



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on June 1, 2023

USA Today: Keeping Men Out of Women's Sports Is a Bigoted "Sham"

USA Today, some may say, is so yesterday. This may be especially true now that the paper has published an op-ed in which it states that opposition to having men in women's sports is a sham driven by "bigotry ... hate, fear and ignorance" — and that we should focus on yesterday's feminists' agenda.

"Don't be fooled by the people who screech about 'fairness,'" screeches *USA Today* writer Nancy Armour, who donned her literary armour (a nod to British spelling) and unsheathed her not-quite-mightier-than-the-sword pen after ESPN's Samantha Ponder gave her something to ponder and piqued her puerile passions. (Eat your heart out, [Peter Piper](#).)



SolStock/iStock/Getty Images Plus

At issue is a tweet (below) in which Ponder mentioned her recently expressed opposition to having MUSS (Made-up Sexual Status, aka "transgender") males compete in females' sports.

In response, Armour claimed that Ponder's fairness crusade is a "sham." She [explained](#) her reasoning:

There has been no shortage of stories in the last year about the actual ways in which women athletes are being treated unfairly and robbed of opportunities to participate. USA TODAY Sports, for one, did an entire series on the subject, detailing how most schools aren't providing equitable funding for their men's and women's programs, are short-changing women athletes on scholarship money and are manipulating numbers to make it look as if they're complying with Title IX, and how the federal government is doing little to stop it.

Did Ponder use her platform to express outrage at any of this? Urge her nearly half-million followers on Twitter to write or call their representatives and ask that women be given the funding and opportunities they rightfully deserve? Did she publicly participate in any of the many excellent documentaries, videos and commentary ESPN did to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Title IX last year? Or even Tweet about them?

What's reflected here is a fight between two branches of feminism (even though, yes, MUSS-agenda opposition transcends feminism). Armour's armour, however, is thin and her sword quite dull.

A critic could first note that when someone cries "Bigotry!" and "Hate!" it usually means he's out of arguments. Armour does have an argument, though; the problem is that she has no perspective. In reality, women's sports are precluded from top funding for the same reason they're protected from top



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on June 1, 2023

competition.

Consider: “Negro League” baseball was ultimately eliminated because there was no just reason — no *sufficiently* compelling biological basis — for prohibiting interracial sporting competition. So blacks compete with whites, Asians with blacks, etc. If the sexual biological reality mirrored the racial one, then, likewise, women would compete with men and thus enjoy the same funding. But they can’t and don’t and, in part, the funding differences correspond to the physical differences.

In other words, here’s what was said, translated, as modernity progressed: Civilization has grown more prosperous, people have far greater leisure time, and sport has become a common activity and big business. Women want to partake, too, but can’t compete with men — so we’ll give them a separate arena in which to play. This means two things, the first reflexively and explicitly understood, the second implied:

1. Women will be *protected* from the best competition (men), so they’ll have opportunities.
2. Since it is an arena that excludes the best competition, it is *secondary*, and thus it follows that its funding and other benefits may not be the same.

This is congruence, and those who’d dispute it should consider an analogy:

Imagine lightweight boxers complained that — since they’re in the same game and train just as hard — they should receive the same purses the heavyweights do. The logical response would be, “If you want the heavyweights’ money, fight (and succeed) in their division. If you can’t do that, then stay in your lane.”

Likewise, any female athlete demanding the men’s money or funding should try to get it the way the men do: Compete with the men. Note, too, that most male athletes are also denied money and funding because, like the women, they can’t compete at men’s sports’ highest levels.

There are market realities, too. Reflecting how the WNBA has lost an average of \$10 million every year since its birth and only exists because the profitable NBA subsidizes it, men’s college sports (notably football and basketball) bring in *far* more revenue than does women’s athletics.

Of course, some may argue that this doesn’t matter, that school sports shouldn’t be about money or adopt policies based on market forces. But since that’s a moral argument, here’s another one:

Since boys are more interested in athletics and participate more often, shouldn’t they have more funding? Shouldn’t we, as parents would do, consider children’s proclivities and interests when deciding what to fund for them?

Note here that, the U.S. Census Bureau [informs](#), girls are more likely than boys to take lessons, join clubs, and do many other things, which means they’re using more resources (“funding”) in these arenas. So is this the feminist conception of fairness: Take away funding from boys in one of the *only* areas their interest outstrips girls’?

This said, Amour needn’t worry. Some feminists are taking a hiatus from the usual “equality” agitation only because, after decades of invading men’s spaces, the MUSS males began returning the favor and are providing an object lesson in actual equality. But should their threat be neutralized, those feminists will be back in Armour’s phalanx, roaring, and preaching their separate-and-equal sermons.



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