



We are LGB Alliance USA, an advocacy organization dedicated to defending the rights of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals. We are very alarmed to learn that Meta is considering banning “misgendering” as part of its hate and harassment policy.

We believe this effort is driven by a selective misapplication of the concept of “rights.” We often hear about the “rights” of transgender people to insist on certain language. But what about the rights of gays and lesbians to name reality as they experience it according to their sexual orientation? What about the rights of women to protect their boundaries — and how can women protect their boundaries when “woman” no longer means what it has traditionally been understood to be, namely, an adult human female?

Indeed, it is important to respect the rights of any individual to express their own beliefs. A person has a “right” to see themselves in any way they want to and to use whatever language they want to refer to themselves. However, that does not mean they have a “right” to make other people endorse their personal beliefs and identities. This means a person has a right to identify as whatever gender they want to, but that does not mean they have a right to make other people endorse their gender identity.

Additionally, Meta’s commitment to fostering a fair, impartial platform would be seriously compromised by enforcing the use of “preferred pronouns.” Let’s consider the videos in question that triggered this debate. One involves a woman objecting to a trans-identified male who wanted access to a woman’s restroom; another involves a woman criticizing a trans-identified male winning a sports event for girls. Surely there are good faith and well-informed arguments that can be made that bathrooms and/or women & girls’ sports teams should remain female-only. Indeed, these are hotly debated topics in school boards, state legislatures, courts, and even the federal government. There is an inherent contradiction in claiming to be open to both sides of an argument while also endorsing (and even enforcing) the language of one side. How can you claim to be a fair and impartial disseminator of information when you put the thumb on the scales in favor of males’ self-identity over the objections of women who say otherwise?

It is disturbing to think how far this sort of “pronoun enforcement” policy could go. What if a woman is sexually assaulted by a fully intact transwoman, and refers to her rapist as “he”? Could her rapist (and defenders of the rapist) report her for “hate” or “harassment?”



As an organization that fights for the rights of same-sex attracted individuals, we have a unique window into the troubling implications of “preferred pronoun” enforcement. For decades, lesbians have seen their spaces threatened and infiltrated by males who call themselves “women” and “lesbians.” Such males manipulate lesbians into having romantic relationships with them by accusing them of “transphobia” and “bigotry” if they refuse to date them. Such lesbians who refuse face ostracism from “LGBTQ” communities as a consequence. Young lesbians are particularly vulnerable, since they are often just out of the closet and lack both experience and self-confidence. Requiring that lesbians refer to such males by female pronouns only facilitates such manipulative tactics.

Now that more and more heterosexual women are transitioning and are identifying as “gay men,” gay men are facing similar trouble that lesbians have. Just like lesbians, gay men have a right to guard the boundaries of their same-sex attraction and spaces, and not be reported for “hate” or “harassment.”

We hope you understand that people who use natal sex-based pronouns are not engaging in bigotry. They are motivated by respect for biological reality, or perhaps they think that sex-based pronouns happen to be the best choice of language for the situation at hand. It cheapens the concept of “hate” and “harassment” by defining these terms to include “misgendering.”

Compelled speech is not free speech. And while we understand Meta is a private company, we urge them to remain steadfast in honoring a core value of the United States: freedom of speech. Only by upholding these principles can Meta preserve its integrity as a platform and ensure that diverse voices can engage openly in fair and impartial debate.

Thank you for considering our input.