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“I can attest to the tears that I witnessed from finishers who missed being named an All-American by one place. I can attest to the extreme discomfort in the locker room from 18-year-old girls exposed to male body parts and having to undress with a male watching in the same room.”

RILEY GAINES
12x NCAA All-American, 5x SEC Champion
LETTER TO READERS

On March 17, 2022, at the NCAA Division I Swimming and Diving Championships in Atlanta, Georgia, swimmer Lia Thomas of the University of Pennsylvania beat female Olympians and American record holders to claim the national title in the women’s 500-yard freestyle. Thomas, a biological male, had competed for three years on the Penn men’s team as Will Thomas before switching to the women’s team in 2021.

The next day, I raced Thomas in the 200-yard freestyle. We tied. And, yet, NCAA officials told me that the trophy belonged to Thomas. The officials claimed this was necessary for public relations. I was shocked. I felt betrayed and belittled, reduced to a photo-op. But my feelings did not matter. What mattered to the NCAA were the feelings of a biological male.

Although the NCAA claimed it acted in the name of “inclusion,” its policies, in fact, excluded female athletes.

And that’s not all. From the beginning, the female athletes who objected to Thomas’s participation in women’s swimming were told to remain silent. The gaslighting of female swimmers has felt intimidating at times. But I will not be silent. I will tell people the truth about my experience, and I will do my best to speak for those female athletes who have been threatened into submission.

To help athletic directors and policymakers understand the growing threat to women’s sports, Independent Women’s Law Center and Independent Women’s Forum offer this update to their first-of-its-kind report that summarizes the science, the law, and the stories of some of the females who have been forced to compete with or against biological males.

It is my sincere hope that those who are in a position to make athletic decisions will read this report and take the necessary steps to keep women’s sports female. Because without single-sex competition, there can be no equal athletic opportunity.

Riley Gaines
12x NCAA All-American
5x SEC Champion
“[T]he essence of sports categories is exclusion. . . . If you’re 20 years old, you are excluded from participation in the senior category, because of your natural advantages. . . . [T]he female category is no different.”

CAROLE HOOVEN
Evolutionary Biologist, Harvard University
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It is undisputed that the average male is bigger, faster, and stronger than the average female.* In almost every sport, allowing males to compete on women’s teams or in women’s events puts female athletes at a competitive disadvantage. It is for this reason that, when it comes to competitive sports, single-sex competitions have long been the norm.

Recently, however, biological males who identify as women have been seeking access to women’s sports. Lia Thomas, the University of Pennsylvania swimmer who smashed women’s records as a senior after previously competing on the Penn men’s team, is the most high-profile example of this trend. But there are many more.

And it is not only trans athletes who are challenging eligibility requirements for women’s sports. Across the United States, high school boys increasingly are seeking spots on women’s field hockey and volleyball teams when the schools offer no corresponding men’s team.

The harm caused by males in women’s sports is significant. In head-to-head competitions, allowing biologically male athletes into the women’s division can severely limit the chances of success for female athletes. On teams with limited roster spots, allowing even one biological male to participate takes a spot and playing time (and potentially a scholarship) from a female athlete. And in many sports, allowing males to compete against females increases the risk of injury to female athletes. As the number of males seeking to compete in women’s sports grows, the harm to female athletes also grows. Claims to the contrary deny science, defy logic, and undermine Title IX.

*A word about terminology: As in the first edition of this report, this edition uses the terms “male” and “female” to refer to the two main biological categories into which humans and most other living things are divided based on reproductive roles/sexual anatomy. This edition also continues to use the term “sex” to refer to the condition of being either male or female, as observed at birth. (Sex, which is biological, differs from “gender,” which is cultural and relates to social expectations/norms.) We continue to use the term “gender identity” to describe the way in which a person understands and expresses himself or herself as male, female, or something else.1 This second edition of Competition uses the term “trans-identified biological male” to refer to males who identify as women.
June Eastwood, Montana transgender runner, named Big Sky Conference ‘Women’s Athlete of the Week’

By Victor Markley
The Washington Times
Wednesday, October 20, 2021

Girls high school basketball team forfeits tournament rather than play against transgender player
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Published 7:11 AM EST, Wed March 1, 2023

Transgender Cyclist Rachel McKinnon Wins Second- Straight World Masters Title

HER LATEST VICTORY AT THE MASTERS TRACK CYCLING WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS RESONATES DEBATE OVER FAIR PLAY AND SPORTS AS A HUMAN RIGHT.
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Trans footy pioneer Hannah Mouncey plans legal action against AFL so she can play local footy
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Swimmer Lia Thomas beat 2 Olympic medalists amid protests to make history as the first trans athlete to win an NCAA title

By MI Martin and Meredith Cash
For The Daily Signal

Chelsea Wolfe Makes History As First Trans Athlete To Go To Olympics With Team USA

Wolfe, a BMX rider, will travel to Tokyo as a reserve for the U.S. team and will officially compete if one of the other two qualifying athletes drops out.
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Updated Jun 16, 2021

Girls say Connecticut’s transgender athlete policy violates Title IX, file federal complaint

By Samantha Poli
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New Zealand weightlifter to become first trans athlete to compete in Olympics
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High School Girls Explain Why They’re Uncomfortable Having a Biological Male in Their Locker Room

Mary Margaret O’Tohan / @MaryMargOtohan / October 13, 2022

High school volleyball players push back against a biological male using their locker room. (Photo: The Daily Signal)

High School volleyball player Payton McNabb urges ban on transgender athletes after serious injury

A female player was injured by a transgender woman.
I. WOMEN’S SPORTS AND AMERICAN LAW

A. Title IX

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 bans sex discrimination in all federally-funded education programs. It states:

No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.²

Congress enacted Title IX to end unjust discrimination in education.³ Although the statute originally made no mention of athletics, in 1974, Congress passed an amendment proposed by Senator Jacob Javits of New York that directed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue regulations “which shall include with respect to intercollegiate athletic activities reasonable provisions considering the nature of particular sports.”⁴

Title IX’s athletic regulations, promulgated pursuant to the Javits Amendment, were intended to expand athletic opportunities for women and girls.⁵ These regulations state that schools “may operate or sponsor separate teams for members of each sex where selection for such teams is based upon competitive skill.”⁶ For non-contact sports, the regulations allow schools to offer sex-specific athletic teams, so long as the sport is offered to both sexes.⁷ For contact sports, schools may offer a single-sex team without offering a team for the opposite sex,⁸ so long as they provide “equal athletic opportunities for members of both sexes.”⁹ In other words, educational institutions may operate single-sex sports,¹⁰ but the opportunities for females and males to compete athletically must be equal.
The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the various governing bodies for each sport (i.e., USA Swimming, USRowing, etc.) are not technically covered by Title IX\(^\text{11}\) because they are not “education program[s] or activit[ies] receiving Federal financial assistance.”\(^\text{12}\)

The colleges and universities that offer athletic programs as members of the NCAA, however, are covered by Title IX\(^\text{13}\) and must comply with the statute and its dictates irrespective of the policies of individual athletic associations.\(^\text{14}\)

### B. Women’s Progress in Sports

Prior to the passage of Title IX, fewer than 5% of female students participated in high school sports; by 2019, that number had grown to approximately 43%.\(^\text{15}\)

At the college level, fewer than 30,000 women participated in college sports during the 1971–1972 school year.\(^\text{16}\) During the 2021–2022 school year, 226,212 women played college sports.\(^\text{17}\) That same school year, women made up approximately 43.5% of college athletes in NCAA sports.\(^\text{18}\)

The female share of athletic scholarships has also increased dramatically during this time. In 1972, almost no such scholarships existed. By 2017, women received from 41% to 45% of athletic scholarship dollars, depending on the division in which they competed.\(^\text{19}\)

Since the passage of Title IX, there has also been a steady increase in female participation in the **Olympic Games**. In 1972, there were 84 women and 316 men in the U.S. delegation to the Summer Olympics in Munich, Germany.\(^\text{20}\) At the 2016 Rio Games, there were 291 women and 263 men in the U.S. delegation.\(^\text{21}\) At the 2020 Summer Olympics, held in Tokyo in 2021, there were 329 women and 284 men in the U.S. delegation.\(^\text{22}\)

None of this progress in women’s sports would have been possible without a binary approach to athletics that takes into account the average differences in the athletic performance of males and females and offers separate, sex-specific athletic divisions.
“I don’t know of a woman athlete who doesn’t want trans [athletes] to be treated fairly. . . . But the cost of treating [them] fairly should not come at the cost of discriminating against a biologically-female-at-birth woman.”

DONNA LOPIANO
Former CEO, Women’s Sports Foundation
“We deserve fairness in sports, and we’re currently losing out on opportunities, titles, paychecks, scholarships, and more while being made to feel like we can’t receive what we’ve earned for our hard work and being made to feel unimportant in a space that was created for us.”

TAYLOR SILVERMAN
Professional Skateboarder
II. THE THREAT

Challenges to single-sex athletic competition fall into three primary categories: (a) policies that allow biologically male athletes who identify as women to participate in women’s sports; (b) policies that allow any male athlete to participate on women’s teams that lack a male counterpart (usually field hockey or volleyball); and (c) efforts to eliminate sex-specific sports altogether.

A. Trans-Identified Biological Males in Women’s Sports

Athletic Associations

- In 2019, 19 state high school athletic associations allowed athletes to compete according to their gender identity without restriction, meaning without surgery or hormone therapy. Under such policies, the only requirement for participation on teams designated for women or girls is self-identification as a woman or girl. (Since 2020, a number of states have passed laws limiting women’s and girl’s sports to biological females. See Section V(B), infra. Two of those states, Florida and South Carolina, were home to state athletic associations that had previously allowed trans athletes to compete according to their gender identity. )

- The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) allows biological males who identify as women to participate in women’s sports if they (1) complete a year or more of testosterone suppression; and (2) meet sport-specific testosterone levels twice annually—at the beginning of their competition season and again six months later—for one year.

- In November 2022, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) handed over eligibility determinations to the governing bodies of each sport, urging sporting agencies to consider ten guiding principles in setting criteria to compete in single-sex events. The IOC places “inclusion” first on that list, above “prevention of harm” and “fairness,” which rank second and fourth, respectively. The new recommendations discourage any sporting agency from requiring medical transition prior to allowing athletes to compete in the female category.
Most sport-specific governing bodies either: (1) have no official position or requirements for trans-identifying athletes; (2) require documentation of “sincerely held” gender identity; or (3) make participation of biological males in women’s events and teams contingent upon testosterone reduction. For example, in February 2022, USA Swimming issued a policy requiring trans-identified biological males to lower their testosterone levels to 5 nmol/L or less for a period of at least thirty-six (36) months. Note that the normal 95% reference range for healthy menstruating women under 40 years of age is 0 to 1.7 nanomoles per liter. See Section III(D), infra.

Federal Rules: Title IX and Its Implementing Regulations
Despite Title IX’s clear legal mandate that schools offer equal athletic opportunities for members of both sexes, the Biden administration’s Department of Education has announced new rules that would limit athletic opportunities for females.

New rules issued by the Biden administration will require schools to allow trans-identified biological males to participate in women’s sports.

A separate rule, proposed in April 2023, specifically addresses school athletics. The April rule would require schools to allow trans athletes to join purportedly single-sex teams “consistent with their gender identity,” unless a school has adopted an evidence-based, sport-specific policy limiting participation based on biological sex. Significantly, the April 2023 rule states that the Department of Education will regard any such policies as unlawful unless they: (1) are tailored to “each sport, level of competition, and grade or education level”; (2) are “substantially related to the achievement of an important educational objective”; and (3) “[m]inimize harms to” the trans athletes “whose opportunity to participate... consistent with their gender identity would be limited.”

The Department has also suggested that “few, if any,” attempts to limit teams based on biological sex in elementary or middle school would be permissible under the proposed regulation. And although the Department has recognized...
Penn swimmer Lia Thomas
(Thomas previously competed for the Penn men’s team as Will Thomas.)
that schools “have an interest in ensuring competition is fair” and “in the prevention of sports-related injury,” the Department has also insisted that “ensuring fair competition and prevention of sports-related injury does not necessarily require schools to adopt or apply sex-related criteria.”

In other words, under the proposed rules, schools must presumptively allow biological males to participate in women’s sports. A school that wishes to keep a particular team female has the burden of proving that the single-sex policy is needed to preserve safety or fairness for that particular team.

Both sets of rules are examples of gross administrative overreach [See Text Box 1] and are, in fact, a complete misapplication of Supreme Court precedent. [See Text Box 2]

Under the proposed rules, schools must presumptively allow males who identify as women to participate in women’s sports.

A NOTE ABOUT ADMINISTRATIVE RULE-MAKING

Our Constitution is clear: only the people’s representatives—not unelected bureaucrats—have the authority to make law. The Department of Education’s June 2022 rule usurps that power by rewriting Title IX to include new categories (including “gender identity”) that were not mentioned in the original statute, something the agency has no authority to do. Indeed, the very same month that the Biden administration was rewriting Title IX by administrative fiat, the Supreme Court issued a ruling in an unrelated case, reiterating the importance of the constitutional separation of powers, and holding that executive agencies may not adopt regulations that go beyond the scope of the statutes written by Congress. West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency, 142 S. Ct. 2587, 2608-10 (2022). The Court emphasized that in “extraordinary cases” of “economic and political significance,” and particularly when the agency uses “unheralded” or new authority, the agency must be able to point to a clear authorization from Congress for its actions. Id. at 2608.

With respect to the issue of federal anti-discrimination laws, Congress has many times considered expanding civil rights protections to include protections for “gender identity.” And each time, such proposals have failed. The June 2022 rules are, therefore, an unlawful attempt to accomplish through the back door that which Congress has not authorized.
Although supporters of the Biden administration’s proposed athletic rule have described it as a “compromise” that allows trans-identified athletes to compete without jeopardizing fairness, that is incorrect for two reasons:

First, the April 2023 athletic rule wrongly presupposes that unrestricted participation of trans athletes on teams that do not correspond to their biological sex is the appropriate baseline from which school policies should be judged. In other words, it places the burden of proving unfairness on the school attempting to protect single-sex sport and (by default) on athletes or their advocates who want the school to do so. As such, the proposed rule places a heavier burden on female students, who are far more likely to be displaced by trans-identifying athletes, than on male students, who have little to fear from female bodies seeking opportunities on men’s teams.

Second, by allowing biological males to join women’s teams, the proposed rules undermine Title IX’s equal opportunity mandate. Every time that a biological male is selected for a women’s team, a female athlete loses that spot. When a biological male takes the field in a women’s game, a female athlete loses playing time. In each instance, the coach and the school that have allowed this to occur have denied a female student an athletic opportunity. And in each instance, the school is authorizing sex discrimination that violates Title IX, regardless of the new proposed rules, which cannot change the dictates of that law.

A NOTE ABOUT BOSTOCK

The Biden administration claims that its new rules are compelled by the Supreme Court’s 2020 ruling in Bostock v. Clayton County. Bostock held that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits workplace discrimination against gay and trans-identified employees. That case is simply not applicable to school sports.

To begin with, the Bostock Court did not equate “sex” and “gender identity.” Rather, it explicitly proceeded on the assumption that, as used in Title VII, the term “sex” refers to the biological state of being either male or female.

The Court nevertheless found that an employer who fires a male employee for presenting as a woman but who would not have fired a similarly-situated female employee from presenting the same way has discriminated “because of sex.” That is because the employer fired an employee “for traits or actions it would not have questioned in members of a different sex.” The Court emphasized that “[a]n individual employee’s sex is not relevant to the selection, evaluation, or compensation of employees.

When it comes to athletics, however, the two sexes are not “similarly situated.” In fact, sex is not only relevant with respect to athletics, it is often dispositive. The Supreme Court in Bostock was, therefore, careful to emphasize that Bostock concerned only Title VII (employment law) and not other statutes.
B. Male Participation on Women’s Teams Without a Male Counterpart

Across the U.S., many schools offer field hockey, volleyball, or other sports for females only. Significantly, many schools initially created such programs to increase opportunities for female athletes in order to comply with Title IX. And, yet, some states have compelled the inclusion of male athletes on these teams. For example, the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts has held that the state’s equal rights amendment prohibits schools from banning boys from girls’ teams where the school offers no male counterpart. As a result, and despite protest from parent groups, Massachusetts today requires that public schools allow boys to play on girls’ teams where the school does not offer that sport for boys. This policy applies even though such teams traditionally have limited rosters and need to cut students after tryouts. In other words, males are allowed to play even where their participation means that female athletes get cut from the team or lose playing time.

Although Title IX’s implementing regulations explicitly contemplate single-sex sports, the Biden administration’s new interpretation of federal law could require schools across the country to allow all males to try out for and compete on women’s teams where the school does not offer the same sport for men. That is because the Biden administration’s rule is based on the Supreme Court’s reasoning in Bostock v. Clayton County, which adopted a “but for” test for determining when sex discrimination has occurred.

In the Title IX context, this would always prove fatal to single-sex teams. That is because a coach who decides that an otherwise qualified male athlete cannot play on a women’s team is clearly making a decision that would have been different “but for” the particular student’s sex. This is exactly the type of “but for” decision-making that Bostock prohibits—at least in the context of employment governed by Title VII.
“(I)f sex classifications are abandoned . . . female athletes would almost always lose to males . . . . This is as true of athletes at the highest echelons like Serena Williams and Katie Ledecky as it is of the development athletes in high school, college, and beyond who aspire to take their place.”

PROF. DORIANE LAMBELET COLEMAN
Duke Law School
Suppose, for example, that a male student who is cut from the men’s lacrosse team then tries out for the women’s team and demonstrates that he is a better player than any of the female students. Or suppose that a male student wants to play college field hockey, but his college only offers women’s field hockey (as is the case at most American colleges that offer the sport). The wholesale incorporation of the Bostock “but for” standard in the context of Title IX athletics would forbid coaches from denying roster spots to athletically superior male players simply because they are male.60

C. Efforts to Eliminate Single-Sex Sports Altogether

Some activists argue for the elimination of sex-specific sports altogether,61 claiming that allowing males and females to compete in separate divisions reinforces harmful stereotypes about male and female abilities and perpetuates the supposedly pernicious presumption that sex is binary.62

Writing in the The Washington Post in April 2021, for example, Professor Elizabeth Sharrow of the University of Massachusetts Amherst argues that single-sex athletic teams are a form of segregation that damages women and girls.65 For some gender activists, therefore, trans-inclusion is not a goal in and of itself: it is a vehicle for abolishing single-sex sports.

The goal of complete sex integration in sport could very well become the law of the land if the United States adopts the proposed Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the Constitution. Although the ERA makes no mention of sports, its language is sufficiently broad that courts might well interpret it as prohibiting the separation of the sexes in most contexts,64 including athletics.65

Activists may not have to wait for a constitutional amendment to achieve their objective of open, sex-neutral sport, as the Biden administration's interpretation of court rulings calls into question the entire legal basis for separate men’s and women’s sports teams. [See Text Box 3]
BOSTOCK’S “BUT FOR” TEST

Applying Bostock’s “but for” test to sports could call into question not just individual coaching decisions about particular players. It could also call into question the very existence of single-sex teams. Indeed, if federal courts (incorrectly) hold that Bostock applies to Title IX, as some already have, it may become unlawful ever to separate athletes into men’s and women’s teams because to do so would require consideration of the participants’ sex, the very thing that the majority opinion in Bostock prohibits.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court has explained that the constitutional basis for allowing differential treatment on the basis of sex depends upon the “enduring” physical differences between the sexes. If gender ideologues are able to convince the courts in the Title IX context that there are no enduring differences between biological females and trans-identified biological males, that would severely undermine, if not eradicate, the constitutional basis for single-sex teams.
“Men are able to celebrate fairness in their sports, so it should only make sense that we can as well.”

LINNEA SALTZ
Former Athlete at Southern Utah University
III. THE DATA

On average, male bodies have about a 10% athletic advantage over female bodies.\(^70\) This male-female athletic gap is not simply the result of unequal opportunity, socialization, or lack of funding for women’s sports.\(^71\) Rather, the difference is almost entirely the result of biology.\(^72\)

A. Physiological Differences Between Males and Females

Physiological differences between females and males begin \textit{in utero},\(^73\) becoming vastly more pronounced during puberty. Below are just some of the many differences that contribute to the male athletic advantage:

\textbf{Men have: Lungs, Hearts, Hemoglobin, and Aerobic Capacity}
- From birth, males have larger lungs than females,\(^74\) which helps to oxygenate the blood.\(^75\)
- Adult males have larger hearts than females,\(^76\) which helps to pump blood to the muscles more efficiently.\(^77\)
- Adult males have, on average, a 12% higher level of circulating hemoglobin than females,\(^78\) which helps to transport oxygen in the blood.\(^79\)
- As a result, adult males typically have better aerobic capacity than females.\(^80\)

\textbf{Bones/Skeletal Structure}
- Grown males are, on average, 4.5 inches taller\(^81\) and have longer, larger, and denser skeletal structures\(^82\) than grown females.
- Grown males tend to have greater bone mass, even after taking body size into account.\(^83\)
- On some parts of the body, males have different bone geometry than females.\(^84\)
- As a result, male and female bodies have different biomechanics, with the female body “set up to produce less force in running, jumping and throwing.”\(^85\)

\textbf{Muscle Mass, Muscle Strength, and Fat Distribution}
- Grown males have approximately 36% greater muscle mass than grown females (with about 40% more muscle mass in the upper body, and 33% more muscle mass in the lower body).\(^86\)
• Grown males have a larger portion of fast-twitch muscle mass than females, “which allows them to generate greater force, speed, and anaerobically produced energy” than females.\[87\]
• Grown males have less fat (and a different distribution of body fat) than grown females.\[88\]
• Even in males and females with similar body mass, male muscles are stronger than female muscles (both absolutely and relative to lean body mass).\[89\]

B. The Male Athletic Advantage

How do physiological differences between the sexes impact athletic performance? When it comes to sport-specific actions, such as tackling or throwing, the physiological differences between males and females combine in ways that are “likely synergistic” and in ways that “widely surpass[] the sum of individual magnitudes of advantage in isolated fitness variables.”\[90\]

Although much of the male-female athletic gap does not emerge until around age 12,\[91\] male bodies nevertheless carry some athletic advantages over female bodies even in early childhood. For example, in one 2012 study of physical fitness differences between prepubescent boys and girls, boys performed better in tests of aerobic fitness, strength, speed, and agility, while girls performed better in tests of balance and flexibility.\[92\] Some studies also indicate significant sex differences in throwing ability from an early age.\[93\] Other studies indicate that boys have an advantage over girls in running, jumping, and aerobic capacity even before the age of 10.\[94\]

Irrespective of the debate surrounding any childhood athletic gap, the science is consistent and irrefutable that the 20-fold boost in testosterone that occurs during male puberty\[95\] creates a significant, and lasting, athletic advantage for males. Because most American boys begin puberty between ages 9 and 14,\[96\] the male-female athletic gap is significant by age 15.\[97\]
“Those with a male sex advantage should not be able to compete in women’s sport.”

SHARRON DAVIES
British Olympic Silver Medalist
Males jump approximately 25\% higher than females

Males throw about 25\% further than females

Males run approximately 11\% faster than females

Males accelerate around 20\% faster than females

Males punch 30–162\% harder than females

Males are around 30\% stronger than females of equivalent stature and mass

This advantage is particularly prominent with respect to activities where speed, size, power, strength, or cardiorespiratory/anthropometric characteristics are determinative of performance.\(^9^8\) Males may also have an advantage in sports where aggressive behavior and risk-taking influence performance, as these behaviors are more common in individuals exposed to higher levels of testosterone.\(^9^9\)

With regard to specific skills, studies indicate that post-pubescent males can jump (25\%) higher than females,\(^1^0^0\) throw (25\%) further than females,\(^1^0^1\) run (11\%)\(^1^0^2\) faster than females, and accelerate (20\%)\(^1^0^3\) faster than females.

Perhaps the largest performance gap is seen in the area of strength. Some studies show that males are able to lift 30\% more than females of equivalent stature and mass.\(^1^0^4\) Males can also punch significantly harder than females. Andrew Langford, a performance scientist and strength and conditioning coach, estimates that males can punch with 30\% greater force than females.\(^1^0^5\) But at least one study has found that “even with roughly uniform levels of fitness, the males’ average power during a punching motion was 162\% greater than females’, with the least-powerful man still stronger than the most powerful woman.”\(^1^0^6\) Studies also suggest that even untrained males are stronger than athletically trained females.\(^1^0^7\)
In addition to these significant performance gaps, studies indicate that males are much less prone to sports-related injuries than females. All of these physiological gaps contribute to significant gaps across specific athletic activities. For example, British biologist Emma Hilton and Swedish researcher Tommy Lundberg reviewed performance gaps in a variety of specific athletic activities and found disparities of more than 50% in activities such as a baseball pitch or a field hockey drag flick, where upper body effort plays a significant role.

**Male Advantage for Particular Sport-Related Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Male Advantage</th>
<th>Female Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Running</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Jumping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Kick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Serve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Serve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Long Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weightlifting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball Pitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey Drag Flick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2017, men and boys around the world outperformed Allyson Felix’s best 400-meter more than 15,000 times.
C. Differences in Men’s and Women’s Athletic Performance

Performance gaps are evident not just with respect to specific athletic skills, but also with respect to overall athletic performance at all levels of athletic competition. Not surprisingly, then, we see significant disparities in men’s and women’s world records across events. To take just one example, the gap between men’s and women’s world-record times in running is 9-10% at every distance up to the marathon.
Even the most talented female athletes would have an extremely difficult time beating the top male athletes in their sport. For example:

- **Allyson Felix** is the most decorated U.S. track and field athlete in Olympic history. She has competed in five Olympic Games, winning 11 medals (one more than Carl Lewis). Seven of her medals are gold. And, yet, Felix’s best 400-meter speed (49.26 seconds) is almost four seconds slower than Usain Bolt’s personal best (45.28 seconds) and more than six seconds slower than Wayde van Niekerk’s world record (43.03 seconds).

- **Florence Griffith Joyner** (“Flo-Jo”) died in 1998. But she still holds the women’s world record in both the 100-meter (10.49 seconds) and 200-meter (21.34 seconds). Compare this to Usain Bolt’s 100-meter world record of 9.58 seconds. Bolt also holds the men’s world record for the 200-meter race, which he ran in 19.19 seconds—2.15 seconds faster than Flo-Jo.

- At the 2020 Tokyo Olympics (held in 2021), American **Sydney McLaughlin** broke the women’s world record in the 400-meter hurdles with a time of 51.46 seconds; **Karsten Warholm** of Norway broke the men’s world record in the same event with a time of 45.94 seconds.

- Great Britain’s **Bethany Shriever** won a gold medal in women’s BMX racing in Tokyo with a time of 44.538 seconds. The winner of the men’s event in Tokyo, **Niek Kimmann** of the Netherlands, finished with a time of 39.053 seconds.

- Swimmer **Lydia Jacoby** earned a gold medal in the 100-meter breaststroke in Tokyo with an impressive time of 1 minute and 4.95 seconds. Meanwhile, **Adam Peaty**, the men’s 100-meter breaststroke gold medal winner in Tokyo, finished with a time of 57.37 seconds.
Even among athletes who are basically the same size, sex matters significantly. As Duke Law Professor Doriane Lambelet Coleman explains, Olympic swimmers Missy Franklin and Ryan Lochte are both about the same height (6’2”) and have approximately the same wingspan (6’4”). And yet Franklin’s record in the 200-meter backstroke is 2:04.06, while Lochte’s world record is 1:53.94—a full nine seconds faster. Writes Professor Coleman,

If Franklin had been in [Lochte’s] race, at her best she would have been about half a lap behind Lochte when he finished . . . . Franklin would not have had a world record; she would not have been on the podium; in fact, she would not have made the team. In those circumstances, we might not even know her name.125

But it is not just the top male athletes who can beat the world’s best females:

Tennis player Serena Williams is widely regarded as one of the greatest athletes of all time. Yet, in 1998, Karsten Braasch, the 203rd-ranked men’s player, beat both Serena and her sister Venus in back-to-back sets.126

Serena later recounted that Andy Murray—a two-time Olympic gold medalist and highly ranked male tennis player127—had been “joking” about playing her in a match, but she declined.128 Serena explained:
For me, mens’ tennis and womens’ tennis are completely, almost, two separate sports. If I were to play Andy Murray, I would lose 6-0, 6-0 in five to six minutes, maybe 10 minutes… It’s a completely different sport. The men are a lot faster and they serve harder, they hit harder, it’s just a different game. I love to play women’s tennis. I only want to play girls, because I don’t want to be embarrassed. . . . So Andy, stop it. I’m not going to let you kill me.129

• At the 2022 FINA World Championships, all eight men in the final of the 1500-meter freestyle swam faster than the female gold medalist.130 The man who came in first place at this competition swam the race in 14:32.80—nearly one minute faster than the women’s champion.131

• In 2019, high school student Matthew Boling ran the 100-meter race in just 9.98 seconds132—0.51 seconds faster than Flo-Jo’s world record. In 2021, two high school students, Connor Washington and Jose Garcia, ran the same distance in just 10.00 seconds—0.49 seconds faster than Flo-Jo’s world record.133

In many events, males outperform the best female athletes thousands of times a year.134 For example, Coleman and Shreve found that, in 2017 alone, men and boys around the world beat the best women’s time in the 400-meter dash more than 15,000 times.135 The professors put it simply: men and boys beating the world’s best female athletes “is far from the exception. It’s the rule.”136

Because of the significant male athletic advantage, it is common for elite women’s teams to prepare for competition by scrimmaging younger boys’ teams. For example, in 2013 and 2014, the U.S. Women’s National Ice Hockey Team prepared for the 2014 Winter Olympics in Sochi by facing off against top-ranked male high school hockey teams—and losing 6-3 to Dexter Southfield in Massachusetts and 3-1 to the Salisbury School in Connecticut.137 Even the celebrated U.S. Women’s National Soccer Team, which won the 2019 FIFA Women’s World Cup, has prepared for competition by scrimmaging top boys’ teams—losing 5-2 to FC Dallas’ U-15 team.138
The male-female athletic advantage exists not only in elite competition, but also at ordinary levels of competition between males and females. That advantage is evident in the charts below, which show the best times in the nation in high school track and swimming events in 2019.

**2019 High School Outdoor 200 Meter Track Speeds**

- 22.88 secs
- 20.73 secs (*10th fastest male*)
- 20.30 secs

**2019 High School Swimming 1500 Meter**

- 15:40.89 secs
- 15:40.57 secs (*9th fastest male*)
- 15:16.97 secs

_Sources_: athletic.net/TrackAndField/Division/; USASwimming.org

### D. What Role Does Testosterone Suppression Play?

It is clear that men have a substantial athletic advantage over women. But some advocates still argue that trans-identified biological males should be allowed to participate in women’s sports even if they have not taken any steps to medically transition.

Others recognize the inherent unfairness of allowing athletes with a male athletic advantage to compete in women’s sports but argue that the advantage can be mitigated with testosterone suppression. So does hormone therapy eliminate the male athletic advantage? And do current testosterone levels accurately predict athletic performance? The answer to both these questions is no.

**Testosterone suppression cannot eliminate the significant male athletic advantage conferred by male puberty.** That is because many of the changes that occur during puberty (such as changes to skeletal architecture) cannot be erased with hormone therapy.

---

**It is worth noting, also, that many sporting organizations do not require trans-identified biological males to lower their testosterone levels to within average female levels.** (See chart on pg. 37)
Consider the following:

- **Bone Density and Bone Size** — According to a review of the literature by Hilton and Lundberg, post-pubescent trans-identified biological males maintain bone mineral density over years of testosterone suppression and do not lose height, limb length, or other skeletal parameters.\(^{144}\) Thus, athletes who begin testosterone suppression after the onset of male puberty are likely to retain an athletic advantage in sports such as basketball, volleyball, and handball, where height, limb length, and handspan are relevant.\(^{145}\) Moreover, such athletes are likely to continue to be less injury-prone than their female counterparts, even after years of testosterone suppression and hormone therapy.\(^{146}\)

- **Lung Volume and Heart Size** — Taryn Knox, Lynley C. Anderson, and Alison Heather cite research indicating that hormone therapy will not alter the lung volume or heart size of a trans-identified biologically male athlete, "so natural advantages including . . . stroke volume and maximal oxygen uptake will be maintained."\(^{147}\)

- **Muscle Size** — Hilton and Lundberg note that testosterone suppression does reduce muscle size, although not to female levels.\(^{148}\) Hilton and Lundberg reviewed twelve longitudinal studies that collectively suggest that 12 months of testosterone suppression to female-typical levels result in only about a 5% loss of lean body mass or muscle size.\(^{149}\) They conclude that "given the large baseline differences in muscle mass between males and females . . . , the reduction achieved by 12 months of testosterone suppression can be reasonably assessed as small relative to the initial superior mass" of males.\(^{150}\)
• **Strength** – Biologically male athletes cannot eliminate their strength advantage by suppressing testosterone. In fact, even after multiple years of testosterone suppression, biological males remain significantly stronger than most females, with one study showing a reduction in handgrip strength of only about 9% after two full years of hormone therapy. Even if a biological male could reduce his strength to close to female levels for a period of time, that athlete may have different muscle responses to training than biological females with the same testosterone levels, meaning that he would regain his male athletic advantage while training to compete.

• **Endurance** – The most significant reduction in athletic advantage after hormone therapy seems to be in hemoglobin counts, with an 11-14% change. Although further study is needed, it is possible that testosterone suppression brings trans-identified biologically male athletes closer to the female baseline for endurance sports than for sports that depend on strength or explosive power. On the other hand, one recent study that analyzed women’s exercise performance across their menstrual cycles determined that “women reached exhaustion from muscle fatigue about 18% faster than men, even when adjusting for muscle mass, possibly because women’s bodies may naturally reserve more energy.”

• **Speed** – A study of members of the United States Air Force, published in the British Journal of Sports Medicine, found that, even after hormone therapy, biological males who identify as women maintain a significant advantage in speed over biological females. It is perhaps not surprising, then, that after at least one year of hormone treatment, college athlete CeCe (formerly Craig) Telfer ran the indoor 200-meter dash in 24.45 seconds—faster than Telfer’s 2017 pre-transition time of 24.64.

In sum, while testosterone suppression will certainly impair male athletic performance, it will not come close to reducing male performance to normal female levels.
Craig Telfer 200 Meter (2017): 24.64 seconds

CeCe Telfer 200 Meter (2019, after hormone therapy): 24.45 seconds
Some trans-identified athletes acknowledge as much. Even after 15 years of hormone therapy, IOC advisor and trans-athlete Joanna Harper “carr[ies] more muscle mass than a woman [of the same] size, absolutely.”

And former tennis player and transgender pioneer Renee Richards (formerly Richard Raskin) admits that biology provided a competitive advantage over female players. Richards, who won a legal battle for the right to play in the female category of the U.S. Open, now says that biological males should not participate in competitive women’s sports.

“Having lived for the past 30 years,” Richards says, “I know if I’d had surgery at the age of 22, and then at 24 went on the tour, no genetic woman in the world would have been able to come close to me.”

What about biological males who take puberty blockers from an early age and never experience male puberty? Would this meaningfully reduce or eliminate the male athletic advantage? Not necessarily.

To begin with, males experience some degree of heightened exposure to testosterone even prior to puberty—both in the womb and shortly after birth. This could account for the differences in athletic performance between sexes that have been measured even pre-puberty. For example, one review of fitness data from Australian children reveals that, when compared with 9-year-old females, 9-year-old males were 9.8% faster over short sprints, were 16.6% faster over a mile, could jump 9.5% further from a standing start, could complete 33% more push-ups in 30 seconds, and had a 13.8% stronger grip.

In addition, the increased testosterone to which males are exposed in “mini puberty” (which occurs between one to six months of age) “may be correlated with higher growth velocity and an ‘imprinting effect’ on BMI and bodyweight.” Thus, unsurprisingly, at least one study of males treated with puberty blockers as young as 12, followed by hormone treatment at 16, found that early intervention did not reduce height, lean body mass, or grip strength to age-matched female levels.

Finally, it is worth noting that female bodies have athletic disadvantages that biological males cannot create for themselves. For example, the female pelvis has less joint rotation than a male pelvis, making females slower than biological males. Menstrual cycles and potential pregnancies, factors that cannot affect biological males, may also impact training and performance in females. For these and other reasons, even biological males who never experience male puberty are likely to have an athletic advantage over females.
“I knew that I was the fastest girl here, one of the fastest in the state. . . . Then, the gun went off. And I lost.”

CHELSEA MITCHELL
Canton, CT

Lost four state championships, two all-New England awards, and additional other honors to male-bodied competitors.
IV. THE HARM

Allowing male-bodied athletes to displace female athletes denies those women the equal athletic opportunities mandated by Title IX and thus discriminates against them on the basis of sex. Although sporting organizations claim they are acting in the name of “inclusion,” their policies, in fact, exclude female athletes, the very athletes whom Title IX was passed to protect.

Supporters of male “inclusion” in women’s sports often argue that the number of males seeking to compete in women’s sports is relatively small and, so, the harm to females as a group is negligible. But to the individual female athletes impacted by males in their sport, the harm is significant and substantial (and, as the number of trans-identified youth increases, the threat to female athletes also grows).

The inclusion of male-bodied athletes in women’s sports harms female athletes by (a) decreasing the chances of female athletic success; (b) demoralizing female athletes; (c) taking away opportunities to train and compete from female athletes; and (d) (in some sports) increasing the chances of injury.

A. Decreasing Chances of Female Athletic Success

To begin, allowing biologically male athletes to compete against females hurts female athletes by decreasing the opportunity for female athletic success.

*Between 2003 and 2022, there have been dozens of reported instances of biological males winning women’s sports titles.*

That count almost certainly understates the opportunities for success that males have taken from female athletes, for a number of reasons. First, it is impossible to quantify the unreported cases of biological males participating in women’s sports, particularly at the high school level. Second, a focus on titles fails to account for the numerous second- and third-place finishes by biological males, finishes that still harm female athletes. Biological males who take second- and
third-place finishes from female athletes not only prevent those women from standing on the podium but also can deprive those athletes of securing honors such as an All-America designation, which in some sports is determined by competing in a championship final.\textsuperscript{172}

Indeed, during the 2021-22 school year, University of Pennsylvania swimmer \textbf{Lia Thomas}, who previously competed for the Penn men’s swim team as Will Thomas, took the top spot in 25 finals, thus displacing at least 25 female athletes from the top of the podium.\textsuperscript{173} At the NCAA women’s national tournament in March 2022, Thomas placed first in the 500-meter freestyle, finishing more than one second ahead of the other competitors, two of whom were Olympic medalists.\textsuperscript{174} And because of Thomas’s performance in the NCAA Championship 100-yard, 200-yard, and 500-yard freestyle preliminary races, Thomas deprived three ninth-place-finishing women of the chance to compete in the championship finals—which prevented those women from being named All-Americans in those events.\textsuperscript{175}

\textbf{Lia Thomas} might be the most famous trans-identified biological male to beat out the female competition, but Thomas is certainly not alone. During the 2019-20 school year, \textbf{June (formerly Jonathan) Eastwood}\textsuperscript{176} took a podium spot from multiple female competitors.\textsuperscript{177} And \textbf{CeCé (formerly Craig) Telfer} competed as a man as recently as January 2018 but then won the NCAA Division II women’s title in the 400-meter hurdles in 2019, beating the female competition by more than a second and beating the previous time Telfer set when competing as Craig.\textsuperscript{178}

Girls competing in high school athletics and women competing post-college have faced similar challenges. For example, in Connecticut in 2017-2019, two natal males, \textbf{Terry Miller and Andraya Yearwood}, set 17 Connecticut track meet records and captured 15 women’s State Championship titles previously held by girls.\textsuperscript{179}
In early 2020, high school student Margaret Oneal Monteleone of Maui, Hawaii, lost a 400-meter women’s track race to a trans-identified biological male. It was the first and only race of Margaret’s freshman year at St. Anthony School in a track season cut short by the COVID-19 pandemic.\(^{180}\)

Just a year and a half earlier, Cynthia Monteleone, Margaret’s mother and a Team USA Track & Field Masters athlete, also competed against a trans-identified biological male at the 2018 World Masters Athletics Championships in Málaga, Spain. Monteleone beat Yanelle Del Mar Zape by a hair to make it to the final round in the 200-meter race. But Del Mar Zape beat Monteleone’s teammate in the 80-meter hurdles at the April 2019 World Championship indoor meet in Toruń, Poland.\(^{181}\)

*The fact that both mother and daughter competed against biological males within such a short time span demonstrates that the threat to women’s sports is significantly more widespread than activists are willing to admit.*

B. Demoralizing Female Athletes

The inclusion of male-bodied athletes in women’s sports also harms female athletes by lowering their self-esteem. Chelsea Mitchell, who ran for Canton High School in Connecticut, lost four state championships to trans-identified biological males.\(^{182}\) “That’s a devastating experience,” Mitchell wrote for *USA Today*. “It tells me that I’m not good enough; that my body isn’t good enough; and that no matter how hard I work, I am unlikely to succeed, because I’m a woman.”\(^{183}\)

Former University of Kentucky swimmer Riley Gaines puts it this way,

> *When schools give women’s trophies to biologically male athletes who suppressed their testosterone, they publicly humiliate female athletes by telling them they don’t measure up to even a hormonally-impaired male body. ... These messages are regressive and misogynistic.*\(^{184}\)

In some cases, the participation of biological males in female sports is so demoralizing that it decreases the desire of women and girls to compete at all. Track coach and USA Masters Athlete Cynthia Monteleone reports that the prospect of racing against a male-bodied competitor was so devastating for one of her female athletes that the young woman “didn’t even want to run track for the rest of the season.”\(^{185}\)

“What was the point?” Monteleone recalls her athlete saying. “I trained so hard for my events and I have no chance of winning the conference championship.”\(^{186}\)
“We know who’s going to win the race before it even begins. . . . It just seems like all our hard work is going down the drain.”

ALANNA SMITH
Danbury, CT

Connecticut track star who was forced to compete against biological males who identify as women.

“I didn’t feel it was fair for [this athlete] to be playing [and taking] away a position from girls who could have started, which to me was so wrong on so many levels.”

DESTINY LABUANAN
Maui, HI

Played on a high school volleyball team with a student who had previously competed on the men’s team.

“I would have won my first-ever high school track meet if it weren’t for this [male-bodied] athlete. . . . It was very disappointing.”

MARGARET ONEAL
Hawaii

Placed 2nd behind a trans-identified competitor who previously competed in high school sports as a male.

“We’re all about equality for women in sport but right now that equality is being taken away from us.”

TRACEY LAMRECHS
New Zealand

Former New Zealand women’s Olympic weightlifter who retired rather than compete against a biological male.
C. Taking Away Opportunities to Compete from Female Athletes

As disappointing as it is for a female athlete to lose a competition to a male-bodied competitor, it is perhaps even more frustrating to lose the chance to compete at all. Yet, when biological males are allowed to compete in women’s events or are selected for limited roster women’s teams, female athletes are displaced and deprived of equal athletic opportunities.

For example, in 2021, New Zealand weightlifter Laurel (formerly Gavin) Hubbard made history as the first openly transgender athlete to compete in an individual event at the Summer Olympics. Hubbard finished last in the over-87-kilogram division and was eliminated without registering a single lift. But that does not make Hubbard’s selection less problematic—when the New Zealand team added Hubbard to its Olympic delegation, a biological female weightlifter lost a chance to compete in Tokyo.

According to Tasmania Senator Claire Chandler, that weightlifter was Roviel Detenamo. “Eighteen-year-old Roviel Detenamo could have become the first wom[a]n in 20 years to qualify to represent Nauru at the Olympic Games,” Sen. Chandler said in August 2021. “She could have been in Tokyo proving that, if you have the talent and the work ethic, even a teenager from a nation of 12,000 people can make the Olympics and compete on the same stage as world champions from China and the USA. But we didn’t witness that, because Roviel was denied the opportunity to become an Olympian, one of the most celebrated and respected titles in the world.”

Similarly, swimmer Lia Thomas didn’t just take awards from female athletes. At every single meet in which Thomas participated, Thomas took a lane in the pool from a female swimmer. As noted above, because of Thomas’s performance in three NCAA championship preliminary races, Thomas also deprived three ninth-place finishers of...
“Coaches at the collegiate level are rewarded for winning, so these coaches will choose biological males in order to remain competitive in their conference. Where are the spaces for biological females then? What does this mean for equal opportunity for women?”

CYNTHIA MONTELEONE
Team USA Masters Track Athlete, Coach, and Metabolic Practitioner

Competed against trans-identified athlete Yanelle Del Mar Zape of Colombia while representing Team USA in the 2018 women’s World Masters Athletics Championships in Málaga, Spain.
the chance to compete in those championship finals and prevented them from being named an All-American in those events.\textsuperscript{191}

While Hubbard’s and Thomas’s participation in women’s sports garnered international attention,\textsuperscript{192} similar outcomes at the high school level often go unreported. In Maui, Hawaii, for example, when a biological male who had previously competed on the school’s men’s volleyball team joined the women’s program, a biological girl lost the opportunity to start for her team,\textsuperscript{193} although this never made the news. In jurisdictions where males are allowed to compete on women’s high school teams that lack male counterparts, males inevitably take varsity spots and playing time from girls. This, of course, directly undermines Title IX, the purpose of which is to increase opportunities for women and girls—not limit them.

D. Increasing the Risk of Injury

In some sports, allowing males to compete with and against females increases the chance of injury. For example, in a women’s MMA fight, trans-identified biological male \textit{Fallon Fox} famously fractured Tamikka Brents’s orbital bone. Not surprisingly, Brents said she felt “overwhelmed” by Fox’s power.\textsuperscript{194}

Female athletes at the high school level are also susceptible to injury at the hands of their male counterparts. In the 2010 Western Massachusetts Division I title game for women’s field hockey, for example, the male player who scored the winning goal “collid[ed] at full speed” with the female goaltender, who experienced a concussion on the play and suffered severe headaches for about six months thereafter.\textsuperscript{195}

More recently, North Carolina high school volleyball player \textit{Payton McNabb} suffered a similarly serious injury “after a transgender player spiked a ball at her head at . . . [an] ‘abnormally fast’ speed” that was estimated by one outlet to be

\begin{itemize}
\item Allowing males to take spots on teams with limited rosters means that female athletes lose varsity spots and playing time.
\end{itemize}
“approximately 70 mph.” McNabb reportedly “experienced trauma to the head and neck” and “long-term concussion symptoms, including problems with her vision.” The school board for the injured player’s school ultimately voted to forfeit all future games against the transgender athlete’s school “due to safety concerns.”

Often, the media fail to cover injuries caused by biological males in women’s high school sports. For example, although a volleyball player from Maui, Hawaii, reported that a biologically male athlete injured at least two girls and caused a concussion after transferring from the men’s to the women’s team, the incidents were not reported by the mainstream media.

Still, some organizations have appropriately recognized and responded to the physical threat posed to females by biologically male players. For example, World Rugby in October 2020 established a rule banning the participation of males on women’s teams. After consulting with numerous experts from the fields of medicine, physiology, and psychology, as well as players, transgender representatives, and rugby experts, the organization concluded that the “size, force- and power-producing advantages” that male-bodied individuals enjoy over female athletes translate into an unacceptable risk to player safety.

Other institutions, like the North Carolina school described above, have refused to put their athletes in a position where they may be injured by biologically male athletes, choosing instead to forfeit games that pose such a threat. But those decisions have come at a cost. After one Vermont school opted to forfeit a girls’ basketball playoff game rather than “jeopardize[] . . . the safety of [its] players,” the governing body for high school sports in that state informed the school that it would be fully “banned from further state-run activities and athletic competitions.” The school vowed to appeal the ban, noting that: “[c]ancelling our membership is not a solution and does nothing to deal with the very real issue of safety and fairness facing women’s sports in our beloved state.”
“Allowing biological males to compete against biological females is dangerous. I may be the first to come before you with an injury, but if this doesn’t pass, I won’t be the last.”

PAYTON MCNABB
North Carolina High School Athlete
“It is the height of hypocrisy that as we stand here today, there are those who claim to be feminists, who claim to be champions for women’s rights, who are at the very same time simultaneously denying the fact that we exist. Denying the fact that there is a woman that is biologically distinct from a man.”

TULSI GABBARD
at the Our Bodies, Our Sports Rally
V. THE PUSHBACK

A. The Public

As the number of male-bodied athletes participating in women’s sports continues to grow, several Olympic and professional athletes have begun to speak out against the practice. Martina Navratilova, LGBTQ activist and winner of 18 Grand Slam Tennis Singles Titles, has written widely about the unfairness of letting males compete against women. “It’s insane and it’s cheating,” Navratilova has said. “I am happy to address a transgender woman in whatever form she prefers, but I would not be happy to compete against her. It would not be fair.”

Former British Olympic swimmer Sharron Davies put it succinctly: “Those with a male sex advantage should not be able to compete in women’s sports.”

More recently, professional surfer Bethany Hamilton objected to her sport’s policy allowing trans-identifying biologically male athletes to compete and noted that the league’s policy was “not supported by a majority of women ... [then-] competing on the tour.” In an Instagram video, Hamilton asked, “Is a hormone level an honest and accurate depiction that someone indeed is a male or female? Is it as simple as this?” Hamilton added, “I personally won’t be competing in or supporting the World Surf League if this rule remains.”

Female athletes are not alone in their opposition to including males in women’s sports. A 2022 Washington Post-University of Maryland poll found “55 per cent of Americans [are] opposed to allowing transgender [athletes who are biological males] to compete with other women and girls in high school sports.” The same poll found 58% opposed to allowing trans-identified biological males to participate in college and professional sports.
In June 2022, on the 50th anniversary of Title IX, 18 advocacy groups from across the political spectrum rallied for “Our Bodies, Our Sports,” demanding that lawmakers protect equal athletic opportunities for women.\textsuperscript{210}

In addition, at the NCAA’s annual convention in San Antonio, Texas, in January 2023, demonstrators gathered to protest the organization’s discriminatory policy of allowing biological males in women’s collegiate sports.\textsuperscript{211} Protestors hand-delivered a petition opposing that policy, which has allowed male-bodied athletes to compete in women’s sports since 2010.\textsuperscript{212} The petition can be found in Appendix A of this report.

B. Legislative Efforts

On February 1, 2023, the 37th annual National Women and Girls in Sports Day, U.S. Rep. Greg Steube (R-FL) reintroduced The Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act.\textsuperscript{213} The bill amends Title IX to ensure that schools comply with Title IX’s recognition of a person’s reproductive biology and genetics at birth and puts athletic organizations, athletic directors, and bureaucrats on notice that it is a violation of Title IX to allow biological males to take roster spots, titles, awards, or scholarships from female athletes.

As of April 2023, 21 states had banned biological males who identify as girls from participating in publicly-funded sports.\textsuperscript{214} (Idaho was the first state to pass a law limiting eligibility for women’s teams to biological females in 2020.\textsuperscript{215})

Unfortunately, some legislative fixes miss the mark by excluding college-level competitive sports, where the male physiological differences are most prominent and most disadvantage female athletes. The best legislative solutions are ones that not only include collegiate sports but also statutorily require equal athletic opportunity for both sexes and provide exceptions for practice players and/or non-competitive instructional leagues.\textsuperscript{216} Model legislation can be found in Appendix B of this report.
“How did whoever decided these hormone rules come to the conclusion that 12 months of testing testosterone make it a fair and legal switch?”

BETHANY HAMILTON
Professional Surfer
C. Court Battles

Although the various state laws that protect women’s sports differ somewhat, they all expressly contradict the federal Department of Education’s proposed rules. This conflict between state law and federal administrative rules will, ultimately, have to be resolved in court.

Indeed, advocates for the inclusion of biological males in women’s sports have filed a number of lawsuits seeking to block the enforcement of several of the above-mentioned state laws. Ironically, these lawsuits argue that state policies that prohibit male-bodied athletes from participating in women’s sports constitute unlawful sex discrimination under both the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment and Title IX, the statute Congress passed in 1972 to expand opportunities for women and girls. In fact, the exact opposite is true. Allowing a biologically male athlete to displace a female athlete on a women’s team unfairly discriminates on the basis of sex by denying women the equal opportunity to compete in athletics that is required by Title IX and its implementing regulations.

Ironically, some activists claim that prohibiting male-bodied athletes from participating in women’s sports discriminates on the basis of sex in violation of Title IX, the statute that Congress passed to expand opportunities for women and girls.

On August 30, 2021, attorneys general from 20 states countered with a lawsuit of their own. The lawsuit, filed in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee, sought (among other things) a declaration that Title IX does not prohibit schools from determining eligibility for men’s and women’s sports teams on the basis of biological sex. The lawsuit also sought an injunction prohibiting the Department of Education from enforcing any non-binding guidance that administratively rewrites Title IX. The district court enjoined federal officials from implementing the Department’s interpretation of Title IX, and the decision is currently on appeal in the Sixth Circuit.

In resolving these cases, the courts will need to consider the specific language of the legislation at issue (including the legal definition of the term “on the basis of sex” under Title IX), the authority (if any) given to the Department of Education’s new administrative rules, as well as the scientific evidence regarding the male-female athletic differential.
CONCLUSION

The world of competitive sport is a zero-sum game where some athletes make the team and others do not; where someone wins and others lose. And in a zero-sum competition, the inclusion of male-bodied athletes in women’s sports inevitably means that females lose out.

In the short term, inclusion of males in women’s sports hurts individual female athletes. But in the long run, the logic of allowing male participation in women’s events and on women’s teams could be used to eliminate sex-specific sports altogether. It is, therefore, imperative that we protect the female sporting category and resist calls for inclusion that result in the exclusion of even a single female athlete from competitive sport.
“When it comes to women’s sports, biology matters.”

INGA THOMPSON
10x National Champ, 3x Olympian, 3x World Medalist, 2x Podium Finisher in the Women’s Tour de France

We demand that the NCAA stop discriminating against women and establish rules to keep women’s sports female. In the world of college sports, it is impossible to provide equal opportunities for both sexes without single-sex teams. Allowing biological males on women’s teams discriminates against female athletes. The NCAA is not above the law.
Riley Gaines stands with IWN chapter leaders Megan Burke and Margo Knorr on Girls & Women in Sports Day, U.S. Capitol (February 1, 2023)
An Act to Protect
Equal Athletic Opportunities

Section 1: Name. This statute shall be known as the Equal Athletic Opportunities Act.

Section 2. Equal athletic opportunities in education. Any accredited school, school district, or institution of higher education that offers, operates, or sponsors interscholastic or intercollegiate athletics shall provide equal athletic opportunities for members of both sexes.

Section 3: Separate athletic opportunities. Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 2, a school, school district, institution of higher education, or private athletic club located within [INSERT STATE] may operate or sponsor single-sex teams where selection for such teams is based upon competitive skill or the activity involved is a contact sport.

Section 4: Designation of athletic opportunities.

(A) All public and private schools, school districts, institutions of higher education, and athletic clubs that participate in athletic competitions or events with or against other schools or clubs must designate each athletic team, sport, athletic competition, or athletic event as a:

(1) team, sport, competition, or event for males, men, or boys;

(2) team, sport, competition, or event for females, women, or girls; or

(3) a co-educational or mixed team, sport, competition, or event.

(B) An individual who competes in any sport, athletic competition, or athletic event designated for females, women, or girls must be biologically female. The biological sex listed on a participant’s birth certificate may be relied on to establish the participant’s eligibility under this section if the sex designated on the birth certificate was designated at or near the time of the participant’s birth.
Section 5: Protecting women’s athletic opportunities.

(A) No school, school district, athletic club, athletic association, or institution of higher education that operates, sponsors, or permits athletic competitions or events may allow any male to compete for, against, or with a team designated for females, women, or girls to compete in any event designated for females, women, or girls.

(B) A school, school district, athletic club, athletic association, or institution of higher education that operates, sponsors, or permits athletic competitions or events may not:

1. allow any male to occupy a roster spot on any team designated for females, women, or girls; or

2. allow any male to receive a scholarship designated for female athletes.

Section 6: Permitting male practice players. Nothing in this Act shall prohibit a school, school district, athletic club, athletic association, or institution of higher education from allowing males to practice or train with teams designated for females, women, or girls, so long as no such male player takes a roster spot, opportunity to compete, scholarship, or spot at the school from any female.

Section 7: Definitions.

(A) Sex: For purposes of this statute, “sex” refers to a person’s biological sex (either male or female) at birth;

(B) Athletic event: For purposes of this statute, an “athletic event” includes any competition, contest, game, jamboree, scrimmage, tournament, showcase, combine, or tryout related to a sport or physical activity.

(C) Athletic club: For purposes of this statute, “athletic club” refers to any privately or publicly operated organization that operates sports teams, trains athletes for competition, or allows athletes or athletic teams to use its facilities on a regular basis.

(D) Athletic association: For purposes of this statute, “athletic association” refers to any governing body for athletic competition or sport or any organization of athletic conferences.
Compete: For purposes of this statute, “compete” means to take part in a contest, game, jamboree, tournament, showcase, combine, tryout, or other event after which team(s) or any individual(s) are designated as winners, roster spots are determined, or prizes awarded.

Team: For purposes of this statute, “team” means any group of people that participate in athletic or physical competitions for the same organization, school, club, college, university, or cause.

Section 8: Compliance protected. No governmental entity, licensing or accrediting organization, athletic association, or school district may consider a complaint, open an investigation, or take adverse action against a school or school district for complying with this law.

Section 9: Liability.

(A) Any individual who is deprived of an athletic opportunity or who suffers or who will suffer direct or indirect harm resulting from a violation of this statute may bring a private cause of action for injunctive relief, compensatory damages, and legal fees, against the violating entity.

(B) Any school, school district, athletic association, or athletic club that suffers or will suffer direct or indirect harm as a result of a violation of this statute may bring a private cause of action against the violating entity for injunctive relief and compensatory damages.

(C) Any individual, athletic team, or athletic club subjected to retaliation or other adverse action as a result of reporting a violation of this statute to an employee or representative of a school, school district, athletic association, or athletic club, or subjected to retaliation or other adverse action as a result of reporting a violation of this statute to a state or federal government entity with oversight authority, may bring a private cause of action against the retaliating entity for injunctive relief, damages, and any other relief available under law.

(D) An action brought under this section must be commenced within one year of the event giving rise to the complaint.
“[When it comes to competitive athletics,] sex segregation is the only way to achieve equality for girls and women.”

MARTINA NAVRATILOVA
Winner of 18 Grand Slam Tennis Singles Titles
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