

Hi Johnnie, I'm just going to get right to my responses to your claims.

"It is impossible to assert a "biological truth" out of context. The "biological truth" is only relevant because of its context and this context is pernicious."

This just isn't true. It is true I have brown eyes. It is true dogs are different from cats. It is true we are more closely related to chimpanzees than oysters. Many birds can fly. Most tigers have sharp teeth and claws. Some species reproduce sexually. Some species contain organisms that are either males and females. These are all biological truths.

"Again, the original article is published as an opinion piece in the Wall Street Journal, not a peer reviewed journal of biology or evolutionary biology."

It wasn't meant to be published in a scientific journal. I am trying to educate lay people on the basic biology of sex. The fact that biological sex is real is not something that needs to be published about anymore. It's an established fact. Please go on Google Scholar and search for the many, *many* thousands of scientific papers describing biological sex in nature. Publishing the claim "biological sex is real" today in a peer reviewed is about as silly as publishing a physics paper saying "gravity is real." Scientists and just about everybody knows these things are real already.

"It is not published as a dialogue amongst evolutionary biologists about the significance of the terms "male" and "female" and the usefulness of those terms in biology-- in the way that the term "species" or "kind" was discussed in the discipline in the past, possibly the present."

Male and female are very different types of categories than species. Males and females don't grow out of and separate from one another incrementally over time. They develop down two very different pathways that reach two very different endpoints. Males and females are real categories, and almost everyone can be instantly and objectively categorized as either male or female at a glance.

"This is an evolutionary biologist and his co-authors claiming to discuss "biological REALITY," and "biological TRUTH" in the disciplines of sociology, political science, sports medicine, parenting and human development, philosophy among others."

I established earlier that there are such things as biological truths and biological reality. Male and female are real categories. We can discuss the nuances of whether things like legal sex, sports sex, or socially observed sex should perfectly correspond to one's biological sex, but that's a different discussion.

"Evolutionary Biological Truth is disagreeing with the American Medical Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Sociological Association, etc.)."

You are confusing biological sex with sex-related characteristics and their social ramifications. That's a different topic. I am talking about primary sex characteristics, not the distribution and

variation of secondary sex characteristics. I am happy to talk about these differences in detail if you'd like.

“While the article pulls up short of prescribing how we should think about trans people--- misguided, confused, diseased, mentally ill, attention seeking, the article is implicitly pathologizing and othering, and the authors seem to be taking a moral high ground as they make these assertions.”

This is absurd Johnnie. We should think of trans people as people! And we should do all we can to help mitigate their gender dysphoria using the best evidence-based methods possible. Again, I never criticize trans PEOPLE, I am criticizing an anti-scientific ideology that has sprung up around it that denies the reality of biological sex.

“If I were teaching how to evaluate an argument from authority in critical thinking, this would be, again, a pernicious example of experts speaking outside of their field of expertise.”

My coauthor is a developmental biologist. This is well within her area of expertise. I am also a biologist and know a lot about the evolution of sex. We are qualified to speak about biological sex.

“Of course biologists shouldn't be talking about gender, it isn't a biological term.”

We didn't really discuss gender, since that wasn't the focus of our essay, and there are a lot of different definitions currently going around. I am happy to talk about gender if you provide a definition though! I am not an expert on gender, but it's a topic I find fascinating!

“We can disagree and still love each other, unless your disagreement is rooted in my oppression and denial of my humanity and right to exist.” The really difficult thing, though, is that it isn't my oppression and denial of my right to "realness" being challenged. It is, however, my son's. It is, however, my students'. It is, however, my friends'. It is, however, my communities'.”

Johnnie, I have never once denied anyone's humanity or right to exist. That's hyperbolic nonsense, sorry. You are real. Your son is real. Your students are real. Your friends are real. Your community is real. So is biological sex.

“Really bothersome to me is that the article trumpets a danger to me as a gay man by the reality of trans-identities.”

Again, no. Trans people don't pose a danger to you. Aspects of gender *ideology* do.

“We use words to describe the world, then we mistake our words for the world and when the world refuses to match our words, we kill it.””

Yes, our words describe the world. Male and female describe two distinct types of reproductive anatomy that develop for the production of small or large sex cells—sperm and eggs,

respectively—and associated biological functions in sexual reproduction. If anyone is “mistaking their words for the real world” it’s you, Johnnie.

Biological sexes are real natural phenomena. That doesn’t stop being true because you don’t wish it to be.

I truly hope we can still be friends, Johnnie.