

Pohlaví, "identifikující jako" a identita, Richard Knight

UR unz.com/article/gender-identifying-as-and-identity

Richard Knight

June 1, 2023

[← Dvacet prohlášení o transgenderismu](#)

[Archiv Richarda Knighta](#)

[Sdílejte s Gabem](#)

[🔍](#) [📡](#) [RSS](#) [🖨️ Print](#)



Podle Helen Joyce je její bestseller *Trans* o genderové sebeidentifikaci: myšlenka, že „lidé by se měli považovat za muže nebo ženy podle toho, jak se cítí a co deklarují, místo své biologie“. Ale neříká, co je pohlaví.[1] Když lidé mají tyto pocity nebo činí tato prohlášení, co cítí a prohlašují? A co to znamená identifikovat se jako něco? Poukazuje na to, že národní zákony, firemní zásady, školní osnovy, lékařské protokoly, akademický výzkum a průvodce mediálním stylem jsou všechny „přepisovány tak, aby upřednostňovaly samozřejmou genderovou identitu před biologickým pohlavím“, ale neříká, co je genderová identita. , nebo, pojďme k tomu, co je identita.[2]

Podívejme se na tyto otázky, abychom zjistili, zda můžeme získat trochu jasnosti. V [předchozím článku](#) jsem tvrdil, že základní termín transgender ideologie, totiž „gender“, je pouze matoucím eufemismem pro sex. Pokud to neznámá sex samotný, ale je to vzato jako odkaz na shluky rysů, které mají tendenci jít s jedním nebo druhým pohlavím, jsou to jednoduše shluky rysů, které mají

tendenci jít s jedním nebo druhým pohlavím. Považovat je za oddělené věci zvané pohlaví, které „máme“ způsobem, jakým máme sex, je mylné.

Lepší způsob, jak se na to dívat, je z hlediska archetypů Carla Junga animus a anima, z nichž každý, jak tomu rozumím, se domníval, že je v různé míře přítomen u obou pohlaví. Navíc mohou koexistovat v různé míře u dvou příslušníků stejného pohlaví. Takže si představuji, že by řekl, že v ženě jako Margaret Thatcherová, která byla vůdčí a pevná, bylo animus silnější než u většiny žen, zatímco anima byla slabší, zatímco někdo jako Theresa Mayová, následná britská premiérka, byl více ženský. To, co by neřekl, je něco tak banálního, jako že paní Thatcherová měla „pohlaví“ muže.

V mém případě jsem se jako chlapec nikdy příliš nezajímal o fotbal nebo vojenskou historii; Preferoval jsem umění a vaření. Bez ustání jsem kreslil na tabuli, kterou můj otec namontoval nad nepoužívaný krb, a upekl jsem svůj první bochník chleba asi v devíti letech. Nikdo mi nenaznačil, že mám „pohlaví“ dívky, ani neviděl své umění nebo vaření jako problém. Náhodou mě také bavilo podnikat dobrodružství s podomácku vyrobeným oštěpem a vracet se s pohledem, jako bych byl tažen živým plotem dozadu. Myšlenka, že lidé mají pohlaví, pokud tím není myšleno jejich pohlaví, je hloupé zjednodušení reality, kterou, i když je pestrá, může každý pochopit, ani skutečnost, že jednomu chlapci se líbí jedna věc, zatímco jinému se líbí jiná, nevyvolává žádnou otázku ohledně jejich pohlaví.

Když se ptáme, co to znamená říkat, že se někdo identifikuje jako něco, narazíme na rozdíl mezi americkou a britskou angličtinou, protože v britské angličtině, správně řečeno, nelze říci, že se někdo identifikuje jako něco, ale musí říci, že se jako něco *identifikuje*.

Jinými slovy, v britské angličtině je sloveso „identify“ tranzitivní.

Protože je trochu snazší vysvětlit odpověď na naši otázku v britské angličtině, použiji to pro začátek a později přejdu na americkou angličtinu.

To, co znamená říci, že se někdo identifikuje jako něco, je to, že se touto věcí nazývá nebo se tak popisuje. Muž, který se blíží k místu nehody, se tak může identifikovat jako lékař. Ale není to jen sebe, koho lze identifikovat jako něco; může to být cokoliv. Někdo by mohl tu ženu identifikovat jako Francouzku, ptáka patřícího k určitému druhu nebo drahý kámen jako smaragd. Můžeme tedy říci, že v sexuálním kontextu se muž, který se identifikuje jako žena, nazývá jím. Nyní je jasné, že identifikace nemusí být nutně správné. Muž, který se identifikuje jako lékař, jím být nemusí; ta žena nemusí být Francouzka a tak dále. Muž, který se identifikuje jako žena, se špatně identifikuje.

Zatímco to, čím se člověk identifikuje, jak se nazývá, jeho identita je tím, čím je. Je to vlastnost, kterou člověk má. Každý má mnoho atributů, a proto má každý mnoho identit, tři v případě herečky se dvěma dětmi jsou to například herečka, žena a matka. Ale v dnešním politickém použití má slovo „identita“ užší význam. K dispozici je pouze několik politických identit, které jsou definovány odkazem na politicky význačné rysy osoby, jako je její rasa nebo pohlaví. Člověk tedy může mít politickou identitu být černý nebo bílý nebo být mužem nebo ženou.

Jakákoli politická identita kontrastuje s jednou nebo více jinými politickými identitami a v určitých párech jsou lidé s jednou politickou identitou konvenčně popisováni jako utlačovaní lidmi s tou druhou. Černoši jsou tedy konvenčně popisováni jako utlačovaní bílými a ženy jsou konvenčně popisovány jako utlačované muži. To pochází přímo z kulturního marxismu a nemá to nic společného s tím, zda je někdo skutečně utlačován. Je to jen teorie. Teorie je však aplikována tak, že „utlačované“ skupiny jsou upřednostňovány před svými „utlačovateli“, což jim dává pocit, že mají nárok na sociální statky, jako je lítost, moc a preferenční zacházení. Boj upřednostňovaných „identifikačních skupin“ o získání takového zboží na úkor jejich opačných skupin je známý jako politika identity.

Když teď přejdeme na americkou angličtinu, ten typ lidí, kteří říkají, že se identifikují jako něco, mají také tendenci mluvit o svých „identitách“ a obecně je spojují. Tedy muž, který říká, že se identifikuje jako žena, řekne, že být ženou je jeho identita. Je to „kdo je“. Ale tím, že to říká, přidává jednu chybu ke druhé. Nejen, že se nazývá ženou, když jí není; trvá na tom, že jím skutečně je. Je to, jako by někdo, kdo si říká Napoleon, trval na tom, že je ve skutečnosti Napoleon. Obě chyby musí být odstraněny, než uvidíme, že je to opravdu jen Fred Bloggs.

Po genderu je nejdůležitějším konceptem transgender ideologie koncept genderové identity, který definuje jako hluboký, vnitřní smysl člověka pro jeho pohlaví, což znamená jeho hluboký vnitřní smysl pro jeho pohlaví. „Genderová identita“ transgender osoby však není její identitou, ale jejím rozporem. Muž, který si říká žena, má stále identitu muže, protože je stále mužem. Pojem „genderová identita“ tedy neodkazuje ani na pohlaví, ani na identitu; odkazuje na představu osoby o tom, jakého pohlaví je. Když tedy slyšíme, že někdo „zpochybňuje svou genderovou identitu“, je to pouze někdo, kdo si klade otázku, zda je muž nebo žena.

Jak zdůrazňuje Helen Joyce, transgender ideologie tvrdí, že všichni máme „genderovou identitu“, která se ve většině případů shoduje s naším pohlavím, ale v případě transgenderů tomu tak není. Ale je pravda, že všichni máme hluboký vnitřní smysl pro svůj sex? Mám podezření, že většina lidí nic takového nemá, než že mají hluboký, vnitřní smysl pro to, kolik paží mají. Pro většinu lidí je jejich sex tak samozřejmou a známou součástí, že o něm nikdy nepřemýšlejí, a ještě méně ho vidí jako věc, na kterou by mohli mít názory. Pokud je to správné, jediní lidé, kteří mají „genderovou identitu“, jsou transgenderové, jejichž hluboký vnitřní smysl pro jejich pohlaví je klame.

„Genderová identita“ těchto lidí může být hluboká a vnitřní, ale pokud se identifikují jako příslušníci opačného pohlaví, je to něco vnějšího, protože nazývat se něčím je akt, který vyžaduje publikum. Pokud

zajdou tak daleko, že se budou prezentovat jako příslušníci opačného pohlaví, v tom, co transgenderová ideologie nazývá jejich genderovým vyjádřením, je to rozhodně veřejný akt.

Lidé, kteří se prezentují jako příslušníci opačného pohlaví, se dostávají do problémů, pokud očekávají, že je ostatní identifikují tak, jak se oni identifikují. Stejně jako Fred Bloggs, který se prezentuje jako Napoleon, bude s větší pravděpodobností považován za pomýleného Freda Bloggse než jako Napoleona, tak muže, který se prezentuje jako žena, bude pravděpodobněji považován za muže, který se prezentuje jako žena, než jako za muže. Žena, ani s ním není mnohem pravděpodobnější, že s ním bude *zacházeno* jako se ženou, než s Fredem Bloggsem, že s ním bude zacházeno jako s císařem. Ale zatímco Fred Bloggs ví, že se musí smířit s tím, že ostatní lidé nepodporují jeho představu o sobě samém, je to víc, než mohou transgenderové udělat. Přinejmenším je to víc, než mohou udělat, když budou následovat příkladu svých aktivistů, kteří nemohou tolerovat, aby někdo nepodporoval jejich sebepopisy. Když se před lety transgender aktivisté sami sebe ptali, co by se s těmito nespolupracujícími lidmi dalo dělat, dostal nápad. Proč je *nepřinutit*, aby podpořili jejich sebepopisy? Začali tedy získat vliv na tvůrce politik a přimět je, aby zavedli pravidla zakazující odkazy na cokoli, o čem nechtěli, aby se zmiňovalo. To by znamenalo, že když by lidé viděli muže, který se prezentoval jako žena, museli by mu říkat žena, nebo alespoň „trans žena“. Všimněte si, že ho nemohli nazývat „trans mužem“. Jako termín pro transgender muže by tento termín byl příliš popisný. Záměrem bylo zatajit skutečnost, že se jedná o muže, nikoli ji prozradit. „Trans-muži“ byly tedy ženy, konkrétně ty, které se prezentovaly jako muži.

Lidé by také museli označovat transgender muže jako „ona“. Pokud by chtěli konkrétně odkazovat na pohlaví takových lidí, jako když mluvili o jejich účasti na ženských sportech, nemohli by je nazývat muži, ale museli by přijít s výroky, jako jsou „lidé zrození mužským

biologickým tělům“ Pierse Morgana. Proč nevyžadovat od lidí, aby ze sebe dělali hlupáky a ztráceli čas všech používáním dvanácti slabik místo jedné?

Když k tomu dojde, proč nepřimět tvůrce politik, aby zabránili lidem používat slova „máma“ a „táta“ a také „manžel“ a „manželka“, jak řekl Qantas svému palubnímu personálu, aby v roce 2018 přestal?

[4]Proč nezakázat termín „nastávající matka“, jak to předloni učinila Britská lékařská asociace, která požadovala, aby byly takové ženy nazývány těhotnými?[5]Proč nezakázat termín „kojení“ jako

výhodnou nabídku? Proč z jazyka nevyřadit všechny odkazy na sex, sexuální role a rodinné vztahy na základě toho, že by mohly „učinit skupiny lidí neviditelnými“ (Qantas) nebo „urazit transgender lidi“ (BMA)? Bez dovolených odkazů na základní přírodní fakta by lidé mohli nakonec zapomenout, že to byla základní přírodní fakta.

Politici si mysleli, že je to tak skvělý nápad, že nechápali, proč je to nenapadlo je samotné, a tak došlo v roce 2015 k tomu, že v roce 2015 mohli být dva texaští pečovatelé propuštěni za to, že odmítli zavolat šestku. -letá dívka „John“ poté, co si její „dva mužští rodiče“ stěžovali.[6]Skutečnost, že ženy, jak vysvětlila jedna z nich, měly „starosti o zmást holčičky“, nebyla ani tady, ani tam. V roce 2016 byl jeden Brit odsouzen za zločin z nenávisti za to, že pozdravil muže, kterého znal od vidění, slovy „V pořádku, hajzle? poté, co se posledně jmenovaný, veterán z Afghánistánu, ukázal jako žena.

[7]Během odvolacího jednání v následujícím roce stěžovatel údajně vzlykal, když soudu řekl, že ho pozdrav „velmi rozčiloval“. To „popřelo jeho lidskost“.[8]

V roce 2018 přišel americký učitel o práci, když na svou třídu sedmiletých dětí zavolal: „Nedovolte, aby vstoupila do zdi!“ .zapomněl, že dotyčná dívka si nyní říkala chlapec. Žena zastupující školní obvod ilustrovala mentální kalibr těch, kteří pravidla uplatňovali, když prohlásila: „To bylo ve skutečnosti diskriminační, protože všichni ostatní studenti používali zájmena a tento student nepoužíval zájmena“.

Všichni jsme ty příběhy slyšeli. V roce 2018 byl učitel v Indianě nucen rezignovat poté, co odmítl přijmout politiku své školy oslovovat transgender děti jejich křestními jmény, která si sami zvolili.[10] Nejprve ho škola nechala používat jejich příjmení, pak si to bez vysvětlení rozmyslela. Na schůzce, kde mu bylo sděleno nové rozhodnutí, shledal vedení školy „velmi vyhrůžující a šikanující“. Zdá se, že postava transgenderových aktivistů má způsob, jak se přenést na jejich zástupce. V roce 2021 byl Kanadčan poslán do vězení za to, že svou čtrnáctiletou dceru nazval svou dcerou a označoval ji jako „ona“.[11] Soudem pohrdal, už mu bylo řečeno, aby s tím přestal. Zrovna onedny byl v Británii učitel zakázáno vykonávat povolání za to, že žák „zkreslil nesprávné pohlaví“ slovy „Výborně, děvčata!“ Jeho třída obsahovala dívku, která se identifikovala jako chlapec. Údajně také ukázal třídě video, které odkazovalo na muže, kteří přebírají odpovědnost. Popřel, že by to udělal, ale obvinění stačilo.[12]

Na důkaz toho, že je nyní nepřijatelné odkazovat na pohlaví samotná a ne pouze na kvality s nimi obecně spojené, bylo ve stejný den oznámeno, že americká studentka dostala nula bodů za úkol, ve kterém použila výraz „biologická ženy“. Její profesor popsal její práci jako „pevnou“, ale výraz „vyklučující“ považoval za tak urážlivý, že její úkol nemohl být uznán jako přínosný.

A tak vidíme logické pokračování zákazů slov jako „předseda“ a „hasič“, které byly zavedeny na příkaz feministek před desítkami let. Následovaly takové věci, jako zákaz Cardiff Metropolitan University z roku 2017 pro výrazy jako „udělaný člověkem“, „pravá ruka“ a „gentlemanská dohoda“.[14] Vyloučena byla také slova „předci“ a „sportovní chování“. „Lidská síla“ se neměla používat, alternativami byly „personál“ nebo „lidské zdroje“, což znamená, že studenti píšící o bitvě u Agincourtu by museli říct, že Angličané vyhráli, když Francouzům došel personál nebo lidské zdroje. Podobná pravidla zavedlo mnoho dalších univerzit.[15]

To vše platí pro teorii Newspeaku George Orwella, že pokud nám chybí slovo, bude nám chybět koncept a bez konceptu se budeme chovat, jako by věc neexistovala. Koncept, který by měl být vypuštěn, je mužský, stejně jako ve všech příkladech v předchozím odstavci, ale jak jsme viděli, naši lingvisté to mají také v konceptu žen. Co je skutečně pod útokem, je jakékoli povědomí o skutečnosti, že existují dvě pohlaví. Stejně jako v Newspeaku je naše slovní zásoba neustále redukována, aby se „zmenšil rozsah myšlení“, a právě na tento nejzákladnější fakt života nesmíme myslet, nebo v ideálním případě umět přemýšlet.

To nás poněkud vzdálí od otázek, se kterými jsme začali, co jsou pohlaví, co jsou identity a co znamená identifikovat se jako něco, ale zopakujeme si odpovědi: gender jako vlastnost lidské bytosti neexistuje, pokud tím není myslen jen jejich pohlaví; identita člověka je něco o něm; a když se někdo jako něco identifikuje, nazývá se tou věcí, což by docela dobře nemusel být.

Z toho jsme se dostali do neutěšené situace dneška prostřednictvím megalomanského nutkání transgenderových aktivistů, které neznáme proč tvůrci politik odevzdali, ovládat řeč ostatních, aby jejich bludy byly podporovány a nikdy zpochybňovány. Ukázalo se však, že jejich agenda sahala daleko za hranice toho, aby je někdo rozčiloval, a zahrnoval přetvoření jazyka tak, aby se vyloučil jakýkoli odkaz na pohlaví nebo jejich role ve společnosti nebo reprodukci. K naplnění se tak blíží to, co Shulamith Firestone v roce 1970 specifikovala jako konečný cíl feministické revoluce, totiž odstranění samotného rozdílu pohlaví.

Poznámky

[1] Helen Joyce, 2022 (2021), *Trans: When Ideology Meets Reality*, London: Oneworld, str. 1.

[2] Tamtéž, s. 2.

[3] Tento článek používá termíny „transgender osoba“ a „transgender“ (jako podstatné jméno) k označení někoho, kdo se nazývá příslušníkem opačného pohlaví. Aby to bylo jednoduché,

nebere v úvahu lidi s jinou „genderovou identitou“, jako jsou ti, kteří se nazývají příslušníky obou pohlaví nebo ani jednoho.

[4] Nový deník, 5. března 2018, „Qantas zakazuje zaměstnancům používat slova „nevhodná pro pohlaví“,

<https://thenewdaily.com.au/life/travel/2018/03/05/qantas-ban-gender-nevhodná-slova/> .

[5] Telegraph, 29. ledna 2017, „Neříkejte těhotným ženám ‚nastávající matky‘, protože by to mohlo urazit transgender lidi, říká BMA“,

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/01/29/nevolej-těhotným-ženám-nastávajícím-matkám-může-urazit-transgender/> .

[6] WND, 6. listopadu 2015, „Zaměstnanci denní péče propuštěni za odmítnutí transgenderových požadavků“,

<http://www.wnd.com/2015/11/daycare-workers-fired-for-refusing-transgender-demands/> .

[7] MailOnline, 4. února 2017, „Podnikatel postaven před soud za zločiny z nenávisti poté, co řekl ‚v pořádku, panečku‘ transgender válečnému veteránovi“,

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4190064/Podnikatel-vytáhl-soud-nenávist-zločiny.html> .

[8] Odsouzení bylo zrušeno.

[9] Kevin's Corner, 15. prosince 2018, „Učitel vyhodil 4 pomoci nesprávného zájmena“,

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xQbjNPjizY0&t=0s> .

[10] Konzervativní Daily Post, neznámé datum v roce 2018, „Učitel byl nucen odstoupit po transgenderových požadavcích nařízených školou“,

<https://conservativedailypost.com/teacher-forced-to-resign-after-transgender-demands-ordered-by-škola/> (stránka už tam není).

[11] Breitbart, March 18th 2021, “Canadian Man Jailed After ‘Misgendering’ His Daughter”,

<https://www.breitbart.com/tech/2021/03/18/canadian-man-jailed-after-misgendering-his-daughter/> .

[12] Christian Concern, May 23rd 2023, “Heartbroken teacher banned from profession for ‘misgendering’ pupil”,

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tm3dKtjN6SQ>. The teacher was Joshua Sutcliffe, who said: “Well done girls!” in 2017. A bible study

club he had started had already been closed down. The Teaching Regulation Agency backed the punishment (Christian Concern, May 26th 2023, “Teacher banned for ‘misgendering’ | Round The Table”, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q-53JYC1Pgg&t=130s>). See also Telegraph, May 23rd 2023, “Joshua Sutcliffe interview: I was told ‘call her a him’. I couldn’t go along with it”, https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2023/05/23/teacher-sacked-misgendering-pupil/?utm_source=email .

[13] Anthony Brian Logan, May 23rd 2023, “College Student Gets ZERO On Project Over The Term Biological Women!”, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9I57tp_9JWQ.

[14] Independent, March 3rd 2017, “University bans phrases such as ‘mankind’ and ‘gentleman’s agreement’ in favour of gender-neutral terms”, <https://www.independent.co.uk/student/news/university-cardiff-metropolitan-bans-phrases-mankind-gentleman-s-agreement-genderneutral-terms-free-speech-a7609521.html> .

[15] For other examples see BirminghamLive, July 7th 2022, “University bans terms ‘mankind’ and ‘manpower’ over fears of offending”, <https://www.birminghammail.co.uk/news/midlands-news/university-bans-terms-mankind-manpower-24421851> .

[16] George Orwell, 1989 (1949), *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, London: Penguin, p. 313 (from the Appendix: “The principles of Newspeak).

[17] Shulamith Firestone’s *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution* is quoted by Ryan T. Anderson, 2019 (2018), *When Harry Became Sally*, New York: Encounter Books, p. 151.

(Republished from The Occidental Observer by permission of author or representative)

← [Twenty Statements About Transgenderism](#)

[Subscribe to New Columns](#)

• Category: [Culture/Society](#), [Ideology](#) • Tags: [American Media](#), [Political Correctness](#), [Transgenderism](#)

← [Twenty Statements About Transgenderism](#)

Hide 45 Comments [Leave a Comment](#)

Commenters to Ignore...to Follow Endorsed Only

Trim Comments?

1. Dr. Robert Morgan says:

June 5, 2023 at 6:30 am GMT • 5.5 days ago • 600 Words ↑

Richard Knight: “Thus what Shulamith Firestone specified in 1970 as the end goal of feminist revolution, namely the elimination of the sex distinction itself, approaches fulfilment.”

Thus?! By saying “thus” Knight dishonestly misrepresents Firestone’s entire argument, since in the referenced quote she isn’t talking about achieving revolution through language reform at all. She’s talking about how technological “progress” will assist women to gain equality with men and only “thus” will they ever be able to eliminate sex distinctions. She describes an incremental process that has been going on for decades, and is continuing at an accelerating pace. In fact, her words are eerily prescient considering she wrote them more than half a century ago.

I’ll reproduce the quote here, my additions bolded in brackets:

[J]ust as to assure elimination of economic classes requires the revolt of the underclass (the proletariat) and . . . their seizure of the means of production, so to assure the elimination of sexual classes requires the revolt of the underclass (women) and the seizure of control of reproduction **[The widespread availability of scientific birth control and abortion technologies has already given women this.]**: not only the full restoration to women of ownership of their own bodies, but also their (temporary) seizure of control of human fertility **[And only “temporary” because, presumably, she foresees a day when artificial wombs will make the real thing obsolete.]**—the new population biology as well as all the social institutions of childbearing and childrearing. **[Nothing new here; women have always dominated these institutions]** And just as the end goal of socialist revolution was not only the elimination of the economic class privilege but of the economic class distinction itself, so the end goal of feminist revolution must be, unlike that of the first feminist movement, not just the elimination of male privilege but of the sex distinction itself: genital differences between human beings would no longer matter culturally **[Birth control tech now allows women to have sex with the same abandon that formerly was a privilege only of men, so this part of the feminist revolution is already accomplished.]**. (A reversion to an unobstructed pansexuality—Freud’s “polymorphous perversity”—would probably supersede hetero/homo/bisexuality.) **[Plausible as a commentary on today’s culture, especially transgenderism. It seems things are headed in this direction, although the whole society’s not quite on board with it yet.]** The reproduction of the species by one sex for the benefit of both would be replaced by (at least the option of) artificial reproduction: children would be born to both sexes equally, or independently of either, however one chooses to look at it **[This, too, is already happening, again only thanks to technological “progress”.]**; the dependence of the child on the mother (and vice versa) would give way to a greatly shortened dependence on a small group of others in general **[Presumably here she refers to children being raised by the state in public schools, which is essentially already the case in the USA.]** and any remaining inferiority to adults in physical strength would be compensated for culturally **[Could be she means technologically, since the role of technology in equalizing differences in physical strength between individuals, regardless of sex, age, or race is easy to demonstrate.]**. The division of labor would be ended by the elimination of labor altogether (through cybernetics) **[Robots will do all the work in Firestone’s transhumanist vision of the future; a vision shared by many today.]**. The tyranny of the biological family would be broken. **[Yes, that’s exactly how it will happen/is happening. All hail the feminist revolution! Chalk up another victory for technological “progress”!]**

2. [June 7, 2023 at 1:06 am GMT • 3.7 days ago](#) • 200 Words [↑](#)

[@Dr. Robert Morgan](#)

A somewhat tangential point, but if a “tournament” system is more natural to humans, yet agricultural-era females are the ones wearing exquisite clothing, doesn’t it mean that patriarchy is unnatural? From this view, wouldn’t the uglification of modern females be in line with a return from arranged marriage monogamy to female choosers? In more prosaic terms, a tatted hole is still a hole. (Although our pal Autisticus Spasticus may disagree, with his point about his posited ugliness of pre-industrial females; I lack the critical information here, however.)

But regarding your technology-first view, the easiest counter-argument would lie in the absence of nuclear clouds on the horizon – since 1945. The presence of a technology does not predispose its use. The Aryan race might have invented innumerable devices, yet funnelled all its strength into helping the other continents instead of otherwise. In this vein, female birth control is an effect, not a cause.

The fears of technological singularity seem premature. The transvestite phase of Christendom is merely forcefully invoking a much farther future – akin to the way the 1920s USSR is haunting the dreams of modern Ziophobes.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

3. Dr. Robert Morgan says:

June 7, 2023 at 4:25 am GMT • 3.6 days ago • 300 Words ↑

Adûnâi: “The fears of technological singularity seem premature.”

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-12161741/Worlds-baby-born-transplanted-uterus-removed-implanted-using-robot-surgery.html>

This first successful birth of a child via a transplanted uterus portends exactly what Firestone predicted in 1970 — the elimination of the sex distinction itself! For how long do you think it will be before this technique is used on a transgender “man”, to enable him to give birth? Not very long, I would think. Technically, it’s not going to be much of a challenge. And that’s the end of the sex distinction, the culmination of the feminist revolution, delivered via technology. No more male and female! Only “souls”; or, only “life units” to borrow a phrase from dystopian science fiction writer Fred Saberhagen.

Adûnâi: “The presence of a technology does not predispose its use.”

Yes and no. While it is true that (for example) the mere existence of an atomic bomb doesn’t imply it will be used, as a practical matter the existence of ANY technique guarantees it will be used provided that using it is the best way to achieve a desired result. This is because not to use the most efficient technique is only choosing to fail. There’s a good expression of this truth to be found in the foreword to Ellul’s *The Technological Society*:

As the political form best suited to the massive and unprincipled use of technique, dictatorship gains in power. And this in turn narrows the range of choice for the democracies: either they too use some version of effective technique—centralized control and propaganda—or they will fall behind.

• **Replies:** [@Adûnâi](#)

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

4. June 7, 2023 at 8:27 pm GMT • 2.9 days ago • 300 Words ↑

@Dr. Robert Morgan

My counter-argument would run like this. The transhumanist future would indeed destroy the very notion of a human being, with fetishists being able to grow fur and bang scalies. Men giving birth would too be a possible experience. The crucial difference with the modern time, however, is that that degeneracy would stem from the “satedness of life” due to a zero-scarcity civilisation conditions – something that is specifically lacking in the modern world.

Sure, I myself am constantly drawing attention to how advanced our stage of development is compared to the chronic Holodomor conditions coupled with smallpox in that illustrious 18th century, but this is one time where I will talk about modern suffering, especially economic. And from that follows my idea that modern transvestites are more akin to a stuffed bird than to an aircraft. This is not even degeneracy in its *décadent* meaning of the world. This is Christian ethics on hormones.

Granted, I may be underestimating as to how central “sexual identity” is to the normies. Maybe huge swarms of men have always fantasised about giving birth, and I’m too autistic to internalise the sentiment? Either way, I will double down and proclaim that they are only interested in it due to a century of Christian propaganda of female rights and male self-humiliation. One is not seeing the same public vigour with anthropomorphic zoophiles (“furies”), even though they are as passionate in private – simply because theirs is a more natural trajectory of fetishists left to their own devices (and fursuits). Whereas the transvestites have the immediate instinctive support of Christendom’s masses and establishment. Because the transvestites are in the Bible (Galatians 3:28), whereas the furies are not.

• **Agree:** AbrahamSteinblattbaumstein

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

5. JWalters says:

June 10, 2023 at 5:35 am GMT • 12.3 hours ago • 500 Words ↑

We observe the features of objects (including living objects), and categorize objects by their features. Dogs have dog features and cars have car features. We use words to label the features of objects (leg, wheel), and to label the categories (dog, car).

It appears that a person can have a body of one gender (male, female) and a mind of the other gender. A *complete* description of such a person would include *both* their body gender and their mind gender.

Analogously, a bike might have both wheels and a motor. Not all bikes have a motor, but for those that do a typical linguistic solution is to combine the general category term “bike” with the optional feature term “motor”, and get “motorbike”. A particular type of bike.

One parallel linguistic solution in the case of a person with a male body and female mind would be to consider the person a particular type of male (based on body type), and describe them as a “female minded male”. Or simply a “female male” for short. Or perhaps a “chick dude”.

Alternatively, we could consider the person a particular type of female (based on mind type), and describe them as a “male bodied female”. Or simply a “male female” for short. Or perhaps a “dude chick”.

This approach retains the information for both body type and mind type, *both of which exist*.

A person with the same gender on both the body and mind features would be categorized and labeled as “male male” or “female female”. Normal linguistic evolution would shorten these to simply “male” and “female”. This matches the longstanding use for these terms.

Retaining all the gender information would clarify discussions about sporting events, which are principally body competitions. Therefore the body gender would be the relevant gender. In a poetry competition the mental gender could be the more relevant gender.

This approach would still respect a person's right to have a mental gender that is different from their body gender.

In terms of labeling, which gender (body or mind) would be used as the primary gender category, and which as the modifying (adjective) gender? Because of society's longstanding use of body gender for categorizing and labeling gender, the simplest choice for society as a whole would be to use the body gender as the primary gender, and the mind gender as the modifier. So a person with a female body gender and a male mind gender and would be categorized and labeled as "male female".

Natural linguistic evolution tends to shorten labels, so we might expect that to happen in this case. Other creative variations using different terms, but maintaining this principle, would also likely arise, such as "dude chick".

- **LOL:** [Gvaltar](#)
- **Replies:** [@Sparkon](#)

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

6. Anonymous[302] • Disclaimer says:

June 10, 2023 at 6:12 am GMT • 11.7 hours ago • 100 Words 

I have a doctor's appointment coming up. They emailed me a form to fill out prior to the appointment. Some of the questions: Am I food insecure? My preferred pronouns? Et al.

I think I'm gonna list my preferred pronouns as: 'Thee, Thy, Thou, Thine, Ye' and wear my Medieval knight costume I bought for last year's Renaissance faire.

• **Thanks:** JR Foley

• **LOL:** RadicalCenter

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

7. anon[152] • Disclaimer says:

Oy Vey!!!

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

Subscribe to New Columns

8. Norm6 says:

Most USians identify as brain damaged hustlers and hucksters who lust after war mongering imperialism.

• **Disagree:** Gvaltar

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

9. Jews decree, whites agree

BREAKING: A showdown is ramping up right now in Ottawa after the school board told all teachers to call all kids by "they/them" pronouns, permanently. Everyone student is now non-binary, and protesters are getting furious. Situation escalating. pic.twitter.com/ZEL24gE2ry

— Kean Bexte (@TheRealKean) June 9, 2023

• **Replies:** @RadicalCenter

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

10. Ayax says:

June 10, 2023 at 8:12 am GMT • 9.7 hours ago • 100 Words 

Calling someone something other than his/her Biological gender is not only absurd and ridiculous, but is also of little importance, because at the end of the day, you are your Biology.

Having said that, I have an idea that may clear up some of the confusion relating to mis-gendering.

Let the Trans-Woman marry Trans-Men, and let them call each other whatever they want to be called as per their feeling that day.

I am sure that in the heat of the moment these Trans-x couple can act naturally and commit an act of procreation leading to having babies.

Reply/Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

11. Anonymous[363] • Disclaimer says:

June 10, 2023 at 9:36 am GMT • 8.3 hours ago • 100 Words 

If one's preferred self identity is now universally taken to supersede any objective and collective statement on the matter, I believe we have spontaneously reduced our society's crime rate, plus its total membership in any group with an unfavorable reputation to basically nil. No one will willingly identify as a law breaker, reprobate, liar, cheater, thief, lunatic, raving maniac... Well, the list of now extinct ne'er-do-wells becomes endless. Being "woke" is like having a license to create one's own total reality! Very empowering! Former King Charles is not going to like hearing that I'm replacing him on the throne forthwith!

Reply/Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

12. Dumbo says:

June 10, 2023 at 9:55 am GMT • 8.0 hours ago • 200 Words ↑

There is no such thing as “gender”. Much less “transgenders”.

They used to be called “transexual” before, and even before, “transvestites”, which is still the best description — this is about men who dress up as women as an act of performance. Play acting. That’s all this is. Even if they cut off their dick and make a fake vagina that is really a wound that never heals, and facial feminization surgeries, and whatever — they are still the same sex.

There is no way that one can change his sex, which is not just about sexual organs (although this is the more evident manifestation), but his whole body and mind.

There is obviously not such thing as “being born in the wrong body”, an absurdity if there ever was one.

This whole thing is being pushed by transhumanist maniacs whose apparent motives are to create some sort of “superior humans” (or at least they sell it as such) transcending all biological barriers, but which in reality tries to create defective humans who will be permanent slaves.

• **Agree:** usNthem, Gvaltar

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

13. Liborio Guaso says:

June 10, 2023 at 9:57 am GMT • 7.9 hours ago • 100 Words [↑](#)

That is among the interested nonsense. When political and economic freedom became a farce, the supposed sexual freedom to love each other, the freedom to arm oneself to kill oneself and drug offers to live in a paradise, became the most important thing.

All this while increasing social inequality. A hundred years ago all of this would be just ridiculous.

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

14. James Forrestal says:

June 10, 2023 at 11:10 am GMT • 6.7 hours ago • 100 Words [↑](#)

@Dr. Robert Morgan

So your point is essentially that feminism — like transsexualism — is entirely based on denial of reality; on promoting the primacy of narrative over reality. Sounds about right. After all, that's a very prevalent theme in semitic propaganda — they call it "tikkuning the goyim."

And of course, shortly after *The Dialectic of Sex* (the book your quote was taken from) was published, Feuerstein completely lost her already-tenuous grasp on reality and descended into full-blown paranoid schizophrenia, eventually dying in obscurity — her body was found about a month after her death after neighbors complained about the smell.

• **Replies:** @One Nobody

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

15. AbrahamSteinblattbaumstein says:

June 10, 2023 at 11:14 am GMT • 6.6 hours ago • 100 Words 

It's refreshing to read someone who obviously thinks in a straightforward and logical manner and writes in the same manner. People on the left mistake someone who uses seemingly technical jargon that they personally cannot parse as someone with a high IQ. The opposite is true in the real world. A genuinely intelligent person is highlighted by their ability to effectively organize and utilize the tools they have at hand, rather than creating some novel and fantastical tool to hammer a nail with when they have 5 different kinds of hammer in their tool belt.

Here, Knight recognizes the nature of the problem and using pure dialectic reasoning says that "A is not B or C, therefore A is A" making reference to common knowledge that is possessed by anyone whose 5 senses and mind are working correctly.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

16. James Forrestal says:

June 10, 2023 at 11:46 am GMT • 6.1 hours ago • 200 Words ↑

According to Helen Joyce, her bestseller *Trans* is about gender self-identification: the idea that “people should count as men or women according to how they feel and what they declare, instead of their biology”. But she doesn’t say what gender is.

In a previous article I argued that the basic term of transgender ideology, namely “gender”, is only an obfuscating euphemism for sex.

Exactly. The “gender” conceit exists merely to add a few more layers of nonsensical pilpul (what the neo-Bolsheviks would term “mystification”) to obscure and distract from the strange underlying metaphysical premise of so-called “transgenderism” — that some men are born with a “female soul,” and vice versa. And that it’s somehow possible to transform oneself into the opposite sex via an act of will (plus a sprinkling of fairy dust).

But this?

We got from this to the unhappy situation of today by way of the megalomaniac urge of transgender activists, given in to we know not why by policy makers.

Yeah and wet streets cause rain. The question at issue here is not “How did ‘transgender activists’ *force* oligarchs to implement their agenda?” but “Why did oligarchs *choose* to promote transsexualism by raising the status of its proponents in the overall narrative?”

The prominent, protected status of “transgender activists” in the current year is not a natural feature of human societies, but a product of oligarchic narrative control.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hyperreality>

Reply/Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

17. [June 10, 2023 at 12:05 pm GMT • 5.8 hours ago](#) • 100 Words [↑](#)

There has always been a tiny fraction of people born with genuinely mixed up sexual orientations and leanings who've up to today have wrestled with it privately. Then there are those on whom the social engineers latch onto and exploit for their own ends. Then the majority of the minority who exploit their own sexual orientation and confusion simply for the attention they get in a world where everyone is just a number. We no longer have a society let alone a civilization. Western "civilization" is now just a homogeneous mass of mindless consumer drones preying on one another to gain the slightest advantage or benefit. No real mystery that we have this mess to deal with.

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

18. [WorkingClass](#) says:

Let us look at these questions to see if we can gain some clarity.

Nah. Lets not.

• **Agree:** [RadicalCenter](#)

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

19. Observer says:

June 10, 2023 at 12:36 pm GMT • 5.3 hours ago • 100 Words 

Feminism is about equal treatment of women before the law. Marxism is about workers owning the places where they earn their living, as they did before the Industrial Revolution. The nonsense that has accreted around these principles is obfuscation pure and simple, designed and funded by the ruling elite to thwart all popular attempts to rein in its power and privilege, and to keep us divided and confused. Transgenderism is so inherently absurd it is if the powers that be are deliberately mocking us, rubbing our noses in it, that it is so pathetically easy to fool so many into eagerly gobbling up whatever serving of bullshit they offer. Their next project, now well into production, replacing our failed democracy with a Christian neofascist tyranny, is going to be a real knee-slapper. So many are yearning for it already!

20. Guate says:

June 10, 2023 at 12:51 pm GMT • 5.0 hours ago • 100 Words 

Maybe I am just too naive but I cannot help but consider gender dysphoria to be similar to a form of body dysphoria, most notably, anorexia. An individual suffering from anorexia sincerely believes they are fat but society has never been forced to agree with that individual's self identification. A surgeon will not recommend gastric bypass surgery to resolve anorexia yet they are doing surgery to "cure" gender dysphoria. Am I missing something?


Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

21. the Man Behind the Curtain says:

Tranny athletes were big in East Germany in the 1980s iirc. It's Opposite Day!

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

22. Dumbo says:

June 10, 2023 at 1:03 pm GMT • 4.8 hours ago • 100 Words 
@Observer

| Christian neofascist tyranny

LOL. You are insane. The Bolshevik Jews who rule us like tyranny, and sometimes even fascism. But not so much Christianity. No, what they want is what they are doing already.

| Feminism is about equal treatment of women before the law

No, it's not. It's about saying that there are no differences between men and women. Which leads to transgenderism as its logical end — if there's no difference, then one can switch from one to the other at will.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

23. That one comment says:

June 10, 2023 at 1:04 pm GMT • 4.8 hours ago • 100 Words ↑

@Observer

Their next project, now well into production, replacing our failed democracy with a Christian neofascist tyranny, is going to be a real knee-slapper. So many are yearning for it already!

There is nothing democratic about electing a small number of pre-determined politicians who are by law not bound to represent the people nor keep any of the promises they made. More importantly, we've always lived in 'controlled' democracies where popular decisions can be ignored or annulled. It might be worth reading up on how Germany and Japan were 'democratized' after WWII. It is also interesting to point out that both Tsarist Russia and Imperial Germany introduced parliaments for the sole purpose of appeasing people, partially by redirecting the blame to elected parliamentaries, with no genuine interest in enabling democratic participation.

Most people also tend to be conformist and to blindly accept leadership, making them unsuitable for real democracy. Humans naturally organize themselves in hierarchies, a fact that is still denied by anthropologists.

Concerning the rest, Neofascist tyranny it will be, but not Christian..

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

24. RadicalCenter says:

@Priss Factor

The advice for Ottawa parents is the same as for California and New York parents: Take the kids out of government school. They can't arrest or prosecute all of you. Not even close. Especially if some of the police won't play along — or if the population does whatever it (lawfully) takes to make the police unwilling to enforce this filth and incoherence.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

25. Sparkon says:

June 10, 2023 at 1:16 pm GMT • 4.6 hours ago • 200 Words ↑
@JWalters

It appears that a person can have a body of one gender (male, female) and a mind of the other gender. A complete description of such a person would include both their body gender and their mind gender.

No. There is no gender in biology, only sex. Similarly, there is no sex in grammar, only gender, just as author pointed out in his second paragraph here.

Almost all of us are born with a sex organ, either male or female, but nobody is born with a gender organ.

In grammar, “they” refers to more than one person, whereas an individual human being can only be a “he” or a “she,” third person singular, but never they, which is 3rd person, plural.

Animals and inanimate objects are usually referred to as “it.”

In order to live in a rational world, names for things must be correct, a fact that was recognized by Confucius in ancient times with his concept of the rectification of names – 正名:

“If names be not correct, language is not in accordance with the truth of things.”

–Kǒng Fūzǐ (孔夫子, “Master Kong”)

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

26. TKK says:

June 10, 2023 at 1:49 pm GMT • 4.1 hours ago • 100 Words ↑

What a carefully constructed distraction of absolute foolishness.

Even the white shoe law firms have “preferred pronouns” at the end of the writer’s email signature block.

If we could not find any edible food, how important would this be? Maybe America needs to experience that to blast this idiocy back into the abyss.

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

27. State of the world

Democrats when they realize they have to vote for Joe Biden.

pic.twitter.com/2lBbvc5yQd

— Ian Miles Cheong (@stillgray) June 10, 2023

• **LOL:** Rurik

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

28. Passing_by says:

XX = female, XY = male, everything else is disease, genetic, hormonal or mental. End of story.

• **Replies:** @bike-anarkist

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

29. Irose says:

Will exchangeable pronouns and 'identities' become the wrench in the "SDG16" target: to provide legal identity for all, including birth registration by 2030"? I wonder.

"SDG16: Part 1 — Building the Global Police State"

<https://unlimitedhangout.com/2023/06/investigative-series/sdg16-part-1-building-the-global-police-state/?ref=unlimited-hangout>

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

30. Mac says:

June 10, 2023 at 2:28 pm GMT • 3.4 hours ago • 300 Words ↑

The article first question or rhetoric, answer is phsyical, ovaries, or actual testicles. Never mind one percent with historectomy etc. Can't create ovaries in a male. Males can use hormones to grow chest tissue, but not ovaries. They can make quasi-penuses or rubber-insert testicle sacks to put on females, but not genetic testicles, xray would prove.

The few who appear opposite but who aren't involved in schemes, have no issue with, especially if was forced on them. The problem is the pushers, and con 'docturs' doing this who should be run out of the territory.

The tranz brigade putting themselves 'over males and females, claiming 'law ' is a problem. Actualy courts period, can search 'judicial immunity' or corrupt. The 'grimm' case, and note the name, sounds planned, but in any event refusal by supreme cons to 'review the case/meaning refused to consider reversing, was/is wrong, one group- dictating no men or women. How is there are a milion 'lawyers, and they and 'state cons mostly only push the schemes.

The thing is they are male dominant, regardless appear male or female, important point, as the cons pretend trans are some sort of victims –when again male dominant, never mind snivel acts.

Everyone should be more masculine, male and female. The jews and cons have been feminizing dopes centuries exactly because feminized fail to shove back against schemes. Focus local.

Two words don't see much anymore, disguise or imposters. Should make note, bizness suits are costumes.

Article subject more important than people assume, and agree with comment fifteen, also comment twenty five.

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

31. Rurik says:

June 10, 2023 at 2:52 pm GMT • 3.0 hours ago • 300 Words ↑

America has always had a gun culture, going back to the very beginning. But no one, ever went into a school and shot up kids.

Ever.

So now when these shootings happen, people always scratch their heads, and say 'what's going on?

But personally I think it should be obvious, that when you impose insane, anti-human narratives on people, and tell them that gender is a false construct imposed on them by evil people, as has our entire history of America specifically, and Western civilization generally- been nothing more than an orgy of white men oppressing and enslaving and persecuting and genociding everybody else, (Jewish perception of history) while enslaving them all to these white-male-imposed 'roles' like 'gender', and then enforce this narrative across the board, and in the government schools, and in the media, to the point that people are convinced that it's true, and this monstrous 'reality' that's been imposed on them by 'whiteness' and evil people going back centuries.. must finally be broken!

Then is it any wonder that so many of these marginalized people snap?



gender confused school shooter, (there will be more)

Everything they've ever been told are insane lies, specifically intended to wreak havoc with their identity and self-esteem and sow division, for the purpose of filling them with hatred, and rending society into fractionalized warring camps.

Then, when half the nation hates the other half, and most of what all of them believe is malignant horseshit, they can sit back and watch their Big Pharma and Total Police State and Big Tech make hay on all that careful programming.

But even then, that's not why they do it. Not for the money or to see so many people snap, or even for their coveted 'gun control'- to give them even more (unlimited) power over the masses. Those things are just benefits, 'such a deal!'

No the reason they do all of that, isn't for money or power per se, but rather..

it's just *what they do*.

• **Agree:** Passing by, bike-anarkist

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

32. Adolf Smith says:

@Dr. Robert Morgan

She write this after getting a severe beating from her negro boyfriend.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

33. Dr. Robert Morgan says:

June 10, 2023 at 3:46 pm GMT • 2.1 hours ago • 100 Words ↕

James Forrestal: “So your point is essentially that feminism — like transsexualism — is entirely based on denial of reality; on promoting the primacy of narrative over reality.”

No, that’s Richard Knight’s spurious claim.

My point is one diametrically opposed to it, namely that both feminism and transgenderism are empowered by technological “progress”, which creates a new reality. The language reform that Knight talks about and that you refer to isn’t a cause, but rather an effect of that same “progress”. First there is “progress”, and then the language (or narrative) is reformed to accord with the new reality created by that “progress”.

• **Replies:** @Gvaltar

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

34. ariadna says:

June 10, 2023 at 3:53 pm GMT • 2.0 hours ago • 100 Words ↑

“woman like Margaret Thatcher, who was a leader and a firm one, the animus was stronger than in most women while the anima was weaker”

No, let's not drag Jung into this. She was just a soulless bitch, one with little interest or affection even for the offspring she had whelped.

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

35. Dr. Robert Morgan says:

Rurik: “But no one, ever went into a school and shot up kids. Ever.”

<https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/1927-bombing-remains-americas-deadliest-school-massacre-180963355/>

• **Replies:** @Rurik

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

36. ariadna says:

June 10, 2023 at 4:16 pm GMT • 1.6 hours ago • 200 Words ↑

I know it is trite and many have said before, but I will say it again because it irks me so much:

I hate the “identifying as” shtick for being so woefully devoid of inclusiveness. It is strictly reserved for sexual identity. In consequence the self-declared “trans” may have their ID documents legally changed, and they gain access to facilities (e.g. bathrooms, sport clubs/teams) previously reserved for people of the sex they only yearned to belong to.

People should be allowed to identify as not only the “gender” they feel they really belong to, but also as members of the social class and income bracket they feel they really belong to and be treated accordingly. Equal treatment in his case means being able to access bank accounts corresponding to their self-identification.

Some people aspiring to level the playing field in this direction attempt to do it indirectly by falsely claiming to be Jews. They don't get far, probably because of the absence of laws that recognize this type of self-identification. Aiming to achieve more modest gains some attempt to self-identify as other (lesser) historically oppressed minorities, like Native Americans. That can get you into college on a preferential basis. but that's about it. That's a shame...

Reply/Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

37. Desert Fox says:

Trance-gender is a zionist/communist scam and a psyop pushed by UN Agenda 2030, the WEF, the Rockefeller and Gates Foundations, the WHO, the CDC, the Bilderbergers etc., etc., to destroy the moral fabric of society and is a zionist/satanic movement to destroy America and the western world.

Reply/Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

38. Gvaltar says:

@Dr. Robert Morgan

“progress” provided by the white man?

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide
Thread

39. gay troll says:

June 10, 2023 at 4:52 pm GMT • 1.0 hours ago • 800 Words ↑

The last time transgender ideology made any sense to me, which was years ago, the scientific reasoning was that “sex” is biological but “gender” is psychological. Now it seems they wish to claim that sex and gender are the same indefinite thing.

Sex is easily defined – if you have a Y chromosome, you’re male. Yet now we have transgender activists who insist on calling males “people assigned male at birth”. No, you are not assigned a sex by a doctor, you are born with it. There are of course cases, such as androgen insensitivity and chromosomal duplication, where a male may present with female characteristics. My prior understanding of “assigning gender at birth” was when a baby was born with ambiguous genitalia. Then the doctor might choose to try to make the genitalia less ambiguous. But now trans activists want to say that every healthy baby boy has merely been “assigned” male, as if sex has no reality or definition at all.

This moving of the goalposts, away from scientific rigidity and towards the realm of fantastic Orwellian language games, is a sure sign that the transgender movement has been poisoned, if it was not poison from the get go.

Honestly it has taken on the same appearance and fanaticism as the vaccine “debate”. Despite the fact that the erstwhile scientific ideology has fallen into a tatter of contradictory talking points, it has become taboo to disagree with it. And behind both movements we find the same moral hazard: the medical industrial complex pining for business. There is a lot of money at stake in promoting transgenderism.

It also used to be the scientific argument that for trans individuals to transition more successfully, they needed to start at a younger age, before puberty. From the point of view of

being able to make a male look convincingly female or vice versa, this is absolutely true. But now they deny they're targeting children – even though they are, and even though targeting children used to be their scientific rationale.

I overheard a highly offensive speech from a trans activist yesterday on NPR, complaining about the old fashioned liberal idea that we should accept ourselves as we are born and not try to become something we're not. She/he likened this attitude to “privilege”. But real privilege is the massive medical intervention required to physiologically transition. This person was literally saying that no medical intervention is a privilege, while a lifetime of drugs and plastic surgery is a right. The doctor must have put her/his head on backwards.

The bottom line is that drugs and plastic surgery are being marketed to children, often against the wishes of their parents. Should a child be able to authorize these purchases? I think not.

My sex is male and my gender is female. I am androgynous. I am not a woman but I have more in common with women than men. I am heterosocial and homosexual. I am in fact transgender, because before puberty awakened me to my sexual desires, I tried to cultivate a stereotypically heterosexual male persona. Discovering and tolerating my female persona was only a matter of increased maturity, not “gender affirming care”.

If adults want to take drugs and pursue plastic surgery and play spiteful word games, go right ahead. 18 is still young. But don't market this absurdity to minors, and don't tell other adults that they can't disagree with you.

More and more contemporary LGBT+ politics look like an attempt to destroy diversity rather than tolerate it. They are destroying what it means to be a woman. They are destroying

women's sports. They are destroying gay people, both physically and reputationally. The fact that they have rebranded the entire US deep state as LGBT+ warriors is a telltale sign that the movement has been weaponized, and in fact it has been adopted as a shield against liberals. Only 20 years ago, liberals were the loudest critics of the US military and deep state. Now, they are MIC lapdogs.

If you are out there and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, whatever, my advice is to trust in God. Do not trust in the U.S. government. Do not trust the medical industrial complex.

Give yourself time to become who you are.

And seriously, flip the bird to the pronoun police, they are straight up Orwell in your face. They need to stop demanding that strangers corroborate their fantasies.

The singular of they is "IT".

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

40. Agent76 says:

June 10, 2023 at 4:56 pm GMT • 57 minutes ago • 100 Words ↑

Jun 1, 2023 EXCLUSIVE: Dallas Mandates Transgender Pronoun Use

An internal City of Dallas “gender transition” toolkit requires all public employees to use a transitioning person’s preferred pronouns regardless of personal beliefs.

<https://dallasexpress.com/city/exclusive-dallas-mandates-transgender-pronoun-use/>



May 16, 2023 Women’s Rights Activist Riley Gaines condemns using Unisex locker room



Watch Video At: <https://youtu.be/jQTRwmYIOqE>

Jun 12, 2022 Why are kids allowed in a Dallas Drag Bar?

On this week's episode of Rebel Roundup, Reporter Juan Mendoza spoke with David about why minors were brought to a place called Mr. Misster in Dallas Texas.



Watch Video At: <https://youtu.be/4560w9pws3c>

Reply/Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

41. One Nobody says:

@James Forrestal

Semitic? are you talking about Arabic propaganda? You mean Jewish propaganda.

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

42. different commentator's name says:

when it suits UNZ, it runs articles that asks what the definitions of words are. But then it continues to use words such as “white” to identify people.

so once again, what is the definition of “white” when applied to humans? where is the article on that subject?

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

43. Mick Jagger Gathers No Mosque says:

Women covering for or trying to conceal what effeminate men (sodomites) do is nothing new;

3 Kings; He destroyed also the pavilions of the effeminate, which were in the house of the Lord, for which the women wove as it were little dwellings for the grove.

ReplyAgree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter

44. Rurik says:

June 10, 2023 at 5:23 pm GMT • 30 minutes ago • 300 Words ↑

@Dr. Robert Morgan

OK, I stand corrected. Thanks.

There were others, I see.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Enoch_Brown_school_massacre

but there again, it may be a case of the exception proves the rule.

Clearly, they have happened in the past, but it seems they were *very rare*, whereas now they seem almost common.

Some say it's the guns. But I think there's something far more dark and malignant going on.

A insidious malaise, and a despairing sense of being alienated from family and community. And the constant refrain that our society has always been evil, and getting more evil each day. The left doesn't say the right is misguided or wrong, they say the right (conservatives, Christians, white people) are evil. (its is ***not*** Ok to be white).

And anyone opposed to drag-queen hour or gay pronouns is an evil person full of hate, just as our entire society has been oppressed by these hateful people from the beginning, when they were genociding the 'Indians' and enslaving the blacks, and oppressing women and everyone else, and imposing gender straitjackets on children who "science" tells us are not either male or female, (as according to today's mantra, none are), but that these genders were always *imposed* by an oppressive and evil system of white supremacy, that the rest of us have all suffered under, and continue to suffer under!

blah, blah.. Climate Change! Blah, blah..

I don't think I'm exaggerating, when I write that. I think that is an accurate assessment of what they're teaching (indoctrinating) these children to believe.

So when they snap, and do a shooting, or commit suicide

Teen Suicide Rate Spikes 56% in a Decade

<https://www.healthline.com/health-news/teen-suicide-rate-spikes-56-in-9-years>

I don't think we should be too shocked.

They're indoctrinating children to *be* insane, (to hate their family and themselves), and then act surprised when they go insane.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

45. [bike-anarkist](#) says:

[@Passing_by](#)

Yup.

Reply Agree/Disagree/Etc. This Commenter This Thread Hide Thread

[← Twenty Statements About Transgenderism](#)

Leave a Reply -

Remember My Information Why?

Email Replies to my Comment

Submitted comments have been licensed to *The Unz Review* and may be republished elsewhere at the sole discretion of the latter

 [Subscribe to This Comment Thread via RSS](#)  [Subscribe to All Richard Knight Comments via RSS](#)