

Justice Jackson, Are You a Woman?

One of the most effective strategies employed by LGBTQ activists has been to join their movement to the Civil Rights Movement, making gay (or trans) the new Black. One of the quickest ways to demolish that comparison is by asking a Black person, "When did you come out as Black?"

At that moment, the air goes out of the tire and the false comparison is exposed. Obviously, there is a massive difference between skin color, which is not a matter of personal perception and which cannot be hidden and does not need to be announced, and one's perceived sexual orientation or gender identity.

In the same way, there is a simple way to demolish the current wave of gender madness, and it is by asking one simple question as well. In fact, it was the perfect follow-up to Sen. Marsha Blackburn's questioning of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson during her confirmation hearings when she asked the nominee, "What is a woman?"

When Judge Jackson was unable to answer that question, stating that she was not a biologist, Sen. Blackburn could have simply asked her, "Judge Jackson, are you a woman?" How could she *not* be able to answer that?

The reality is that even women on the left, including radical feminists, realize that if you can't give a simple, self-evident definition of the term "woman," then there is no such thing as women's rights. After all, if we don't know what a woman is, how can she (or he?) have equal rights?

As expressed by Pamela Paul in an op-ed for the *New York Times* (citing her colleague Michael Powell), "even the word 'women' has become verboten. Previously a commonly understood term for

half the world's population, the word had a specific meaning tied to genetics, biology, history, politics and culture. No longer. In its place are unwieldy terms like 'pregnant people,' 'menstruators' and 'bodies with vaginas.'"

This is madness. Absolute madness.

When we say "men and women" or "males and females" there is no ambiguity here at all—not unless you are a radical gender activist. As Paul rightly said (and to repeat the obvious), in the past, the word "woman" was "a commonly understood term for half the world's population, the word had a specific meaning tied to genetics, biology, history, politics and culture."

But not today.

Paul continued, "Planned Parenthood, once a stalwart defender of women's rights, omits the word 'women' from its home page. NARAL Pro-Choice America has used 'birthing people' in lieu of 'women.' The American Civil Liberties Union, a longtime defender of women's rights, last month tweeted its outrage over the possible overturning of *Roe v. Wade* as a threat to several groups: 'Black, Indigenous and other people of color, the LGBTQ community, immigrants, young people.'

"It left out those threatened most of all: women. Talk about a bitter way to mark the 50th anniversary of Title IX."

To say it again: this is madness.

But it gets worse.

On July 13, Breitbart reported that, "A senior bishop of the Church of England said this week the Church has no 'official definition' of a woman amidst an evolving understanding of gender in the contemporary world."

To quote the bishop directly (his name is Dr. Robert Innes, and he is "the Church's Bishop in Europe and chairman of the Faith and Order Commission"), "There is no official

definition, which reflects the fact that until fairly recently definitions of this kind were thought to be self-evident, as reflected in the marriage liturgy.”

Indeed, a special project within the church “has begun to explore the marriage complexities associated with gender identity and points to the need for additional care and thought to be given in understanding our commonalities and differences as people made in the image of God.”

So, the Church of England has lost its way, too. How sad (albeit not surprising).

And then this, reported by Fox News on July 12: “The World Health Organization will update its gender guidance to reflect its belief that gender goes ‘beyond non-binary,’ the organization has announced.

“The WHO has an existing ‘gender mainstreaming manual’ which argues that there are many genders existing on a spectrum from male to female. The organization now says that does not go far enough, however.”

But of course. The social reengineering must go further still.

Accordingly, “The updated guidance will focus on ‘highlighting and expanding on the concept of intersectionality, which looks at how gender power dynamics interact with other hierarchies of privilege or disadvantage, resulting in inequality and differential health outcomes for different people,’ the WHO website reads at the time of reporting.

“The update will also emphasize ‘going beyond non-binary approaches to gender and health to recognize gender and sexual diversity, or the concepts that gender identity exists on a continuum and that sex is not limited to male or female.’”

To say it yet again (but with more emphasis this time), this is madness!

So, the WHO has it wrong biologically, the Church of England has it wrong biblically, and the radical left has it wrong ideologically.

Perhaps Justice Jackson can help bring clarity here. Justice Jackson, are *you* a woman? {eo}

Dr. Michael Brown () is the host of the nationally syndicated Line of Fire radio program. His latest book is The Silencing of the Lambs: The Ominous Rise of Cancel Culture and How We Can Overcome It. Connect with him on Facebook, Twitter or YouTube.