



“Biological Male” Is a Leftist Propaganda Term; Let’s Not Use it

Calling someone a “biological male” makes as much sense as speaking of a canine dog, feline cat, bovine cow, mechanical machine, or biological human — and we shouldn’t use the redundant term. So says writer Florian Barbedienne, warning that it’s a “tautological” propaganda device designed to promote the Made-up Sexual Status (MUSS or “transgender”) agenda.



Barbedienne’s point is that language can influence thinking, and the side defining the vocabulary of a debate wins the debate. Yet when fighting cultural and political wars, conservatives consistently use the Lexicon of the Left, relinquishing half the battle (at least) before it has even begun.

It wasn’t that many years ago that “biological male” was unheard of, and this is for a simple reason. **“Male’ is a Solely Biological Term,”** [writes](#) Barbedienne, at *American Thinker*. “It is defined by various aspects of biology such as genetics, embryology, phenotypic morphology, and especially sexual anatomy and the structure and types of sex cells.”

Put simply, you wouldn’t go to a dog breeder, intending to breed Neapolitan mastiffs, and say, “Given me a biological male and a biological female.” You wouldn’t even think to talk that way. There’s no other type of male and female you could get. To quote Barbedienne, **“There is no Non-Biological Definition of Male or Female....** There never has been.”

You also wouldn’t indulge the delusion of sex as social construct and say to that breeder (again, with an eye toward canine procreation), “Give me any two pooches that look good; I’ll put ‘em together and see what happens!” He’d be sizing you up for a straitjacket.

So why do we indulge this fanciful thinking with one — and only one — species on this planet: humans? One difference is that man, being a rational being (and sometimes an irrational one), can have a conception of himself at odds with reality. He can have what MUSS activists call a “gender identity” contrary to his sex. This is better known as delusion, Barbedienne points out.

A “man may believe himself to be a woman. He may wish above anything else to become a woman,” he writes. “That would make him a delusional man who wants to be a woman.”

He may have his genitals “surgically removed, which would make him a castrated delusional man who wants to be a woman,” Barbedienne continues. “He may add, through surgery, breast implants — which would make him a very bizarre looking castrated delusional man who wants to be a woman. But nothing will ever make him a woman, or bring him any closer to being a woman, regardless of how extreme or tragic the act or desire.”



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 10, 2019

“Male and female are biological terms, and they signify biological realities,” he reiterates. “Full stop.” In fact and as [I’ve oft pointed out](#), there is *no legitimate scientific basis whatsoever for the MUSS agenda and claims*. I challenge any so-called “expert” to prove otherwise. “Transgender” is a *political designation*, not a scientific one.

As for language, why do even many conservatives use terms such as “biological male”? Barbedienne correctly states that many people are afraid of the scorn, ostracism, and even career destruction opposing the Lexicon of the Left can bring. Yet it’s also true that many conservatives are confused about these issues and, while generally opposed to the MUSS agenda, believe the “other side” must be “met halfway” — otherwise known as compromising your way to destruction.

Another issue is that many conservatives think this focus on language is much ado about nothing, the kind of hang-up characterizing leftists. This is a grave mistake.

Barbedienne insists that we shouldn’t cede “rhetorical ground,” which is an understatement. After all, “the power of language has long been recognized,” as I wrote in my 2017 essay [“Tongues Twisted Left: Manipulating Minds by Managing Words.”](#)

“Orwell wrote in his dystopian novel *1984* that the aim of ‘Newspeak’ (the prescribed language of the totalitarian government portrayed) was ‘to narrow the range of thought’ and render dissent ‘literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it,’” I continued. “The ancient Chinese sage Confucius, stressing the need for the ‘rectification of names,’ warned that failing to call things by their proper names would lead to social disorder because, through mislabeling, you’d make it impossible for people to clearly perceive reality. And the thesis of Stuart Chase’s 1959 book *The Tyranny of Words* is that the side that defines the vocabulary of a debate, wins the debate.”

“This last point is easy to understand,” I further explained. “Imagine a German culture and a French one vying for primacy in a certain geographical area. If the French could convince all the Germans to speak French, wouldn’t they already have won at least half the battle? Is it any different in our ‘culture wars’? Would traditionalists have any chance of victory if they reflexively adopted the Lexicon of the Left?”

Language is as significant as the battle of ideas itself, for language is how we relate ideas. Why, after all, do you think the Nazis, Marxists, our politically correct Thought Police, and evil movements in general seek to manipulate words? It’s because the social engineers (e.g., the Left) aim to create language that mirrors, and paves the way for, the faux reality they wish to impose.

As for specifics, using “biological male” abets the MUSS agenda because it implies that there can be some other kind of male — or that a male can actually “be a woman” if he thus identifies — which is *exactly what the sexual devolutionaries want you to believe*.

This is just as how the redundancy “traditional marriage” implies there is another legitimate kind. Or, imagine technology yields “androids” so lifelike that they’re indistinguishable from man. If we wanted to combat the life-devaluing notion that they were human, would it be wise to imply that this is precisely what they are by calling people “biological humans”?

(For more language-manipulation examples, read my [aforementioned essay](#).)

So don’t be a conedservative. It’s fruitless combating leftists’ obsession with controlling our lives if we let them control our tongues.

Image of Michelangelo’s “David”: Morrison1977/iStock/Getty Images Plus



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.