

# The Transgender *Societal*<sup>1</sup> Agenda Stands on a House of Cards

"...they became futile in their thinking and their senseless minds were darkened." (Romans 1:21)

With taunts<sup>2</sup> evocative of the "*huffing and puffing*" of the "*Big Bad Wolf*," the transgender (TG) *societal* agenda is currently plowing roughshod through society with a degree of boldness suggesting that its tenets are grounded in truth. Is that assumption correct? Brashness of this level must surely appeal to some sort of grounds for surety as to the rightness of its cause. Yet I ask, is the impulse that drives its touters *legitimately* grounded? The sciences have strict rules which distinguish between either *factual* conceptions or mere emotions and opinions. Consequently, it is high time societal movers face the question whether the TG *agenda* is based on facts that justify the upheaval that it leaves in its wake.

The *guidelines* certifying that knowledge is *scientific* are strict and clear. Firstly, science draws a sharp distinction between observation (science) and *boundless* pondering (fiction). Secondly, *scientific* insights are gathered without regard for either the wishes or the loathing of its researchers since only by its conformity to the facts is its validity secured. Thirdly, qualities which attest that data is *scientific* include that it is both **measurable** AND **observable**.<sup>3</sup> Only claims that can be reconciled with **data** that fulfills **both** factors qualifies as being *scientifically* sound. Fourthly, it is fallacious to suppress data in order to force a *desired* conclusion.<sup>4</sup> These parameters do not mean that non-scientific statements are necessarily false. Far from it! (only materialism (MT) limits *truth* statements to just *scientific* discourse). How ironic it is that by their own definition MTs disqualify their own views as *unscientific*!<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, if any conception is *subjective* (*sourced* inside one's head) **then it lacks the required grounds that justify imposing onto NON-TGs, demands that its' champions allege, can redress what are just fantasies!**

It is urgent that these guidelines be rigorously observed. The clarity they bring is like the colored lines drivers look to in order to stay within their lane along a winding road on a stormy night. Firstly, they hinder erroneous claims from getting a hold on audiences due to the seductiveness of charming, though ill-informed voices. Secondly they boost the likelihood that *principled* scientists will focus their declarations on the *verifiable* realities that their academic curricula convey, thereby highlighting the **actual facts of the matter under discussion**<sup>6</sup> as opposed to "poisoning the well" through ploys such as gaslighting.<sup>7</sup>

Furthermore, in addition to the *empirical*<sup>8</sup> evidence that scientists specifically grapple with, another means in our search for truth includes a "manual" (so-to-speak) for correct thinking called rationality. This body of concepts is distinguished from the *physical* stuff and properties of the *scientific* realm in that this is the set of *rules* about **how** interactions function in the additional crucial matter of

<sup>1</sup> This paper makes the vital distinction between the validity of *private subjective* experience and the imposition of public policy onto others.

<sup>2</sup> The outcome from the agenda results in not only winners, but also entirely innocent losers. See the list of such in the 2nd par. on p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> James Ladyman. *Understanding Philosophy of Science*. (Routledge, 2002), pp. 94-96.

<sup>4</sup> This is called the "*fallacy of exclusion*." <https://web.stanford.edu/~jonahw/PWR1/LogicalFallacies.htm>

<sup>5</sup> See my paper, "Scientism is NOT Science," at my website: [www.christianityontheoffense.com](http://www.christianityontheoffense.com) \*\* Indeed, philosopher David Hume's contention at the close of his "Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding" (<https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3il3/hume/enquiry.pdf>) which declares that only scientific claims qualify as truth statements is absolutely false; so utterly so that his claim discredits his *philosophical* essay.

The truth or falsity of verbal statements may be validated if eye-witness, historical analysis, and/or cross examination satisfy the legal standards of evidence. See John Warwick Montgomery. *History, Law, and Christianity*. (Canadian Inst. for Law, Theology, and Public Policy, 2002).

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4244881/> (2014). "Mental Health Care for those who Identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and (or) Queer." It states, "The "Position Statement on Discrimination Against Transgender and Gender Variant Individuals," released by the American Psychiatric Association in July 2012, states that "**being transgender or gender variant implies no impairment in judgment, stability, reliability, or general social or vocational capabilities; however, these individuals often experience discrimination due to a lack of civil rights protections for their gender identity or expression**" (boldface mine). Notice firstly the inexplicable refusal to acknowledge obvious psychological maladies and secondly they **ignore science** by assigning the cause of these unacknowledged maladies to "social injustice!"

<sup>7</sup> As an enflamed pool of gasoline in the dark confuses one's senses, the goal of GL is to cause its victim to doubt commonsense and knowledge. <https://www.thoughtco.com/poisoning-the-well-fallacy-1691639>

<sup>8</sup> Empirical data pertains to evidence that can be apprehended through our five senses by means of observation and experimentation.

*human* interactions by adjudicating such matters as truth vs. falsehood, innocence vs. guilt, right vs. wrong, and valuable vs. worthless. Apart from submission to the laws of rationality, even science can offer us no profit. *Scientific* insights can be beneficial to us only insofar as they are correctly framed in verbal sentences and/or mathematical formulas that lead to a reconciliation of rationality with the structure of matter as it is *actually* configured. Likewise, in order for *verbal* directives to be truthful and meaningful they demand governance by critical-thinking guidelines; the rules<sup>9</sup> which apply to **all** intellectual engagement the "three fundamental laws of logic." These include the 1) "Law of Identity" which says that every object can be only itself, so that it is never confused with another seemingly identical object, the 2) "Law of Non-Contradiction," which says that no concept can be both true and false in the same way at the same time. And the 3) "Law of the Excluded Middle," which says, for example, that the statement, "*It is raining,*" can [ONLY] be either true or false."<sup>10</sup> In summary, rationality then insists that although we can *adjust* ourselves to external realities; we can never *re-create* reality to our own wishes.

For the reasons laid out up to this point, it is achievable for non-specialists to discern whether or not the **societal** TG policies have *scientific* and *rational* merit. First of all however, I want to highlight that in my title the word I chose to *italicize* is "societal." I do not deny either the reality or the gravity of the *experience* of sexual dysphoria from the vantage point of the individual. My purpose is instead solely to **refute** the prevailing assertions that TG is correct in hailing science and reason as validators behind the following binding policies: (1) Under threat of severe penalty, school administrations require that TGs be addressed by teacher and classmates with the pronoun of the TG's choice, (2) they impose the intermingling of TG males with females in public showers, (3) they exact **irreversible** surgical and/or pharmaceutical procedures onto public school students who self-identify as TG; in many cases in denial of **parental permission or even knowledge** about the specifics of their child's ponderings, (4) school administrators further remove TC children to so-called "safe places;" the location of which is not revealed to the parents, (5) administrators effectively berate and belittle the dignity of parents by suggesting the latter are incompetent to make the decisions for their children, and (6) they judge as a fair compromise that in athletics that it is a tolerable loss that biological girls are deprived of not only rightful medals and ribbons due to TG male winners in contests, but also athletic scholarships, to name a bundle of **enormously consequential decisions** being enacted at the expense of non-TG peoples.

TG nomenclature distinguishes between the two related concepts *gender* and *sexual* identity. *Gender* identity, on the one hand, pertains to *internal sensations* of *individuals* that can't be observed by objective means since the feelings must be *reported verbally* by the *patient* in order for specialists to become aware. This aspect of TG indicates that *gender* identity cannot even in principle qualify as a *scientifically-validated* (let alone *apprehended*) mental state. On the other hand, by contrast the aspects of *sexual* anatomy and the human genome do fulfill all four requirements that qualify data as *scientific* (p. 1), while not even one tenet of TG can appeal to any of the same factors as a validator that (inner) sexual dysphoria *scientifically* replaces one sex for the other. Furthermore, the logical fallacy the "Law of Non-Contradiction" highlights that, in matters of truth, *physical* actuality trumps feelings, while the "Law of the Excluded Middle," removes all avenues of confusion over which sex a given individual actually is.<sup>11</sup>

Gary Jensen, NALC Lutheran Pastor, retired © October 3, 2023

Gjensen549@gmail.com \*\* Christianityontheoffense.com \*\* offensivechristianity.blogspot.com

M.Div. Degree from Luther/Northwestern Theological Seminary \*\* M.A. Degree with Honors in *Science and Religion* from BIOLA University

---

<sup>9</sup> [https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/general\\_writing/academic\\_writing/logic\\_in\\_argumentative\\_writing/fallacies.html](https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/general_writing/academic_writing/logic_in_argumentative_writing/fallacies.html)

<sup>10</sup> J.P. Moreland. "What are the Three Laws of Logic?" the anthology, *If God Made the Universe Who Made God?* (Holman, 2012), p. 20f.

<sup>11</sup> This is not to deny that ambiguities never occur. Yet these occurrences are rare and usually treatable. <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/ambiguous-genitalia/symptoms-causes/syc-20369273>