



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on April 1, 2022

Excluding Cyclist “Emily” Bridges and Splitting the “Transgender” Baby

Society is undergoing a “transgenderism” transition. Where not long ago authorities insisted that men claiming womanhood be allowed to use females’ locker rooms and compete in their sports, we’re now starting to see reversals. States such as Florida, Mississippi, and Tennessee have banned MUSS (Made-up Sexual Status, aka transgender) males from competing in women’s sports. It’s also increasingly common now to question MUSS men’s presence in them. Yet there’s still a tendency (including on conservatives’ part) to seek on this issue a middle ground that, somehow, will make everyone happy. But perhaps a question should be asked:



Selwyn Duke

Is this debate about MUSS men in women’s sports really, at bottom, about sports?

A good example of this split-the-MUSS-baby phenomenon is a recent article in the British publication the *i*. The piece covers how male MUSS cyclist “Emily” Bridges — who set a British national junior men’s record in 2018 — was set to compete in British National Omnium Championships *women’s* category this weekend. That is, until the cycling world’s governing body, the UCI (Union Cycliste Internationale), intervened and stated he was ineligible just days before the April 2 race.

No, the UCI hasn’t suddenly started taking all the testosterone Bridges is suppressing and manned up; rather, Bridges (shown below) was disqualified on the technicality that he’s still registered as a male cyclist.

The technicality was perhaps a good way to kick the can down the road (briefly) on Bridges’ participation, which had become a controversial issue because he was an elite male athlete. It’s much as with the case of Will (aka “Lia”) Thomas, the University of Pennsylvania swimmer (shown below) whose setting of “women’s” records here in the United States was for many an an object lesson in MUSS insanity.

Such a lesson’s fruits were perhaps evident in the piece at the *i*, which is significant because it’s not a conservative publication. [Writer Matt Butler](#) admits that Bridges “has a physical advantage over” women, that everyone “should have a right to compete on a level playing field,” and that “scientific evidence points to transgender athletes holding a significant advantage over biological females.”

(By the way, is there such a thing as a non-biological female? “Biological female” is a MUSS-agenda-enabling redundancy.)



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on April 1, 2022

Yet like so many others, Butler also attempted that baby split. For instance, he discusses three possible ways to address the issue of MUSS men in women's sports, all of which are predicated on the notion that a MUSS "identity" is a legitimate state of being. One suggestion is significant because it has long been promulgated by conservatives in article comments sections. To wit:

"Introduce a third category to compete," Butler writes, "separate from both men and women."

Butler notes that there aren't enough MUSS athletes to make such a category viable. Yet this and all the suggestions ignore a simple fact:

This isn't really about sports.

After all, rarely mentioned is that no one is stopping the world's Will Thomases and "Emily" Bridges from playing competitive sports: They can participate in the categories *designated for their actual sex*.

Yet this isn't good enough, apparently — and, no, it's not because their chances of victory would greatly diminish. Note here that Thomas has been [credibly accused](#) of throwing races to take heat off the MUSS movement. These people tend to be activists before athletes.

Rather, the real issue was touched on by "Schuyler" Bailar, a woman and an-ex college swimmer who claims to be a man. When asked, "Is there any middle ground in this debate?" Bailar replied, "I don't think that there is space to say, 'Yes, I affirm your identity, but I don't in sport,' [related](#) CBS News on Sunday. "You can't divide me in half and have my transness and my masculinity show up here, and not over here."

Bailar is right, too — there is no middle ground. Central to the MUSS agenda is the idea that if someone claims opposite-sex status, he is *actually* a member of that sex and *must be treated as such*. And to facilitate the MUSS movement in any way is to enable this claim because of how integral it is to its agenda. Thinking otherwise is a bit like supposing you could allow communism to take hold in your society, in tolerance's name, without enabling its redistributionist tenet. Certain things are inseparable — package deals.

So this is the issue with concessions such as "third" sporting categories and "gender-neutral" restrooms: They send the wrong message. Transmitted is not the reality that MUSS identification is a psychological problem, but that it's a legitimate state of being worthy of accommodation. Send this message long enough and strong enough, with children being the main indoctrination targets because they're impressionable, and this proposition can be accepted. There will then be a move away from our current, all-too-common and already destructive tolerance (correctly defined as "the abiding of a *negative*") for MUSS "identities" and toward the notion that they're not negative at all — otherwise known as acceptance. And acceptance of the MUSS agenda, in its *entirety*, can follow.

For conservatives to stop conserving leftists' mistakes, they must learn that they don't have to compromise on every insane social innovation coming down the pike, saying, in essence, "If you feel that strongly about it, we'll accept half your mental illness." Ever seeking a middle ground is a recipe for putting your civilization in the ground.



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.