

**Health Law Paper - The Legal & Ethical Implications of Banning Gender-Affirming Care
for Adolescents/Minors**

Name:

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

In recent years, as noted by Levine et al. (2023), discussions on gender-affirming care for youngsters and adolescents have been more heated lately, and several jurisdictions have attempted to enact laws restricting or outlawing this type of care. In order to fully explore the legal and ethical aspects of this highly contentious topic, this paper examines relevant court decisions, weighs their significance, and comes to a firm conclusion about the rights and welfare of transgender adolescents.

Gender transition procedures, as defined by the Human Rights Campaign (n.d.), are any medical or surgical services, including without restriction physician services, inpatient and outpatient hospital services, or prescription medications connected to gender transition that aim to:

(i) Modify or eliminate anatomical or morphological traits diagnostic of the person's biological sex; or

(ii) Instilling or creating physiological or anatomical traits that resemble a sex other than the individual's biological sex, including without limitation, healthcare services that offer hormones that cross-sex, medications that prevent puberty, or other methods to encourage the development of masculinizing or feminizing traits in the other biological sex, or gender reassignment surgery, either nongenital or genital, carried out with the intention of supporting a person going through a gender transition (Brandt v. Rutledge, 551 F. Supp. 3d 882 (E.D. Ark. 2021)).

The legal landscape surrounding gender-affirming care for adolescents and minors is complicated and multifaceted. According to Davis (2024), several states, including Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, including others, have offered or enacted legislation aimed at prohibiting or limiting access to such care, citing concerns about young people's ability to make sensible choices about their gender identity and healthcare needs. As made clear by Branstetter (2023), in the case of *ACLU Brandt v. Rutledge*, two physicians and four families of transgender children have contested an Arkansas statute that would forbid medical practitioners from supplying or even directing transgender children to receive critical medical care. Additionally, the proposal would forbid the use of public funds or insurance coverage for gender-affirming medical care for transgender individuals under the age of 18, and it would provide private insurance companies the right to decline to pay for such care for clients of any age. The plaintiff's victory in the court's decision emphasized how crucial it is to protect transgender youths' autonomy and right to self-determination when it comes to receiving necessary medical care. Similarly, according to Reproductive Rights (n.d.), the *Roe v. Wade* case has deeper implications for reproductive rights and physical autonomy, which connect with the problem of gender-affirming care.

The historic ruling upheld people's fundamental right to privacy under the Constitution and their autonomy to make decisions regarding their own bodies, particularly those pertaining to reproductive health. Arguments in favor of transgender teenagers' and minors' rights to gender-affirming medical care without excessive interference from governmental or regulatory agencies have cited this precedent. The discussion surrounding gender-affirming care for youngsters and adolescents raises important ethical issues in addition to legal ones. Rummler

(2023) asserts that the medical ethics principle, which places a high value on patient autonomy, beneficence, and non-maleficence, is essential to these issues. Refusing transgender youth access to gender affirming care violates their right to autonomy and prevents them from receiving necessary medical care that can help with gender dysphoria and enhance their general health. In addition, as noted by Tordoff et al. (2022), transgender adolescents and minors may experience severe mental health consequences if they are denied access to gender-affirming care, such as elevated rates of anxiety, depression, and suicidal thoughts. In order to perform ethical medicine, healthcare professionals must put their patients' needs first, which may mean giving gender-affirming treatment in compliance with accepted medical wisdom and standards of care.

As reported by GLAAD (2023), professional medical organizations, especially the American Medical Association, have announced statements in support of providing gender-affirming care to transgender youth, highlighting the significance of affirming gender identities and managing this population's particular healthcare needs. To promote the health and well-being of transgender adolescents and minors, these ethical principles emphasize how crucial it is to give them access to care that is gender affirming. The argument over gender-affirming care for teens and kids is complicated and nuanced because it involves both legal and moral issues. D'Angelo, R. (2023) argues that advocates for banning or restricting access to this type of care believe that minors may not be able to completely understand the consequences of receiving medical treatment for gender dysphoria and may come to regret their choices. They also bring up questions regarding the possible long-term impacts on teenage development of hormone therapy or surgical procedures. These considerations, however, have to be balanced against the fundamental medical ethics and human rights concepts of patient autonomy and bodily integrity.

The American Medical Association. (n.d.), states that denying transgender adolescents access to care that is gender affirming can worsen mental health disparities, cause injury and discrimination, and raise the risk of negative outcomes like suicide and self-harm. Legal challenges against restrictions on gender-affirming care have brought attention to the significance of judicial review in defending the rights of vulnerable communities, claims Alfonseca (2024). Courts have routinely upheld legislation that violates transgender people's rights to receive vital healthcare treatments and have acknowledged this right. Setting a precedent with these decisions supports the idea that medical care should be based on clinical need and informed consent, not on political or legal goals.

In summary, the prohibition on providing gender-affirming care to kids and adolescents poses a serious moral and legal quandary that has far-reaching effects on the welfare and rights of transgender youth. Court cases like *Brandt v. Rutledge*, *Roe v. Wade*, and more recent challenges show how important it is to protect people's right to make their own choices about their bodies and health care. To protect the physical and mental health of transgender adolescents and minors, it is crucial to provide them access to gender-affirming care, as ethical considerations underscore. It is important to consider these principles while evaluating any attempts to limit or outlaw this kind of care, keeping in mind the special requirements and experiences of young transgender people. In the end, gender-affirming care policies and practices must be shaped by the preservation of their rights and welfare above all else. By having a thorough grasp of the moral and legal implications of this problem, society may work toward building a healthcare system that is more affirming and inclusive of all people, regardless of their gender identity or expression.

References

Alfonseca, K. (2024, February 9). Transgender youth care misconceptions lead physicians, researchers to set the record straight.

<https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/researchers-dive-common-gender-affirming-care-youth-misconceptions/story?id=107041920>

AMA to states: Stop interfering in health care of transgender children. American Medical Association. (n.d.).

<https://www.ama-assn.org/press-center/press-releases/ama-states-stop-interfering-health-care-transgender-children>

Attacks on gender affirming care by state map. Human Rights Campaign. (n.d.).

<https://www.hrc.org/resources/attacks-on-gender-affirming-care-by-state-map>

Branstetter, G. (2023, February 24). *Brandt v. Rutledge: What to know about the Arkansas trial on gender-affirming care: ACLU.* American Civil Liberties Union.

<https://www.aclu.org/news/lgbtq-rights/brandt-v-rutledge-what-to-know-about-the-arkansas-trial>

D'Angelo, R. (2023). Supporting autonomy in young people with gender dysphoria: psychotherapy is not conversion therapy. *Journal of Medical Ethics.*

Davis Jr., E. (2024). *These states have restricted gender-affirming care for Trans youth.* States That Have Restricted Gender-Affirming Care for Trans Youth.

<https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/articles/2023-03-30/what-is-gender-affirming-care-and-which-states-have-restricted-it-in-2023>

Glaad. (2023, June 21). *Medical Association statements in support of Health Care for transgender people and Youth*. GLAAD.

<https://glaad.org/medical-association-statements-supporting-trans-youth-healthcare-and-against-discriminatory/>

Levine, S. B., & Abbruzzese, E. (2023, April 14). Current concerns about gender-affirming therapy in adolescents - current sexual health reports. SpringerLink.

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11930-023-00358-x>

Roe v. Wade. (n.d.). https://reproductiverights.org/sites/default/files/documents/roeprivacy_0.pdf

Rummler, O. (2023, November 7). *The 19th explains: The groundwork for a Supreme Court case on gender-affirming care is being laid now*. The 19th.

<https://19thnews.org/2023/10/supreme-court-transgender-rights-gender-affirming-care/>

Tordoff, D. M., Wanta, J. W., Collin, A., Stepney, C., Inwards-Breland, D. J., & Ahrens, K.

(2022). Mental health outcomes in transgender and nonbinary youths receiving gender-affirming care. *JAMA network open*, 5(2), e220978-e220978.