



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on May 6, 2025

The “Trans” Empire Strikes Back, Attacks U.K. Court; J.K. Rowling Responds

If Daniel Radcliffe and the rest of the *Harry Potter* actors really could perform magic, maybe, just perhaps, they could turn a man into a woman. But it’s impossible beyond the world of Hollywood fantasy. This hasn’t stopped them, however, from embracing the fantasy that this sexual transformation can, somehow, occur in real life. Moreover, actors as a group have become defenders of this “faith,” reflexively attacking any expression of anti-“trans” sanity. Thus did many hundreds of actors and writers recently sign open letters opposing last month’s U.K. Supreme Court (UKSC) ruling. The issue?



Vladimir Vladimirov/iStock/Getty Images Plus

The ruling found that 15-year-old British legislation really did mean “sex” when using the term “sex,” and not a misused term (“gender”) with twice as many letters and syllables.

(The UKSC puts our Supreme Court to shame on this, by the way. That is, a few years back the latter somehow couldn’t figure out that 1964 legislators didn’t mean “gender” when writing “sex.” This is even though “gender” was virtually never applied to humans at the time.)

But one writer that didn’t sign any protest letter is *Harry Potter* creator J.K. Rowling. In fact, she [posted](#) a long rebuttal to the effort on X this past Saturday. She made some excellent points, too.

Who Are the Radicals?

The kicker here is that [the UKSC ruling](#) was very narrow. It didn’t find that the MUSS (Made-up Sexual Status, aka “transgender”) agenda is destructive, which it is. It didn’t state that “trans” individuals don’t exist, which they don’t. It didn’t dictate that Britain’s 2010 “Equality Act” — the legislation in question — couldn’t be updated to encompass wider insanity. This it can. It simply found that since words mean things, “man,” “woman,” and “sex” in the act mean “man,” “woman,” and “sex.”

Nonetheless, the aforementioned entertainers take issue with lexical correctness. Thus did they sign the protest letter (info [here](#)). But, [writes](#) commentator Andrea Widburg,

you already know what it says. “Lived reality and threatens the safety” ... “exposes trans people to embarrassment and harassment” ... “negative consequences for all women” ... “harm that trans and gender nonconforming people face” ... blah, blah, blah.

Widburg also puts this effort in perspective:

There are a couple of things to understand about the “we love ‘trans’ people” pile-on. First, the entertainment industry is disproportionately populated with non-heterosexuals. In other



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on May 6, 2025

words, while most people know very few homosexuals and have never met someone claiming to be “trans,” the entertainment types really do believe that half or more of the world is “on the spectrum.”

This references the notion that sex isn’t a binary quality, but is a continuum — like the left-right political spectrum.

An Alternate Reality

As an entertainment-industry case in point, Widburg then presented the following spiel by actress Cynthia Nixon, a lesbian herself.

Nixon’s testimonial is eyebrow-raising. She said her daughter is “trans” (and had “top surgery”) — which made the crowd present cheer wildly. She also said that her niece is “trans.” Ditto with the cheers.

And, well, she wasn’t done yet.

Her “best friend’s kid is ‘trans,’” too — as is her “kid’s best friend.”

If this strikes you as statistically improbable, to say the least, join the club. As a commenter on the above video put it, “Transchausens syndrome by proxy.” But it’s not unusual among Hollywood types.

Yet there’s more to it. As Widburg notes, in entertainment, “the metric of success is popularity.” What really matters is “being in with the In Crowd.” In fact, the field attracts an inordinate number of narcissists. Thus has been said about entertainment and media types that if you’re not talking *about* them, they’re not really listening. (I believe I’ve experienced this with fellow media figures myself.)

In other words, not all the MUSS defenders *really* believe the dogma — not deep down. But posturing is necessary for career success. Rationalization is a factor, too. Remember that people generally don’t want to feel like phonies. As a coping mechanism, therefore, they’ll often convince themselves that “yeah, this agenda really does make sense.” This way, they can not just gain the approval of others, but also of themselves.

Simply put, though, they’re creatures of human respect, of fashions. Had they been living in 1936 Germany, they’d have been doing the goose step.

Rowling’s Realism

J.K. Rowling, though, bucks this trend. Of course, this is made easier because she’s a billionaire; she’s got ample go-pound-sand money. But she’s also reviled by pseudo-elites for her stand and has received violent threats, so she deserves credit. Anyway, here she is below celebrating the UKSC ruling.

I love it when a plan comes together. [#SupremeCourt](#) [#WomensRights](#)
pic.twitter.com/agOkWmhPgb

— J.K. Rowling (@jk_rowling) [April 16, 2025](#)

And the following is an example of the criticism, from Harry Potter actress Emma Watson.

Emma Watson is not ignoring fascism. pic.twitter.com/DbmmEzSWw5

— Wensley Garbell (@WesGarbell) [May 1, 2025](#)



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on May 6, 2025

Ah, a “fascism” accusation — how original.

Unfazed by this, however, Rowling posted the aforementioned rebuttal (below)

In light of recent open letters from academia and the arts criticising the UK's Supreme Court ruling on sex-based rights, it's possibly worth remembering that nobody sane believes, or has ever believed, that humans can change sex, or that binary sex isn't a material fact. These...

— J.K. Rowling (@jk_rowling) [May 3, 2025](#)

It's a long, well-written, no-holds-barred post that makes numerous good points (and contains one or two errors). One in particular is quite profound. That is, in reference to the MUSS lie, “Trans Women are Women, Trans Men are Men,” Rowling writes that its proponents are

not repeating it because it's true — they know full well it's not true — but because they believe they can make it true, sort of, if they force everyone else to agree.

What Rowling is touching upon is the mindset that rejects objective reality — the moral variety in particular.

Diving Deep

That is, there are two conceptions of right and wrong. One involves the idea that morality is real, existing apart from man, and is universal, eternal, and unchanging. Our only job is discovering it and aligning our lives to it.

The other conception is the relativistic one, which, sadly, prevails today. It reflects Greek philosopher Protagoras' notion, “Man is the measure of all things.” This involves the idea that we humans invent what can only be called “morality.” And, of course, if we invent it, we can reinvent it — as is convenient.

I'll illustrate this with a story. About a decade ago I was interacting with a little girl, of about eight or nine, who was in my charge. Some topic arose, and I mentioned a moral imperative. Well, she replied, quite innocently, that it wasn't true because (I'm paraphrasing) “all the people could disagree and think otherwise.” (I gently corrected her.)

This is today's default relativist setting. The idea is that “right and wrong” are just a function of consensus social values, of what people believe. Ergo, change what people believe, and you can change “right and wrong.”

How does this relate to the MUSS agenda, which involves scientific fact? First, as relativistic operation becomes instinctive, it begins to be applied beyond the moral realm. And why not? If everything is relative, what could be “wrong” with having your own alternative scientific “facts”?

Realize, too, that advancing the MUSS agenda is seen by its acolytes *as* a moral imperative. Moreover, if consensus determines “morality,” then whether or not you're a “good” person is determined by majority social vote. And that's one election that entertainment narcissists, and others, really don't want to lose.

Unfortunately, embracing lies has consequences — that are not at all relative — as entertainers' many mutilated children prove.



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.