

# Germany must legally recognize 'third gender' from birth – top court

RT

Germany's top court has called on the country's parliament to legally recognize a 'third gender' which allows intersex people to identify as neither male nor female. Germany could become the first European country to allow a third gender on birth certificates.

The current law on civil status discriminates against intersex people as it rules out *"the registration of a gender other than 'male' or 'female,'"* the Federal Constitutional Court said in a ruling on Wednesday. The German parliament should introduce new provisions into current legislation by December 31, 2018, it said.

The court made its ruling in favor of an appeal brought earlier this year by an intersex person whose name hasn't been revealed in the German media. The person was registered as female but chromosome analysis showed that the plaintiff was neither male nor female. The person brought the appeal to the top court after several lower courts had ruled against the bid for gender change in the birth register.

*"Even if this person chose the option 'no entry' [for gender], it would not reflect that the complainant does not see themselves as a genderless person, but rather perceives themselves as having a gender beyond male or female (sic),"* according to the ruling. Civil status is not *"a marginal issue,"* but rather a *"position of a person within the legal system, as stated by the law,"* the statement said. The German constitution does not require civil status to be *"exclusively binary in terms of gender,"* it added.

Germany's Third Option activist organization has hailed the court's decision. "We are completely overwhelmed and speechless. That's a small revolution in the gender area," the group wrote on Twitter.

*Beschluss und Leitsatz vom [#BVerfG](#) findet ihr hier: <https://t.co/xeNsUXSJ7R> [#dritteoption](#)*

*– Dritte Option (@DritteOption) [November 8, 2017](#)*

According to the UN, intersex people are born "with sex characteristics that do not fit typical binary notions of male or female bodies." Intersex traits can be "visible at birth" while in others "they are not apparent until puberty," the agency [says](#). Between 0.05 and 1.7 percent of the world population has intersex traits. "The upper estimate is similar to the number of red-haired people," UN experts say.

In 2013, Germany became the first European country to allow parents of babies born with no clearly-defined gender characteristics to leave the 'male/female' field on birth certificates blank, creating a 'third sex' category in the public register. The law prevents parents from making hasty decisions on controversial genital surgeries for their newborns.

---

**[Deluded Strategies in the Twilight of the Cold War by](#)**

# Denis Healey

[Download \[8.66 MB\]](#)

**Page Count:** 11 pages

**Date:** April 1971

**Restriction:** Confidential

**Originating Organization:** Bilderberg Group

**File Type:** pdf

**File Size:** 9,080,179 bytes

File	Hash	(SHA-256):
401B12D49F0CF6E3C7376071DFDE2CF50BDA619262BD956FFDD8E35753C407		
F1		

For a quarter of a century international diplomacy has been dominated by the concept of the cold war as it crystallized under Stalin and Dulles. Mankind was seen as split into two camps to use Zhdanov's phrase – led by the Soviet Union and the United States, and inspired by totally incompatible visions of world order. Sooner or later every country would have to join one camp or the other. The West believed that the communist camp would use force to expand its frontiers unless faced by superior power and the manifest will to use it. The communists believed that the West would resort to war when faced by its inevitable defeat at the hands of international revolution.

This picture of the world is still an element in the approach of communist governments. It has also shown an impressive capacity to survive the West. As late as 1960, after the convulsions in Eastern Europe and the split between Moscow and Peking, Professor Walt Rostow was able to believe that the Soviet leaders could look ahead "within the bounds of reason" to achieving "virtually total power, exercised from Moscow" in 10 years; in the same year Mr. Crossman could write: "We can predict with mathematical certainty that, as long as the public sector remains the minority sector throughout the western world, we are bound to be defeated in every kind or peaceful competition which we undertake with the Russians".

---

**Twitter takes big step  
backward in new privacy**

# policy rollout

## Natural News

A new update to Twitter's privacy policy sees the end of a longstanding pledge to protect user privacy by the firm. Twitter, which has never been profitable, is now taking a more proactive approach toward boosting revenue and it's coming at the expense of its loyal users.

In an effort to improve the reach of its targeted ads, Twitter will be collecting more data about people. This will include tracking your activities even when you're outside of its app and website and then storing this information for as long as 30 days; the current maximum is just ten days.

This will be made possible thanks to those "Tweet" and "Follow" buttons that can be seen on many of the websites you visit. Any time you visit a page containing these buttons, your browser sends a request to Twitter's servers that includes a header indicating the website you came from. Twitter then sets a unique cookie to create a profile of your browsing history whether you actually use their platform or not.

In the past, Twitter offered support for Do Not Track for those who would prefer not to be followed around the internet. Do Not Track gives users a simple and universal way to [opt out of any third-party web tracking](#). It's easy to use and works across browsers regardless of the other privacy measures you have in place.

Now, however, Twitter is looking to get rid of Do Not Track and use a tool from the Digital Advertising Alliance (DAA) called WebChoices, which does not offer the same level of protection. It allows users to opt out of "customizing ads," but it will still collect your information either way – it just won't show you targeted ads so you'll have the illusion

of not being tracked.

Another problem is that [WebChoices is not compatible](#) with other privacy tools and requires a lot of babysitting to use properly, which includes setting a third-party cookie for opting out on 131 different advertising sites! This is also incompatible with a popular basic browser privacy setting most smart internet users have already set: disabling third-party cookies. Should you decide to go ahead and allow third-party cookies for some reason, your opt-out will still end when you clear your cookies.

## Stopping Twitter From Tracking You

These changes go into effect on June 18. Given their [affinity for political censorship](#), it might be time to get rid of Twitter altogether.

If you can't live without it, however, The Electronic Frontier Foundation has published a report showing users [how to opt out of the new privacy settings](#). Keep in mind that you'll likely need to adjust these settings on both the Web and within the app if you use it. EFF also offers a browser extension known as Privacy Badger that will give you additional protection against tracking behavior.

You can also [review the data that Twitter has already collected about you](#) by navigating to the appropriate place within the settings of your account. You'll also have the chance to remove your data, and you'll see the option to have Twitter email you a list of the advertisers it has shared your data with.

Twitter has also said that a number of its partnership agreements permit "non-personal, aggregated, and device-level data" to be [linked to personal information](#) about you like your name and email address, although they claim to only do this when you give consent.

The amount of personal information we give up – willingly and knowingly or not – to Google, Facebook, and many other [websites and platforms](#) every time we use them is alarming, so it is vital to pay close attention to the policies, user agreements, and privacy settings everywhere you go online.

**Sources include:**

[EFF.org](#)

[DoNotTrack.us](#)

[EFF.org](#)

[FoxNews.com](#)

---

## [China intensifies its Orwellian policies with the world's biggest DNA database](#)

Frances Bloomfield

[NaturalNews](#)

Beginning in the early 2000s, the Chinese Ministry of Public Security has been building a searchable, national DNA database as part of their police information project, *Golden Shield*. As of 2015, the “Forensic Science DNA Database System” has amassed over 44 million “miscellaneous data entries” from more than 40 million individuals. The database of DNA information is the largest in the world, according to the Chinese government, especially when compared to the second, separate “Combat Trafficking DNA Database” which contains just over 513,000 DNA entries. Authorities claimed that the databases

are for crime-fighting purpose, but people like *Human Rights Watch*'s China Director Sophie Richardson [have called it "Orwellian."](#)

The word itself is evocative of the totalitarian society in George Orwell's landmark novel "Nineteen Eighty-Four", wherein all of the novel's citizens are constantly being monitored by the government through cameras. It aptly describes how many Chinese citizens feel after police forcibly collected DNA samples from them. Social media platforms such as *Tieba*, *Weibo*, *Tianya* and *Zhidao* have become replete with stories from concerned and enraged netizens. As stated by many a citizen, police officers without warrants entered their homes, workplaces, and schools for sampling. Others recalled being required to give DNA samples when they applied for ID cards or residency permits.

One netizen described this happening to them while undergoing a routine roadside ID check. They wrote in their *Tianya* post: "Why was I treated like this? I am not a criminal, but this is worse than a criminal, I've been feeling very upset. I'm afraid what they'd do to my sample."

Another citizen had a similar experience when they applied for an ID. "I went to the county police station to get them to re-issue my ID, and they took my blood and DNA sample...why did they take my DNA?" The netizen wrote on *Tieba*. " [They said] that's the rule. If you don't let us do it we won't issue [your ID] ...now even f\*\*\*\*g DNA belongs to the Chinese Communist Party!" (Related: [China now assigning 'citizen scores' to target dissenters and maintain sheep-like obedience among populace](#))

Far from limiting DNA sample collecting to criminals, suspects, and ordinary citizens, the police force has also turned their attention to anyone they have deemed as potential threats. Migrant workers, petitioners, peaceful government critics, and locksmiths are just some of the people who fall



under this broad umbrella. One particularly egregious case involved passport applicants in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, home to 10 million Muslim Uyghurs. The Turkic ethnic group has long been subjected to state repression, and local authorities have intensified their efforts against them in the wake of increasing terrorist activities worldwide, reported [QZ.com](#).

Although the legitimate uses of DNA collection are undeniable, there are questions about China's DNA database that have yet to be answered. Beyond what has been written in Article 130 [in the country's Criminal Procedure Law](#), there have to definite answers on how the data will be stored or how it will be used. As was written: "To ascertain certain features, conditions of injuries, or physical conditions of a victim or a criminal suspect, a physical examination may be conducted, and fingerprints, blood, urine and other biological samples may be collected."

[In a statement to HRW.org](#), Richardson commented: "Mass DNA collection by the powerful Chinese police absent effective privacy protections or an independent judicial system is a perfect storm for abuses. China is moving its Orwellian system to the genetic level."

When approached by the rights group, Chinese Ministry of Public Security declined a request for comment.

Find similar stories of how [science is used to create tyranny at ScienceTyranny.com](#).

**Sources include:**

[QZ.com](#)

[HRW.org](#)

[CECC.gov](#)

---

# Same media outraged over Manchester bombing of little girl totally SILENT when 100,000 U.S. children are maimed or killed by vaccines every year

Ethan Huff  
[NaturalNews](#)

The recent terrorist bombing that reportedly took place at an Ariana Grande concert in Manchester, U.K., has once again brought shock and awe to the world. Media outrage over the incident has reached a crescendo, particularly [with circulating images of eight-year-old Saffie Rose Roussos](#), one of the younger concertgoers who's said to have been killed along with at least 21 others during the attack. It's a painful reminder that terrorism is still very much present in the world today, and yet the fallout pales in comparison to the number of children [who are injured or killed every year from government-approved vaccines](#) – for which the media is completely silent.

Vaccine Holocaust deniers who pretend to be journalists are profiled at the non-profit website [VaccineHolocaust.org](#).

It's a shame because, according to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting

System, also known as V.A.E.R.S., at least *seven times* the number of people who died in Manchester during the recent terrorist bombing also died from vaccine injuries *just in 2016*. You can look for yourself and see that a total of 144 deaths are listed in V.A.E.R.S. as having resulted from childhood vaccinations, the vast majority of these probably occurring in little boys and girls who are really no different from young Saffie Rose Roussos.

Of course, these are just the deaths that were *reported* to V.A.E.R.S., which some sources say represent only about one-tenth of the actual number that occur every year. This suggests that as many as 1,440 children die every year in the vaccine holocaust from chemical violence, though you'd never know about it from the total media blackout on the subject. To the mainstream media, all vaccines are completely safe and effective and would never harm any children, which is why inconvenient information like this is intentionally kept out of public view.

[When visiting the V.A.E.R.S. database](#), follow the prompts to download the data sheets and search for deaths that reportedly occurred following vaccination.

## **Vaccinated Lives Matter**

You'll notice on the landing page before you're even allowed to download the V.A.E.R.S. data sheets that you have to read through and agree to a disclaimer stating that underreporting is one of the major limitations of V.A.E.R.S. What this implies is that the data contained in V.A.E.R.S. represents only a very small fraction of the total number of *actual* events that occur in conjunction with vaccinations.

This means that not only are potentially thousands of children dying as a result of vaccines every year, but tens or even *hundreds* of thousands are suffering vaccine injuries that compromise their immune systems or leave them neurologically

damaged. This is a highly concerning prospect, to say the least, and one that demands answers as to why the media and government health authorities see fit to ignore this elephant in the room while making much ado about terrorist attacks.

What happened in Manchester is tragic. But so is what's happening to innocent children all across the country and world who are being subjected to chemical injections that are damaging their bodies, and in some cases killing them. [The lives of vaccine-injured children](#) matter just as much as the lives of terrorist attack victims, and it's high time that their plight get the same attention.

The vaccine-injured [also outnumber those who are victims of gun violence](#), by the way – the right to bear arms representing another hot-button issue that gets media attention every time someone is harmed or killed by a firearm. But getting vaccines off the streets isn't part of the agenda, hence the silence in this area as well.

**Sources for this article include:**

[TheSun.co.uk](#)

[NPR.org](#)

[NaturalNews.com](#)

[FacebookTwitterGoogle+Share](#)

---

**Schools have the right to limit free speech. But how**

# much should they?

Ellen K. Boegel

[America \(Jesuit\) Magazine](#)

From [Halloween costumes](#) to prom dresses, Facebook posts to commencement addresses, school administrators are required to make difficult decisions regarding appropriate limits on free speech and expression. For the educational community, the summer is a good time to review, reflect on and possibly revamp current policies.

## **Dress codes**

Headaddresses, tattoos and form-fitting clothing present increasingly complicated challenges for school administrators seeking to balance the values of fun, comfort and fashion with individual and community sensitivities, educational and social propriety, contractual and statutory provisions and, for public educational institutions, constitutional requirements.

[As evidenced by the 2015 Yale controversy](#) and [the 2016 creepy clown scare](#), Halloween costumes create problems at all educational levels. In addition to safety concerns regarding weapons and dangerous props or materials, codes of conduct at many schools prohibit “offensive” or “hostile” conduct.

Application of conduct restrictions to one-time occurrences, such as the wearing of an insensitive costume, is problematic. Public and private school students have due process and/or contractual rights (based on student registration and tuition payments) that require clearly articulated dress codes; vague and subjective terms are unenforceable. In addition, public school students enjoy [First Amendment rights](#) that protect expressive clothing.

Restrictions on the speech of public college-level students must be “narrowly tailored to serve a significant government

interest.” Public secondary and elementary school students are granted less extensive [free speech rights](#). Apparel that “materially disrupts classwork or involves substantial disorder or invasion of the rights of others” may be prohibited. Clothing with lewd or sexually explicit messages and those that are viewed as encouraging illegal drug use also may be banned in secondary and elementary schools.

Nevertheless, school administrators should use their authority sparingly lest they become enmeshed in even more disruptive (and expensive) litigation. In Pennsylvania, for example, a middle school’s unconstitutional prohibition of “I ♥ Boobies” cancer awareness bracelets engendered a lawsuit that lasted four years and cost taxpayers close to \$400,000 in legal fees.

Gender-conforming clothing requirements at public schools are prohibited by the [Equal Protection clause](#), but reasonable restrictions may be placed on feminine and masculine attire. This means a female student should not be forced to wear a skirt or dress and a male student should not be prohibited from wearing a skirt or dress, but restrictions can be placed on skirt and dress lengths. Dress code restrictions are more common on feminine attire, which has led to [the #iammorethanadistracted movement](#).

Private schools that accept federal funds must abide by Title IX gender discrimination protections, but religious schools with religious objections are exempt. Thus, religious schools can impose gender-specific clothing restrictions but that does not shield them from [student discontent and publicized controversy](#), often involving prom attire.

Legal rights are not self-enforcing; many unlawful codes and enforcement practices persist. Students and parents who object to overly restrictive policies must comply, negotiate or sue. [A recent CNN story](#) highlighted the ingenuity of one family who used a marker to disguise their son’s non-complying decoratively shaved hair. School officials who want to avoid

conflict and litigation should dispense with judgmental and gender-biased rules and then collaboratively create and uniformly apply standards designed solely to promote safe and effective learning environments.

## Campus Speech

[Public college](#) and university students enjoy full free speech rights. Federal and state anti-harassment laws only may be used to limit public university speech when it is so objectively severe or pervasive that it reasonably can be determined to interfere with another student's ability to learn.

University officials also may place reasonable time, place and manner restrictions on student speech and may impose additional restrictions on spaces considered limited public fora, such as lecture halls reserved solely for curriculum-related events. Nevertheless, students and student groups with myriad controversial viewpoints must be given equal access to campus facilities. The [twice-cancelled appearance by Ann Coulter at the University of California, Berkeley](#), illustrates the difficulty of meeting these constitutional requirements while protecting the safety of the entire campus community.

The "special characteristics of the school environment" enable secondary and elementary public school administrators to regulate classroom speech and school-sponsored speech to a greater extent than permitted on public college campuses. Most states have anti-bullying laws that promote inclusiveness and prohibit harassment. As with dress codes, non-disciplinary discussions that lead to cooperative compliance are better than banning speech that does not pose a realistic threat or is objectively harmful or disruptive. One [public high school](#) teacher learned this lesson the hard way when he lost a lawsuit brought by a student disciplined for stating, "[I don't accept gays because I'm Catholic.](#)"

[Private school](#) students are not protected by the First Amendment and are subject to all clearly articulated speech restrictions. Moreover, private schools may prohibit or invite any speaker to a school forum. As was evidenced by [student protests during Vice President Mike Pence's commencement address](#) at the University of Notre Dame, however, freedom from government involvement does not eliminate controversy. Private schools that accept federal funding are subject to civil rights laws and, except when based on religious considerations, may not permit harassment of students based on disability, race, gender, religion or national origin. State anti-bullying laws generally do not apply to private schools.

## **Social media posts**

Out-of-school expression on social media is of growing concern to public and private school administrators. Although the forum is different, the same legal principles apply.

Public universities may impose disciplinary action when restrictions are narrowly tailored to serve a significant government interest. Protecting fellow students from discriminatory or harassing conduct is a significant government interest, but derogatory social media posts may be prohibited only when they amount to an actual threat or objectively impair the educational environment. Posting bomb threats on the internet may be prohibited, but lewd online behavior and off-campus criticism of teachers and principals should be tolerated. Private schools may adopt whatever restrictions are deemed appropriate and clearly communicated to students and parents.

Teachers understand the tremendous risks and benefits of free expression, and administrators understand there is no pleasing some people (parents, students or teachers). The best-reasoned and most clearly written code of conduct will not prevent every controversy nor quell every protest, which, in a free society, should not be the goal. Education, rather than



litigation, is the best tool we have to create respectful environments for the free exchange of ideas. Town hall meetings, student-designed codes of conduct, inclusive lesson plans and academic presentations may do more to achieve compliance with reasonable guidelines than threats of discipline.

Making student buy-in a priority does not guarantee unanimity, but it does increase understanding of school policies and defeat claims of ignorance, which is, after all, an important educational goal.

---

## Trump Sides With ISIS Supporters in Middle East Sectarian War

Dan Wright  
[Shadowproof](#)

In a speech that contradicted numerous public statements, [President Donald Trump](#) praised the rulers of Saudi Arabia and other gulf state autocracies for fighting [Islamic](#) terrorism in his first foreign trip as president. Despite irrefutable evidence (that [he himself previously referenced](#)) that the [Kingdom of Saudi Arabia](#) is the primary source of support for [Sunni](#) jihadist terrorist groups such as [Al Qaeda](#) and ISIS, Trump celebrated the Saudi government's commitment to combating Islamic extremism.

Beyond support for terrorism, Trump had slammed Saudi Arabia in the past for wanting to ["enslave women and kill gays."](#) But, in another reversal, Trump characterized the country as a

wonderful place to live, [saying](#), “I have always heard about the splendor of your country and the kindness of your people, but words do not do justice to the grandeur of this sacred place.”

While some of the complete rhetorical flip-flops could arguably be attributed to diplomatic niceties, the actual substance of President Trump’s speech addressing the Islamic world was both absurd and dangerous.

Trump not only praised one of [Al Qaeda and ISIS’ chief backers](#) as a leader in the fight against Islamic extremism, he essentially blamed Iran and [Shiite Islam](#) for the instability in the [Middle East](#). He even praised the government of Bahrain whose Sunni minority government has been engaging in a [brutal crackdown](#) of the Shiite majority post-Arab Spring.

His condemnation of Iran as an authoritarian regime was particularly hollow, given the audience was made up of autocrats working to suppress domestic democratic movements and Iran had [successfully conducted an election](#) two days earlier. While it was by no means an open or substantially fair process, the Iranian people did get to offer a limited voice in deciding their future—an influence not granted in the slightest by the other governments represented in the room, especially the Saudis who rule under literal feudalism.

Putting aside the hypocrisy of the moral claims, President Trump blew a major opportunity to address one of the leading causes of Sunni jihadist extremism today: the export of [Wahhabist/Salafist ideology](#) by the Saudis to the rest of the world. That poison helped inspire both Al Qaeda and ISIS as well as the wealthy gulf state officials who fund them.

Rather than confront the roots of the terrorism that has savaged the U.S. and Europe, Trump praised its benefactors and took a side in a sectarian war that continues to rip apart the Middle East. The position is fundamentally counterproductive

if your primary concern is American security.

The strategy is not good for America, but it is good for Saudi Arabia and [Israel](#). Trump's first foreign trip included a visit to Israel and the Vatican as well as Saudi Arabia. According to Israeli Education Minister Naftali Bennett, he spoke with Trump about his proposal for a "[right wing peace](#)" across the region, which relies on the Sunni gulf states allying with Israel against Shiite Iran and its allies, such as the government of Syria and Hezbollah in Lebanon.

President Trump ran on getting the [United States](#) out of the Middle East and away from [stupid wars](#). But his actions and rhetoric so far as president indicate he is ready to double-down on dumb.