BRON: ANP

The Obfuscation of the Trans Movement

The trans movement operates in the dark as much as possible because it knows that its agenda cannot stand the light of day, writes Jan Kuitenbrouwer. He is surprised that there is no heated debate about the upcoming Transgender Act. "Which party has the courage to break through this conspiracy of silence?

Published on: 21/07 | 2021

Written by: Jan Kuitenbrouwer

It was to be expected that, after my column last week, I would become the target of the kind of hate speech I described in that piece. Actually, it was not that bad. Of course, there were accusations of "transphobia", of inciting the suicide of young people with gender doubts, who you are not allowed to question critically because otherwise, they would become suicidal. (A claim that is based on a study that, according to reviewers, has little basis in fact).

That a transman is a man and a transwoman is a woman, full stop, is by now a foregone conclusion for a surprising number of people. An elementary biological fact has somehow been declared invalid, and apparently sensible people who can explain to you in great detail at another time that crop circles are the work of man, the earth is round and children do not grow on trees, have made room in their brains for this new superstition.

According to reports, at present only the SGP and Forum for Democracy oppose revising the Transgender Act in the Lower House, all other parties seem to have been "converted". If this remains the case, in the Netherlands it will not be long before you

can decide for yourself which gender you want to be. If a man registers as a woman, it will become punishable to deny him access to a women's prison, a women's sauna, a women's sports club or "Blijf Van Mijn Huis" (woman's refuge). Children can change gender without seeing a doctor or getting therapy, whether they are truly "trans" or not.

> **Estimates of how many people consider themselves transgender vary but even the broadest surveys rarely exceed 1 per cent, with various governments counting around half a per cent.**

Estimates of how many people consider themselves transgender vary, but even the broadest counts rarely exceed 1%, with various governments calculating around half a per cent. How is it possible that such a small minority is able to push through a change in the law that poses serious problems for considerably larger minorities and that is based on an idea - biological sex is outdated - that nine out of ten Dutch people consider insane?

How is it that sceptics and opponents of this change in the law are hardly heard? That there is hardly any discussion about it at all, let alone the heated discussion we know from other medical-ethical issues, such as abortion, euthanasia, end of life, etc? Why is it so deafeningly quiet?

This is the question Joanna Williams tries to answer in *The Corrosive Impact Of Transgender Ideology*, an investigation into the origins of the transgender boom. It is fascinating reading, a meticulous unravelling of how the trans movement worked for twenty years on a campaign with the final goal that is now in sight, also in the Netherlands: gender self-ID.

From a designation for a small group of individuals who are unhappy with their birth gender, "transgender" changed into the ideology of transgenderism, which states that gender is purely a spiritual matter, separate from biology and anatomy. The male-female division is arbitrary and repressive, and the "transgender" breaks through that division by choosing for him/herself what he/she wants to be. A trans person is not a quasi-man or -woman -- as was once thought -- because biology no longer matters. Most of these ideological transgenders are men who call themselves "women", but often do not make a real transition. They used to be called transvestites, but they pretend to be women; the new ideological transwoman thinks he is a she. "A trans woman is a woman" is the mantra. Anyone who questions this is "transphobic". Transphobia' is now a form of prohibited discrimination and is enforced as such by many governments. (English women who posted the dictionary definition of "woman" on Twitter received a house call from the police. Expressing trans-scepticism is also enough to get thrown off Facebook). Addressing a man who

has decided he is a woman as a man ("misgendering") is "an act of violence". Discussion and criticism are equated with "denying someone's right to exist". Criticism of this new transgenderism is framed as "hatred" of all transgender people, including the real ones, those who suffer from gender dysphoria, a deep and abiding dissatisfaction with the body into which they were born. The strange thing is that many real trans men and women also oppose cheap, fashionable transgenderism, because it trivialises their struggle and their pain.

Transgenderism is vintage identity politics, which tolerates no dialogue, no discussion and no debate. Whereby the demands of a "marginalised group" must by definition be met, because contradicting them only harms that group more. It is amazing how easily people go along with this anti-democratic ideology, or at least conform to it.

> **This is vintage identity politics, which tolerates no dialogue, no discussion and no debate, and where the demands of a "marginalised group" must, by definition, be met because contradicting them only harms that group more.**

One of the reasons the media neglect this subject is that trans activists refuse to enter into debate with trans critics. A news medium only has to allow a critic to speak to immediately be accused of "transphobia" and a call to cancel follows. Many news media would rather not take that risk, so the subject is dropped.

And what is the upshot? That is exactly the intention! It is a conscious strategy by the trans movement to avoid press attention for gender self-ID, Williams describes. The trans lobby should get as little publicity as possible, because if the general public gets wind of what self-ID implies, it will provoke resistance. In a report on trans rights, law firm Dentons advises the trans movement to "*avoid excessive press coverage. Many believe that public campaigns are actually a hindrance, as a large part of the general public is not well informed about trans issues, and therefore misunderstandings may arise.*"

Replace "not well informed" with "sceptical" and "misunderstandings" with "resistance" and the advice is clear: don't draw fire, fly under the radar. In Norway and Ireland, this strategy has already been successfully applied, writes the report. In the Netherlands, too, by now, judging by the media silence. So far, so good.

The trans movement operates in the shadows as much as possible because it knows that its agenda cannot stand the light of day. They lobby decision-makers outside of the public eye, who swallow their objections for fear of damaging their image and hope that things will remain quiet until the die is cast. And, if their malpractice comes to light, they can point the finger at each other.

Which party has the courage to break through this conspiracy of silence?