To Whom It May Be Concerned at META, September 7, 2024

Conversations centered around “gender identity” and “trans rights” cannot be branded “hate speech” because science, facts, or opinions are not agreeable with another’s bias. What’s more, flagging conversations that present facts and science as “hateful” is detrimental for everyone, including the very demographic that’s insisted to be “under attack.”

**Biological males do pose a very real threat to the rights, spaces, and safety of women and girls, and pretending otherwise is anti-science and willful ignorance.** Keeping a society willfully ignorant is dangerous to everyone.

For example, in the state of California under Sen. Scott Wiener’s SB 132 where by self-declaration alone a man may claim he’s a “woman” and be transferred to a women’s prison, no questions asked, [**Tremaine Carroll,**](https://feministlegal.org/male-inmate-charged-with-raping-woman-inside-california-womens-prison-cdcr-confirms-pregnancy/)[**a man who identifies as a woman**](https://www.thecentersquare.com/california/article_c7c9de20-22ac-11ef-9aaf-4f40566e4565.html)**, is scheduled to have a hearing for two counts of rape in the women’s prison in Chowchilla, Central California Women’s Facility.** This after he was imprisoned in a men’s prison for crimes including three counts of forced oral copulation.

Here we have policy based on the idea that biological males pose no real harm to women and therefore, “transwomen” are no threat to women and they must be housed with women to protect them from men. In response, the women housed with biological males are terrified, gaslit by prison staff about their reasonable fears, and they are being raped, sexually assaulted, harassed, and intimidated by the biological males housed with them. These men do so without question by authority because of the very nature of SB 132 which states no one has a right to question one’s “gender identity.”

Pointing out that a man took advantage of a law to gain access to vulnerable women may be flagged as “hateful” because one does not want to believe that “transwomen” may be dangerous to women and want to believe that “transwomen are women.” However, **shutting down the conversation to entertain another’s false idea of the world allows for more harms to go unchecked without resolving them.**

What’s more, flagging every conversation that has something less than flattering to say about the harms of certain policies and issue regarding “gender identity” and “trans rights” creates a distorted view of reality and who’s against or for such policies and why.

Such as, **the concept of “gender identity” was invented by pedophile and abusive child psychologist** [**John Money**](https://reduxx.info/john-money-the-pervert-who-invented-gender/) who was infamous for exposing twin boys as young as six to pornography and forcing them to perform sex acts on each other to form their “gender identities.” The survivors of this horrific abuse were interviewed by Oprah, and [both would take their own lives](https://archive.fo/3qGEL) due to the torture this man put them through. **This unethical experiment is the basis for our concept of “gender identity.”**

**We should talk about how transition is a for-profit business that doctors and makers of hormones and chemicals have been profiting from.**[**The WPATH Files**](https://environmentalprogress.org/big-news/wpath-files)and the[**Cass Review**](https://cass.independent-review.uk/)have both demonstrated that these policies are based on weak evidence and politics. None of the claims made about reducing suicidality or gender dysphoria are supported. Several European countries that are ahead of us in "gender affirming care" have since walked-back their prior positions and have allowed for puberty blockers for clinical trials and research only. Transitioning of children is happening because men need children to validate their own position of “always being this way,” as [**Adm. Rachel Levine**](https://www.thecentersquare.com/national/article_7eaaa51a-6499-11ef-b07c-d3fc940307fb.html) has done his part to influence removing the age requirements for “gender affirming care” for children.

**META must allow these conversations to be had.** In monitoring conversations, one cannot be denied or flagged simply because facts presented do not affirm another’s bias.

After years of censoring anything people do not want to hear, we should question how much we’ve contributed to creating a society of delusional, thin-skinned people and allowed for policies that have done grievous harm to society, especially to the rights, liberties, and protections of women and children.

Sincerely,

Janet T. Sasaki