



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on May 24, 2021

Conservatives Who Call Caitlyn Jenner “She” Participate in a Lie

“The worst form of impoliteness is insincerity in discourse.” It’s unknown if writer Gabe Kaminsky would agree with this line, which I coined many years ago, but a piece he recently penned at the Federalist certainly reflects its spirit.

Titled “Conservatives Who Call Caitlyn Jenner ‘She’ Forfeit the Truth,” the article’s subhead [states](#), “If you know a man is a man and a woman is a woman, then referring to Jenner in the feminine sense violates your moral compass and prescription to the truth.”



Selwyn Duke

Jenner, of course, is the famed ex-Olympian whose given name is “Bruce” and who now claims to be a woman. A longtime Republican, he’s also now running for the California governorship, which has made conservatives even more sympathetic to his cause (even if a big part of it isn’t, ostensibly, theirs).

Yet while Jenner’s political views deserve a fair hearing, says Kaminsky, what we shouldn’t be hearing are conservatives describing him with feminine pronouns. Echoing ex-“transsexual” Alan Finch’s [statement](#) that you “fundamentally can’t change sex.... Transsexualism was invented by psychiatrists,” Kaminsky writes that Jenner is “still a man regardless of any attempts to look or act like a female. It is not imprudent to adhere to science in describing his sex. It is the moral thing to do.”

He continues:

Some on the political right, particularly those who are more fond of fusionism or libertarianism, are quick to pump the brakes on using a biological pronoun. *It is rude to the person and it is important to be friendly*, the person will often plead. *If they wish to be called by a false pronoun, I will honor that request. It’s a free country!* One conservative I spoke with said using inaccurate pronouns for transgender identifying people is being “respectful” and “every single conservative” ought to do so.

Of course, if ours is a “free country” (and not only is that now debatable, but it’s a loose term), then these conservatives should defend people’s right to use biologically relevant pronouns and, in fairness, they perhaps would. Regardless, their claims “could not be further from the truth,” Kaminsky avers.

“In actuality, it is disrespectful to both you and the transgender person to use the anti-science pronoun,” he explains. “It demeans your knowledge of reality and perpetuates lies harmful to you and the transgender person, as well as to the rest of society.”

Yes, except that this is almost an understatement. The side that defines the vocabulary of a debate wins the debate, warned the book *The Tyranny of Words* decades ago. Consequently, it’s almost a waste of time opposing the MUSS (Made-up Sexual Status or “transgender”) agenda — or *any* movement — if



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on May 24, 2021

you're going to embrace its terminology. Why, we may as well think that a French group vying for cultural primacy with a German group in a given area could win its culture war despite agreeing to speak and write in German. It's not happening.

I warned of this, and mentioned the "transgender" movement by name, as far back as 2004 in ["Speaking out of the left sides of our mouths: How the language engineers reshape civilization by reshaping the language."](#) Since then, nothing has changed — except that conservatives have found even more leftist terms to embrace.

Of course, it's tempting to go along to get along. But this notion that we should call people whatever they wish is silly — and few actually believe it.

I've met a couple of Roberts who wouldn't tolerate being called anything but "Robert" ("Bob" was out), and though I considered it a hang-up, I complied. There's no moral imperative there contradicting their desires. But what if someone insists you call him "God"? Would you comply? Would you expect a Muslim to address you as "Allah"? The point is that we all draw lines.

Oh, as with Kaminsky, I've no desire to gratuitously offend the world's Jenners. In fact, a quick story: 20 to 25 years ago, I happened to run into "Renee Richards" at a local golf driving range. Young people wouldn't recognize that name, but he was a professional tennis player who was sort of the Jenner of the late '70s. Having undergone the mutilation euphemistically known as "sex change" in 1975, at age 40, he later played the women's tennis circuit and received great press.

Anyway, having been a tennis pro myself, I recognized Richards and struck up a conversation. Lasting only seven or eight minutes, it was confined to small talk. But he seemed like a very nice person, and I've only the warmest feelings toward him.

Yet regardless of his feelings, I'd never address him as anything but "him."

For facts trump feelings, and emotion doesn't justify error. Using a MUSS individual's desired (and incorrect) pronouns tacitly rubber stamps the claim that the person really has become the opposite sex. It's another way of stating, "You know, your agenda really is correct; it's just not yet fashionable in conservative circles to explicitly say so."

It's also a bit like insisting that you oppose a group's racist agenda, but then nonetheless following its lead in describing a member of the racial group it targets for dehumanization as "it" (yes, I've seen this done). Would your claims of opposition ring true?

Returning to Kaminsky, he, most ironically, also inadvertently aids the MUSS agenda by using its terminology. That is, he writes that "Jenner was born a biological male." Question: Can you be born a non-biological male? Are there artificial males running around?

Calling someone a "biological male" makes as much sense as speaking of a canine dog, feline cat, bovine cow, mechanical machine, or biological human. "Male" is by definition a *biological designation*. Thus is "biological male" not only a redundancy, but one implying that the sexual devolutionaries are correct in claiming that a man can, via mere identification, alter his "male" status.

The bottom line is that we must not only speak Truth, but use terms reflecting it. And as Kaminsky reminds us (and his [piece](#) is worth reading in its entirety), "Since truth and goodness are intertwined, bowing to transgender ideology threatens both."

So California may be better off with Jenner as governor than Gavin Newsom (that's not a high bar), but there's an even larger issue. If his victory would mean another win for the MUSS agenda, the Golden



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on May 24, 2021

State's gain would be everyone's loss.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.