.

Hope this helps

Scott

Email #17 DATE: 10 June, 2026



Sall Grover

Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece

To: Scott Stephens

10 June 2026 at 2:46 PM

Dear Scott,

Thank you for your feedback.

I must respectfully note that when you accepted the piece for consideration, I was already a party to the two relevant court proceedings. For that reason, I do not believe my involvement should preclude publication. I also note that the ABC recently published a favourable piece quoting Anna Cody, who has likewise been involved in both matters.

I remain very keen to work collaboratively with you to produce a publishable article. I am happy to:

- Remove any references to violence, as previously mentioned
- Review and adjust the language you have flagged
- Reframe the piece as a more general discussion of the tension between women's rights and trans rights, written from a women's rights perspective, rather than a direct response to Paula Gerber's article

My goal is to present a clear, well-supported argument that meets ABC editorial standards while preserving the substance of my position. I believe the topic is important and would welcome the opportunity to refine the piece more.

Kind regards,

Sall Grover

Email #18 DATE: 10 June, 2026



Scott Stephens

Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece

To: Sall Grover

10 June 2026 at 4:17 PM

Sorry about the delay, Sall. Had radio commitments this afternoon.

You're absolutely right about your involvement in court proceedings not precluding an opinion piece from you. But, along with a number of the other issues I mentioned, it is a contributing factor. I believe it makes it all the more important that a piece from you presents itself as broadly persuasive.

If you're happy to rectify some of these editorial issues, I'm certainly happy to keep working with you to arrive at an article we can publish. It was not my intention to close the door to an article from you. My recommendation would be that you have a clear sense of the audience you are trying to reach, and gear your argument to what will best convey your sense of moral importance about this issue.

Thank you, again, for the constructive way you've responded throughout.

With my best wishes

Scott

Email #19 DATE: 10 June, 2026



Sall Grover

Re: Response to Paula Gerber's piece

To: Scott Stephens

10 June 2026 at 4:24 PM

Thank you very much, Scott.

I will send you a revised draft tomorrow AM.

Kind regards,

Sall Grover

Sent from my iPhone

Email #20 - Part 1 DATE: 11 June, 2026



Sall Grover

Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex

To: Scott Stephens

11 June 2026 at 7:24 AM

Hi Scott,

Thank you again for your detailed feedback and for continuing to engage with this piece. I've taken your notes on board and produced a new draft.

I've written this purely from the perspective of women's rights. The article focuses on the collision between sex and gender identity and what that means for women's long-established protections under law, which is exactly what the Giggle v Tickle case is about from my point of view.

As requested, I've removed any reference to male violence. Instead, the piece speaks about survivors seeking recovery and the practical importance of female-only spaces for ordinary Australian women.

I believe this version is calmer, more focused, and better structured for your audience while preserving the core of my argument. I've aimed for a tone that invites reflection rather than confrontation.

Here is the revised piece:

Email #20 - Part 2 DATE: 11 June, 2026

Women's Rights: Why the Law Must Define What a Woman Is

By Sall Grover

Australian law once understood something simple and essential. A woman is an adult human female. The Sex Discrimination Act was written to protect women as a sex class, recognising that our biology creates distinct needs and vulnerabilities that require specific safeguards. Single-sex refuges, changing facilities, prisons, sports categories and support groups were not afterthoughts. They were deliberate responses to the material realities of female lives, acknowledging menstruation, pregnancy, menopause, and the physical differences that shape everything from competitive sport to personal privacy.

That original clarity mattered. The Act once contained explicit biological definitions of “man” and “woman.” Those definitions were quietly removed. The only plausible reason for stripping out clear, objective definitions is to allow the category to be corrupted, to make “woman” mean something other than adult human female. That quiet change has had loud consequences.

I created Giggle as a platform where women, adult human females, could connect with each other. It was designed as a space that reflected the same sex-based boundaries women have long relied upon in the physical world. The resulting legal battle, Giggle v Tickle, has become a test case for whether female-only spaces can still exist in Australia. At the moment, they cannot.

When gender identity is permitted to override sex, the legal category of “woman” becomes a mixed-sex category. What was once a clear class open to all females turns into something anyone who identifies as a woman can enter. Female-only spaces then lose their purpose and the safeguards women fought to establish begin to dissolve. Single-sex spaces become unisex.

This is not theoretical. Ordinary Australian women rely on these single-sex provisions. Survivors seeking recovery, women needing intimate care, religious women for whom modesty is non-negotiable, and lesbians for whom same-sex attraction is rooted in sex, not identity. Redefining lesbian spaces and boundaries to include male-bodied people does not expand rights. It erases the meaning of same-sex attraction and asks lesbians to set aside their orientation or be labelled exclusionary.

People who identify as trans are entitled to the same basic rights as every other Australian, such as fair access to employment and housing, protection from harassment, their own dedicated spaces and services, and the freedom to organise events as they see fit. Those rights can exist, they just need not come at the expense of women's sex-based rights.

Women who defend these boundaries are not motivated by animus. We are women who stand on centuries of hard-won battles for female rights and recognition. We fought for legal acknowledgment of our sex-based reality precisely because it shapes our lives in concrete, measurable ways. We will not surrender it. We should not be asked to. Women's rights were never granted by redefining reality. They were secured through evidence, persistence and insistence on material facts.

Dismissing women who simply want clear sex-based spaces, whether the dismissal comes from academics, bureaucrats or activists, does not resolve the tension. It merely underscores how deep the problem has become. A fact-based conversation is both possible and necessary. One that calmly acknowledges women's need for sex-based spaces alongside anyone's desire to support people who identify as trans.

Australian women ask for nothing extravagant: that our material reality - adult human female - be clearly recognised in law where it continues to matter. That recognition should not diminish anyone else. It simply ensures that women's rights remain meaningful rather than symbolic.

Parliament has the power to restore clarity to the Sex Discrimination Act. Defining sex accurately and protecting female-only spaces where biology is relevant is not a rejection of anyone. It is the responsible act of a society that values evidence, fairness and the hard-won rights of half its population.

Australian women are not asking to turn back the clock. We are asking that the law remember what a woman is, so the rights attached to that word can continue to serve the women who need them most.

Sall Grover is the CEO of Giggle and an accidental women's rights campaigner.

Email #21 DATE: 11 June, 2026



Scott Stephens

11 June 2026 at 7:29 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex

To: Sall Grover

Great. Thank you Sall. I'll work on this today and get back to you as soon as I can with editorial feedback and/or a revised version for publication.

Best

Scott

Email #22 DATE: 11 June, 2026



Scott Stephens

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex
To: Sall Grover

11 June 2026 at 7:30 AM

I would just mention — given the importance of references/sources for readers being able to evaluate the merits of an argument, if there are particular resources or studies or research that you've drawn on, could you send through links so I can integrate them into the piece?

Scott

Email #23 DATE: 11 June, 2026

Found in Sent - Google Mailbox



Sall Grover

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex
To: Scott Stephens

11 June 2026 at 7:41 AM

Hi Scott,

You'll have to give me specifics of what you want a reference for, because I've taken a common sense approach rather than make claims that require data. That being said, every claim made can be backed up.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #24 DATE: 11 June, 2026



Scott Stephens

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex
To: Sall Grover

11 June 2026 at 7:49 AM

Ok, no problems.

S

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Email #24 DATE: 11 June, 2026



Sall Grover

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex
To: Scott Stephens

11 June 2026 at 4:55 PM

Hi Scott,

Justin following up on this.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #25 DATE: 12 June, 2026



Scott Stephens

12 June 2026 at 8:35 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex

To: Sall Grover

Hi Sall.

Thank you again for sending this through yesterday. I worked on it late yesterday afternoon, and went through it all again early this morning. I think the piece is very, very good. I've made a few editorial changes and am checking with a couple fellow senior editors on some matters. I'll let you know as soon as I've heard back, and will send you the revised version.

Again, I really appreciate the constructive, generous way you've engaged with what can be a bit of a nit-picky editorial process.

Back to you soon.

Scott

Email #26 DATE: 12 June, 2026



Sall Grover

12 June 2026 at 9:22 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex

To: Scott Stephens

Hi Scott,

Thank you so much. I genuinely appreciate it.

Looking forward to reading the revised draft.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #27 DATE: 12 June, 2026



Sall Grover

12 June 2026 at 4:50 PM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex

To: Scott Stephens

Hi Scott,

Just following up on this.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #28 DATE: 15 June, 2026



Sall Grover

15 June 2026 at 9:51 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex
To: Scott Stephens

Hi Scott,

Just following up on this.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #29 DATE: 15 June, 2026



Scott Stephens

15 June 2026 at 9:58 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex
To: Sall Grover

Hi Sall

Sorry about the delay. I had to do a significant rewrite of the first half of the piece on Friday, due to a number of accuracy issues involving your characterisation of the SDA and 2013 amendments. It's now back with a fellow senior editor to see if there are other outstanding issues. We're trying to put your piece on the firmest footing we can.

I'll get back to you as soon as I can.

Scott

Email #30 DATE: 15 June, 2026



Sall Grover

15 June 2026 at 10:05 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex
To: Scott Stephens

Hi Scott,

Can you please send these changes through to me? I would appreciate being part of this process. There should be no reason to keep it a mystery from me.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #31 DATE: 15 June, 2026



Scott Stephens

15 June 2026 at 10:09 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex

To: Sall Grover



Nothing is being kept a mystery from you. There is nothing that will go online that you won't see/approve/modify first. I just don't want to send you dribs-and-drabs. I want to ensure that the version you receive includes all the revisions from my end.

S

Email #32 DATE: 15 June, 2026



Sall Grover

15 June 2026 at 10:54 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex

To: Scott Stephens

Hi Scott,

Can't wait to read it. Will it be today?

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #33 DATE: 16 June, 2026



Sall Grover

16 June 2026 at 9:07 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex

To: Scott Stephens

Hi Scott,

Just following up on this.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #33 DATE: 18 June, 2026



Sall Grover

9:27 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex
To: Scott Stephens

Hi Scott,

I am once again following up on this.

If you want to send me the notes you are attempting to implement, I have no doubt I can produce a new draft in a reasonable time.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #34 DATE: 18 June, 2026



Scott Stephens

9:57 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex
To: Sall Grover

You've been so patient. Just waiting for a colleague to get back to me.

I'll send you the revised version as soon as I possibly can.

Scott

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Email #35 DATE: 18 June, 2026



Sall Grover

10:09 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex
To: Scott Stephens



Thanks, Scott. I appreciate it.

Kind regards,

Sall

Sent from my iPhone

Email #36 DATE: 19 June, 2026



Sall Grover

Follow-up on op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex – Request for progress and timeline

To: Gavin Fang, Cc: Scott Stephens

Sent - Google 9:24 AM

[Details](#)

Dear Gavin,

I hope this email finds you well.

I am writing to follow up on the op-ed I submitted in response to Paula Gerber's piece. As you know, I initially pitched this to you on 28 May. You kindly passed it to Scott Stephens, who has since worked with me through multiple rounds of editorial feedback.

I incorporated Scott's feedback, provided supporting references where requested, and submitted a significantly revised version on 11 June. This version focused on the legal and practical importance of clear sex-based definitions from the perspective of women's rights. Scott described the piece as "very, very good" and indicated he had made some editorial changes while consulting senior colleagues.

Despite several follow-ups, I have not yet received the revised version or a clear timeline for next steps. Given the public interest in the *Giggle v Tickle* decision and the ABC's stated commitment to presenting different perspectives on contentious issues, I would be grateful for your assistance in moving this forward.

Could you please advise on the current status and let me know when I can expect to receive a publication date? I remain very happy to discuss any further adjustments, but I would prefer to implement editorial notes myself so that the piece retains my voice.

Thank you again for your time and for originally facilitating this process. I appreciate the opportunity.

Below is my reviewed piece submitted on June 11.

Kind regards,

Sall Grover

(NOTE: No response from Gavin)

Email #36 DATE: 19 June, 2026

**Scott Stephens**

10:21 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex

To: Sall Grover

Good morning Sall.

Thank you for your patience. I know this has been a drawn out process, and I realise that your patience has been sorely tested.

I am certainly not expecting any sympathy from you, but I would like to assure you of the hours that I have spent working through successive versions of your piece, the hours I spent last Friday rewriting the first half of your article to address some of the inaccuracies in your presentation of the Sexual Discrimination Act and subsequent amendments. I spent a significant amount of time, during an otherwise very, very busy week, advocating for some of the merits of your piece and deliberating with a number of fellow senior editors. There is one particular colleague whose input I was awaiting, hence the delay this week.

The issues we keep coming up against have to do with pervasive **inaccuracies** in your presentation of both the SDA (what it allows, what it forbids, what exemptions — eg, for single sex spaces — it allows for, and how pervasive were the changes in 2013) and the *Giggle v Tickle* judgement; and **overstatement** about the extent to which changes to the SDA present a threat/danger to women and single-sex spaces (as opposed to, for instance, chronic underfunding, understaffing, etc.). Put these two issues together, and the effect is to single out transgender persons for particular and perhaps unwarranted attention.

The ABC can and does publish opinion articles (which represent the views of individual writers), but once the decision is made to publish, the ABC also needs to have firm grounds on which to defend the decision to publish in the face of complaints over inaccuracy, discrimination, harm, etc.

I had expressed my gratitude to you for your constructive and open-handed engagement throughout this process, and have said the said to many colleagues. But I'm afraid our decision is not to publish your piece.

Wishing you the very best

Scott

Email #37 DATE: 19 June, 2026

**Sall Grover**

10:52 AM

Re: Revised op-ed: Women's Rights and the Need for Legal Clarity on Sex

To: Scott Stephens, Cc: Gavin Fang

[Details](#)

Dear Scott,

Thank you for your email and for the time you say you invested in considering my piece. I appreciate you setting out your reasons clearly.

I note your decision not to publish. While I respect that this is your editorial judgment, I disagree with the characterisation of my piece as containing "pervasive inaccuracies." The interpretation and application of the Sex Discrimination Act, particularly following the 2013 amendments and in light of the *Giggle v Tickle* judgment, is genuinely contested in legal and public debate. The Full Federal Court's ruling on the meaning of "woman" under the Act does not settle broader questions of biology, parliamentary intention, or the scope of single-sex exemptions. There are well-documented cases of biological males accessing women's prisons and other single-sex spaces, and these have been reported in mainstream Australian media, if not the ABC. My piece addressed these issues from the perspective of women's sex-based rights, which is a legitimate and longstanding viewpoint.

As an opinion piece, rather than a news report, it is entitled to argue from that perspective. The concerns I raised about the erosion of single-sex spaces are not speculative, they reflect material realities that many women, including survivors of male violence, consider important. Framing these concerns as singling out transgender people for "unwarranted attention" appears to apply a different standard than the one applied to Paula Gerber's piece. Gerber's article presented contested interpretations as settled fact, for example, stating that the court decision "puts an end to any debate about who is a woman" and that it represents a "win" for women's rights. It also characterised opposition to the ruling as diverting from "real problems" and equated concerns about biological sex with anti-trans rhetoric, while downplaying countervailing women's rights arguments. That piece appears to be published without the same level of scrutiny applied to mine.

I will therefore be publishing my submitted op-eds, along with an account of this editorial process, on other platforms and publications. Your detailed explanation of the decision has made the ABC's position on these matters very clear.

I wish you well.

Kind regards,

Sall Grover

[See More from Scott Stephens](#)

First article pitched June 8, 2026:

Trans Rights and Women's Rights: When "Inclusion" Means Exclusion

By Sall Grover

Some readers will find this uncomfortable. Others will dismiss it as unkind. But here is the undeniable biological fact that underpins this entire debate: the only prerequisite to being a "trans woman" is to be male. I cannot be a trans woman, no matter how I feel, because I am female. This is not hatred; it is grammar, biology, and reality meeting in plain English. Paula Gerber and Anna Cody, in their recent contributions to ABC, insist otherwise. They are wrong, and understanding precisely why matters more than ever.

Gerber's piece on the *Giggle v Tickle* judgment celebrates it as a win for both trans rights and women's rights. Cody condemns proposals to restore biological definitions in the Sex Discrimination Act as a "retrograde step." Both treat sex-based rights as negotiable, and both frame disagreement as bigotry rather than a necessary defence of hard-won protections. The truth is simpler and more uncomfortable. Trans women's rights, rights predicated on male bodies identifying into female categories, and women's sex-based rights are in direct conflict. One cannot expand without the other contracting.

Women have fought for single-sex spaces, services, and sports not because we are delicate flowers offended by existence, but because male-pattern violence, strength, and sexual dimorphism make mixed-sex environments risky or unfair for the female sex, either way necessary. This is not theory. It is data from prisons, refuges, change rooms, and sport. Rape victims rebuilding lives in female-only recovery groups should not have to audition their trauma to justify basic dignity. A woman should not need to recount the worst day of her life at the hands of a man simply to say this space is for us. No means no, remember? That principle applied to consent. It applies here too.

The law once understood this. The Sex Discrimination Act once defined "man" and "woman" by reference to biology before those definitions were quietly removed. The full federal court in the *Giggle v Tickle* appeal effectively ruled that a male who identifies as a woman is a woman for the purposes of the Act. In doing so, it admitted the very thing it denies. If you must redefine "woman" to include men, then trans women are not, in the ordinary meaning, women. You cannot have it both ways. Accurate definitions are not bigotry, they are the foundation of coherent law. Without them, female-only spaces become meaningless. Prisons, shelters, sports, and even apps like Giggle become mixed-sex by stealth.

Consider the women who rely on these rights. Survivors of male violence. Women in crisis accommodation. Teenage girls in school change rooms. Female athletes watching records and scholarships evaporate. Muslim and religious women for whom modesty is non-negotiable. Disabled women needing intimate care from their own sex. These are not abstract categories. They are millions of ordinary Australian women who never asked to surrender their boundaries for someone else's identity.

Gerber suggests that excluding males who identify as women risks excluding "unfeminine" lesbians or others who defy stereotypes. This is a sleight of hand. Sex is not a stereotype. It is observable,

immutable reality. Lesbians remain female. The solution to rigid gender norms is not to dissolve sex, it is to stop enforcing stereotypes on either sex. Cody claims women have fought “not to be defined only by biology.” Yet the women’s movement fought precisely because of biology, reproductive capacity, vulnerability to male violence, physical differences. To pretend biology is incidental is to erase the reason single-sex provisions exist.

We are told trans rights are about compassion. But compassion that demands women absorb male bodies into every female category is not kindness, it is entitlement dressed in progressive clothing. Trans-identified people deserve dignity, mental health support, and protection from violence. They do not deserve to rewrite reality or override the sex-based rights of half the population. The idea that disagreement equals hatred has chilled debate for too long. Courts awarding aggravated damages for “misgendering” or courtroom demeanour only deepen the chill.

This issue will not disappear because activists wish it so. Women are noticing. Polling shifts. International reversals, from the UK Supreme Court to growing sporting policy updates including the Olympics, show the tide turning. Australians deserve open conversation, not slogans. We can support distressed individuals without dismantling sex-based protections. We can affirm that trans women are males with an identity while refusing to pretend that identity erases sex.

Women’s rights were never guaranteed by feelings or redefinitions. They were won through evidence, courage, and clarity about material reality. To deny that clarity is to admit the emperor has no clothes and, in this case, that the emperor is male. Parliament must act. Define sex clearly. Protect female spaces unapologetically.

The alternative is not inclusion. It is the slow erosion of the very category “woman” until it means nothing at all. And that serves no one.

Sall Grover is the CEO of Giggle and an accidental women’s rights campaigner.

Revised article sent June 9, 2026:

Trans Rights and Women's Rights: When "Inclusion" Means Exclusion

By Sall Grover

Some readers will find this uncomfortable. Others will dismiss it as unkind. But here is the undeniable biological fact that underpins this entire debate: the only prerequisite to being a "trans woman" is to be male. I cannot be a trans woman, no matter how I feel, because I am female. This is not hatred. It is grammar, biology, and reality meeting in plain English. Paula Gerber and Anna Cody, in their recent contributions to ABC, insist otherwise. They are wrong, and understanding precisely why they are wrong matters more than ever.

Gerber's piece on the *Giggle v Tickle* judgment celebrates it as a win for both trans rights and women's rights. Cody condemns proposals to restore biological definitions in the Sex Discrimination Act as a "retrograde step." Both treat sex-based rights as negotiable, and both frame disagreement as bigotry rather than a necessary defence of hard-won protections.

The truth is simpler and more uncomfortable. Trans women's rights, rights predicated on male bodies identifying into female categories, and women's sex-based rights are in direct conflict. One cannot expand without the other contracting.

Women have fought for single-sex spaces, services, and sports not because we are delicate flowers offended by existence, but because male-pattern violence, strength, and sexual dimorphism make mixed-sex environments risky or unfair for the female sex. This is not theory. It is data from prisons, refuges, change rooms, and sport.

This is not an accusation that trans-identified males are inherently violent. It is a recognition that trans women are biologically male, and that single-sex provisions were created to address well-documented average differences in physical strength and offending patterns between the sexes.

Rape victims rebuilding lives in female-only recovery groups should not have to audition their trauma to justify basic dignity. A woman should not need to recount the worst day of her life at the hands of a man simply to say this space is for us. No means no, remember? That principle applied to consent. It applies here too.

The law once understood this. The Sex Discrimination Act once defined "man" and "woman" by reference to biology before those definitions were quietly removed. The full federal court in the *Giggle v Tickle* appeal effectively ruled that a male who identifies as a woman is a woman for the purposes of the Act. In doing so, it admitted the very thing it denies. If you must redefine "woman" to include men, then trans women are not, in the ordinary meaning, women. You cannot have it both ways. Accurate definitions are not bigotry, they are the foundation of coherent law.

Without them, female-only spaces become meaningless. Prisons, shelters, sports, and even apps like Giggle become mixed-sex by stealth.

Consider the women who rely on these rights. Survivors of male violence. Women in crisis accommodation. Teenage girls in school change rooms. Female athletes watching records and scholarships evaporate. Religious women for whom modesty is non-negotiable. Disabled women needing intimate care from their own sex. These women, particularly the survivors of male violence, depend on female-only recovery spaces because trauma from male-perpetrated abuse often makes the presence of male bodies re-traumatising. Australia's first women-only trauma hospital and specialist programs were established precisely to provide that safe, sex-specific environment for healing. These are not abstract categories. They are ordinary Australian women who never asked to surrender their boundaries for someone else's identity.

Gerber further suggests that excluding males who identify as women risks excluding "unfeminine" lesbians or others who defy stereotypes. This is a sleight of hand. Sex is not a stereotype. It is observable, immutable reality. Lesbians remain female. The solution to rigid gender norms is not to dissolve sex, it is to stop enforcing stereotypes on either sex. Cody claims women have fought "not to be defined only by biology." Yet the women's movement fought precisely because of biology, reproductive capacity, vulnerability to male violence, physical differences. To pretend biology is incidental is to erase the reason single-sex provisions exist.

We are told trans rights are about compassion. But compassion that demands women absorb male bodies into every female category is not kindness, it is entitlement dressed in progressive clothing. Trans-identified people deserve dignity, mental health support, and their own protection from violence. They do not deserve to rewrite reality or override the sex-based rights of half the population. The idea that disagreement equals hatred has chilled debate for too long.

This issue will not disappear because activists wish it so. Australian's are noticing. Polling shifts. International reversals, from the UK Supreme Court to growing sporting policy updates including the Olympics, show the tide turning. Australians deserve open conversation, not slogans. We can support individuals without dismantling sex-based protections. We can affirm that trans women are males with an identity while refusing to pretend that identity erases sex or the category of woman as an adult human female.

Women's rights were never guaranteed by feelings or redefinitions. They were won through evidence, courage, and clarity about material reality. To deny that clarity is to admit the emperor has no clothes and, in this case, that the emperor is male. Parliament must act. Define sex clearly. Protect female spaces unapologetically.

The alternative is not inclusion. It is the slow erosion of the very category "woman" until it means nothing at all. And that serves no one.

Sall Grover is the CEO of Giggle and an accidental women's rights campaigner.

New article sent June 11, 2026:

Women's Rights: Why the Law Must Define What a Woman Is

By Sall Grover

Australian law once understood something simple and essential. A woman is an adult human female. The Sex Discrimination Act was written to protect women as a sex class, recognising that our biology creates distinct needs and vulnerabilities that require specific safeguards. Single-sex refuges, changing facilities, prisons, sports categories and support groups were not afterthoughts. They were deliberate responses to the material realities of female lives, acknowledging menstruation, pregnancy, menopause, and the physical differences that shape everything from competitive sport to personal privacy.

That original clarity mattered. The Act once contained explicit biological definitions of “man” and “woman.” Those definitions were quietly removed. The only plausible reason for stripping out clear, objective definitions is to allow the category to be corrupted, to make “woman” mean something other than adult human female. That quiet change has had loud consequences.

I created Giggle as a platform where women, adult human females, could connect with each other. It was designed as a space that reflected the same sex-based boundaries women have long relied upon in the physical world. The resulting legal battle, *Giggle v Tickle*, has become a test case for whether female-only spaces can still exist in Australia. At the moment, they cannot.

When gender identity is permitted to override sex, the legal category of “woman” becomes a mixed-sex category. What was once a clear class open to all females turns into something anyone who identifies as a woman can enter. Female-only spaces then lose their purpose and the safeguards women fought to establish begin to dissolve. Single-sex spaces become unisex.

This is not theoretical. Ordinary Australian women rely on these single-sex provisions. Survivors seeking recovery, women needing intimate care, religious women for whom modesty is non-negotiable, and lesbians for whom same-sex attraction is rooted in sex, not identity. Redefining lesbian spaces and boundaries to include male-bodied people does not expand rights. It erases the meaning of same-sex attraction and asks lesbians to set aside their orientation or be labelled exclusionary.

People who identify as trans are entitled to the same basic rights as every other Australian, such as fair access to employment and housing, protection from harassment, their own dedicated spaces and services, and the freedom to organise events as they see fit. Those rights can exist, they just need not come at the expense of women’s sex-based rights.

Women who defend these boundaries are not motivated by animus. We are women who stand on centuries of hard-won battles for female rights and recognition. We fought for legal acknowledgment of our sex-based reality precisely because it shapes our lives in concrete, measurable ways. We will not surrender it. We should not be asked to. Women’s rights were never granted by redefining reality. They were secured through evidence, persistence and insistence on material facts.

Dismissing women who simply want clear sex-based spaces, whether the dismissal comes from academics, bureaucrats or activists, does not resolve the tension. It merely underscores how deep the problem has become. A fact-based conversation is both possible and necessary. One that calmly acknowledges women's need for sex-based spaces alongside anyone's desire to support people who identify as trans.

Australian women ask for nothing extravagant: that our material reality - adult human female - be clearly recognised in law where it continues to matter. That recognition should not diminish anyone else. It simply ensures that women's rights remain meaningful rather than symbolic.

Parliament has the power to restore clarity to the Sex Discrimination Act. Defining sex accurately and protecting female-only spaces where biology is relevant is not a rejection of anyone. It is the responsible act of a society that values evidence, fairness and the hard-won rights of half its population.

Australian women are not asking to turn back the clock. We are asking that the law remember what a woman is, so the rights attached to that word can continue to serve the women who need them most.

Sall Grover is the CEO of Giggle and an accidental women's rights campaigner.