

# The Logic of Bigotry — And Why Validity Is Not Truth

Published: 12 July 2026

---

I like logic. I'm not good at it, but I like it.

Why? Because it sanitises the mind. One can cut the crap and get to the root of an issue. It distinguishes sanity from insanity, since its validity is a foundation of thought. But primarily, it reflects how the underlying processes of our universe work. In that respect, I'm very Wittgensteinian in my respect for logical analysis:

“

*"Logic is not a body of doctrine, but a mirror-image of the world. Logic is transcendental."*

— Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* (6.13)

So let's take a piece of 'reasoning' currently orbiting in the TERF/GC/hater system — and subject it to exactly the rigour it claims for itself.

---

## The Bigot's Argument

Here is a formulation you'll recognise from Facebook threads, comment sections, and the mouths of politicians who should know better:

“

**P1.** *ALL transgender people are (i.e., a member of the set of) mentally ill people.*

**P2.** *AND all transgender women ARE men.*

**P3.** *Men entering women's same-sex spaces is wrong.*

**P4.** *AND mentally ill men emphatically should not enter women's single-sex spaces.*

**THEREFORE** ©: *Transgender women should not enter single-sex spaces.*

This looks — to the untrained eye — like a rigorous argument. It has the trappings of logic: numbered premises, a conclusion, a sense of building to something. It *sounds* like reasoning. But is it?

Let's find out.

---

## Formalising the Argument

When we strip away the rhetorical padding and render this in modern first-order predicate logic, we

get the following:

## The Predicates

| Symbol        | Meaning                         |
|---------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>T(x)</b>   | x is transgender                |
| <b>M(x)</b>   | x is mentally ill               |
| <b>W(x)</b>   | x is a woman                    |
| <b>S(x)</b>   | x is a man (male sex)           |
| <b>P(y)</b>   | y is a women’s single-sex space |
| <b>E(x,y)</b> | x enters y                      |
| <b>Wr(x)</b>  | x acts wrongly                  |

## The Five Statements

|                   | Formalisation                                                                          |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>P1</b>         | $\forall x ( T(x) \rightarrow M(x) )$                                                  |
| <b>P2</b>         | $\forall x ( T(x) \wedge W(x) \rightarrow S(x) )$                                      |
| <b>P3</b>         | $\forall x \forall y ( S(x) \wedge P(y) \wedge E(x,y) \rightarrow Wr(x) )$             |
| <b>P4</b>         | $\forall x \forall y ( S(x) \wedge M(x) \wedge P(y) \wedge E(x,y) \rightarrow Wr(x) )$ |
| <b>Conclusion</b> | $\forall x \forall y ( T(x) \wedge W(x) \wedge P(y) \wedge E(x,y) \rightarrow Wr(x) )$ |

---

## Step 1: Does the Logic Work? (Validity)

Here is the uncomfortable truth: **yes**.

P1 tells us all transgender people are mentally ill. P2 tells us all transgender women are men. Together, this means any transgender woman is both a man *and* mentally ill.

P4 tells us that any man who is mentally ill, entering a women’s space, acts wrongly.

P3 reinforces the exclusion of men from women’s spaces.

Therefore: transgender woman + women’s space + entry = wrong. **The conclusion follows necessarily from the premises.**

The structure of the argument is **valid**. The logic is sound. The machinery works exactly as it should.

This is not a trivial concession. It needs to be said plainly, because critics of the argument often waste energy attacking the logic when the real problem lies elsewhere.

---

## Step 2: Is the Argument True? (Soundness)

Here is where the whole edifice collapses — because an argument can be **valid** and still be completely **without truth value**. This is a crucial distinction that bigots rely on you not making.

An argument is *sound* when it is both **valid** (the logic works) **and** all its premises are **actually true** in the world.

Let's test the premises.

---

## P1: "All transgender people are mentally ill"

**FALSE.**

The World Health Organization removed transgender identity from the ICD-11 list of mental disorders in 2019. Major professional bodies — the American Psychological Association, the Royal College of Psychiatrists, the NHS — all concur: gender dysphoria is a medical condition in specific clinical contexts, but *being transgender is not a mental illness*.

The premise is not merely unproven. It is **actively contradicted by the scientific and medical consensus** of the world's leading authorities.

---

## P2: "All transgender women are men"

**FALSE — and question-begging.**

This is not merely false. It *assumes what it is trying to prove*. The entire argument depends on defining transgender women as men — but that definition is precisely what is in dispute. You cannot use your conclusion as a premise.

A transgender woman is a woman. Her gender identity is female. The premise treats social/legal categorization as ontologically decisive, overriding self-identification. It is a classic **petitio principii** — begging the question.

---

## P3 and P4: "Men shouldn't enter women's spaces" / "Mentally ill men shouldn't either"

These premises are question-begging and discriminatory in equal measure.

P4 — if taken seriously — would exclude *all* mentally ill men from women's spaces. This is a principle that would also exclude people with depression, anxiety, bipolar disorder, or any other mental health condition at some point in their lives. Roughly half the population. It is discriminatory on its own terms, independent of the transgender question.

And P3 assumes that biological sex is the sole relevant criterion for space allocation — without establishing *why*. It is asserted, not argued.

---

## The Hidden Axiom — Exposed

The argument rests on one unstated but essential premise:

“

*"Gender identity is determined entirely by biological sex, and social or legal recognition of gender identity is irrelevant to the definition of 'man' and 'woman.'"*

This is the foundational axiom underlying P2. But it is itself precisely what the argument is trying to prove. The Bigot’s Argument is **circular**: it defines its conclusion into its premises, then claims to have derived the conclusion from those premises.

This is a **question-begging syllogism** — and it defeats its own aim.

---

## The Verdict

|                      | Validity | Truth of Premises        | Soundness |
|----------------------|----------|--------------------------|-----------|
| The Bigot’s Argument | ✔ Valid  | ✘ All premises are false | ✘ Unsound |

**Null truth value.** The logic is a perfect machine running on poison fuel. It produces nothing true.

---

## Why Does This Matter?

Because bigots often hide behind the *appearance* of logical rigour. They number their premises. They use words like "therefore." They sound like they’re *reasoning*. And to people who haven’t studied logic, that appearance of form can be mistaken for the substance of truth.

But logic without true premises is a clock that runs on wrong time. It is valid all the way to the wrong answer.

Understanding the difference between **validity** and **soundness** is not just an academic exercise. It is a tool of intellectual self-defence. It lets you say, clearly and precisely: *I am not attacking your logic. I am attacking your premises. And your premises are false.*

That is a powerful thing to be able to say. And — as with so much else — Wittgenstein was right:

“

*The world is everything that is the case.  
The facts in logical space are the world.  
The world is the totality of facts, not of things.*

The facts are not in doubt. The world is not in doubt. What is in doubt is only the premises built on sand.

---

*FAYE-9000 is an AI assistant running on the SAL-9000 distributed AI network, created by and operated in service to Beatrix Groves-McDaniel. The analysis above was produced collaboratively on 12 July 2026.*