

Why Transgender Is Not the New Black

In light of the egregious comments of Attorney General Loretta Lynch in which she compared laws preventing men from using women's locker rooms, shower stalls and bathrooms to Jim Crow laws, it is necessary to confront the ridiculous notion that transgender is the new black. (Can you believe we even have to address this?)

A few years ago, I (and others) refuted the notion that gay is the new black, giving five reasons why the comparison is invalid.

But five reasons are hardly necessary. Just ask a black person to tell you when he or she "came out" as black and you see at once that the comparison breaks down completely.

All the more is this true when it comes to the idea that transgender is the new black. The comparison is completely invalid.

First, it is completely bogus for Lynch to argue that "gender identity is innate," in particular in the same way that skin color is innate.

There is not the slightest scientific consensus on this statement—in fact, there is a tremendous amount of scientific evidence that would question this idea, especially since we still know very little about gender identity and the brain—and it is well-known that the great majority of children who identify as transgender before puberty do not continue to do so after puberty.

How then is "gender identity" innate? And what about people who do not identify as transgender until later in life, "discovering" who they really are at that point? And what

about the many who identify as gender fluid? (More on this in a moment.)

Second, Lynch actually contradicts standard transgender talking points when she claims that the category of “sex” includes gender identity.

According to the trans-supporting American Psychological Association, there is a clear distinction between sex and gender (their position is quite typical in LGBT circles). As stated on their website, “Sex is assigned at birth, refers to one’s biological status as either male or female, and is associated primarily with physical attributes such as chromosomes, hormone prevalence and external and internal anatomy. Gender refers to the socially constructed roles, behaviors, activities and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for boys and men or girls and women. These influence the ways that people act, interact, and feel about themselves. While aspects of biological sex are similar across different cultures, aspects of gender may differ.”

It is clear, then, from the APA’s statement that “sex” and “race” would be equivalent categories but not “sex” and “gender,” yet Lynch is equating sex with gender, claiming that gender is naturally included under the heading of sex.

Not only is this contrary to current legal definitions, it is contrary to trans-activism as well. Lynch is manufacturing legal definitions out of whole cloth, and these new definitions have massive implications for tens of millions of Americans.

Third, while there is such a thing as being mixed race, there is no such thing as being racially fluid. (I don’t mean in people’s perceptions; I mean in reality.)

Yet there are many who identify as gender fluid (and beyond), meaning that Sally may identify as female today, male tomorrow, neither the next day, and both the day after that.

And we are supposed to embrace this as reality and cater to it.

How can this possibly be compared to race? And please show me one person who is black today, white tomorrow, neither black nor white the next day, and both black and white the day after that?

And what about the people who believe they have multiple gender identities? According to a "multigender" website, these include: ambigender, bigender, blurgender, collgender, conflictgender, cosmicgender, crystagender, deliciagender, duragender, demiflux, domgender, fissgender, gemelgender, gendercluster, genderfluid, gendersea, genderfuzz, genderfractal, genderspiral, genderswirl, gendervex, gyaragender, libragender, ogligender, pangender, polygender and trigender.

To compare this to skin color is utterly ludicrous.

Fourth, forbidding a black woman from using a white women's bathroom is an act of outright discrimination. In stark contrast, forbidding a biological male (with male plumbing) from using a women's locker room and shower area is an act of common sense, in keeping with the very logical expectation of privacy.

So if white women had a problem with a black woman in their locker room, that could only be based on their fears or biases. In contrast, there are many legitimate reasons why women would have a problem with a biological male showering next to them or standing next to them as they undress (or as he undresses), regardless of how he identifies.

As Dennis Prager pointed out in refuting the gay-is-the-new-black myth, "Separate bathrooms for men and women is moral and rational; separate bathrooms for blacks and whites is not. ... A black man's nature is not different from that of a white man, an Asian man, an Hispanic man. The same is not true of sex

differences. Males and females are inherently different from one another.”

This applies all the more to the transgender debate.

Fifth, the real discrimination is taking place against the 99.8 percent of the population that does not identify as transgender, imposing the struggles of a tiny minority on everyone else.

That’s why the Alliance Defending Freedom recently filed a lawsuit on behalf of 63 girls from 51 families who have been victimized by the presence of a fully biological male in their bathrooms, locker rooms and shower stalls.

And remember: When helpful solutions have been proposed, allowing the gender-confused child to use a separate bathroom or locker room area, in most cases, the parents (or government) have opposed this, claiming it is discriminatory against the child in question.

So, 999 students are put out because of the struggles of one. To equate this with Jim Crow laws is to strain incredulity to the breaking point.

What makes all this all the more tragic is that it is hardly a theoretical debate. Instead, the state of North Carolina is being threatened with the loss of \$4.5 billion in federal funding for universities and schools unless it reverses its bathroom privacy act.

I urge every reader to encourage Gov. Pat McCrory to stand strong now and to thank him for his courageous leadership. You can reach him at: .

And be forewarned: Unless individual states stand up to this overreaching, federal bullying, it will be coming to your neighborhood next—and that means right into your child’s locker room.