

Response from Sall Grover

First of all, I want to address something you have been told that is blatantly wrong:

The SDA is (was) based on biology. Whoever told you it otherwise is categorically incorrect. Woman, pregnancy, breastfeeding - these are all things based on biology. It is utterly stupid - and ideologically captured - to say the SDA isn't based on biology. You have spoken to an activist, not a legal expert. Additionally, CEDAW is based on biology and the SDA is based on CEDAW. Before men started claiming to be women in law, it would not have been a controversial statement to say the SDA is based on biology. Woman is (was) a biological category.

People will humiliate themselves to try to validate men as women.

Now, to your questions:

- **Do you accept that your piece DID contain inaccuracies, intended or otherwise, and there were points that lacked evidence or may have been misleading?**

No. My piece wasn't inaccurate or misleading.

I also don't believe "inaccuracy" was the problem with my piece. The problem is I told the truth: "transwomen" are men. That's the issue here.

I explained why women's sex based rights are important. I believe the ABC doesn't want that explained to their audience.

In terms of inaccuracy, the ABC will publish inaccuracy in an op-ed. Paula Gerber's op-ed is full of inaccuracy and misleading comments, the most obvious being her claim that the issue is now legally settled. No it isn't. The high court is still available. Why was the ABC fine to print that inaccuracy, amongst others? Put her piece into AI and ask it to assess it. I have. Also, find out if her piece was subject to the same editorial scrutiny as mine was. If it wasn't, what does that suggest?

The ABC has effectively accused me of being a liar to cover up their ideological bias and the lie that men can be women.

I want an apology, at least.

Additionally, the ABC has previously run a headline about me that was incredibly misleading (attached). In my experience, the ABC has no problem being misleading - so long as it suits their agenda and supports gender ideology.

- **To what extent were you prepared to work through these issues to get the piece published?**

I wouldn't have put my name to the inaccuracies the ABC was wanting, nor lost my voice, but so long as the piece stayed accurate and explained the issue from the perspective of women's rights, I would have continued to work with the ABC. I would still work with them. I'd write an op-ed for the ABC tomorrow. I'm not the reason why the relationship has fallen apart, it's their refusal not mine.

I met Scott Stephens with solutions at every step of the way. I gave him references to back up my claims. I followed up with him. I asked questions. I asked for the ABC's editorial standards so I could implement them. I was ignored.

Additionally, he was claiming to be re-writing my opinion piece. On what planet does someone else write someone's opinion piece? Why not just give me notes? Why not send me the supposed rewrites? Has anyone seen his rewrites? Do they exist? And then to have the audacity to accuse me of inaccuracy when he was claiming to be rewriting an OPINION piece by me? His words (opinion) under my name would have been inaccurate, a lie. The ABC is fine with inaccuracy so long as it suits their agenda.

I write op-ed's for The Australian and Sky News. I have NEVER been rewritten or accused of inaccuracy by those publications.

- **It may be self-evident, but I'm interested to hear in your words why you felt it was important to have this piece published on the ABC?**

Because the ABC is the national broadcaster and should represent both/all sides of issues. On gender ideology, it does not. To emphasize that point: I have sent the ABC every media release for the Giggle v Tickle case, up to & including the recent one for the high court application. Four and a half years of media releases. The ABC has never contacted me or published an article based off a media release I have sent. Have a look right now to see if the ABC has reported on Giggle applying to the high court. Spoiler: it hasn't. Why not?

- **The ABC argues that by publishing an inaccurate and misleading item, harm could result, to a vulnerable group. What is your response to this?**

Men who claim to be women are not vulnerable. They are the most powerful group in the country. Don't believe me? "Misgender" or say no to one of them and see who has the upper hand. Hint: it isn't you.

This "vulnerable" group has the Australian Human Rights Commission and the government on their side. Women who want woman only spaces on the basis of sex don't have that. Who is more vulnerable?

To say that men who claim to be women are vulnerable is an inaccuracy I would seek to challenge at the ABC. Would the ABC publish an op-ed by me explaining that men who claim to be women aren't vulnerable? What does it say about the ABC if they wouldn't?

I trust you can see what I'm getting at.

Furthermore, it is not inaccurate or misleading to say that "transwomen" are male. That is a statement of pure fact.

- **Have you sought to appear anywhere else on the ABC? When and how?**

I have sent media releases for 4.5 years. The ABC had never responded to me until this occasion.

I have the receipts.

- **Do you think the ABC is biased on this issue? If so why?**

The ABC is clearly biased on this issue. Find a piece - any piece - in the ABC that reflects my position. Good luck.

You're welcome to email me if you need any more information.

I hope that, due to the topic at hand, Media Watch does not make any claims or suggestions that are inaccurate about me. Not only would the irony be too great, I would have to see legal advice.