



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 1, 2016

American Voters Choose “Transgender” Candidates in Historical First

Play Misty for me? This could appear the message of the Utah and Colorado Democrat voters who just scored historical firsts in nominating, on a major party ticket, “transgender” candidates for congressional seats. And if that isn’t strange enough, both politicians are named Misty. The individuals, Misty Snow and Misty Plowright, are men who insist they’re women and dress as such. Reports the [Washington Times](#):



Snow, a 30-year-old grocery store cashier from Salt Lake City, bested marriage therapist Jonathan Swinton, a self-identified conservative Democrat who ran on a centrist platform, in the primary for a Utah U.S. Senate seats.

...[Snow] will now face off against incumbent Republican Sen. Mike Lee in November. Mr. Lee ran unopposed in the Republican primary and will be an overwhelming favorite in a state that has not elected a Democrat to the U.S. Senate during...Snow’s lifetime.

Although Mr. Swinton won the initial ballot at the state party’s Democratic convention, he failed to garner 60 percent of the vote, sending the race into a primary runoff. The unofficial returns showed...Snow with a 59.5 percent-to-40.5 percent advantage.

...Snow ran on a platform of increasing the minimum wage and criticized [his] opponent for supporting restrictions on abortion.

...A 33-year-old who works in information technology, [Ms. Plowright](#) secured the Democratic nomination over Donald Martinez, an Iraq War veteran, by 58 percent to 42 percent.

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

While Plowright and Snow won their primaries handily, the general election will be a different matter. The aforementioned Senator Lee is practically a shoo-in, and Plowright is running against incumbent Republican Congressman Doug Lamborn in a district that has never elected a Democrat.

And this may partially explain the selection of Plowright and Snow. As the *Times* also reported, “The fact that the two were nominated in races where any Democrat would have little chance didn’t surprise other Democrats. ‘We’re going to lose anyway; we might as well make a statement about inclusion,’ Utah state Sen. Jim Dabakis, who is gay, told The Associated Press.” Of course, “‘Inclusion’ of what?” is the question. (Dabakis certainly doesn’t want inclusion of religious social conservatives; he draws lines like everyone else.)

And this surely explains some voters’ motivation. We live in an age of tokenism and odd prejudice, where change and the unprecedented allure the immature. In 2008 we heard from and of those who wanted to be part of the history of electing the first “black” president; in fact, a poll at the time showed that Barack Obama’s race was a net advantage for him, not a liability. And now the talk is of putting the “first” woman in the White House, as identity politics reigns supreme.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 1, 2016

As for what many euphemistically call “gender identity,” it was no doubt a factor in the Utah and Colorado races. In fact, the *Times* tells us that Snow actually “played up” his candidacy’s historic nature. And while we’ve heard of high-school students [choosing](#) a “transgender” classmate for homecoming king, that adults’ voting choices are likewise influenced by fallacy-based fashions doesn’t bode well for our nation.

Having said this, critics could wonder how many voters knew of Snow’s and Plowright’s condition. After all, interviewer [Mark Dice](#) and others have amusingly illustrated how little average voters know. Moreover, the media don’t help. Even the supposedly conservative *Washington Times* echoes the wider mainstream press in referring to the two candidates — who are both male — using feminine pronouns. Thus, if the “uninitiated” just quickly perused such an article, they could possibly think that at issue is merely another female politician running for office.

Yet many knew that at issue wasn’t just another female candidate; they agree with Snow that being “transgender” shouldn’t be a “barrier” to office. But do they really understand what being “transgender” (a deceptive, recently originated term) means?

I’ve often quoted ex-“transsexual” Alan Finch, who once said, “You fundamentally can’t change sex.... Transsexualism was invented by psychiatrists.” Then there’s former psychiatrist-in-chief for Johns Hopkins Hospital Dr. Paul McHugh, who likewise [stated](#), “‘Sex change’ is biologically impossible. People who undergo sex-reassignment surgery do not change from men to women or vice versa. Rather, they become feminized men or masculinized women. ...We psychiatrists...would do better to concentrate on [trying to fix their minds](#) and not their genitalia.” Of course, such statements are today considered politically incorrect, and social engineers like to call those uttering them “unscientific” (when they’re not calling them something worse). But what does the science really say? This matters because if it’s only a person’s body that needs changing, then, well, so-called “sexual-reassignment surgery” is merely a necessary cosmetic change. But if it’s the individual’s mind that needs fixing, it’s probably not a good idea to vault him to power.

Consider: Let’s say I visit a psychiatrist and say “Doc, I’m a woman trapped in a man’s body, and I’ve known for as long as I can remember that I’m really, truly, deep down female. I want ‘sexual-reassignment’ surgery.” Since my feelings have been persistent and lasted for more than six months, the physician will diagnose me with “gender dysphoria” and may, down the road, give me approval for the aforementioned surgery. But, question: What physiological markers will he look for to verify that I actually am, “legitimately,” transgender? After all, no cardiologist will cut my chest open simply because I insist I have heart disease and demand a bypass. He’ll examine me and render a diagnosis based on medically verifiable evidence. So what’s the answer?

Don’t feel bad not knowing,

The so-called experts can’t tell you, either.

There are no physiological markers. There is no blood test for gender dysphoria. No brain scan. No genetic test. All the doctor can do is go by my feelings — and take my word for it that I’m “transgender.” In other words and, quite unscientifically, the patient *self-diagnoses*.

Thus, regardless of what anyone believes about the “validity” of a gender dysphoria diagnosis in a given case — and whatever future scientists may ultimately conclude on the matter — the fact is this:

There simply is no scientific proof whatsoever that gender dysphoria is anything but a psychological disorder.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 1, 2016

Sexual activists bristle at this notion, but even their proposed remedy — that mutilation called “sexual-reassignment surgery” — can only have a *psychological* effect. After all, a man receiving it doesn’t end up with a female body or something performing the functions of one.

He ends up with something *resembling* a female body.

So it is akin to a cosmetic change and, as with a facelift, any benefit derived is purely psychological. And “transgender” people tacitly acknowledge this: When they say the change has made them *feel* better, they aren’t alluding to an abatement of physical pain. They mean between the ears.

And how much of a remedy is this attempt to live as an opposite-sex member? A shocking 41 percent of “transgender” people attempt suicide.

Of course, they may not be nearly as suicidal as a society that ignores facts and science in favor of feel-good agendas.

Photo of Misty Snow: AP Images



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.