

There are only two genders



Phos Halas (PRO)

Greetings, welcome to another e-debate. Today's topic I believe is fairly simple. There are two genders. Male and female.

Those two genders are not societal constructs, because they are rooted in physical and genetic realities that are not subject to change.

The topic of this debate will be to address the transgender movement and it's supporters who claim the following:

There are a multitude of genders.

Gender can be changed by 'self identification' or by surgery or hormones.

Gender is a societal construct.

These claims are self evidentially false.

1. Gender is determined by chromosome patterns, not by your feelings.

A male gender is determined by the presence of a y chromosome. A female gender is determined by the presence of two x chromosomes. This is basic biology. Since there are only two genetic expressions (xx, xy) there are only two genders. (Yes, I am aware of rare genetic anomalies that may classify a person as intersex, however these are genetic mistakes regarding already existing sexual organs that belong to only two genders.

Again, since we have two genetic expressions, we have two genders.

Society cannot change this. Feelings cannot change this. Surgery cannot change this. Name changed cannot change this. Hormones cannot change this. Hair cuts cannot change this.

Pronouns cannot change this. Bathrooms cannot change this. Words cannot change this.

Thank you



tombos21@gmail.com (CON)

Greetings! This is my first debate here, so please let me know if I'm violating any debate etiquette, I'm still learning. :)

Now, I've started this debate in a tough position. My opponent has put the burden of proof on me this argument so it is up to me to prove my points.

Gender is a societal construct.

Well of course it is. Gender is defined as whatever society defines it to be. As our understanding of human culture and sexuality evolves, so must our language. Most dictionaries define gender as male, female, or "a term is also used more broadly to denote a range of identities that do not correspond to established ideas of male and female". The American Psychological Association defines gender as: "The attitudes, feelings, and behaviors that a given culture associates with a person's biological sex. Behavior that is compatible with cultural expectations referred to as gender-normative; behaviors that are viewed as incompatible with these expectations constitute gender non-conformity".[1]

Like it or not, the definition, and the very concept of "Gender" has evolved.

My opponent's argument rests on the fact that gender is tied to biological sex. This was true ten years ago, but these primitive concepts have changed. For clarity, let's use the term **biological sex** to mean "Only male or female". And we will use the phrase **gender identity** to describe "A person's inherent sense of being a man, woman, or alternative gender [1].

I argue that the idea that one's gender identity should not be tied to their biological sex, its a primitive notion. These are two separate concepts, and they deserve separate identifiers.

Before we go any further, we must reach a common ground. Do you accept the idea that people can feel incongruency between their biological sex and gender identity?

[1] chrome-

extension://oemmndcbldboiebfnladdacbfdmadadm/https://www.apa.org/pi/lgbt/resources/definitions.pdf



Phos Halas (PRO)

A thank you to my opponent for the well thought out response. I would like to make known that I am posting from a phone because I do not have computer access, so I will ask the judges to please excuse my brevity.

My opponent has taken the pretty standard route these days and that is to make gender a separate word from sex. Although my opponent seems to have admitted the two were synonymous at one point, my opponent now thinks that we should expand our definition to **exclude biological reality.**

If you don't mind tombo, I am going to work backwards a bit and unpack what you have stated.

My opponent asks:

***"Before we go any further, we must reach a common ground. Do you accept the idea that people can feel incongruency between their biological sex and gender identity? ***"

Absolutely, it's a disorder that used to be known as Gender Identity Disorder. Now it is simply referred to as dysphoria.

My opponent states:

" I argue that the idea that one's gender identity should not be tied to their biological sex, its a primitive notion. These are two separate concepts, and they deserve separate identifiers."

And herein lies the madness of the transgender movement. They have taken the definition of a word, and redefined to the point of delusion

Imagine the absolute absurdity if we tried this with anything other than gender.

My "OLDNESS" is 16 years, but my "AGE" I express as 21, where's my

beer?

Reality doesn't work that way. Your AGE is inextricably tied to how OLD you are. The two cannot be expressed differently.

My species is human, but my taxonomy is that of an orangutan.

Again, no. Your species is a biological reality. **Hijacking a word and giving it a subjective meaning does not change the fact that you are a human not an orangutan.**

I am genetically Chinese, but my ethnic expression is Scandinavian.

These types of things are obviously absurd. Yet when we put the word "gender" and sex in there, we must act as though they are not?

My opponent states:

*** "For clarity, let's use the term biological sex to mean "Only male or female". And we will use the phrase gender identity to describe "A person's inherent sense of being a man, woman, or alternative gender."***

If only my opponent could settle the debate that easily. The entire point of my original argument was that the gender is tied to a genetic reality. My opponent would like to state that SEX is tied to genes, but gender is not.

My opponent does not seem aware that the word gender comes from the Latin genus which is a biological classification.

(<https://www.etymonline.com/word/gender>)

Simply stating that the definition of a word is outdated and needs to be changed is not going to

Simply stating that the definition of a word is outdated and needs to be changed is not going to suffice. Furthermore, we need to be exceeding cautious when the definition we are proposing has no ground in reality.

In summary, my opponent did NOT address my first argument that gender is tied to biology. My opponent simply is asking that we update the meaning of the word to exclude biology.

The transgender movement has waged war on the English language creating new words like "zir" and "herstory", they have sought to redefine words and their meaning.

This is not acceptable. I ask that my audience consider biological reality and linguistic meaning to be OF VALUE, if we are going to survive as a civilization. Thank you all



tombos21@gmail.com (CON)

My position: *** I argue that the idea that one's gender identity should not be tied to their biological sex. These have become separate words with separate meanings.

Opponent: *"And herein lies the madness of the transgender movement. They have taken the definition of a word, and redefined to the point of delusion. Imagine the absolute absurdity if we tried this with anything other than gender."*

Here are some other words that got redefined over time: [2]

- "Girl" once meant a young child of either sex.
- "Naughty" used to mean poor people. Because they 'Had Naught'
- "Egregious" used to mean something outrageously good - it now means the opposite.

"The transgender movement has waged war on the English language creating new words like "zir" and "herstory", they have sought to redefine words and their meaning. This is not acceptable. I ask that my audience consider biological reality and linguistic meaning to be OF

VALUE, if we are going to survive as a civilization. I thank you all"

Legally I could change my name to zzzxxxxyyy. Is this also an affront on language? I'm within my legal rights to do so am I not?

Words change all the time. Definitions change all the time. The Oxford dictionary added 1100 new words last year alone[3]. The notion that adding a few extra words to the English language will somehow plunge us into madness is just silly.

You have agreed that Gender Dysphoria is a thing - (A condition where one's biological sex and gender identity are incongruent - causing distress). However, you seem unwilling to make room in your vocabulary to ease their suffering. **If name-changes and reclassifications don't sit well with you, what would you suggest instead? How can we, as a society, ease the pain of these disparaged individuals** without infringing on your personal beliefs?

Let's switch to something less divisive for a moment.

Did you know that you can get laser eye surgery to change your eye color from brown to blue? Eye color is a "vital statistic" - you need all new photo ID afterward. **So let me ask you, if I changed my eye color to blue, would you insist on calling my eyes brown? After all, that's the color biology intended right?**

-

[2]<http://mentalfloss.com/article/61876/11-words-meanings-have-changed-drastically-over-time>

[3]<https://public.oed.com/updates/>



Phos Halas (PRO)

Thank you again to my opponent for his response. Let's get to it:

My opponent asks

***""So let me ask you, if I changed my eye color to blue, would you insist on calling my eyes brown? After all, that's the color biology intended right? ***""

If your eye color literally changed to blue, I would have no problem calling your eyes blue. If your eyes were brown however, I am not going to go around and call them blue. Same thing with gender. I am not going to call a man a woman. That's falsehood

***"". However, you seem unwilling to make room in your vocabulary to ease their suffering.
*** "

That's not the way to treat those who are suffering from this disorder. We don't pretend biology doesn't exist to appease those who are suffering, who are a very small percent of the human population. **I will call an individual by their chosen name, regardless of gender. However I will not pretend that a man who identifies as a woman does not have every cell in his body coded with male genes.**

My opponent states;

".Legally I could change my name to zzzxxyyy. Is this also an affront on language? I'm within my legal rights to do so am I not?

No that's not an affront on anything. Your name is not rooted in a physical reality like gender is.

***Here are some other words that got redefined over time: [2]

"Girl" once meant a young child of either sex.

"Naughty" used to mean poor people. Because they 'Had Naught'

"Egregious" used to mean something outrageously good - it now means the opposite."

My issue is not with the fact that words can change meaning. My issue is when people create non existing categories for words that already have set meanings. If I broadened the definition of the word cat to include human beings, that's false because cats are cats and human are humans. Likewise, if we create new categories like pangender or gender fluid, we create things that aren't real. There's not a biological correspondent for these categories.



tombos21@gmail.com (CON)

Well first off, credit to my opponent. This guy is obviously well practiced.

I asked my opponent: "if I changed my eye color to blue, would you insist on calling my eyes brown? After all, that's the color biology intended right?"

They stated:

1. *"If your eye color literally changed to blue, I would have no problem calling your eyes blue. If your eyes were brown however, I am not going to go around and call them blue. Same thing with gender. I am not going to call a man a woman. That's falsehood"*

2. *"I will not pretend that a man who identifies as a woman does not have every cell in his body coded with male genes."*

So my opponent believes that I can go get surgery to change my eye color. He said he

will accept the new eye color despite the fact that every cell in my body is coded with brown-eyed genes. I put it to the judges if we changed "Eye surgery" to "Gender reassignment surgery", shouldn't the logic be the same?

- In both cases, you're getting surgery to change our bodies
- In both cases, you need all new photo ID
- In both cases, you are renaming parts of our body despite the fact that genes still encode for a brown-eyed male.

Why is my opponent okay with one but not the other?

My opponent also implied that they don't think surgery can change gender (page 1), so there is literally nothing a trans person could do to appease him.

My opponent freely admits that trans people are suffering, and he believes in Gender Dysphoria, however, he is unwilling to make room in his vocabulary because:

"That's not the way to treat those who are suffering from this disorder. We don't pretend biology doesn't exist to appease those who are suffering, who are a very small percent of the human population."

First point - This is exactly how modern psychiatrists treat this disorder. According to the APA: "Treatment options for gender dysphoria include counseling, cross-sex hormones, puberty suppression, and gender reassignment surgery." [4] It even includes a helpful table so that friends and family can learn all the gender/queer terms.

Secondly - Letting small minority groups suffer, just because they are a small minority group - is generally frowned upon. Some people might mistake it for prejudice.

I asked my opponent what we can do to help these people, without infringing on his

personal liberties (changing the definition of words), however, he didn't have any suggestions.

Lastly, my opponent clarified their position on vocabulary:

"My issue is not with the fact that words can change meaning. My issue is when people create non existing categories for words that already have set meanings. If I broadened the definition of the word cat to include human beings, that's false because cats are cats and human are humans."

I've already demonstrated that words get changed and their definitions get hijacked all the time. Language is constantly evolving. Between that and the 1100 new words getting added each year, I don't think this is a real issue.

"Likewise, if we create new categories like pangender or gender fluid, we create things that aren't real. There's not a biological correspondent for these categories."

Humans have words for abstract concepts that are not rooted directly with physical reality. Here are 6 abstract concepts off the top of my head that do not have physical representations in reality:

- Idea
- The complex number i
- Wanderlust
- Time
- Imagination
- God

Should we scrap those words too or just the ones you don't like?

Look man, I get it. These ideas challenge long-held social and religious beliefs, and from the

looks of your profile, I'm guessing those beliefs run deep. But those beliefs do not give you the right to disparage minority groups.

I urge you, Phos Halas, to stop hiding your inner bias behind thin veils like vocabulary arguments. Confront your prejudice head-on. Ask yourself if these feelings are coming from a place of hatred or from a place of logic.

Thank you, Phos Halas, for this intellectually challenging debate.

p.s. I'm a straight white guy - so... no real horse in this race. It was fun though :)

[4]<https://www.psychiatry.org/patients-families/gender-dysphoria/what-is-gender-dysphoria>

