



The bizarre world of Ketanji Brown Jackson

She and her ilk sacrifice women, children to transgender gods

Washington Times Commentary By Everett Piper - Sunday, January 18, 2026

Pictured above: Supreme Court Associate Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson speaks at the commencement ceremony for Boston University School of Law, Sunday, May 21, 2023, in Boston.

On Tuesday, the [Supreme Court](#) heard the cases of Little v. Hecox and West Virginia v. B.P.J. The plaintiffs are suing Idaho and West Virginia, respectively, for enacting laws that expressly prohibit men from competing in women's athletics.

During oral arguments, Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson expressed her concerns. More specifically, she asked attorneys to defend why their clients are telling boys who pretend to be girls that they may not participate in girls' sports.

"I guess I'm struggling to understand how you can say that this law doesn't classify on the basis of transgender status," Justice Jackson told Idaho Solicitor General Alan Hurst. "The law expressly aims to ensure that transgender women can't play on women's sports teams. So why is that not a classification on the basis of transgender status?"

Thus, the woman who told us that she couldn't define the word "woman" proved again what every thinking person already knew: Today's ruling class has a palpable disregard for what it means to be a human.

It's not hard to see that this is exactly who and what Justice Jackson and her tribe really are. In their own words, they are misogynists who deny that women are real; they are misandrists who believe that all men are toxic, and they are misopedists who despise children so much that they are now arguing for the

legal “right” to sacrifice the innocence of little girls and boys on the altar of their transgender gods.

Just step back and look at the obvious. How can anyone not see that, in Justice Jackson’s circus of intersectionality, women are losing? How can anyone deny the psychological damage suffered by boys, who are being told they might not be male after all?

How can you possibly believe in the dignity of children while applauding as 11-year-olds are being dressed up in drag by a bunch of adults? How can you tell me you respect the value of a man when your default position is that everything wrong with the world can be summed up in two words: “male toxicity”?

How can anyone claim to believe in the dignity of the female while they accuse all the nation’s girls of bigotry for wanting to keep boys out of their showers, locker rooms and bathrooms?

We all need to stop and take a deep breath, let the adrenaline subside and ask these basic questions. If our schools support women, why do they teach our youngest girls that a female is little more than a leprechaun and unicorn (a make-believe social construct) instead of a biological fact?

If our politicians believe in women’s rights, then why do they refuse to protect a woman’s most basic rights?

If our liberal exemplars believe it’s wrong for a man to force himself on a woman, how is it ever right for these smarter-than-thou folks to force a bunch of coeds to compete against Lia Thomas as he flaunts his male genitals in front of all these girls?

There’s more.

If Justice Jackson and her liberal handlers truly believe in the dignity of women, then why are they defending the cultural appropriation of a woman’s identity by a bunch of delusional men? If left-leaning jurists such as Justice Jackson really believe in gender inclusion, then why do they want to exclude those who are simply defending the objective integrity of the female gender?

Finally, why would a Black woman on the [Supreme Court](#) of the United States publicly defend the “blackfacing” of women in a manner that is just as cartoonish and insulting as it was when White people painted their skin to mimic and mock people of color? Isn’t Justice Jackson’s world, by definition, just hypocritical and bizarre?

In “The Abolition of Man,” C.S. Lewis warned us of a time when we would become a characterless culture of “men without chests,” but the prophetic foresight of even the Oxford don fell short on this score. Lewis didn’t foresee that the next domino to fall would be a culture of “women without breasts,” which, being so proud of its abolition of men, would next argue in the highest courts of the land for the legal right to sexually abuse its women and children under the banner of minority rights.

• *Everett Piper (dreverettpiper.com, @dreverettpiper), a columnist for The Washington Times, is a former university president and radio host. He is the author of “Not a Day Care: The Devastating Consequences of Abandoning Truth” (Regnery). He can be reached at epiper@dreverettpiper.com.*