

Christian Attorney Comes Out as Transwhatever

Hold on.

Courage, Matt, courage.

Breathe.

OK, I'm ready.

This is it. I'm coming out. I want the world to know. I'm a black, lesbian platypus trapped in a white, straight guy's body. This is my truth. It's my experience. It's how I identify. It's my reality (actual reality notwithstanding). Transracial, transgender and transpecies lives matter (#TransLivesMatter), and I'm declaring myself an out and proud member of the LGBTTT community.

Crazy, you say? Don't judge me, hater. This is my race-species-gender identity and expression, whether real or perceived, and if you refuse to play along, then you're violating my civil rights.

This is my struggle. I demand admission to the wrong bathrooms and showers, the right to play for the other sports teams and unfettered access to your children so I can indoctrinate them till they can't see straight, or I'll ruin you.

Identify me by whichever stupid pronoun I invent, you cisgender, cisracial, cisspecies bigot, or I'll glitter bomb you so bad that you'll be slightly inconvenienced.

Move over, Caitlyn Jenner.

You're yesterday's news, Rachel Dolezal.

I'm here! I'm, er, whatever! Get used to it!

It's my turn. I want my reality show. I want my heavily-Photoshopped, little duckbilled mug on the cover of National Geographic posthaste.

Call me Mrs. Wiggles.

Oh, and transwealthy. I'm that, too. I really need to get my mortgage transpaidoff, so, yeah, I'm transwealthy.

Well? Don't just sit there. Get busy. Suspend disbelief. Bend the space-time continuum and otherwise adjust your life to accommodate my moonbat pathologies, you microaggressive transphobe, or I'll have your job.

Black, lesbian platypi of the world, unite!

Merriam-Webster defines "reductio ad absurdum" as "disproof of a proposition by showing an absurdity to which it leads when carried to its logical conclusion."

You've just experienced reductio ad absurdum. "Species identity," "racial identity" and, to no lesser extent, "gender identity" each represent comically absurd contrivances.

Yet here we are.

Seriously, thank you Bruce and Rachel for making this rant possible. Thank you, secular "progressives" and mainstream media for overplaying your hand on the whole "transwhatever" twaddle to the extent that Americans at large are beginning to sit up and, with a bold, unified voice, declare, "Um, say what?"

These past three weeks have served to set your extremist agenda back years, and that's fantastic. People get it. Putting the "trans" prefix ahead of some objective truth that you oh-so-very-much-wish weren't so, does not reverse that truth and make your personal fantasy become everyone's reality.

Ever heard of a “transabled” person? “Transgender” activists have long distanced themselves from the “transabled” community because the two clinical psychoses are effectively different manifestations of the same disorder. The “transabled” person has a sincere, deep-seated belief that he or she is a disabled person trapped in a perfectly healthy and able body. In an effort to align their false identity with objective reality, “transabled” people have amputated healthy limbs, intentionally blinded themselves, had their legs crushed and worse.

Ironically, the transabled person who saws off a perfectly healthy arm, pokes out an eye or deliberately cripples healthy legs can actually achieve success. If he does one or more of these things, he will, in fact, become disabled.

The “transgender” person, on the other hand, can never enjoy this same success. If one who tragically believes that he or she is trapped in the wrong-sexed body goes through with cosmetic “gender reassignment” surgery and maims his or her body by mutilating perfectly healthy reproductive organs (or by having healthy breasts cut off if female), then that person remains as that person began—male or female. “But from the beginning of the creation God ‘made them male and female’” (Mark 10:6).

The pitiful paradox here is that, rather than being transformed to the opposite sex (or “gender” as “progressives” prefer) the “transgendered” will, like his or her similarly situated “transabled” counterpart, simply become physically disabled (and sterilized).

Or consider the anorexic. This is the emaciated person who, misperceiving herself to be grossly overweight, will starve herself to death. You don’t help the anorexic by affirming her delusion, calling her “transfat” and giving her liposuction. You feed her. And then you get her therapy.

Leftists love to say that race and “gender” are social constructs. Clever little buggers, aren’t they? This is a classic example of George Orwell’s doublethink. It’s a deliberate tactic by which relativists are able, with a straight face, to call up down, white black and male female. They muddy fixed, objective truths by labeling them “social constructs,” while, at the same time, socially constructing the rhetorical tools needed for fascism. Pretendoids like “gender identity,” “transphobia,” “sexual orientation” and “homophobia” are just a few examples of such social constructs (yes, I made up “pretendoids.” If they can do it, then so can I).

For relativism to work—and that’s what we’re talking about here, relativism—reality must be undone, adherents to objective truth pilloried and all dissent stifled.

This is classic cultural Marxism. It’s a bizarre and despotic world in which the left’s upside-down version of “inclusivity” trumps authenticity—a society wherein any recognition of objective truths that “progressives” cannot (more properly, will not) abide, are labeled offensive “microaggressions” that, when uttered even offhandedly, demand swift punitive measures.

While penning the infamous majority decision in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, a decision that upheld the phantom “constitutional right” for a mother to have her own child dismembered alive, Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote, “At the heart of liberty is the right to define one’s own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life.”

This, of course, is abject nonsense. Still, it is illuminating. It’s the rationale that undergirds, to the extent that anything devoid of substance can undergird anything else, the moral relativist worldview responsible for the postmodern “trans” phenomenon.

But it's much more than all that.

Justice Kennedy is widely expected to be the swing vote in the Supreme Court's imminent "gay marriage" decision, *Obergefell v. Hodges*, which will come down within the next couple of weeks. He will presume to dictate whether black is white, up is down, and whether we must all pretend, under penalty of law, that a man can somehow "marry" another man.

Kennedy thinks people have the "right" to redefine the universe.

This is "transsane."

Which does not bode well for marriage.

Or reality.

Matt Barber is founder and editor-in chief of . He is an author, columnist, cultural analyst and an attorney concentrating in constitutional law. Having retired as an undefeated heavyweight professional boxer, Matt has taken his fight from the ring to the culture war. (Follow Matt on Twitter: @jmattbarber).