

The XX Chromosome Nominee

by [Joseph DeMaio](#), ©2022



<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JIOYnxYQWwY>

(Mar. 27, 2022) — Un-flaming-believable. The Goofball-in-Chief has nominated to a seat on the highest court in the land an “XX chromosome” individual who claims an inability to define the term “woman.” This flawed nomination was initially addressed [here](#), but following the events of the confirmation hearings, another review is indicated. Out of courtesy to the nominee, and to avoid a potentially problematic use of a gender-specific pronoun, the balance of this offering will refer to the nominee as “Jackson” or “it.”

Jackson claimed – laughably – that the reason she... oops..., sorry..., “it” cannot offer a definition is that it is [not a biologist](#). Seriously?

Worse yet, the apparatchik media rushed to her... sorry..., “its” defense, arguing that the [“science is unclear”](#) as to what a “woman” actually is. Memo to Jackson: a woman is an [adult female human](#).

Ironically, in “Mosby’s Pocket Dictionary of Medicine, Nursing and Health Professions” linked in the preceding sentence and where one finds the four-word definition of “woman,” on the same page one can find a definition of “word salad”: “A jumble of words and phrases that lacks logical coherence and meaning, often characteristic of disoriented individuals and persons with schizophrenia.” No kidding.

While that latter medical dictionary definition could fit the public statements of virtually anyone in the current administration – including, without serious question, the Goofball at 1600 – Jackson’s performance at the confirmation hearing came uncomfortably close as well.

At its most elementary level, the science is clear: if an individual's genetic chromosome composition is "[XX](#)," that individual is a "woman." If the chromosomes are "XY," the individual is a "man." Granted, if there are damaged chromosomes or other genetic anomalies, altered characteristics may exist. But the general conclusion is: XX = woman. And surgically altering one's plumbing does not change the genetic blueprint.

Jackson's sad revelation of how the mind of a "progressive" or contemporary "Democrat liberal" operates ought to be a flashing red traffic signal for the United States Senate as it performs its "advice and consent" function under the Constitution.

Lamentably, the performance came at a hearing for confirmation (or not...) of someone aspiring to a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court. Sadly as well, Jackson's response is disturbingly reminiscent of Slick Willie's signature [contribution](#) to word salads: "It depends on what the meaning of is..., is."

If the current nominee to the Supreme Court cannot articulate a commonly understood definition of a word that has been in universal use for thousands of years and in millions if not trillions or even quadrillions of instances – in everyday speech; in statutes and rules, and in judicial decisions including those of the Supreme Court – it is beyond comical for Jackson to claim ignorance on the matter.

And, by the way, has anyone checked Jackson's judicial decisions to see how many times the judge has used a word that it cannot define, and yet the parties in the case are expected to understand? You can bet the farm it is probably more than once or twice.

In fact, it is likely not ignorance of biology which prompted Jackson to respond as it did. Instead, in order to pander – no word better describes the motivation – to the radically woke transgender and "fluid sex" camp, Jackson could not articulate the truth. Plainly, it could have responded: "A woman is an adult human female..." and tossed the ball back to Senator Marsha Blackburn (R-TN), who asked for the definition. But it refused.

Clearly, there are shorter and more juvenile definitions, but for purposes of testimony at a confirmation hearing for a seat on the Supreme Court, a definition such as that would have sufficed. For it to have responded as it did could constitute, at another time, perjury: of *course* Jackson knows what a woman is despite not holding a degree in biology. To contend otherwise is an untruth; to contend otherwise *under oath* is... a problem.

The painfully obvious reason it did not answer the simple question is because Jackson did not *want* to respond truthfully. Had that occurred, its supporters might have objected and, perhaps, vindictively withdrawn their support and even badgered it to back out of the process. Threats of cultural cancellation might have also oozed out from social media sites.

Stated otherwise, Jackson's confirmation hearing response is likely an ominous – yet revealing –sneak preview of the various judicial “word salads” which might be expected from its chambers and law clerks over the next few decades, assuming it is confirmed.

Yikes.