

# THE ABOLITION OF SEX



**HOW THE “TRANSGENDER” AGENDA  
HARMS WOMEN AND GIRLS**

**KARA DANSKY**

Published by Bombardier Books  
An Imprint of Post Hill Press  
ISBN: 978-1-63758-229-9  
ISBN (eBook): 978-1-63758-230-5

The Abolition of Sex:  
How the “Transgender” Agenda Harms Women and Girls  
© 2021 by Kara Dansky  
All Rights Reserved

Cover Design by Tiffani Rudder

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means without the written permission of the author and publisher.



Post Hill Press  
New York • Nashville  
[posthillpress.com](http://posthillpress.com)

Published in the United States of America

*Sex:* the differentiation between male and female, determined by whether an X-bearing sperm or a Y-bearing sperm fertilized the X-bearing ovum, which determines the type of sexual and reproductive organs that develop, and the biological differences between females and males.



*“They literally stopped recognizing every actual single woman and girl, every female person. And they told us that we were now all an identity instead of a sex, a psychology instead of physiology. That was what female now meant. So that men could say they were women. And they did, hundreds of thousands of them did. There was no single word for actual females. We weren’t allowed one. Our word was reallocated to men. We had to talk about ourselves as people with cervixes, or menstruators, and we had to agree that biology wasn’t the real difference between the sexes, identity was. One by one, every reference to biological sex was replaced in every law with references to identity, until the law had erased any connection with female biology from pregnancy, childbirth, motherhood. Everything became something that applied to both men and women because it was forbidden to have real references to sex. Stating that only females were women was enough to lose your job, or even be charged with a crime. Failing to agree with a man that he was a woman was enough to be ostracized, censored, or threatened with legal action. Men took over women’s sports, institutions, groups. Men represented us in every level of society, calling themselves women. There were no words to distinguish ourselves from these men. Everyone could see the female sex were becoming unspeakable people, unspoken of.*

*You weren't allowed to acknowledge our separate existence from male people. Men committed crimes and society said women did it. You could never escape a man because he could follow you into any public space by identifying as female. People were very, very afraid to tell the truth. Many hundreds of children lost their reproductive organs trying to become the other sex. It was a very dark time."*

Copyrighted material

---

—Posted in 2020 by a woman in the British online forum Mumsnet under the pseudonym "Barracker"

# Introduction

## **The “Transgender” Delusion (Observations of a TERF)**

**I**N MARCH OF 2021, a person named Rachel Levine was confirmed as the Assistant Secretary for Health at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Levine is a biological male who claims to be a “transgender woman.” During the confirmation hearings in February 2021, every single member of the United States Senate was expected to pretend that Levine is a woman. Every single member did so. No one was permitted to question this, and no one even tried.

Under questioning from Senator Rand Paul, Levine refused to state whether or not he approved of administering life-altering (potentially sterilizing and lethal) drugs to physically healthy teenagers. On October 19, 2021, the Department of Health and Human Services announced that Levine had been sworn in as the “first female four-star Admiral of the U.S. Public Health Service Commissioned Corps.” On the same day, the *New York Times* said the same thing on Twitter. The United States government and the *New York Times* outright lied to everyone by saying that Levine is female.

On September 18, 2021, the one-year anniversary of the death of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) tweeted a quote about abortion rights from Justice Ginsberg’s 1993 Supreme Court confirmation hearing, editing out all of the words that identified abortion as a right that pertains exclusively to women, i.e.,

female humans—the only humans who are capable of getting pregnant (full disclosure: I worked at the ACLU from 2012 to 2014). Justice Ginsberg’s original statement read:

“The decision whether or not to bear a child is central to a woman’s life, to her well-being and dignity. It is a decision she must make for herself. When government controls that decision for her, she is being treated less than a fully adult human responsible for her own choices.”

The version that the ACLU tweeted read:

“The decision whether or not to bear a child is central to a [person’s] life, to [their] well-being and dignity ... When the government controls that decision for [people], [they are] being treated as less than a fully adult human responsible for [their] own choices.”

It is difficult to imagine a graver insult to one of the most prominent women’s rights advocates in the history of the United States of America and the founder of the ACLU’s Women’s Rights Project than to edit women completely out of one of her most famous quotes on the anniversary of her death. The ACLU’s Executive Director later acknowledged that this was an error but stated that it was “not an error without a thought,” and then went on to state that “there are people who are pregnant and who seek abortions who do not identify as women.”

This is no doubt true, but it is also beside the point. There is no such thing as a pregnant person who is not either a woman or a girl, and there never has been. This is, of course, precisely why conservatives work so



never has been. This is, of course, precisely why conservatives work so hard to keep women from having abortions.

Later the same month, *The Lancet*, arguably the most reputable medical journal in the world, tweeted an image of the cover of its next issue. The cover stated: “Our new issue is here! On the cover—‘Periods on display’ and the cultural movement against menstrual shame and #PeriodPoverty. Plus, @WHO air quality guidelines, low #BackPain

Copyrighted material

management, community-acquired bacterial #meningitis, and more. Read.” The cover of the issue stated simply: “Historically, the anatomy and physiology of bodies with vaginas have been neglected.” And with that message, *The Lancet* reduced women to “bodies with vaginas.”

The editor later apologized, and in his apology, added, “I want to emphasize that transgender health is an important dimension of modern health care, but one that remains neglected. Trans people regularly face stigma, discrimination, exclusion, and poor health, often experiencing difficulties accessing appropriate health care. The exhibition review from which *The Lancet* cover quote was taken is a compelling call to empower women, together with non-binary, trans, and intersex people who have experienced menstruation, and to address the myths and taboos that surround menstruation.” The editor did not explain the purpose of going into depth about the health needs of so-called “trans people” (or bother to define the phrase “trans people”) in this statement apologizing for referring to women as “bodies with vaginas.” Why?

assertions, why all this such peddling.

In late September 2021, the U.K. Labour Party met for its annual conference. When asked by a news reporter, “Is it transphobic to say that only women have a cervix?” Labour leader Keir Starmer said that that is something that “should not be said.” Doubling down, Labour member David Lammy later said that the statement “only women have a cervix” may not be “transphobic, but it is not accurate.” His reasoning was that “while it’s probably the case that transwomen don’t have ovaries, but a cervix, I understand, is something you can have following various procedures.” One might reasonably wonder whether these men have any idea at all what a cervix is.

Notably, the statement “transwomen can have a cervix” in response to the question “is it transphobic to say that only women have a cervix” is an implicit acknowledgment that the category of people being referred to as “transwomen” are, in fact, not women at all. The category of people being referred to as “transwomen” are, in fact, men—and everyone knows it.

Copyrighted material

Thus, in September of 2021, all of this set off a firestorm in U.K. media and on social media about what a woman is. The U.S. media paid little to no attention to the controversy at all.

Awareness of this problem has been building for some time, but only recently has it begun to engender resistance. The “breakthrough” issues in terms of public opinion have involved the invasion of female spaces by

men claiming to be women, particularly women's sports and other female-only spaces like public bathrooms and changing rooms.

All over the world, men are competing in women's sports on the pretext that they are "trans women," which is taken to mean some special type of women. For example, a man named Laurel Hubbard was permitted to compete in the women's weightlifting category in the 2020 Tokyo Olympics on the basis that he is a so-called "transwoman," i.e., a man who pretends to be a woman. This is said to be true because he has a so-called "female gender identity." The International Olympic Committee and the global media expected everyone to accept these assertions as true. Most people appeared to play along with the charade.

Male convicted rapists are being permitted to be housed in women's prisons with vulnerable women, many of whom have already suffered tremendous abuse at the hands of men. A man who goes by the name of Princess Zoe Marie Andromeda Love, who was convicted of raping a twelve-year-old girl, is being housed in a Washington state women's prison and has allegedly had sexual intercourse with a female inmate (which, if true, legally constitutes rape). His placement in the women's prison is in accordance with the official policy of the Washington State Department of Corrections.

In July of 2021, a man was permitted to enter the women's section of a nude spa in Los Angeles and expose himself and his erect penis to naked girls. The reason this was allowed to happen is that California law prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in public accommodations, but it also defines sex to include "gender identity and gender expression," completely ignoring the material reality of biological sex. All of this is accomplished via the claim that men can be some form of women, i.e., "transwomen." Anyone who questions this is immediately labeled



“transphobic.” Discussion is not permitted. This assault on women’s sex-based rights is not occurring in a vacuum or by accident. It is being perpetrated by a vicious and brutal industry that operates openly and yet manages to sneak under the public radar. Its aim is to abolish sex in the law and throughout society. We are all victims of this assault, but those most harmed are women and girls, i.e., female human beings. Our society has simply not grappled with the implications of enshrining words like “transgender” and “gender identity” in law, policy, business, academia, and media. We need to start grappling with this. The time to do that is now.

The media will not speak candidly about this, and any woman (or man, for that matter) who attempts to speak the truth is immediately labeled a TERF (“Trans Exclusionary Radical Feminist”). This kind of labeling is extremely dishonest and misleading, but it has also been remarkably effective, putting feminists on the defensive as though defending our existence as female is somehow harmful.

Here is the truth we cannot speak: “gender identity” does not exist in any real, material sense, and “transgender” is simply a made-up concept that is used to justify all kinds of atrocities. It is, in effect, a *men’s rights* movement intended to objectify women’s bodies and erase us as a class. It is left-wing misogyny on steroids.

I say this is as a leftist and a Democrat.

Famed author J.K. Rowling recently said that we are living in one of the most misogynistic times in recent history.<sup>1</sup> She is right. From a feminist perspective, men as a class have always dominated women and trampled on our rights, and today is no different, except that it is worse because it is being done under the ruses of “transgenderism” and “gender identity,” both of which are being enshrined in law at all levels of government and pushed by the political left. Many of us women on the



political left are accustomed to having our rights trampled on by the right; we are not used to experiencing it from within our own political ranks.

I care about this issue for two reasons: First, as a feminist, I care about the rights, privacy, and safety of women and girls, and allowing men and boys to invade female-only spaces is dangerous and profoundly misogynistic. Second, as a human being, I want public policy to be

Copyrighted material

grounded in material reality and science. Enshrining vague concepts like “transgender” and “gender identity” in law and policy threatens both of those interests.

I have always considered myself a feminist, although my understanding of what that means has changed over time. I became a registered Democrat in 1990. When I was in college, I took numerous women’s studies courses, volunteered at the Women’s Center, served on a task force to eliminate sexual assault and rape on campus, and engaged in abortion clinic defense. During law school, I volunteered at the Philadelphia chapter of NARAL, which was then known as the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. After law school, I embarked on a twenty-year career in criminal law and criminal justice, but that would eventually come to an end. In 2015 I joined the Women’s Liberation Front (WoLF) and I served on its board from 2016–2020. In 2020 I got involved in the Women’s Human Rights Campaign (WHRC) and currently serve as the President of the U.S. chapter.

My involvement in WoLF and WHRC meant that I was a TERF, i.e., a feminist who cares about the rights, privacy, and safety of women and girls. That meant that I was no longer permitted to associate in so-called “progressive” circles or work in the so-called “progressive” criminal justice reform movement. Instead, I am labeled a TERF.

J.K. Rowling, Canadian journalist Meghan Murphy, and the U.K.-based Member of Parliament Rosie Duffield (a member of the left-wing Labour Party) have all been labeled TERFs for their public statements. Rowling’s offense was saying that women should not be fired for saying that sex is real. Murphy referred to a man as “him.” Duffield said that only women have a cervix (as noted above, the head of the Labour Party, Keir Starmer, later commented that the words “only women have a cervix” should “not be said”).

In October 2021, Netflix released a Dave Chappelle comedy special called “The Closer,” in which he offered support to J.K. Rowling before announcing that he is “Team TERF.” He made taboo-breaking jokes about the issue and boldly mocked the pretense that a man can become a woman (or vice versa) simply by declaring it so. This set off a firestorm of

Copyrighted material

Critic

debate about whether Dave Chappelle was “transphobic,” including predictably angry demands from a small group of very vocal activists for Netflix to pull his (extremely popular) special offline. (So far the network has refused.) Commentator Bill Maher, a staunch defender of free speech,

has previously commented on March, a staunch defender of free speech, would later declare on television that he is “Team Dave,” and called for an “honest, free discussion about this.”

Many feminists have chosen to reclaim the term TERF, saying that it stands for “Tired of Explaining Real Facts,” “Totally Exceptional Radical Feminist,” or “Tirelessly Explaining Reality to Fools.” Nonetheless, the acronym continues to be used to smear feminists who insist on fighting for rights for women and girls. On September 8, 2021, famed gay leftist George Takei tweeted: “Quite right. TERFs are like the anti-vaxxers of the left: resistant to science and reason, convinced of their wrong position, and a real danger to others.” But what is dangerous, wrong, or resistant to science and reason about saying that women have rights *as women*?

Whether or not to refer to oneself as a TERF is a difficult and personal decision. I will not label anyone a TERF because of the word’s negative connotations. For myself, having been called a TERF more times than I can count, I say this: If caring about the rights, privacy, and safety of women and girls, if caring that law and policy are grounded in science and reality, makes me a TERF, then so be it.

Feminists have a saying—we can’t fight sexism if we can’t say what sex is. And that is precisely where we are as a society today—we can’t say what sex is. We are abolishing sex and replacing it with “gender identity” or “transgenderism” throughout law and society.

Intriguingly enough, increasing numbers of lesbians, gay men, and bisexual people (LGB) are taking a stand against the inclusion of the “T” in the acronym LGBT because sexual orientation and “gender identity” have nothing to do with each other, although they are typically linked together. Sexual orientation is about sexual attraction to people of the same sex, the opposite sex, or both sexes, whereas “gender identity” is a fiction that denies the reality of sex altogether. Further, the notion that



sexual orientation is some kind of identity, rather than a reality, is extremely homophobic. How can we legally protect same-sex attraction if

the law denies the reality of biological sex? The conflation of sex and gender has come to be known within radical feminist and gay rights communities as “woke homophobia”—and it’s coming from the political left.

Many readers will have a hard time believing the things that I describe throughout this book. That is understandable because, on a certain level, the things that I describe are unbelievable: these include such dangerous absurdities as the mandated incarceration of male convicted murderers and rapists in women’s prisons, the protection of known male sexual abusers in women’s domestic violence shelters, and the complete silencing of women (and men) who speak out against these abominations.

For example, in California, it is perfectly legal for men to be housed in a women’s prison because of a 2020 law that redefined sex to include “gender identity” for the purpose of deciding where to house convicted felons. Under this law, female correctional officers may be required to conduct intimate searches of male prisoners and prison staff are prohibited from referring to inmates using an “unwanted gender pronoun.” This is championed as “life-saving legislation.” In August 2021, WoLF reported that the main California women’s prison was distributing condoms to female inmates and that one woman had become pregnant from rape. The

reason that it is possible for a man to rape and thereby impregnate a woman is, of course, the material reality of biological sex, which is now being blatantly ignored throughout the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Things like this are understandably hard to believe. But they are real, and they can be documented.

This is nothing less than a war against biology, and predictably, it is creating tremendous confusion. It also presents a unique challenge for feminists because while we support nonconformity with traditional sex-based stereotypes, we strongly object to the complete obliteration of biological sex.

Often, when I discuss these matters in regular life, my statements are met with stares of incredulity. It is very difficult to get one's head around what is happening because it all sounds so astonishing. People often say things like, "I am trying to make sense of it all." My response to this

Copyrighted material

understandable expression is typically, "You are trying to make sense out of something that does not make sense. You are using critical thinking and intelligence to make sense out of something that cannot be made sense of. You are not the crazy one here." So I hope that readers will bear with me as I discuss this very important matter of public concern.

Throughout this discussion, I will be focused primarily on U.S. law and society because I am most familiar with it, but it is important to note that the abolition of sex is playing out globally as well and that many of

the stories I tell here come from outside the U.S. In short, the abolition of sex is not just an American problem; it is playing out all over the world.

Readers can be forgiven for not knowing much about this. No one ever reads about the abolition of sex in the media because most mainstream media outlets are actively engaged in a concerted effort to conceal it. Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube all deplatform critics of “transgenderism.” Amazon has said publicly that it will not sell books that criticize it. But the abolition of sex is real—and it is dangerous.

This book is an effort to uncover and explore its origins, the reasons it is happening, and its impacts on women and girls. My aims are twofold: (1) to persuade readers that while “sex” is real, “transgender” in fact is not, and therefore has no basis for being enshrined in the law; and (2) to persuade readers that to the extent our society seems to have accepted the lie that “transgender” is real, its main victims are women and girls because the agenda is to obliterate sex. If we cannot talk about the material reality of sex, we cannot fight for the rights, privacy, and safety of women and girls as a sex class.

Many people think that the phrase “transgender people” refers to a grassroots movement to secure the rights of a marginalized community. This is not true. The truth is that there is no such thing as “transgender,” which is why I always put the word in quotation marks. Instead, the entire agenda is grounded in and fueled by an industry whose aim is to abolish the material reality of biological sex. Jennifer Bilek, who founded and writes at *The 11th Hour Blog*, coined the phrase “gender identity industry” to describe this loosely affiliated conglomeration of

corporations, law firms, non-profit organizations, foundations, and others that literally aim to obliterate the material reality of biological sex, legally and physically.<sup>2</sup> This industry is fueling the “transgender” agenda by giving out billions of dollars in funding, lobbying for the redefinition of sex to mean “gender identity” in the law, and pushing the idea that “transgender” has some coherent meaning beyond sex.

To be clear, my argument is not that anyone is trying to abolish or criminalize sexual activity between consenting adults. The title of this book refers to the abolition of sex as a noun—“either of the two major forms of individuals that occur in many species and that are distinguished respectively as female or male especially on the basis of their reproductive organs and structures,” as Merriam-Webster defines it. I am also not arguing that anyone is attempting to abolish sex as a biological category in non-human animals.

Instead, the arguments put forward in this book are (a) that sex is being abolished as a *legal*, *social* and *physical* category of human beings; (b) that the so-called “transgender” movement (what I will call the “gender identity industry”) is a key component of that effort; and (c) that this movement is detrimental to everyone, but especially to women and girls (i.e., human females).

Feminists worked hard to ensure the creation of female-only spaces such as public bathrooms, sports teams, and domestic violence shelters. Before that, suffragists secured the right of women to vote. Today, we have scholarships, business loans, and other civic institutions that are intended exclusively for women and girls—because women have historically been discriminated against on the basis of sex. The “transgender” agenda threatens all of these important historical gains and undermines feminists’ ability to fight for future goals by insisting that



women do not exist as a class of people.

That sex is being abolished is bitterly ironic, because feminists—i.e. those who work toward the liberation of women and girls as a class of human beings—have been expressly calling for the abolition of gender for decades. As feminist scholar Sheila Jeffreys states, “[t]ransgenderism depends for its very existence on the idea that there is an ‘essence’ of

Copyrighted material

he book      Similar books

gender, a psychology and pattern of behavior, which is suited to persons with particular bodies and identities. This is the opposite of the feminist view, which is that the idea of gender is the foundation of the political system of male domination.”<sup>3</sup>

For feminists, gender is purely a social construction that is loaded with various patriarchal roles, values, and expectations. For example, women in our society are expected to wear high heels in order to comply with the rules of womanhood and to attract the attention of men, even though it has been shown time and again that wearing high heels causes lower back pain, sore calves, foot pain, ankle sprains, constricted blood vessels, crooked feet, and weakened ligaments. Women are expected to be sweet, docile, and subservient to men. This is all still true, notwithstanding the gains that feminists have made over the years.

The *reason* feminists have been calling for the abolition of gender is that from a feminist perspective, gender is a prison that keeps women in a position of subservience to men. For feminists, in other words, gender is



the problem, not the solution. Feminist philosopher Marilyn Frye perhaps describes the situation best when she discusses the nature of this prison in terms of cages.

“Consider a birdcage. If you look very closely at just one wire in the cage, you cannot see the other wires. If your conception of what is before you is determined by this myopic focus, you could look at that one wire, up and down the length of it, and be unable to see why a bird would not just fly around the wire any time it wanted to go somewhere. Furthermore, even if, one day at a time, you myopically inspected each wire, you still could not see why a bird would have trouble going past the wires to get anywhere. There is no physical property of any one wire, *nothing* that the closest scrutiny could discover, that will reveal how a bird could be inhibited or harmed by it except in the most accidental way. It is only when you step back, stop looking at the wires one by one,

Copyrighted material

Critic

microscopically, and take a macroscopic view of the whole cage, that you can see why the bird does not go anywhere; and then you will see it in a moment. It will require no great subtlety of mental powers. It is perfectly *obvious* that

the bird is surrounded by a network of systematically related barriers, no one of which would be the least hindrance to its flight, but which, by their relations to each other, are as confining as the solid walls of a dungeon.”<sup>4</sup>

Using Frye’s birdcage analogy, we can see how gender confines us. Each wire in the cage is a sex-stereotype—an expectation put on us by society as to how we should look, speak, and behave on the basis of our sex. This is what feminists have been seeking to abolish for decades. Feminists do not want women to have to conform to sex-stereotypes because they keep us in a position of subservience to men. As Jeffreys states, “‘Gender,’ in traditional patriarchal thinking, ascribes skirts, high heels and a love of unpaid labor to those with female biology, and comfortable clothing, enterprise and initiative to those with male biology.”<sup>5</sup> So it is with a bitter sense of irony that feminists are now having to contend with the abolition of sex instead.

If “gender identity” means anything at all, it means conformity with the set of sex-stereotypes that are imposed on the opposite sex—for example, the expectation that women wear high heels. For feminists, liberation entails women breaking free from the societal expectation that women wear high heels. But for gender ideologues, wearing high heels is one of the things that make a person a woman. So today, a man who wears high heels can call himself a woman on that basis. This new form of gender ideology, which grew out of so-called “queer theory” in academia, is extremely anti-feminist, anti-woman, and politically regressive.

This book is primarily about the aspect of the “transgender” agenda that involves men claiming to be women. It is not about the aspect of the

“transgender” agenda that involves women claiming to be men, so-called “detransitioners” (people of either sex who go through hormonal and/or

Copyrighted material

surgical “transition,” and then revert back), differences of sexual development (commonly referred to as “intersex”), “transwidows” (the women whose husbands “transition” late in life and typically abandon them and their children), or the heartbreaking phenomenon of medically “transitioning” children. Those are all extremely important topics that deserve separate attention. Author Abigail Shrier tackles the agonizing problem of the medical “transitioning” of teenage girls in her 2020 book, *Irreversible Damage: The Transgender Craze Seducing Our Daughters*.<sup>6</sup>

The book is also not about the relatively new phenomenon of people claiming to be “non-binary.” I mention “non-binary” here only because it is an aspect of this discussion that is playing out in society, and it cannot be omitted. In April 2016, actor and singer Amandla Stenberg stated that she “identifies as non-binary.” Actor Sam Smith did the same in March 2019. Then came Actor Brigitte Lundy-Paine in November 2019. There was a series of additional “coming out as non-binary” stories, and then Ellen/Elliot Page made the same announcement in 2020. What these celebrities appear to be saying is that they are neither male nor female. Readers who think that this does not make any sense are correct. All human beings adopt some characteristics and personality traits that are typically considered to be either masculine or feminine. That does not



change a person's sex. All human beings, like all mammals, are either female or male. Every single one of us.

The only additional thing that might helpfully be said about the phenomenon of people “identifying as non-binary” at this time is that it is inaccurate to suggest that male and female are identity categories. They are not; they are biologically based sex categories that appear in five of the seven kingdoms of life. Suggesting that female is an identity category is also insulting to feminists who have fought for decades to secure rights for women and girls. “Woman” is not a category that anyone can “identify” into or out of.

Many people, conservatives especially, like to argue that feminists are responsible for the abolition of sex by accusing us of making the claim that men and women are identical, but this is not true. Feminists have been fighting the concept of gender for decades. No feminist that I am

Copyrighted material

aware of has ever said that women do not exist as a coherent biological and legal category. In fact, it is quite the opposite—feminists know exactly what the category “women” means. The ultimate aim of feminism is to liberate women and girls from the cages that imprison us. That the category “women and girls” does not exist is the central claim of the gender identity industry, not of feminists.

At this point, many readers might be thinking, “Okay, but I have a child (sister, brother, niece, nephew, cousin, friend, etc.) who is trans.

What should I do about that? Just ignore his/her identity?" My answer is this: Your child, sister, brother, niece, nephew, cousin, friend, or whomever, is still either female or male biologically, even if the person has adopted a so-called "trans" identity. That is what matters. That is what is true in a material, real, objective sense. The person in question can adopt a subjective "gender identity" if she or he wants to, but that identity is no more real than it would be for you, me, or anyone else to identify as a tree or a chair.

I know that these issues are difficult to think and talk about. I know that many of us have loved ones who are caught up in the delusion—and yes, it is a delusion—that there is a coherent category of people called "trans." I have loved ones who are caught up in this cultural fad. Many people struggle with painful confusion as to whether they are "really" of the opposite sex. Many conclude that they are, in fact, the opposite sex and go on to get all kinds of surgeries and take all sorts of hormones to validate that fantasy. They then insist on having everyone else in our society act as though it is perfectly normal.

If you ask me, the best thing we can do for these people is to be kind to them by telling them the truth. We can help our children, sisters, brothers, nieces, nephews, cousins, and friends to love and accept themselves as they are—girls, boys, women, and men. Everything else is a lie. I am often told that I ought to be "be kind and compassionate" and let people "live their best lives" as they choose. Fair enough, except that I do not think that validating a person's delusion counts as kindness.

In this regard, I speak, as they say, from lived experience. When I was eighteen years old and starting college, I became anorexic. Going to

college was a difficult transition for me. I went from living in a small town in southeastern Ohio to attending a highly ranked private school on the East Coast, with many people who had attended private high schools. I was very much out of my league, socially and academically. My eighteen-year-old brain decided to get matters under control by studying as hard as possible and by starving myself. I convinced myself that I was overweight, even though I was not. This strategy does not make sense to me today, as a mature adult, but it made a lot of sense to me then.

Helpfully, my parents refused to validate my delusion about my body weight. They persuaded me to get the help that I needed. They did not encourage me to take drugs or get surgery to validate my deluded ideas about my body. That would have been unkind. Instead, my parents did the kindest and most compassionate thing possible by helping me out of my delusion. That is what our society needs to do for the people who are sincerely confused about their biological sex and/or “gender identity,” whatever that may mean for them.

The purpose of this book is to break down each of these topics in detail. We will examine the concept of womanhood, the abolition of sex in law, the implications of the abolition of sex for everyone, and for women and girls in particular, the difficulty of discussing these topics, and the industry that is fueling the abolition of sex. Lastly, we will discuss what can be done to stop it.

In 2014, a friend opened my eyes to the problems that the “transgender” agenda presents to women and girls in terms of rights, privacy, and safety by telling me that “transgender” is anti-feminist because it is, in her words, “the ultimate penetration of our bodies by men.” Along the way, I have met numerous parents whose children, both minors and young adults, were struggling with matters of sex and gender. Many of

these children appeared to believe that they were “born in the wrong body” and that they were, in fact, the opposite sex. Some simply wanted to escape their biological sex in search of something different.

Today, such a phenomenon might seem healthy and normal; it is not. The parents I have met with “trans” children are in agony. The gender identity industry is feeding their children drugs that will result in

Copyrighted material

permanent sterilization and possible terminal illness. It is subjecting them to surgeries that mutilate, amputate, and destroy healthy body parts. Most of these parents are unable to speak out because they have very legitimate concerns about their relationships with their children and about their children’s privacy. So they sit, and wait, and hope, while their children’s lives and bodies are being destroyed. This book is for them.

- 
- 1 J.K. Rowling, “J.K. Rowling Writes about Her Reasons for Speaking Out on Sex and Gender Issues,” (June 10, 2020)
  - 2 Readers can find the blog at <https://www.the11thhourblog.com/>, on Twitter at @11thBlog, and on Facebook at @The11thHourBlog.



- 3 Sheila Jeffreys, *Gender Hurts: A Feminist Analysis of the Politics of Transgenderism* (Routledge 2014), 1; see also Sandra Lee Bartky, "Shame and Gender," in *Femininity and Domination* (Routledge 1990), 84 ("What patterns of mood or feeling, then, tend to characterize women more than men? Here are some candidates: shame; guilt; the peculiar dialectic of shame and pride in embodiment consequent upon a narcissistic assumption of the body as spectacle; the blissful loss of self in the sense of merger with another; the pervasive apprehension consequent upon physical vulnerability, especially the fear of rape and assault.").
- 4 Marilyn Frye, "Oppression," in *The Politics of Reality* (The Crossing Press 1983), 4-5.
- 5 Jeffreys, GENDER HURTS, 2.
- 6 Abigail Shrier, *Irreversible Damage: The Transgender Craze Seducing Our Daughters* (Regnery Publishing 2020).



# What is a Woman?

**O**N JULY 28, 2014, journalist Michelle Goldberg published a piece in *The New Yorker* titled “What is a Woman?” The piece dealt with the growing rift between radical feminists and activists who claim that “transgender” is a meaningful concept.<sup>7</sup> In it, she chronicled an event from 1973, where feminists were discussing the identities of men who claimed to be “transsexuals,” and where feminist Robin Morgan is reported to have stated:

“I will not call a male “she”; thirty-two years of suffering in this androcentric society, and of surviving, have earned me the title “woman”; one walk down the street by a male transvestite, five minutes of his being hassled (which he may enjoy), and then he dares, he *dares* to think he understands our pain? No, in our mothers’ names and in our own, we must not call him sister.”<sup>8</sup>

Feminists are still holding this line today in the face of relentless social pressure to use people’s so-called preferred pronouns. Feminists do not use “preferred pronouns” (unless compelled to do so) and there are a few reasons for this. One is that we will never say that a man is a woman. Another is that we refuse to lie.

It is commonplace today to say (and to think we *have* to say) that “trans women are women.” But little thought is given to what this