

Midterm Strategy Framework for Candidates: Transgender Policy, Governance, & Public Trust

This document has two purposes for your campaign: first, to advise you on how to generally position your campaign regarding Transgender Community issues, and second, to offer answers to several frequent questions that have been asked of candidates in the past - questions you can expect during your campaign. These answers are solid and should satisfy the person asking the question while helping your candidate maintain their moral principles to support what is right and fair.

For more information, medical/scientific studies, and more in-depth concepts, please visit our website: NotThisTime.com

Recommended Overall Strategic Thought/Approach

Democratic and progressive candidates must speak about transgender and nonbinary Americans with moral clarity and political courage. This is not a legitimate “both sides” policy disagreement. It is a coordinated political strategy designed to stigmatize and dehumanize a small, vulnerable group of people while manufacturing fear, division, and distraction.

Questions about transgender people are often framed not to seek understanding, but to bait candidates into hesitation, triangulation, or implicit concession. Voters are not looking for leaders who panic under pressure or abandon their principles when confronted with bad-faith attacks. They are looking for leaders who know who they are, what they stand for, and whether they will defend the dignity and rights of all Americans consistently.

Attempts to “thread the needle,” and carve out politically convenient exceptions, or concede the underlying premise of these attacks do not project moderation; they project weakness. The moment a candidate signals that one vulnerable group can be treated as negotiable, voters begin to question whose rights and humanity may become expendable next.

The strongest response is to reject the premise entirely and reframe the conversation around democratic values and constitutional principles. Do not get dragged into sensationalized hypotheticals or fringe scenarios designed to dominate headlines and distort public understanding. Name the tactic for what it is: a cynical effort to divide working people, distract from material issues, and place marginalized communities under political siege.

Then return to first principles: every person deserves equal protection under the law, personal dignity, bodily autonomy, safety, and the freedom to live openly without state-sponsored humiliation or discrimination. Leadership is demonstrated not through defensiveness or retreat, but through steadiness, clarity, and conviction.

When candidates refuse to surrender moral ground, refuse to participate in dehumanizing narratives, and remain anchored in justice and democratic values, they deny opponents the wedge they are trying to drive, and they demonstrate the kind of leadership voters respect.

Shared Principles ~ Grounded in Facts

TGI & Allied American Citizens' lives rely on facts & science. As do Democrats and independent-thinking voters. These Shared Principals cut across ideological lines and show how much common ground there is, and demonstrate how falsehoods are spread throughout traditional and social media:

- No one under 18 undergoes gender-affirming surgery. No one has ever advocated for that. When you hear this, it's a fabrication and never a serious argument or question. The decision for any medical care for a minor is made by the minor, their parents, and their doctor.
- No one under 18 is ever prescribed gender-affirming medication, including puberty blockers, without parental permission. Every child works with their parents and doctor to ensure all medications are administered safely.
- Anti-discrimination protection and support for fair treatment in employment, housing, healthcare, and public accommodations is a right all Americans deserve and pay for with their taxes, and is guaranteed by the Constitution, law, and common sense of the United States of America.
- The TGI Community, like all communities, should be treated with respect, should not be harassed, and should not be singled out for humiliation or exclusion.
- Schools should protect students from bullying, harassment, and violence, regardless of gender identity, their sexuality or their race or beliefs. The Constitution and laws of the United States of America have already guaranteed this.
- Medical decisions are not and never should be political questions. Care is already based on peer-reviewed science and research, rigorous, unbiased testing, and continuous research to develop standards of care, and is designed to improve a patient's life. Adults/Parents have always had the right to "opt-out" for their individual child or self, so blanket "across-the-board" political maneuvering is unnecessary, harmful, and unconstitutional.
- Adults should be able to make their own healthcare decisions, including name and gender-marker updates, without unnecessary government interference.

Questions and Recommended Answers

Listed below are some of the most frequent questions asked by reporters and voters to political candidates. We have provided you with two answers for your consideration. a = an answer that is brief and allows you to move on to the next question. b = a much more in-depth answer that gives you facts and key words to shut down the premise and line of questioning. Using these answers will help your campaign keep its principles while maintaining the support of the LGBTQ+ and TGI Communities.

1. Do you support or oppose gender-affirming care for minors?

a. I support access to gender-affirming care for minors when it is guided by the child, their parents or guardians, and qualified medical professionals. Decisions should be individualized and based on medical best practices, not political fear.

b. "This question is built on a misleading premise. We already provide puberty blockers for precocious puberty. We already prescribe testosterone to teenage boys whose development is delayed. These are well-established, evidence-based treatments. What is always left out is that there are as many cisgender minors receiving this care as there are transgender minors. So the

real question isn't about the medicine—it's about whether we apply it fairly. Do you support equality, or do you support discrimination?

I trust doctors to do their jobs and families to make deeply personal decisions about their children's health. What I don't support is politicians inserting themselves into exam rooms to chase headlines.

This so-called "issue" is a manufactured crisis. We don't invite politicians to weigh in on cancer treatment plans, and we shouldn't start now. The only reason this care is being singled out is that it's been made politically convenient to treat it as something different. But voters are smarter than that—they understand the difference between real healthcare and political theater."

2. Should transgender girls and women be allowed to play on girls' and women's sports teams?

a. I support evidence-based inclusion policies that allow transgender girls and women to participate in sports, with fair, age-appropriate guidelines. Participation isn't just about competition—it's a critical part of mental health, development, and belonging. Sports should build community, not be used as a tool to exclude young people from it.

b. Banning trans women from sports has never been about fairness, it has always been a political wedge used to target trans people and distract voters from real issues. There are roughly 300,000 trans youth in America, yet only a handful of trans girls compete in high school and college sports, while politicians and special interests have spent hundreds of millions of dollars attacking them. Think about that: hundreds of millions of dollars spent targeting fewer than twenty athletes nationwide.

Meanwhile, opponents rely on fear-based rhetoric and misleading language while ignoring the scientific evidence that trans women who compete under hormone regulations experience significant reductions in strength and muscle mass. When so much money, legislation, and political energy are directed at so few people, it's clear this was never about protecting sports, it was always about discrimination.

"Everyone knows pushing Trans Women out of women's sports neither protects women nor has it ever been about fairness. It's the wedge used in a systemic campaign to drive trans people out of society. And nobody's falling for it anymore. Of the 300,00 trans children in the US, only 5 trans girls are playing high school sports, 10 are playing in the NCAA, and even fewer are in the professional ranks. And yet, the attack ads alone spent to politicize this were north of 222 million dollars to stop less than 20 girls and women from playing sports. Does this sound rational at all to anyone? No. And the Voters can add. "

"How much does it cost to write a piece of legislation? It's \$30,000 per bill in California to \$125,000 per bill in Georgia and in Michigan it's \$272,000 per bill. There's less than 20 girls and women who actually play sports, but since this administration took office in 2024, there have been over 2,485 anti-trans bills introduced at an average cost of 310 million, 625,000, and of those, 270 bills were sports-related. So, that's \$33 million, 750,000, or 1 million 687,00 ***per girl***. So tell me again where the fairness is?"

"This single issue has been successful in getting around the voters' values and eroding them from behind. Using degrading and inaccurate language, such as "Biological Male" (for female, woman, or even trans woman) it manipulates the voter to drop the notion of a person's credibility or humanity

without even realizing they have. It also steps around any real data – pretending that science hasn't already weighed-in on this: The IOC's (International Olympic Committee) own report concluded that *any Trans woman who competes has had to suppress her hormone levels so low that she suffers degradation of bone & muscle functions, slashing any "advantage" that may have been conferred during puberty.*" and despite this, they choose to ignore their own study and still banned Transwomen from competition. So - it's never been about fairness, only discrimination."

3. Should schools be required to notify parents if a student asks to use different pronouns or a different gender identity at school?

a. No—blanket requirements aren't recommended.

From a gender-affirming care perspective, these situations need to be handled on a case-by-case basis, balancing family involvement with student safety. Groups like the American Academy of Pediatrics and American Psychological Association emphasize that automatic disclosure can put some students at risk of harm, rejection, or homelessness.

The appropriate approach is: Support communication with families whenever it's safe—but don't mandate disclosure in ways that could endanger a student.

b. "Do you support children and women being abused in the home? 43 percent of Trans children are abused at home, just for being who they are. Do you support aiding and abetting the abuse of these children?" It's already law that if a parent abuses their child, the state will take them away."

"Donald Trump has stood on stages and told parents that a child can go to school and come home after a 'brutal operation,' lying that schools are secretly performing surgeries during the school day without parents knowing. What adult American would believe that for even a second? I never bought it, and neither did the voters."

4. Should schools be allowed to teach about gender identity and sexual orientation in the classroom?

a. Yes. When taught in age-appropriate ways, it's simply part of giving students an accurate understanding of the world and how to treat others with respect.

Major medical and psychological groups like the American Academy of Pediatrics and American Psychological Association support inclusive education because it's linked to lower bullying and better mental health outcomes.

This isn't about ideology or replacing parents—it's about student safety, reducing stigma, and making sure schools reflect reality so all students can learn in a stable environment.

b.

Let's be honest about what's being taught: empathy, understanding, and history.

Students learn about Americans like Bayard Rustin, Lynn Conway, and Martine Rothblatt, people whose achievements helped shape our country and our world. They belong in our classrooms because of what they accomplished, and because every student deserves to know that greatness comes in many forms.

And no, a child cannot be taught to be gay or trans. What they can be taught is respect, compassion, and the truth about the people who built America.

So when some say a child should be removed from class the moment an LGBTQ+ person appears in a lesson, ask yourself: is that education, or is that erasure?

This isn't about protecting children. It's about deciding whose stories are allowed to be told. In California, we don't erase people, we teach the truth.

"Yes—and let's be honest about what's actually being taught. Empathy. Understanding. Compassion. History, made by the people involved with it, like Bayard Rustin, who was the architect of the Civil Rights Movement, Lynn Conway, whose innovation revolutionized the microchip, and made your cellphone possible, or Martine Rothblatt, who led the team to map the human genome, founded Sirius Radio, and pioneered lifesaving medicine. What's taught is that these and all inspiring humans can be role models because of their achievements, and their humanity, like all Americans."

"Does anyone seriously believe that their child could be taught to be gay? To be trans? This is a fantasy of people who have better things to think about."

"And think about the standard being set here: some parents want the right to pull their child out the moment an LGBTQ+ person exists in a lesson. Imagine if LGBTQ+ students wanted to be excused every time a straight, cisgender relationship was discussed in a class. The truth is, no relationships, cis or straight, are discussed in a class unless they're studying Shakespeare or the Old Testament. So no—this isn't about protecting kids. It's about deciding which kids get to be acknowledged at all."

5. Should transgender students be allowed to use bathrooms that match their gender identity?

a. Yes--from a gender-affirming care perspective, allowing transgender students to use bathrooms that align with their gender identity supports safety, dignity, and mental health. There's no evidence that inclusive policies increase incidents, but there is clear evidence that exclusion increases the risk of harassment. The goal is simple: policies should reduce harm and allow all students to function safely at school.

b.

This bathroom debate was never about safety. It was manufactured to make trans people seem threatening, and in doing so, make it easier to deny them basic dignity.

The facts don't support the fear. Trans people are far more likely to be harassed or assaulted in bathrooms than to pose any threat to anyone else.

And these bans don't even make sense. They ignore the reality that trans men exist, exposing the contradiction at the heart of the argument. That's because the goal was never a workable policy—it was a political wedge issue.

Voters deserve honesty. Instead of inventing problems and targeting vulnerable people, we should be focused on the real challenges facing our communities. I trust voters to see this issue for what it is: not a matter of public safety, but an attempt to divide people by stripping some of their neighbors of their humanity.

"It's hard not to brush your question off as the tactic that it is. And the absurdity that it is has only grown stronger as Republicans weaponize language to camouflage their own failings in creating any meaningful legislation in the last 12 years. But it is a favored weapon in recent years, with the latest tactic to include draconian punishment and fines for offenders, and creating a bounty system to ensure the dehumanization continues. So, this requires a forceful rejection – because every trans

person is affected by the bathroom bans. But just like sports, the intention *and result* is the stripping of a trans person's humanity, making it easy for everyone to "go along" with the ban, because "after all, Trans people can just go to the bathroom at home" out of sight of us normal folk.

"I haven't ever heard of any Trans women assaulting someone in a bathroom? But I've heard of several Republicans assaulting someone in a bathroom – what is it with that party and bathrooms? You know who does get assaulted in women's bathrooms? Trans women. Just going in to do their business. Imagine that? Hmm.

"This question has never made any sense - it never takes into account that Trans men will have to use the women's bathroom. So which is it? Again, it's a ridiculous attempt to instill in the voter's mind that Trans people are the enemy. Voters deserve honesty. This issue has been manufactured to divide people, not to protect them. I trust the public to recognize that, and to reject policies that target people rather than address real concerns."

6. Do you support protections for transgender people under civil rights laws in housing, jobs, and public accommodations?

a. Absolutely--from a gender-affirming care perspective, stable housing, employment, and access to public life are foundational to health and well-being. Discrimination in these areas is directly linked to worse mental and physical health outcomes.

Protections are also consistent with existing law clarified in *Bostock v. Clayton County*, which recognizes discrimination based on transgender status as a form of sex discrimination.

Equal protection isn't a special provision—it's a baseline requirement for health, safety, and full participation in society.

b.

Yes, and this is already settled law.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 makes it illegal to discriminate "because of sex," and the Supreme Court has been clear that this includes gender identity. In *Bostock v. Clayton County*, the Court ruled directly: firing someone for being transgender is sex discrimination.

That isn't a new interpretation, it's the law recognizing what was always true.

So when people try to carve out exceptions, they're not seeking clarity. They're trying to undo civil rights protections that already exist.

We've answered this question as a country. The only issue now is whether we follow the law equally.

Because that's not optional. It applies to everyone. Period.

"Yes—and this isn't up for debate. It's already the law. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act made it illegal to discriminate 'because of sex.' For decades, the Supreme Court has made clear that includes gender—how people present, how they're perceived, and whether they conform to expectations.

Then, in *Bostock v. Clayton County*, the Court said it plainly: discriminating against someone for being transgender is discrimination because of sex.

That's not a new idea. That's the law catching up to what was already there.

So when people try to carve out exceptions, they're not asking for clarification—they're asking to roll back civil rights protections.

We've already answered this question as a country. Some people just don't like the answer.

And that's not how this works. You don't get to pick and choose who the law applies to. It applies to everyone. Period."

7. Should transgender people be allowed to update passports, driver's licenses, and other government IDs to match their legal name and gender identity?

a. Yes--from a gender-affirming care perspective, accurate IDs are essential for safety, privacy, and everyday functioning. When documents don't match a person's identity, it increases the risk of harassment and creates unnecessary barriers in travel, employment, and healthcare.

Updating IDs isn't ideological—it's a practical step that helps systems work smoothly and allows people to move through the world safely and with dignity.

b.

Yes, and this is about basic function, not ideology.

If a married woman can update her passport or driver's license after a legal name change, that's not political, it's administrative reality the courts already recognize.

IDs exist for one reason: to help people move through the world safely and efficiently. When documents don't match who someone is, it creates confusion, delays, and real risk, especially in places like airports and security checkpoints.

This isn't about making anyone less safe. It's about making government work as it's supposed to work.

When people try to block trans Americans from having accurate IDs, they're not improving safety, they're increasing exposure to harm and using bureaucracy as a form of exclusion.

That's not public policy. That's government overreach dressed up as concern.

"Yes—and this is about basic functionality, not ideology. Should married women be allowed to update their passports, driver's licenses, and other government IDs when they get married and begin using their spouse's last name? Yes again. It's a legal name change – the courts have weighed in, and it's not for anyone to decide along political lines.

IDs are supposed to help people move through the world safely and efficiently. When they don't match the person standing in front of you, it creates confusion, delays, and unnecessary risk—for everyone involved.

Think about airport security or passport control. If the photo and gender marker don't match how someone presents, you're not making anyone safer—you're exposing them to real violence and danger. We have to see this for what it is – government overreach, policing, and intentionally marginalizing a minority of American citizens. But this question already knows all of this. If you don't support this, then you're telling the world you don't care about transgender citizens' safety or rights. And that is and always has been the point.

8. Do you support transgender people serving openly in the military?

a. Yes, transgender people served honorably, bravely, and efficiently in our military – just like all our troops who swear to our Constitution. They met and exceeded the same standards as anyone else. Military readiness depends on capability, not identity. And our military has suffered without their service.

If someone is qualified and able to serve, their gender identity should not be a barrier to service.

b. “Yes. If someone is qualified to serve, they should be allowed to serve.

The military depends on dedicated, patriotic Americans willing to serve their country, not political talking points or ideology. Their removal was never designed to improve our military; it was to strip away professional troops, airmen, sailors, and guardians who would honor their oath to serve their constitution and country over any political party—something this administration desperately needs to wage illegal wars.

Standards matter: readiness, discipline, and ability. If someone meets those standards, their gender identity doesn’t disqualify them. The majority of Trans service members discharged from service were among our most decorated and strategic assets, contributing, like all service members, to the safety and security of our nation. Ask yourself, do you feel safer with this administration? The voters know that this ban and other strategic mistakes and blunders of this administration have alienated our allies, emboldened our enemies, and stripped away our capabilities to meet any challenges, making the country weaker. It’s that simple.”

9. Should federal rules like Title IX protect against gender identity discrimination in education?

a. Yes. Education protections need to include trans students so they can learn in safe, fair, and affirming environments.

b. “Yes— Title IX was designed to ensure opportunity and equality to those who were missing out on the funding allocated for ALL students. Because men and boys get all of the funding (and attention), Title IX made it a law that you must fund and provide opportunities to participate in sports and activities equally for *all* students, regardless of sex or gender identity.

If you start carving out exceptions, you’re not strengthening the law—you’re undermining it.”

10. Should parents be required to consent before a child begins a social or medical transition?

a. Family involvement matters, but rigid mandates can be harmful. These decisions should be handled case by case, with parents, doctors, and the young person working together.

b. “I want to be precise: no child undergoes medical transition without parental involvement and consent. That is not how the healthcare system operates.

Care for transgender youth is carefully considered, individualized, and delivered through established medical guidelines, with families and clinicians working together. It is not impulsive, and it is not done in secret.

When political proposals claim otherwise, they are addressing a scenario that does not reflect medical reality. Health care decisions belong in exam rooms and family conversations, not in blanket legislative mandates.

Our role in government should be to support families and clinicians making evidence-based decisions, not to replace them with one-size-fits-all rules that override medical judgment."

11. Do you support bans or limits on transgender healthcare coverage through Medicaid, Medicare, or private insurance?

a. No. Health coverage should not discriminate against trans people or make medically necessary care harder to access.

b. "No, because that's just discrimination dressed up as policy.

We don't decide coverage based on politics. We rely on medical necessity and professional standards.

And let's be clear—we don't put other medically necessary care up for political debate. The only reason this is being singled out is because of who it's for. If something is medically necessary, it should be treated that way. If you start picking and choosing who deserves care, you're not fixing the system—you're breaking it."

12. Should transgender people have access to shelters, prisons, and other sex-segregated public facilities based on gender identity?

a. People should have access to safe facilities that match their gender identity, with policies designed to protect safety and dignity. Real safety policy looks at actual outcomes, not imagined scenarios.

b. "This is a safety issue, plain and simple. These segregations put Trans people—especially in shelters and prisons—into real danger & violence. That's not hypothetical—that's well documented.

13. Should candidates and elected officials use a person's pronouns and names in public settings?

a. Yes. Basic respect matters, and using someone's correct name and pronouns is a simple way to affirm their humanity.

b. "Yes. Using someone's name and pronouns takes no effort, costs nothing, and is just basic respect. But *not* using someone's pronouns conveys the exact opposite - it's forcing your politics on your own voter. The idea that this is some kind of burden is hard to take seriously. If basic respect feels like an inconvenience, that's something worth examining.

Our constitution guarantees life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all Americans; baseline respect in public life is part of that. It's not complicated."

14. Do you believe transgender rights should be a priority issue in this election, or should the campaign focus elsewhere?

a. Transgender rights should be part of the campaign because they are part of human rights, but they should be discussed alongside housing, healthcare, safety, and economic dignity—not treated as a distraction.

b. Trans rights are human rights—they sit alongside housing, healthcare, safety, and economic dignity. They're not separate from those issues; they're part of them. And let's be clear: turning this into a culture war is a choice made by politicians to distract from scandals and failures they don't want to talk about.

I'm focused on solving real problems. That includes everyone."