

# An Interview with Carey Linde and Dr. Lloyd Hawkeye Robertson on Transgender Identities, Transsexual Identities, Current and Historical Orientations, and Psychological Science Definition of the Self (Part One)

March 22, 2020

**Interviewer: Scott Douglas Jacobsen**

Numbering: Issue 22.A, Idea: Outliers & Outsiders (Part Eighteen)

Place of Publication: Langley, British Columbia, Canada

Title: In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal

Web Domain: <http://www.in-sightjournal.com>

Individual Publication Date: March 22, 2020

Issue Publication Date: May 1, 2020

Name of Publisher: In-Sight Publishing

Frequency: Three Times Per Year

Words: 3,916

**ISSN 2369-6885**

## Abstract

**Dr. Lloyd Hawkeye Robertson founded Hawkeye Associates. Carey Linde founded Divorce for Men (Law Offices of Carey Linde). They discuss: some qualifications; transgender identities and transsexual identities; dominant orientation of the psychological community; historical perspective on the issue; the current social and political context in Canada now; the impacts of these social and political contexts on conversations around transgender identities and transsexual identities; the position taken by Mr. Linde impressing Dr. Robertson; confusion of the public on terminology; and the psychological science definition of the self in relation to transgender identities and transsexual identities.**

*Keywords:* Carey Linde, Divorce for Men, Hawkeye Associates, Lloyd Hawkeye Robertson, psychological science, self, Transgender, Transsexual.

**An Interview with Carey Linde and Dr. Lloyd Hawkeye Robertson on Transgender Identities, Transsexual Identities, Current and Historical Orientations, and Psychological Science Definition of the Self: Founder, Divorce for Men (Law Offices of Carey Linde) & Founder, Hawkeye Associates[1][2]**

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen:** Let's begin with some open statements, not on general but, on relevant expertise in these areas. On transgender identities and transsexual identities, what are the relevant areas of expertise or qualification, or professional experience, for each of you?

**Dr. Lloyd Hawkeye Robertson:** *I know Carey primarily from newspaper reports, and I admire him for taking an unpopular and public stand while representing a father who argued his daughter should wait until she was 16 before transitioning into a male form. I know none of the actors in this case and therefore I cannot comment as a psychologist on any of their motivations, but the public discussion demonstrated, I think, confusion over terminology and a hardening of positions that sometimes trumped reason. I would like to hear Carey's views on this.*

*My own area of expertise within psychology is the self, and I have a book coming out on that subject this fall. Transwomen volunteered to become research participants in two research projects I conducted: one on mapping the self and the other on stigmatization of men. In one case the subject had a series of bad experiences with males, and ze viewed short hair as a sign of evil. Another subject had a series of bad experiences with women, but both viewed themselves to be part of a third gender separate from men or women so the term "transgender" was not really appropriate in their cases. I have also worked with trans people in my private practice, and I have a personal interest in this area. My cousin and I were raised together as kids and ze transitioned when ze was in his fifties. I think of my cousin as a "her" when remembering her in female form, but as a "him" in his present male form. I suspect this tells you more about me than him, but I suspect I am probably normative on this point.*

**Jacobsen:** To define terms scientifically, psychologically, and colloquially, what are transgender identities? What are transsexual identities?

**Carey Linde:** For a person feeling their gender is different from their sex assigned at birth they can adopt 3 degrees of transitioning:

1. They can adopt an opposite gender name, assume the clothes and hair style and outward manifestations of the opposite sex. Perform and present as if the opposite sex. This is called social transitioning.
2. After a period of time and psychological if not psychiatric counseling, and a medical determination that the person suffers gender dysphoria, or perhaps not, the person can receive opposite sex hormones. This is called hormonal transitioning.
3. After further counseling and medical attention, a person can undergo genital reassignment surgery. Women desiring to be men, will have double mastectomies. The term transsexual is currently narrowing to describe this 3rd stage.

**Robertson:** *I am going to disagree with Carey a little here, although I acknowledge he is using politically correct definitions, and probably the definitions that are used in court. The idea that sex is assigned at birth is just silly. Human infants are born with penises or vaginas (some are intersex but they are a vanishingly small percentage). We do not assign the sex, but we notice and name the difference.*

*There is a stronger argument that we assign gender at birth. The term "gender" was appropriated from the study of grammar in English speaking countries during the 1960s to represent learned roles, behaviours and associations associated with sex: we teach*

girls to act as girls and boys to act as boys. What we have learned since then is that much of what we thought was learned with respect to personality, behaviours and even interests is innate, and that men's and women's brains are different in some ways. An excellent primer on this is Steven Pinker's classic *The Blank Slate*.

The fact that we are not "blank slates" does not mean we are all the same. Both women and men exhibit a large spectrum of behaviours with considerable overlap with the result that it is a mistake to overgeneralize and say "this is what men are like" or "this is what women are like." A problem with the concept of gender it tends to lead to just that. At one time people who were cross-dressers, or were "masculine" women and "feminine" men still retained their biological sex identification. Now many are considering themselves "transgender" without any intention of changing their sexual characteristics. I read a newspaper account of a biological woman who is having a child and wants to be named as the child's father. You can see that the concept of gender is actually restricting diversity by suggesting to people who do not adhere to what are now considered gender norms for that sex are not really of that sex, and that gender trumps sex. The term "transsexual" is more objective. A person who has completed hormonal and surgical sex change has now changed their sex, and we can see that this is so.

**Jacobsen: Dr. Robertson, what seems like the dominant orientation of the psychological community – across schools of psychological thought – on the question of heritability of general intelligence, personality, sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity, inasmuch as a consensus exists on these areas of ongoing research?**

**Robertson:** *Its nature and nurture. Twin studies, for example, suggest that intelligence is .80 heritable. Similarly the "big five" personality traits including extroversion, neuroticism, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness are not only highly heritable, but are predictive of voting patterns. Sex is 99.7% heritable if we define sex by one's genitalia. In identical twin studies, 52% of gays whose twin was gay were also gay. Gender is not heritable by definition if we view gender as learned behaviour distinct from sex. Sex linked characteristics are heritable and may vary with individuals. We build our gender identities to accommodate our biology from a menu provided by society. That menu is changing.*

**Jacobsen: To take a historical perspective, what are some of the oldest substantiated cases of transgender and transsexual identities known in the anthropological records?**

**Linde:** Here I have to plead lack of time at this moment to get into detail. There are numerous web sites treating this subject. Lots. I will try and send the URLs for some. Historians and even archeologists have and are reporting presumed evidence for trans people through out history, either as individuals or segments of societies. I have just started listening to an Audible book *Transgender History* by Susan Stryker. It canvases the history from colonial USA to present.

**Robertson:** *Cultures indigenous to North America often had a category of "two-spirited" people who dressed and took on many of the roles of the other sex, but also had special roles assigned to them. The role of male "two-spirited" people among the Cree, for example, was to break up fights and negotiate peaceful behaviours. Here we have the example of people of the male sex, dressing like women, taking on female roles such as*

*making pemmican, but also doing more dangerous work as peace officers. This could be interpreted as a third gender and supports the idea that transsexual people probably existed in Neolithic societies prior to recorded history.*

**Jacobsen: To set a tone for expectations of some interpretations and misinterpretations of the responses, even the questions, for the interview with the two of you, what is the current social and political context (or are the current social and political contexts) for Canadian society now?**

**Linde:** Again, I feel the need to refer to the extensive existing opinion on this. It depends on who you ask. SJWs thinks the future looks great, despite the continuing struggle to get there. Gender critical feminists (TERFs) see unmitigated disaster. Take your pick.

Having said that, it is a mugs game trying make any statement about how “regular” citizens of Canada think. Mainstream media bias has kept what little is reported almost exclusive supportive of the SJW warriors. It is my sense that the majority of Canadians, for instance, do not agree with the idea of trans women (men to most) in protected women’s spaces.

**Robertson:** *I think Canada is a tolerant society compared to most in recorded history. We have encouraged people from minority cultures to maintain their cultures and languages, we have enshrined aboriginal rights in our constitution, we have even taken down statues of the founding father of the country because his memory offended some people. These accommodations are rare in human history and have only occurred during the modern era. I think overwhelmingly most Canadians support social justice, but we may have differences on what that means.*

*When Carey is talking about social justice warriors, in this context, he must be talking about the activists in the transgender movement who attempt to prevent people whose opinions they abhor from speaking in universities and libraries. But what he misses, I think, is that the gender critical feminists are also social justice warriors. They are directly descended from the radical feminists who were and continue to be almost androphobic in their fear of men as oppressors of women. We are asking these women to share their safe spaces in bathrooms to women’s shelters to people who have penises.*

*I agree with the transactivists who say this fear is often overblown. Most men define their gender role as protecting women, not oppressing them. Further men who identify as women would be expected to be less likely to assault those that they wish to emulate. Having said that, some men are a threat to women, and the subjective and fluid nature of gender allows such men to declare themselves to be women so as to gain predatory access.*

*I agree with Carey that most Canadians do not want men or women with penises in protected women’s spaces. I see a coalition forming that would have been unthinkable just ten years ago. The radical feminists and the traditional women represented by organizations such as Real Women agree on this issue. This coalition could spell disaster for some of the people I care about deeply.*

**Jacobsen: How does this social and political context (or do these social and political contexts) impact the conversations on transgender identities and transsexual identities?**

**Linde:** If by “conversations” you mean two or more people in rational polite discourse, there is none, zero, Squat. No one is talking to anyone of the opposite belief. The gender critical feminists regularly invite participation from the trans warriors. None accept.

A further unknown is to what extent can it be said the ANTIFA led demonstrators who show up to shut down the symposiums of gender critical feminists represent anyone other than themselves?

**Robertson:** *I love my cousin. I watched her battle recurrent major depression for decades and since he transitioned he has been depression free. He was able to transition, and thousands like him, because we live in a relatively tolerant society with people who see the social justice of it. But in an outright battle between a feminist-traditionalist alliance and the transactivists, I can see many of these gains being lost. I agree with Carey that no one is talking to each other, but we need to begin this dialogue, and soon.*

*For my contribution to this dialogue, I would like to propose we discard the language of transgenderism. In the first place, the idea of transgender is binary, and this restricts us from considering the possibility that there may be three, four, or even more genders. Second, the idea of gender is subjective. Cross-dressers, female impersonators and people who simply prefer what they see as the normative behaviours of the opposite sex can call themselves transgender. I see nothing wrong with that except gender cannot be allowed to trump sex. In Vancouver we have seen a transwoman complain to a human rights tribunal that a gynaecologist refused to examine her male genitals. If you believe the precept of genderism that male and femaleness is a matter of cultural preference, you can see the logic of this, except that gynaecologists have no training in working on male genitalia. But the structure of transgender ideology is rife with such contradictions.*

*I prefer the concept of transsexualism. If a person believes that they were born into the wrong body, then it is therapeutic that they change their body. Once a person has transitioned to the body of their preferred sex, then they should have no problem occupying the spaces of that sex. We can negotiate special protections for those in the process of transitioning. What of the people who have no interest in changing their sex? Well, in a tolerant society you can live as a man or a woman in any way you desire as long as you do not pose a threat to others. I think by focussing on transsexualism we can reach compromises in the interests of all sides.*

**Jacobsen: In question 1’s response, Dr. Robertson references a case by you, Mr. Linde. He was impressed by the courageous position taken on a father of a 16-year-old child. He could not comment on it. You could comment on it. What were the details of this case, Mr. Linde? Dr. Robertson, what was the more impressive position taken by Mr. Linde?**

**Linde:** The client had a 14 year old child identified as female at birth. IN grade 7 the school gave the child a male name without telling the father. He found when reading the

year book and found a male name under the photo of his child. I grade 8 the school moved the child along the treadmill leading to a trans pro psychologist and to the Gender Clinic at a local hospital. The clinic advised the parents the child was going to receive puberty blockers and opposite sex hormones. The father objected and the matter ended up in court.

The 2 lower court judgments and the decision on the appeal of those 2 judgments can be seen at

<https://divorce-for-men.com/resources/social-justice-identity-politics/vancouver-14-yr-old-trans-gendering/>

**Robertson:** *I think I said that the father in this case wanted his progeny to wait until ze was 16 to commence her biological sex change, but he lost the case. There are potential arguments on both sides of such cases. On the one hand, adolescence is a time of exploration with respect to sexuality. Given this, the request of the father seems prudent; however, an alternate conclusion could reasonably be reached where the child is suicidal. Unfortunately, there are websites coaching children of 12 or 13, or even younger, on how to appear suicidal so as to convince professionals and courts that a sex change is necessary. Complicating the issue is the fact that post-transition youth also have a higher than average suicide rate. There are psychological reasons why a child might make the determination that they were “born in the wrong body,” and if I understand this case correctly, the father’s fear was once his daughter began to transition into his son through hormonal blockers, the transition would be a fait accompli. We need a societal conversation on these issues, but to date the conversation has been rather one-sided with people who question transactivist orthodoxy “deplatformed” or silenced. What I appreciated about Carey’s stand is that he presented an unpopular position on an issue where discussion has been repressed. I do not know what the professional fall-out has been for him, if any, but I imagine the pressure was immense.*

**Jacobsen:** **Dr. Robertson, you mentioned the confusion of the public in terminology. What confusions were present in this case? Mr. Linde, what sparked original interest in the aforementioned case? Also, to the two of you, did the case come to a resolution?**

**Linde:** I came aboard on the case because I felt the father had not been treated fairly in the whole mishmash. Also I objected to the manner in which the court was denying the father freedom of expression.

The appeal court allowed the hormone treatment to remain but broke open speech freedom a little bit. Most importantly it established that mis use of pronouns and name could not be family violence. The court ducked the issue of the best interest of the child stating that was up to the doctors. It strongly implied the doctor had to look at a lot more than merely the child’s felt gender wish.

**Robertson:** *I think the term “transgender” is the source of much of this confusion. The federal legislation giving human rights protection to “gender identity” was ill thought out and added to the confusion. As we have seen, gender is learned behaviours associated with sex-roles. Identity is how we choose to define ourselves, and that can change over time. But much public policy conflates this with the assumption that gender is somehow*

*innate. For some purposes in the public arena gender is learned, for others it is a synonym for sex, and which rule is applied seems arbitrary. This confusion leads to poor decision making.*

**Jacobsen: Dr. Robertson, how does the psychological science definition of the self link to the issues here on transsexuality and transgenderism?**

**Linde:** Above my pay grade.

**Robertson:** *As I said in response to a previous question, the psychological consensus is that we are a product of both nature and nurture. In my academic writing, I have argued that the self is a culturally evolved structure that has come to give definition to our species. The very name we give ourselves “homo sapiens” suggests we are rational and volitional. But to exercise these potentialities, we need to have them embedded in our self.*

*The self is not entirely a cognitivist structure. Years ago Demasio suggested there existed an emotive “feeling of me.” Further research has identified differences between the male and female brain, and such research supports the idea that at least some transsexuals were indeed “born in the wrong body,” with regard to the structure of their brains. We also need to recognize, however, that there are other possible routes to transsexuality. A further complication is that homosexuals also often exhibit this cerebral variation as do some heterosexuals.*

*In the end, however, we develop a kind of mental map of who we are, and we act as though the self-identifiers in that map are true. I present the self-map of a transwoman in a book that will be published by University of Ottawa Press this fall. Not unsurprisingly, the self-map includes two clusters – male and female. The memes ze placed in the male cluster were all things ze did not like about herself including being bald, mortal, old, depressed and self-defeating as well as being male. The memes in the feminine cluster included being creative, sensual, hopeful, intellectual and a writer. Ze pictured a war going on within this self between masculine and feminine sides; however this is surely wrong. The male side had no consciousness capable of making war, it was merely the repository of unwanted characteristics. For example, “self-defeating” referred to the subject’s habit of ensuring failure when on the brink of success. Ze said, “no testacles will benefit from my success.” The essential components of our evolved self including volition, uniqueness, productivity and social interest were all on the female side. It was a war like a person is making war on nature when he, she or ze mows the lawn. In keeping with that metaphor, ze had zer testes removed during the course of our interviews.*

**Jacobsen: As the 2010s rolled past us, what were the most sensitive political and social outgrowths of transgenderism and transsexualism in this period?**

**Linde:** If you mean for the trans community, it was the developing collectivity of community. This increasing conspicuous collectivity in the public eye caused the very phobia from which the community wished to escape. As with acceptance of blacks and gays over time, gender identity issues and people are ubiquitous in the media. It is all less sensitive to a growing progressive set of the population. At the same time the faith based right is rallying and dangerous. Gender radical feminists are under literal attack by the trans warriors.

**Robertson:** *Transwomen have been extremely sensitive to being accepted as women, and have battled for recognition often using the courts and human rights tribunals. A coalition of women is challenging their right to compete in women's sports, occupy women's safe spaces such as women's washrooms and shelters, and access special female funding and programming for education and career development. It is interesting that transmen have not faced the same resistance from the vast majority of men. I can see a number of possible reasons for this difference. First, it is possible that men are more accepting of diversity as compared to women. Second, it is possible that women do not want to share their special privileges with people they do not recognize as women, and that would include allowing people who have had the physical advantages of growing muscle and bone density in a testosterone rich environment competing in competitions reserved for women. Third, in some situations, women may have a genuine fear that people with penises who claim to be women may be a threat to their safety.*

**Jacobsen:** **Following from the previous question, what might be a furtherance of these, positive and negative, social and political outgrowths of these issues?**

**Linde:** Increasing acceptance by hopefully the majority will make life less dysphoric for most. The conservative right will become more harsh and succeed in passing laws against what they don't like. Freedom of speech will be a major victim. It already is.

**Robertson:** Relying on recent federal legislation, the Ontario courts have forced the Ontario Minor Hockey Association to allow adolescents with female bodies to change in male change rooms. This is the kind of social experiment no university ethics committee would ever approve. One of two outcomes is possible. Either a number of people with girl's bodies will be sexually assaulted by adolescent boys, or they will not. If we don't see sexual assaults flowing from this experiment then we may reasonably decide that we do not need separate facilities for males and females at least for safety reasons. We are beginning to see this change with respect to the washroom issue. If, on the other hand, we see a number of sexual assaults, the logical conclusion would be to end the experiment; however, I don't think that will happen. I think politically, the politicians behind the experiment will refuse to accept its failure. They will double down with increasing expensive measures to protect the genetically female while engaging in male-blaming, perhaps with references to "toxic masculinity." But we as a society do not need to follow them down this hole.

I think we need to begin by acknowledging that people on both sides of this issue have valid points and concerns. As a society, we need to construct a synthesis from the thesis presented by the transactivists and the antithesis represented by the growing feminist-traditionalist coalition. We can only achieve this by respectfully listening to all concerns and responding to those concerns with sympathy. Scratch any scared or angry person and you will likely find a good person inside.

**Jacobsen:** **Mr. Linde, how is Canadian society more dysphoric than in the past? How can Canadian society become less dysphoric than at present with the issues of transsexuality and transgenderism more in the public consciousness now?**

**Linde:** There are great works written that diagnose the malaise, alienation, addictive self destruction and dysphoria experienced by most of mankind in the present stages of world corporate capitalism etc etc. Canadians among them. With some exceptions, life



is more stressful and not less. "...transsexuality and transgenderism in the public consciousness" is a freak out knee jerk ego offended reaction. One percent or less of the North American population has captured an historic position in the broad political, cultural and social media consciousness. The ubiquitous question is how did this happen so fast and why?

Many explanations are given. All making a contribution. No single answer has rung the bell yet. One of the new phenomena fueling the panic is the increasing number of young girls and women deciding that being a boy in this world is a safer bet than being a girl.

And the medical profession and big pharma is right there to enable this delusion.

**Robertson:** *We have the situation of men being more accepting of transmen than women are of transwomen. The hypothesis that men are more accepting of diversity would require more study across different groups; however such an explanation would be more acceptable to feminists than the obvious alternative, that biological women are protecting their privileges from competition while men have no such privileges to protect.*

*If men are more accepting of diversity, it would have to be a function of socialization. The testosterone that gives men their sexuality also translates into stronger bones, more muscle mass, and increased aggression and competitiveness. These latter two traits were necessary in traditional hunter gathering societies to fearlessly challenge competitors, both predatory and human, to protect bands that were essentially extended families. But aggression and competitiveness needs to be controlled or channelled if civilization is to work. Religion played a pivotal role in controlling and channelling male aggressive instincts in the formative years of our human civilizations. We have largely transcended religion by secularizing our ethics and expanding their application to all humanity, as for example, with the establishment of universal human rights. And we have been incredibly successful. Steven Pinker has meticulously documented how we now have fewer homicides, fewer deaths due to war, more gender equality and lower poverty than ever before in human history.*

*The argument would be then that the history of civilization is, at least in part, a history of controlling and channelling male testosterone. That aggression has been channelled into business, sports, politics and protection of the nation-state. Men have been conditioned to increasingly ignore minor or insubstantive difference, but of course there are numerous variables that also influence behaviour in particular contexts. Of concern to me is that tribalism has been increasing with a recent focus on ideological, cultural and racial identities and that this will result in breaking down the more universal humanist ethic. To take the argument full circle then, if the process of civilization included the aspect of controlling and channelling male testosterone-linked behaviours, then we would expect that women would have been less affected by this aspect of socialization. This would have left women more susceptible to ancient xenophobic fears including fear of "the other."*

**Jacobsen:** **Dr. Robertson, Mr. Linde opines, "Freedom of speech will be a major victim. It already is." Is this true to you, too? If so, what forms of freedom of speech, as a colloquialism for freedom of expression? Mr. Linde, on the same note, who have been the central culprits in the reduction in freedom of speech? To both of you, why them?**

**Linde:** The central culprits in killing free speech are public institutions (such as universities and libraries) and the main stream corporate media. Having said this, on the evening of Feb 1 I attended a hotly protested talk at the Seattle Public Library by WoLF radical feminists. Seattle's finest had to come in and haul off demonstrators who were set on denying women the right to speak. And in March the Vancouver Public Library will be reversing previous denials and permitting radical feminist to rent space for a function. This is a good sign for libraries. Now if only the universities would come out of hiding.

**Robertson:** *I agree with Carey that freedom of speech is threatened, but I would add that it has always been in a vulnerable position. I have argued that the modern human self capable of individual volition and objective thought is a cultural artefact that evolved more than 3,000 years ago (see: Free Will), and that modern religions evolved, in part, to control and restrict the individual volition inherent in this self. Galileo, for example, was imprisoned for observing that there were moons circling Jupiter. Such observations undermined the Catholic Church's then geocentric view of the universe. Fundamentalists and literalists from all major religions hold that their dogma is "revealed truth" superseding any contrary findings of science or philosophy. Until recently, that view was on the defensive worldwide; however, the attack on science and reason has been enjoined from a different direction.*

*On the surface, postmodernism which holds that all "truths" are provisional based on time and context appears democratic. The logic of postmodernism holds that there are different "ways of knowing" and that all are provisionally true. In keeping with this, Tom Strong of the University of Calgary stated that science is merely a "white, male way of knowing." Similarly, some feminists have coined the somewhat sexist term "mansplaining" to counter males when they use logic to refute some aspect of feminist dogma. I pointed out to Dr. Strong one and one half decades ago that if science were only a "white, male way of knowing," the holocaust would be a Jewish male way of knowing (most of the writers on the subject are male), and the colonization of the Americas is only an indigenous way of knowing. With postmodern relativism each identity group conflates belief with truth ignoring or discounting evidence that may undermine that "truth." But when framed as "truth" instead of "belief," people exercising their freedom of speech to deny "my truth" is felt to be offensive. Hence, we have seen people "deplatformed" from speaking at universities and libraries, and we have even seen university professors fired for not speaking the "truth" of the dominant ideology. In my forthcoming book I point out the roots of postmodernism in German fascism, and I believe that it inevitably leads to totalitarianism.*

*I think we can agree that transsexual people have a human right to freedom of expression which is, of course, a broader concept than freedom of speech. Concomitantly, radical feminists, traditional women, and fathers such as the one Carey is representing need to be heard. But there can be no dialogue without differentiating between subjective realities and objective reality. If we do not respect science and reason, then we are left with different "tribes" shouting at each other with no discourse possible.*

**Jacobsen:** What *should* be the legal status on the issues of transsexuality and transgenderism in regards to some of the aforementioned stages of change? Where do parents' rights and children's rights work well together in this context and not well together for the overall well-being of the child or adolescent?

**Linde:** I detect cocktail and beer parlour disputants, maybe out of pure exhaustion caused by confusion, are intellectually prepared to throw up their hands at what adults want to do. But children – hell no! The ever louder exception are the die hard cultural resister radical feminists who say men who think they are women must stay the F\*#K out of women's historical safe and protected spaces.

The rights of parents and children ultimately exist only in legislation and law. In the US increasing numbers of republican dominated state governments are enacting laws making it illegal for doctors to transition children, schools to push it, sports teams segregated by sex, and to stay with historic pronouns. Provincial and federal governments in Canada are going the other way. Canadian courts have barely started looking at this stuff.

**Robertson:** *Although I am not a lawyer, I would think that it is difficult to have consistent law on internally subjective criterion. I would therefore switch from a focus on gender to sex. A person's sex can be objectively determined by criteria that is understood beforehand. People who are in the process of transitioning may be granted special or provisional status taking into account the fears and concerns raised by women and by parents.*

**Jacobsen:** Mr. Linde, why the focus on world corporate capitalism as an ill? What makes the "medical profession and big pharma" part of the problem rather than a component of an integrated solution? Dr. Robertson, why the limitations in the study of, and the lack of study of, the acceptance of greater diversity by men than by women? That is, why are some questions simply not asked in some eras? Why is the channelling of aggression and competition necessary for the advancement of civilization? Will religion or proto-religious movements rise in the place of diminishing universal human rights as an ethic? Are they rising?

**Linde:** The profit motive is ubiquitous in corporate share owner capitalism. Big pharma pushes pills. Too many in the medical profession are ideologically rather than scientifically driven. One either sees and understands this or they don't. Together they integrate in the current world wide experimentation on transitioning children.

**Robertson:** *It is in the nature of the capitalist to maximize profit. Capitalists who fail to live by this maxim do not remain capitalists for very long. Unless they have a monopoly, they lose to the more ruthless. From this lens, corporate philanthropy is a public relations expense. A bit of history is useful for illustration.*

*Husky Oil was such a small player after World War II that it could not afford to build a new refinery. Instead, they bought an abandoned oil refinery in Moose Jaw and moved it to the Alberta side of Lloydminster to avoid Saskatchewan's more stringent worker-safety legislation. When I worked at the refinery it was easy to recognize the men who worked "on the rack" for years because they had thick leathery faces from repeated exposure to the fumes from loading tanker cars. I had the more dangerous job of working in the packaging plant where we poured roofing tar and super heated pipe*

*enamel into cardboard drums where the product cooled and solidified prior to shipping. Occasionally the mixture would bubble and splatter the workers in the plant. The boiler plant operators were different because they looked normal, but they tended to be deaf. Yes, the company provided ear plugs but you had to take them out when communicating with other workers when a boiler was about to blow. The heyday of industrial capitalism is over in this country, and such working conditions would no longer be permitted except in third world countries, but the principle is the same – to grow a company needs to exploit its workers or its consumers. Certain questions would destabilize the existing order and are simply not asked. In Lloydminster during the post war era, no one ever questioned Husky Oil.*

*Could “big pharma” be part of an integrated solution? Only if you feed the beast. Husky Oil eventually built its new upgrader plant in Saskatchewan only after a massive subsidy from that province. “Big pharma” will be part of the solution to the new coronavirus, and they will pocket a significant portion of the billions governments have earmarked to fight the disease. Who is going to maximize their profits on the transsexual issue? Follow the money.*

*Why is there no money to study the greater acceptance of diversity by men on these and other issues? Why is there less money for the study of men’s health generally? Certain questions would destabilize the existing ideological order. We are supposed to see the men at Husky who knowingly sacrificed years off their lives in order to provide for their families as exploiters. Men’s lives just don’t count for as much. Prior to her presidential run in the U.S. Hillary Clinton said that the real victims of war are women who lose their husbands and their fathers. The notion that the real victims of war are dead did not appear to have crossed her mind.*

*Why are men used as cannon fodder on the front lines of war? Because we evolved to be more aggressive, stronger and fearless in protecting family-based bands, tribes and eventually nation-states. But that aggression must be controlled if those political units are to endure. In the end, being a man is a cooperative enterprise. Now we have males transitioning to be females and vice versa. It’s an interesting social experiment.*

**Jacobsen: Dr. Robertson, why is free speech important now, or always? Mr. Linde, is the event described in Seattle a harbinger of anything or events to come in the 2020s in regards to free speech, and hate speech, or "freedom of expression" in the parlance of the Canadian *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and the United Nations (and the European Union)? Mr. Linde and Dr. Robertson, what is the purpose of hate speech? What are the positive and negative results of the legislation of speech via hate speech laws? Mr. Linde, how are social factors and various legislations of speech preventing needed conversations and the infusion of appropriate expert testimony on relevant medical matters surrounding transgenderism and transsexuality? Dr. Robertson, with postmodernism extant without explicit labelling, and so more easily spread in some ways, how is the nullification of values via the collapse of all principles to the same valuation exacerbating clarity on issues on transgenderism and transsexuality?**

**Linde:** Hate speech serves to rationalize and compensate for feelings of fear and inferiority in the hater. Hate speech legislation is a good if it can prevent physical harm befalling a person or group of people.

Needed conversations are frustrated because the gate keepers of the public platform for discourse are cowed by the trans warriors who redefine the common usage of phobic and hate. For an expanded expression of this see my letter attached.

**Robertson:** *Without free speech, and its twin “freedom of thought,” society ossifies. We lose the ability to meet new challenges in new ways. One of the challenges in improving society is to deal with hate speech and we need freedom of speech to do that. Hate speech is the advocacy of harm to a group of people based on inherent qualities ascribed to that group. Having one’s concept of reality challenged, or one’s entitlements challenged, is not in itself hate speech. We have an example from the transsexual community that brings this to light. There are some who believe that sex is a social construct while one is born with an innate gender. I happen to believe the reverse. People are born with certain genitalia and that is not socially constructed. On the other hand, gender is a social construct – it is how we learn to be a man or a woman. And gender is fluid because there are all sorts of ways of living one’s life as a man or a woman without going through reconstructive surgery. Is it hate speech for me to have this opinion? Some people would say “yes” but that is an abuse of the term. I don’t hate anyone, and I am not telling anyone how they are to live their life, except that they should not live their life in a way that harms other people, or restricts their freedom of speech.*

**Jacobsen:** **Mr. Linde, what seems like the precise ideological premise - not philosophical view as a whole - of "cultural resister radical feminists" behind the cultural resistance? That which leads to the cultural resistance on these particular discussed topics. What is the culture being resisted? How will the split between some of Canadian society and some of American society in legislation lead to different problems to the cultural issues at present? Dr. Robertson, an objective perspective on the issues can be helpful, i.e., sex discrimination in criteria compared to subjective perceptions of self in regards to gender. What facets of the self, of self-perception as in gender, can be close to objective to make some of the issues of gender clearer and more distinct in conscious discrimination in a manner similar to a sex criterion? What aspects of the self in gender will remain entirely, and far, within the realm of the subjective to make these considerations simply harder to delineate?**

**Linde:** If by “cultural resister radical feminists” you mean TERFS or gender critical feminist, I can say this: the population of trans gendered persons in the US and Canada is estimated to be between 1 and 2 %. The opinion survey quoted in my Attached letter says 19% of Brits are in support. Therefore it is the proponents of transitioning who are the resistance to the more dominant culture. The gender critical feminists and those who support them vary on their definitions of a trans woman. They all agree that such a person does not have the life experiences and biology to qualify as entitled to enter women’s special spaces. Not necessarily because of fear. For many it is cultural. Breach of historic privacy.

**Robertson:** *I don’t think gender can be objectively defined. We construct our selves through a menu of possibilities given to us by an increasingly international and cosmopolitan culture, and by new creative possibilities we may invent for ourselves.*

*Part of that construction is how we relate first and foremost to ourselves as sexual beings. In the end, some people may conclude that they were born into the wrong sex, and if they want to change their sex so be it. But it is their subjective notions they are pursuing, nothing objective about it.*

**Jacobsen:** The law, it may stagnate or change here. Mr. Linde, what seems most needing change? Dr. Robertson, how can any future change in law incorporate expert/professional medical and psychological opinions to issues facing a super minority of the national population while causing severe divisions within the sociopolitical environs of the country? Mr. Linde and Dr. Robertson, let's say Canada sits on its hands on issues of transgenderism and transsexuality, what happens at that time? Alternatively, let's say Canada becomes entirely onerous in either sociopolitical direction on issues of transgenderism and transsexuality, what happens in either of these cases? Please take both extremes to provide a personal interpretation of a possible range between the antipodes presented here.

**Linde:** Gender warriors, being outed more and more by the media, respond with increasing animosity and ferocity. ANTIFA is now at every rally. The gender critical feminists and the legions of conservative and faith based citizens who support them remain equally adamant they won't change their positions. It is an intractable confrontation of fundamental human values on both sides. The trans warriors refuse to talk to the other side. The TERFS are always inviting the warriors to talk. Neither side talks to the other. Even the Palestinians and Jews talk to each other. Until and unless each side is prepared to moderate and accommodate the concerns of the other there will be no peace. Period.

**Robertson:** *We live in an era dominated by identity politics where people who are not part of, or do not support our particular tribe are thought of as oppressive, evil, hate mongers. Were either of these sides in the extreme win and define the law, that would result in the negation of the rights of the other. It would be nice if these sides were to come together and come to some agreement, but that is not likely. It is more likely that the great majority who have remained largely silent will tire of the game and will proclaim the rules both sides would have to live by. I would hope those rules would provide for the sanctity of freedom of speech and freedom of expression. I would hope that those rules define objectively when a man becomes a woman and when a woman becomes a man, and that will mean relegating all notions of gender to the subjective. But once a transwoman meets that definition, then she should be accorded all of the rights and privileges our society gives to women. No half measures.*