



Trans(con)fusion: When Men Claim They're Women, They Can't be Rapists

Last year, Loudoun County, Virginia, authorities were accused of covering up the school-restroom rape of a 14-year-old girl by a “trans” boy in a skirt. But hospital officials in Britain have gone this one better (read: worse):

They “told the police that a patient could not have been raped because her alleged attacker was trans,” [reported](#) *The Telegraph*.

The kicker: The sexual assault was captured on a hospital security camera.

“The attack took place a year ago and the woman reported it but when officers contacted the hospital, which has not been named, they were told ‘that there was no male in the hospital, therefore the rape could not have happened,’” the paper continued.

This is just as how, according to the sexual devolutionaries, no women were beaten by a man in the “Lia” Thomas (the U. of Pennsylvania swimmer) [affair](#) because there was no “male” in the pool.

American Thinker [adds](#):

It turns out that the hospital subscribes to the now antediluvian concept of single-sex wards. However, it is also controlled by a National Health Service rule — Annex B — mandating the postmodern deconstructionist idea that people can simply declare their “sex” (“I am woman; hear me roar”). Having done so, they will be placed in the ward consistent with that identity rather than with their biological sex (and, clearly, their biological sexual urges).

Unfortunately for the hospital, which is trying to navigate between intelligent traditionalism and actual biology, on the one hand, and the NHS’s Marxist madness, on the other hand, CCTV, nurses, and other observers actually saw the fake woman commit the rape.

The matter was also raised in the British Parliament’s House of Lords, with Baroness Emma Nicholson of Winterbourne taking the hospital to task. Despite the witnesses and video evidence, she said, “it has taken nearly a year for the hospital to agree that there was a male on the ward and, yes, this rape happened,” *The Telegraph* relates.

“During that year she has almost come to the edge of a nervous breakdown, because being disbelieved about being raped in hospital has been such an appalling shock,” the Baroness continued. “The hospital, with all its CCTV, has had to admit that the rape happened and that it was committed by a man.”



Teraphim/iStock/Getty Images Plus



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on March 20, 2022

(Hat tip for *Telegraph* material, which is behind a paywall: [Powerline's John Hinderaker](#).)

Aside from the obvious, there's much to be noted here. First and foremost, this is another example of how "leftists" don't have principles, only provisional preferences.

First, as during the Brett Kavanaugh hearings in 2018, there was a time when we heard the #MeToo line that even just the *allegation* of rape was serious enough to warrant consequences for the accused; there was at least an implication that it was okay to treat an accused man as guilty until proven innocent, with the burden of proof almost insurmountable. But that's so last Thursday.

So is something else. Accepting for argument's sake that a MUSS (Made-up Sexual Status, a.k.a. "transgender") man is in fact female because he identifies as such, what is this business about the impossibility of rape occurring because no male is present?

It's reminiscent of how in the 1984 film *A Soldier's Story* a somewhat naive white officer [claims](#) that a black serviceman couldn't have committed a certain transgression because, as he puts it, "colored people aren't that devious." This was Hollywood making fun of the prejudiced, paternalistic attitudes it believes prevailed in bygone days. Likewise, however, it wasn't too long ago that leftists would've condemned anyone who claimed a woman couldn't commit rape as chauvinistic (and they would now also do so if convenience pushed their emotions in that direction). In fact, Hollywood still often portrays master-criminal female characters who are just as tough as men.

So what gives with the hospital? Is this situational weaker-sex-ness?

But even if Equality™ is so Thursday before last, the hospital isn't even up on the latest cultural fads. Oh, it's true that, according to [this source](#), only a man can commit "rape" under British law, and this may explain the hospital's no-rape-claim rationale. But not so fast.

The U.K. law in question (unless there has been an update I'm unaware of) [states](#) that a "person" — not a "man" — has committed rape if he uses his phallus to commit certain non-consensual acts. Note, however, the sexual devolutionaries [claim](#) that the beings some of us still anachronistically call "men" can have periods (and not just when using punctuation). In this vein, they also insist that there aren't actually "women" and "men," but "[people who menstruate](#)" and "[people with penises](#)." So, *voilà!*

In the hospital ward was a sentient biped with, uh, that particular human organ.

In reality, this sexual devolutionary failure to keep the story straight is not surprising. First, many of those participating in this lie are not devoted to it, but merely fear cancel culture. Second, however, there's a reason why it's said that one way to expose a liar is to ask him the same question at different times and see if his answers change:

When adhering to Objective Reality, your answers won't change because you formulate them with reference to the unchanging — Truth. But a person detached from this has no unchanging moral guide and thus can only be rooted to the transitory, things such as fads and his own feelings. And then contradiction and fiction, lunacy and libertinism will be his lot.



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.



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.

Subscribe