



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

## Americans Waking Up to the Reality of Sex, but Not to the Reality of “Tolerance”

If recently released polling data are any indication, there certainly is one issue on which Americans have moved “right” in recent years: the spread of MUSS (Made-up Sexual Status, aka “transgender”) ideology into schools and the wider society. In fact, more people oppose this agenda now than did five years ago.

At the same time, most Americans also oppose “discrimination” against MUSS individuals. But does this “tolerance” ultimately guarantee the spread of what they find intolerable?



AlxeyPnferov/iStock/Getty Images Plus

The aforementioned data was provided by Pew Research Center, which [tells us](#):

Roughly eight-in-ten U.S. adults say there is at least some discrimination against transgender people in our society, and a majority favor laws that would protect transgender individuals from discrimination in jobs, housing and public spaces. At the same time, 60% say a person’s gender is determined by their sex assigned at birth, up from 56% in 2021 and 54% in 2017.

The public is divided over the extent to which our society has accepted people who are transgender: 38% say society has gone too far in accepting them, while a roughly equal share (36%) say society hasn’t gone far enough. About one-in-four say things have been about right. Underscoring the public’s ambivalence around these issues, even among those who see at least some discrimination against trans people, a majority (54%) say society has either gone too far or been about right in terms of acceptance.

A critic may note here that Pew’s question phraseology itself reflects confusion. First, sex isn’t “assigned” at birth, but observed. Second, saying “a person’s gender is determined by their sex,” assigned or observed at birth, makes little sense. If you believe, as many laymen do, that “gender” is synonymous with “sex,” then the statement equates to making the gratuitous assertion that “sex is determined by sex.”

If you accept what psychologists aver, that “gender” is one’s *perception* of his sexual status, then, of course, a person’s gender *should* be determined by his sex. Yet it may actually be determined by psychological phenomena having little or nothing to do with it. The real answer?

People *don’t legitimately have gender* — only “sex.”

The term “gender” was some decades ago used almost exclusively in reference to words. It was then co-opted by sexual devolutionaries and applied to people to promote an agenda. Yet if you believe it’s synonymous with “sex,” why use it, a longer term that could possibly sow confusion?



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

---

If, however, you believe “gender” should describe your perception of sexual status, which can depart from reality, why use it and thus normalize delusion by assigning it a different label and lumping it in with normalcy (the correct perception of one’s sex)? Remember, words matter — they shape thinking.

As for Americans’ MUSS-belief evolution, the *Washington Examiner* [points out](#) that conservatives are “enjoying success in the battle of public opinion” because biology is “on their side.” A man is a man, no matter how he alters the externals. Yet will conservatives win the long-term battle? Their application of “tolerance” calls this into question.

Just consider the wide belief that MUSS individuals should be protected from “discrimination.” First, this term merely means choosing one or some from between/among two or more. We engage in it continually, too. Not only do we discriminate between the qualified and not so (and occasionally today even still favor the former), but leftists discriminate against Christians, conservatives, and whites, to provide a short list. And most people would be disinclined to hire a Nazi sporting a Swastika or someone openly embracing bestiality.

As for not discriminating against MUSS individuals, taking this literally has serious implications. Hiring such people to sometimes be schoolteachers and nursery school workers means that some children will be under the care of men in dresses (see video below). Even if you believe such people’s influence could somehow not be colored by their psychological issues, note that “values” are caught more than they’re taught; it’s what’s assumed that is learned best.

Do you want to have to explain to young children why their male teacher is wearing a dress? Should this behavior be normalized via modeling?

Moreover, if you’re a businessman, should you be forced to hire a MUSS individual? Not only might his presence alienate customers, but you may morally oppose having to be party to such behavior’s normalization (in particular, with regard to the children entering your establishment).

Additionally, the Pew research indicates that most Americans apparently believe a MUSS results from a psychological problem. If so, why encourage public manifestations of it?

Years ago, there certainly were men who liked dressing as women, but they kept it behind closed doors and assumed a normal public face. Enter “tolerance.”

Widely misunderstood, tolerance always implies the abiding of a perceived negative; this is why we wouldn’t tolerate a delectable meal, but relish it, yet would have to tolerate a stubborn cold. The lesson here is that if a *perceived* negative is an *actual* one, you don’t tolerate it unless absolutely necessary.

Tolerance is apathy dressed up as virtue, confusion masquerading as comity. As I pointed out in “[The Acceptance Con](#),” tolerating something brings it out into the open; this can lead to the marketing of it, increased acceptance and, eventually, even preference for it. For stigmas are the corollaries of values. If we’re going to value normality, this means devaluing abnormality.

And insofar as we value abnormality, we’ll — well, look around you.



## 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.