

Memorandum

Date: July 21, 2022

To: Allies in opposing legal sex change

From: Twiss Butler and Patrick Butler

Subject: 3rd Step – Expose what the trans idea promises and what it imposes on everybody

Why is legal sex change allowed? Our “First Step” memo credits its promoters’ choice of ambiguous words. Our “Second Step” memo describes successes in establishing legal sex change. This memo defines *trans* in light of its promise and legal requirements.

Our definition of *trans* stems from observations by Helen Joyce in a recent video interview. She describes what the trans promise means to teenage girls.

They’re discovering who they are at 14, 15 at the same time as they're being made to feel massively uncomfortable about it. And the idea that's presented to them the one fix for everything is you might be trans.... you know it's very hard to cure ... eating disorders or something. You know that there's a great difficulty in front of you and a lot of sadness, but this is being presented as a one-size-fits-all solution for absolutely everything. [Joyce, 2022]

“Absolutely everything” may seem hyperbolic if applied just to girls. But to both sexes at all ages, trans promoters’ offer a “one-size-fits-all solution” for a wide variety of individual problems. This may be especially so in the realms of sexuality, sex roles, and sex stereotypes, but identifying as the opposite sex also promises to solve problems in many other situations such as being in trouble with the law or as an opportunity to gain status and recognition.

True believers in the promise of a trans fix, such as children, can be permanently injured. They, along with their families, are victims of the trans promise. Some adults, however, who adopt opposite-sex identities, do this for opportunistic and even anti-social reasons. However, it is the promoters of trans for financial, professional, erotic, and social gains who must be held responsible for harms sustained by believers in the trans promise and for the collateral damage to those forced to give lip service in support of the trans idea.

Taking into consideration that a myriad of motives is involved, here is a long definition of the word trans:

Trans refers to an instrumental idea about compelling all society legally and socially to treat on demand persons who claim the right to identify as the opposite sex (or no sex at all), and thus the right to be treated by law and society exactly as though they were the opposite sex. By assigning the adjective trans to this “right to a legal sex change,” we can denominate all such demanders as “trans persons.” From dysphoric children to adult men trapped in a fetish or the “wrong” prison, every trans person is led to expect that compelling society to acquiesce to this idea of an invented but uncontestable right to an opposite sex identity which all society is legally compelled to validate will somehow improve their lives. [This memo]

This long definition is consistent with the short one Helen Joyce gives at the beginning of her 2021 book *Trans*.

This is a book about an idea, one that seems simple but has far-reaching consequences. The idea is that people should count as men or women according to how they feel and what they declare, instead of their biology... [A]nd it is the identity, not the body, that should determine how everyone else sees and treats them. [Joyce 2021.]

With these two definitions of what the trans idea promises and requires, the debate can focus on two questions:

- first, can law empowering individuals to identify legally as the opposite sex really be the simple solution to their complex social and psychological problems?
- and second, is the public willing to do what proponents say is essential to making the trans solution work, namely relinquishing sex-based legal arrangements while also accepting without complaint a universal compulsion to treat everyone who identifies as the opposite sex exactly as though there were the opposite sex?

Given these and other clear statements of what is at stake, in response to the first question the public would overwhelmingly reject the reckless promise of the trans panacea and, as described in the second question, would certainly not accept the unbounded draconian regulations on everybody—especially of their speech—that promoters say are essential to the success of the trans panacea. Thus, to succeed in opposing legal sex change law, it will be necessary to expose the simple promise of the trans idea and what the idea requires of everybody.
