

Biological realities: Only nature and God 'assigns' an infant's sex at birth



by Eric Rozenman

From roughly 300,000 years ago, when early human beings appeared until Barack Hussein Obama II took the oath as the 44th president of the United State in 2009, there were two sexes, male and female. Yet today, secular fundamentalists in faculty lounges, newsrooms, corporate human resources departments and studios of the politico-entertainment complex have discovered more genders than [Baskin-Robbins](#) has flavors.

This is possible only because the same people who insist we “follow the science” when imposing clinically unsupported mask requirements on young children and discount fetal heartbeats at six weeks also avoid the chromosomal reality of XX, that

is, female, and XY, male. We're all – with rare hermaphroditic exceptions – binary babies.

Contrary to the Orwellian vocabulary of the Twitterverse, no one – other than nature and the biology of nature's God – "assigns" an infant sex at birth. They're born with it, and that matters.

A "transgender woman" – a person born male but, let's say, treated with hormones and surgically manipulated to appear as a female–will still have the cardiopulmonary, skeletal and to some extent musculature of his natural, organic, unprocessed male self. That is certainly the case for a man who, though "identifying" as a woman, has not so transitioned.

So, when and why did this basic fact become taboo? By the end of the last ice age roughly 12,000 years ago, men and women connected sexual intercourse with pregnancy and birth. Moving from nomadic hunter-gatherer clans to agricultural settlements, couples increasingly paired off. It might have taken a village to help ensure group survival, but parental, not communal, bonds to offspring proved primary.

Nevertheless, after a dozen millennia or more, the cult of woke progressivism preaches that the nuclear family with man and woman, father and mother at its foundation is not just a social construct but one based on "cisgendered patriarchy." That makes it part of the West's democratic-capitalist "systems of oppression."

How did such anti-empirical nonsense gain censorial power analogous to that of the medieval Church's Inquisition? What enables it to burn heretics at the digital stake? As is often the case, blame the French.

Post-World War II literary deconstructionists sought to erase France's acquiescence to, when not in collaboration with, Nazi occupiers. Since facts got in their way, these postmodernists began replacing history with "narratives," social-cultural

truths with subjective “lived experience.”

This anti-objectivity spread from university English departments through the humanities and into the hard sciences. So today, white medical students find themselves indicted for “implicit racism” and traditional mathematicians exposed as tools used to oppress “people of color.” As one result, when female athletes object to sharing locker rooms and competing against – and losing to – male athletes who “identify as female,” the women get condemned as bigots, and the men are portrayed as noble.

As for why this delusion, consult a once-familiar source against which progressive cultists war. That would be the Bible. In his final address to the Israelites, Moses recounts that God made “this covenant, with its sanctions, not with you alone, but both with those who are standing here with us this day before the Lord our God and with those who are not with us here this day.”

A note in the Etz Chayim (Tree of Life) version of the Five Books of Moses used by the Conservative Jewish movement asks “what right did our ancestors have to impose the obligations of the covenant on us? Why do we have to feel bound by their actions?”

Good question, one increasing numbers of Americans and not only the 20%-plus who now declare no religious affiliation whatsoever, answer by asserting “we don’t.” Yet one hardly need be traditionally religious to recognize the covenant at Sinai as central to ethical monotheism and that theological/ideological outlook as the core of what makes Western civilization civilized.

Etz Chayim continues: “Many aspects of our lives were determined by decisions of our parents and ancestors, including when and where we would be born, what skills and physical qualities we would possess, and where and how we

would be educated. Maturity consists in accepting those conditions as the facts of our lives, rather than fantasizing about how our lives would have been easier had we been born otherwise.”

Any family, my own included, who has had a family member or friend affected by it knows sexual dysphoria is real. But that psychological syndrome does not displace biological reality.

Postmodernists warred against truth because it exposed them as less than heroic. Woke progressives, who worship the idols of their own radical personal autonomy, attack maturity because it denies their fantasies.

First published in the [*Washington Times*](#).