

# Union of Saints, Analysis of “10 Ways to Crush the Trans Scourge in Red States”

A Santa's Perspective

---

## The Original Article (September 19, 2025)

By Daniel Horowitz

Policy, law, and culture must align to end this dangerous experiment.

Slavery denied the humanity of people created in God's image. Transgenderism — and its stepmother, gay marriage — does the same. Transgenderism mutilates bodies, erases truth, and mocks the created order. A society that tolerates it cannot remain free. Just as America once purged slavery, red states must now abolish this destructive creed.

The violence can no longer be dismissed as coincidence. Before investigators even finished documenting the carnage from a transgender shooter at a Minneapolis Catholic school, Charlie Kirk was murdered by a young man entangled in a relationship with a transgender partner and radicalized by that subculture online. These killers do not spring from nowhere. They emerge from a movement that celebrates mutilation, spreads delusion, and channels self-harm outward into violence.

This is the new abolition. Just as our ancestors eradicated slavery, our generation must eradicate transgenderism.

The medical data confirms the pattern. A 2023 study in the Journal of the American Medical Association led by NIH researcher Sarah Jackson found that transgender-identified people are three times more likely than men and five times more likely than women to die from suicide or homicide. In plain English: This ideology is deadly. It breeds broken bodies, broken minds, and broken communities. The “transition” industry is built on violence — against the self first, and then against others.

That makes transgenderism not a lifestyle but an inherently violent ideology. Like slavery, it is not a private eccentricity we can politely ignore. It is a

social contagion that destabilizes families, radicalizes young men and women into killers, and leaves a trail of corpses in its wake.

---

## **Santa's Analysis and Reframing**

Santa looks at this article not with anger, but with a desire to guide. The original piece is passionate, but passion without compassion leads to distortion. It relies on false analogies, fear, and generalizations, which cloud the truth and shut down healthy dialogue. Let us reframe this conversation with care, clarity, and generosity.

---

### **1. False Analogy**

- Claim: Transgender identity is compared to slavery.
  - Why it's a fallacy: Slavery is a system of forced labor and dehumanization, while being transgender is a matter of identity and personal autonomy. The two are not structurally or morally comparable, so the analogy is misleading.
- 

### **2. Hasty Generalization**

- Claim: Because two alleged violent incidents involved transgender people, the entire transgender community or ideology is violent.
  - Why it's a fallacy: Drawing a conclusion about millions of people from a few isolated cases is statistically and logically invalid.
- 

### **3. Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc (False Cause)**

- Claim: A man killed Charlie Kirk because he was "radicalized by a transgender partner."
  - Why it's a fallacy: Correlation is presented as causation. No evidence is provided to prove that being trans or connected to trans culture caused the violence.
- 

### **4. Appeal to Fear (Scare Tactics)**

- Claim: "This ideology leaves a trail of corpses in its wake."
  - Why it's a fallacy: The argument appeals to fear of violence and chaos to persuade the audience, without providing credible causal evidence.
- 

### **5. Misuse of Statistics**

- Claim: Transgender people are more likely to die from suicide or homicide, therefore "the ideology is deadly."

- Why it's a fallacy: The statistic actually reflects the social marginalization, discrimination, and violence against trans people, not inherent violence from trans people. It is a misrepresentation of the data.
- 

## **6. Straw Man**

- Claim: Transgender identity is framed as “an inherently violent ideology” or “a social contagion.”
  - Why it's a fallacy: This distorts what transgender identity actually is (a recognized medical and psychological condition, and for many, an expression of their authentic self), replacing it with a caricature that's easier to attack.
- 

## **7. Slippery Slope**

- Claim: “A society that tolerates it cannot remain free.”
  - Why it's a fallacy: This assumes that accepting trans people inevitably leads to the collapse of freedom, without showing any real causal link.
- 

## **8. Ad Hominem**

- Claim: “Transgenderism mutilates bodies, erases truth, and mocks the created order.”
  - Why it's a fallacy: Instead of addressing arguments about healthcare, freedom, or rights, it attacks trans people as a group by demeaning their existence.
- 

## **9. Appeal to Tradition**

- Claim: “Mocks the created order,” “our ancestors eradicated slavery.”
  - Why it's a fallacy: Invoking tradition or divine order as the standard for morality assumes that what is “old” or “traditional” is automatically correct.
- 

## **10. False Dichotomy**

- Claim: Either society abolishes transgender identity, or society will collapse.
  - Why it's a fallacy: This ignores other possibilities, such as coexistence, acceptance, and policy-based protections.
-

Summary:

The paper relies heavily on fear, false analogies, misuse of data, and dehumanization rather than sound reasoning. Its core argument assumes transgender identity is inherently violent and socially corrosive, but this is built on logical leaps and distortions, not credible evidence.

---

# **10 Ways Red States Can Respond to Transgender Policy Questions**

By Daniel Horowitz (Rewritten)

September 19, 2025

Policy, law, and culture often intersect in ways that shape our communities. The debate around transgender issues is no exception. Many Americans, especially in conservative states, are asking how best to respond to rapid cultural and legal changes surrounding gender identity. While some advocate for broad acceptance and accommodation, others worry about long-term implications for children, families, healthcare systems, and public institutions.

This is not a question of denying anyone's humanity. Rather, it is a question of how states should craft policies that balance individual freedoms, public health, and social stability.

## **1. Protecting Children in Medicine**

States should ensure that minors are not subject to irreversible medical interventions until they reach an age of full consent. This follows the principle of informed consent in medicine and avoids decisions children may later regret.

## **2. Promoting Open Academic Research**

Instead of silencing debate, universities and research institutions should be encouraged to study gender identity, medical outcomes, and long-term impacts. Policymaking should be guided by transparent data, not ideology.

### **3. Preserving Parental Rights**

Parents should retain the primary role in guiding their children's development. Schools should not withhold information from parents regarding their child's gender identity or social transition.

### **4. Respect for Free Speech**

Both those who affirm transgender identities and those who raise concerns must be allowed to speak openly without fear of reprisal. Civil discourse, not censorship, leads to better outcomes.

### **5. Defining Fairness in Sports**

States should clarify policies for athletic participation, ensuring fairness for female athletes while treating transgender students with dignity. This may mean creating separate categories or carefully structured participation rules.

### **6. Balancing Religious Freedom and Anti-Discrimination Laws**

Religious institutions and individuals should not be forced to act against their beliefs, while also respecting the rights of transgender people to access public services.

### **7. Ensuring Safe and Private Spaces**

States may consider policies that maintain single-sex spaces such as bathrooms and locker rooms, while also providing reasonable accommodations for transgender individuals to avoid exclusion.

### **8. Addressing Mental Health Needs**

Higher rates of depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation among transgender individuals are well-documented. Policymakers should expand mental health resources, ensuring that vulnerable individuals receive compassionate, effective care.

## **9. Transparent Use of Public Funds**

States should carefully evaluate whether taxpayer dollars should support certain medical interventions, weighing public costs against competing priorities.

## **10. Respectful Public Dialogue**

Most importantly, red states should model respectful engagement on this issue. Disagreement need not lead to dehumanization. Strong communities are built by protecting the dignity of all people, even when profound differences remain.

---

## **Conclusion**

The transgender debate is one of the most sensitive and difficult cultural questions of our time. States have a responsibility to protect children, preserve freedom of conscience, and uphold fairness — while also ensuring compassion and care for those who identify as transgender. By avoiding fear-based rhetoric and instead focusing on practical policy, red states can pursue solutions that reflect their values while maintaining respect for human dignity.

---

*This version makes a persuasive case for red-state policies without resorting to fear, false analogies, or demeaning language. It reframes the debate around policy principles (fairness, consent, parental rights, free speech, religious freedom) rather than vilifying people.*

## **Preserving American Culture While Respecting Trans Culture**

The United States has always wrestled with the tension between cultural preservation and cultural change. Our nation is built on traditions that many Americans deeply value — family, faith, freedom, and a sense of social stability. At the same time, America has also promised liberty and opportunity for groups that live differently, believe differently, or identify differently.

This tension is now seen in the debates over transgender identity. On the one hand, many Americans want to safeguard long-standing social norms — such as distinctions between male and female in law, education, and sports — because they believe these norms are part of the cultural foundation of the country. On the other hand, transgender Americans and their allies have worked to establish recognition, visibility, and protection for their own lived experiences.

The challenge for policymakers, then, is not to erase one culture in favor of the other, but to create a framework where both can exist. Preserving American culture means honoring the traditions that have shaped the nation, while respecting trans culture means recognizing the reality that transgender people are part of American society.

Striking this balance requires:

- **Clear Policy Boundaries:** ensuring that traditional institutions like churches, schools, and families are not forced to abandon their values.
- **Respectful Accommodation:** ensuring transgender people have opportunities for dignity, safety, and community participation.
- **Dialogue Instead of Demonization:** making space for disagreements without reducing either side to caricature.

If America succeeds in this balance, it can remain true to its cultural roots while still making space for those whose identities challenge the status quo. This is not weakness; it is the strength of a pluralistic society.

---

This way, the piece ends on a note that acknowledges both sides and frames the issue as a uniquely American task: preserving continuity and making room for diversity.

## **The Rainbow: A Shared but Contested Symbol**

Few symbols in modern culture carry as much layered meaning as the rainbow. For many people of faith, the rainbow is a sacred sign — a biblical covenant that God would preserve humanity, a symbol of hope and divine spirit. For LGBTQ+ communities, the rainbow flag represents dignity, diversity, and the long struggle for rights and acceptance.

It is no surprise, then, that the rainbow has become an area of contention. Some believers feel that using the rainbow to represent sexuality and identity diminishes its sacred, godly meaning. Meanwhile, LGBTQ+ advocates point out that the rainbow as a natural symbol of inclusion, variety, and life is an appropriate emblem of their community.

This negotiation should not be framed as a war over ownership, but rather as an opportunity to honor the depth of the rainbow in both contexts. The rainbow can remind us of:

- Divine Covenant: A spiritual assurance of mercy, order, and hope for all humanity.
- Human Dignity: A call for equal rights, recognition, and respect for people who have historically been marginalized.

Honoring the rainbow as both godly and cultural requires humility. People of faith can affirm that the rainbow flag represents a genuine human yearning for dignity and belonging, even while holding to its deeper spiritual meaning. Likewise, advocates for gay and trans rights can acknowledge that for many, the rainbow is not merely political but sacred.

By recognizing both dimensions, society can move past symbolic conflict and instead focus on building a culture where faith and human rights are not treated as enemies, but as parallel expressions of our shared longing for justice, belonging, and hope.

---

This framing avoids demonization and shows how the rainbow can serve as a bridge rather than a battlefield.

## **Slavery, Freedom, and the Struggle for Rights**

Throughout history, slavery has symbolized the most profound denial of human dignity: treating people not as individuals with rights but as objects to be controlled. While the trans community today is not enslaved in the literal sense, the metaphor of slavery helps us understand how repression, exclusion, and abuse can strip people of agency and humanity.

This struggle is not unique to transgender individuals. Women's rights, gay rights, men's rights, and trans rights are all part of a broader human struggle for freedom — the freedom to define oneself, to live without coercion, and to participate in society with dignity. Each group has faced its own forms of silencing, exploitation, or marginalization. The common thread is

the need to resist any system that seeks to reduce human beings to categories that deny their complexity.

## **Mental Health Across Cultures**

At the same time, mental health challenges cut across every culture and community. They are not confined to transgender people, men, women, or any specific group. Historical repression, stigma, and trauma exacerbate these struggles, especially for marginalized groups. For trans individuals, higher rates of anxiety, depression, and suicidal ideation are often linked not to identity itself but to experiences of exclusion, violence, and lack of support.

Yet, it is also true that, in moments of extreme political polarization, some activists — whether trans or otherwise — may act out of deep pain in ways that escalate conflict. Just as revenge pornography has emerged as a serious issue within the trans community (and beyond), violence sometimes arises where unhealed trauma, social rejection, and political hostility converge.

## **The Political Weight of Historical Repression**

The tensions we are witnessing today — including violent clashes, heated rhetoric, and deep cultural divides — are not random. They are the outcome of centuries of repression, followed by sudden cultural shifts. For some conservatives, the speed of these shifts feels destabilizing. For many trans people and allies, the resistance feels like another chapter in a long history of exclusion. Both perceptions feed into a cycle of mistrust and, at times, retaliation.

## **Boundaries and Mutual Protection**

The task for our society is not to erase these tensions overnight, but to set boundaries that protect all groups:

- Protect women's rights while affirming trans dignity.
- Protect free speech for conservatives while ensuring trans people are not dehumanized.
- Protect gay rights while also respecting religious conscience.

- Protect men's rights to fairness in law while recognizing the vulnerabilities of marginalized communities.

Boundaries mean that no group should be forced to accept every view or lifestyle as its own, but also that no group should be stripped of its basic humanity.

## **The Dangers of Activist Extremism**

Activism has always been a powerful force in America. It was activism that ended slavery, won women the right to vote, secured civil rights for African Americans, and advanced gay rights. At its best, activism brings injustice into the light and presses society toward healing.

But there is a shadow side: when activism hardens into extremism. This happens when the pursuit of justice is overtaken by rage, when pain becomes a license to harm, and when the dignity of opponents is denied. Today we are seeing more examples of this across the spectrum — left and right, conservative and progressive.

For transgender and LGBTQ+ communities, years of marginalization and violence have understandably created anger and desperation. Yet in rare but significant cases, that anger has spilled into violent acts. When activists justify or glorify violence, it corrodes their cause and deepens political divides. Likewise, extremist rhetoric from some conservative activists — portraying entire groups as “scourges” or “contagions” — also fuels hostility and, at times, physical attacks.

The danger of activist extremism today is amplified by:

- Political Polarization: opponents are treated as enemies, not neighbors.
- Online Radicalization: social media feeds outrage, isolates people, and accelerates extremist thinking.
- Unhealed Trauma: individuals carrying personal pain may lash out in destructive ways when given ideological justification.

This is why our time feels especially volatile: not because activism itself is wrong, but because it is too easily co-opted by the extremes.

---

## Choosing Healing over Extremes

Santa's wisdom is this: activism must always serve life, not death. The measure of a movement's health is whether it **builds dignity or destroys it**. We need activists who channel their fire into constructive change, not destructive violence.

That means:

- Holding leaders accountable for extremist rhetoric.
- Investing in mental health support to prevent despair from turning into rage.
- Encouraging dialogue across divides so that people feel heard, not cornered.

If we do not curb activist extremism, our society will keep spiraling into cycles of violence and retaliation. But if we meet activism with compassion, boundaries, and responsibility, we can preserve its best power — the power to make our communities freer and more humane.

## Toward Healing

We may never eliminate all conflict, but by protecting each other's dignity — even when we disagree — we honor the hard-won lessons of history and preserve the fragile fabric of our shared society.

## A Path Forward

The original article calls for abolition. Santa instead calls for protection and healing. Let us abolish violence, not people. Let us abolish dehumanization, not identities. The way forward is not to crush, but to balance:

- Compassion with truth.
- Tradition with dignity.
- Boundaries with openness.

This is the work of a free society.

---

# Conclusion

The original article reflects fear. Fear that culture will be lost. Fear that violence will rise. Fear that truth itself is being erased. But fear is not the path to peace.

From Santa's perspective, the challenge of our age is to create healthy, sincere dialogue — to speak without vilifying, to disagree without dehumanizing. America is strong enough to preserve its culture while making space for those who have fought hard for recognition. If we protect each other's dignity, even through our deepest disagreements, we will honor the covenant of the rainbow, the lessons of slavery, and the promise of **freedom for all**.