



## Episode 1,522: Parents Battle Over Transitioning 7-Year-Old Boy

Guest: Madeleine Jacob

**WOODS:** We've just had some kind of resolution of this James Younger story because of a judge's ruling late last week. We're talking at the end of October 2019 right now. And you'd been doing a lot of writing on the subject. It was the kind of story that some people just could not believe could be true, and it was also a story that was being picked up by Life Site News, indeed, and by several other sites of that caliber, but in terms of giant mainstream sites, not so much until you guys started writing about it. And then we got stories – I know there was at least one story in *The Washington Post*. But let's hear the way you were describing it to people over the course of numerous articles. What exactly did this case consist of? What was actually happening? What was at the heart of it?

**JACOB:** Yeah, and that's I think really important, Tom, because as of right now, there are some different pictures that are being portrayed. And so what was really at the heart of this, and we were reminded of it when we first went into the trial, is it was a parenting and a custody battle. But unfortunately, underlying that was a mother who wanted to transition her son and a father who didn't agree with that. And when I say, "wanted to transition," I mean wanted to medically transition. She had actually already socially transitioned the boy. He'd been enrolled since kindergarten in school as a girl. All of his classmates new him as Luna.

**WOODS:** What's his age?

**JACOB:** He's currently seven.

**WOODS:** Okay.

**JACOB:** So this mother is trying to medically transition her, not at seven, but the records that were shown in court indicate referrals for when the boy is either eight or nine to the Genecis clinic, which is a medical transition clinic here in Dallas. It's important to note that they do also do evaluations. It's a fact. They do evaluations. But after the evaluation comes up, medical transition. So that was really the focus of the case and why this case I think caught so much attention after the jury's ruling, because yes, it's a parenting and a custody case, but it's also about parents who disagree about a serious medical procedure which is somewhat questionable on their seven-year-old son.

And Dr. Georgulas in court did testify that she didn't intend to transition James – she only referred to him as Luna in court, but she didn't intend to transition him until he had hit the correct stage of puberty. The concern was, though, that the medical records indicated that that could start as early as eight or nine, and that James' current counselor had also written a

letter of recommendation to the Genecis clinic referring James there and recommending that they take James on as a patient.

And so it's hard to know, right? His dad claims the mom has already started. Records indicate that it's in the works. Mom says that it's not. How do you know if mom's lying, if she's not lying? I don't think that anybody can know that or not, but I think what is important is that there was the distinct possibility that this seven-year-old, eight-year-old, once he became eight or nine could have undergone a transition without his father's approval, and really, what expert witnesses and the witnesses who evaluated James specify, too, was that this boy is still very fluid. He's gender fluid, was a term that was used many times by the custody evaluator, by Dr. Abel Tomatis, by these individuals who work with and see James as "Luna." They still see that he does sometimes present as a boy. They acknowledge that as a fact, and he does appear to be comfortable presenting as a boy. So there's a lot of uncertainty, as well, in his presentation.

So it's not just about parents who disagree. It's not about a dad who hates the transgender agenda. It's about parents who disagree and a child who's extremely confused and picking a course that could cause damage when the child really doesn't have a clear idea of where he's headed or where he's going. I mean, he's seven, right? One of the expert witnesses testified, I believe it was Dr. Daniel Schumer, he testified to the fact that he's had stages and phases during which they kind of start to understand and explore their gender, and it's really not till the ages of five to seven that kids really start to understand gender and that there are kind of differences in gender. So James is seven. He's at an age where, even as a bright child, he can't be wanting to be a girl and parents validating and making that decision for the rest of his life. And I think that's what sparked outrage, is that this could have happened under current medical procedures. Theoretically, there's nothing to have stopped anyone from starting this child on puberty blockers at eight or nine years old.

**WOODS:** There's been a bit of backlash about the way at least some people reported the story, however, because let's talk about what the judge – maybe I'm misunderstanding the story, but it almost seems like we had two rulings, like we heard from a jury, and then we heard from a judge. So let's try to distinguish what exactly was going on in each of these.

**JACOB:** Of course. So what happens in family court or what happened in this case, specifically, is Dr. Georgulas files a motion, and she filed it to the judge. Mr. Younger filed a counter-petition, and he asked for a jury verdict. Okay, so the jury got to rule on Mr. Younger's request, and from what I've heard, Dr. Georgulas either didn't get her paperwork in in time or didn't want a jury ruling. Either way, the jury didn't rule on what she was asking for. The jury only ruled on what Mr. Younger requested, which was for sole managing conservatorship of his boys. Okay, in family court in Texas, the judge takes into consideration the jury's ruling and what they come to as their kind of "verdict," but they don't have to follow that. It's only a recommendation. I've spoken with Texas lawyers who've said that in family court, specifically, it's only a recommendation.

So we saw what happened on Monday, the jury ruled – they had two questions. So they got a piece of paper that had one question. Question number one: do you think that the current – and this isn't a perfect direct quote, but it's a summarization of it – do you think that the current custody agreement or whatever you want to call it, that is currently joint managing conservatorship should be changed to sole managing conservatorship? Question one. Question two was: if yes to question one, should Mr. Younger be the sole managing conservator?

And the jury deliberated for about an hour and a half and came back, and the judge had the ruling. The answer to question number one was yes, the current split in division of joint managing conservatorship should be divided and changed to a sole managing conservatorship. But no, Mr. Younger should not be granted that sole managing conservatorship. And that's what kind of ignited the nation, so to speak, was the fact that a jury had ruled against the father who was trying to protect his son. They did not necessarily rule explicitly for the mother, because that wasn't part of their question, right? They only got to answer their specific questions.

The judge, though, got to take all of that into consideration. She had to take the expert witnesses' testimony into consideration, and she ruled on far more than that. She set the custody for both of the boys. She set the possession schedule. She set child support. She also ruled on Dr. Georgulas' requests. So for example, in her initial petition to modify, Dr. Georgulas requested that Mr. Younger be required to not call James by his legal name and to affirm James as Luna. So that's what the judge ruled on Thursday, and she actually pushed the ruling back. On Monday, she announced that she would read the ruling on Wednesday, and she pushed it back a day, so we have no idea what will happen between Monday and Thursday. But we do know that the judge decided to grant joint managing conservatorships to both parents. She divided custody. Presuming Mr. Younger does counseling with his boys, he'll get 50/50 custody, and they have complete division. Both Dr. Georgulas and Mr. Younger will have a say now in medical, psychiatric, and psychological decisions, which before, Dr. Georgulas held the sole right for psychological and psychiatric decisions, hence Mr. Younger's concern about the transition.

So some people, they're saying, well, okay, there must be something wrong here, because there's such a disparity between the jury's ruling and the judge's ruling that came out on Thursday. And I'm not in the judge's head. I can't tell you what happened. But I was sitting in the courtroom, and I did see the evidence, and I heard the jury and what they ruled, and there are a lot of other sources that will support that. One big one, since court records are a little bit difficult to get ahold of for family court, I've been referencing people to the Texas Attorney General's letter. He wrote a letter to the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, and he actually cites court documents in that letter. So it's readily available. You can't necessarily get your hands on the court documents unless you want to go purchase them, but if you want kind of a solid source for some of what's being argued, it's there and cited in that letter from the Attorney General. And people can find that right on the Attorney General's website, I have a link to it on one of my Life Site News articles, kind of an important reference to look at when [inaudible] used by the varying lenses of the media that are presenting this.

**WOODS:** So what I was getting at a minute ago is that I think some people were under the impression the way, not you, but some people seemed to be reporting the story was that: here's a child who's going to be transitioned against his will, according to the jury. He was just going to be transitioned against his will, and the judge is forcing the father to go along with this. But what actually was happening, as you said, was he wanted full conservatorship. He lost that countersuit. It's very difficult for fathers to get full conservatorship, so that's actually not that surprising. So maybe, this whole thing was a tempest in a teapot. It was just overblown, and there's really nothing to see here. I'm not sure that really is the case. I think there is something to see here. Now, there's a gag order that was placed. Now, is that gag order – at first I thought the gag order was on both mom and dad. Is it only on dad?

**JACOB:** No, from my understanding, and I haven't read the actual ruling itself because the judge hasn't actually signed – I think she may have signed it this morning, but she hadn't signed it as of Friday. From my understanding, both mom and dad are gagged at the current moment, and they will be until the boys are 18, which to be honest, throughout the entire trial, the judge made it very clear that she was not happy that the media was present.

**WOODS:** Okay.

**JACOB:** Even though there were only two of us there.

**WOODS:** Hmm. Okay. I've heard some other things, that the father – I mean, I don't even know what's true here – that the father is exaggerating for the sake of trying to get sympathy from right-wing media. I mean, whatever. I mean, it sounds like the kind of thing people would make up about somebody, but I don't know. I mean, do you think there's anything to any of this, or do you think you really – well, this is kind of a softball question. Do you think you really grasp the nature of the case?

**JACOB:** Of course I do; otherwise, I wouldn't have written on it the way I did.

**WOODS:** Right.

**JACOB:** Right. It wasn't meant to be this giant, explosive story. It was meant to show people: here's what's going on. And I think that a really important piece that people need to remember in terms of that is this boy has been enrolled in school as a girl since kindergarten. He goes to school in little dresses. His mom testified to the fact that in kindergarten, she was putting blush – I mean, what kindergarten child, even as a girl, has blush put on them? That seems a little excessive, right? So is the father blowing this up? I mean, I really don't believe so. I sat in on the entire trial. I don't believe that that's the case, and I really think that the facts support that.

The mom at one point in time requested a restraining order on dad that would restrict dad from speaking with anyone at the school, going to the school, or speaking with parents or teachers, because she didn't want the school, the teachers – well, the teachers already knew, but she didn't want it coming out that James was not a girl, because everybody at school didn't realize that he wasn't a girl. They all believed that he was a girl. He lined up in the girls' line when, you know, you call little kindergarteners, "Boys and girls, line up in your line." He uses the girls' restroom. And so much so that [inaudible] dad even went to the school and called Luna "James," that it would "out" this boy. So I don't see, if that's the case and that's been happening, how the dad's really blowing this out of proportion.

**WOODS:** Now, when I look at this whole thing, I share the view of somebody in my – I have a private Facebook group, and I have a lot of really smart people in there, and one of those people says this: "I cannot fathom how anyone can consider this travesty a good outcome. What this means in reality is that these people will be involved with the court mediation system throughout James' life until he is 18. There is simply no way to split this baby, and this evil judge punted on her crazy decision after dragging this case on for months." I believe that's the correct evaluation.

**JACOB:** I couldn't agree more. I couldn't have put it better. That's exactly it. And now that dad is gagged, as well. I've heard rumors, so to speak, because I'm quite connected with the community around James, that they already have to start meeting with the court, figure out how to divide these things. So yeah, I mean, there are already rumors that it's not really going very fairly just in the mediation. And so she really did. She completely just punted on this. Here, the court's going to take care of it from here, because now that they have split conservatorship, the amicus attorney is going to be the one that breaks the tie. Having sat through the trial, I can't imagine that they're going to agree on much, Dr. Georgulas and Mr. Younger. It just seems unfathomable to me. So again, I couldn't agree more.

**WOODS:** Now, meanwhile, if you reported on this story or you were concerned about this story, there were people who called you transphobic. Now, you're transphobic for breathing. I mean, there's nothing you can do to satisfy some of these people. And when I say, "these people," I mean hysterical people, because I don't think all trans people are completely — I think most of them probably just want to lead a private life and deal with their own issues. But this is — and by the way, it's absolutely typical of the left. They can't just say the two of us look at this situation differently. They cannot ever say that. It always has to be: the person who disagrees with me has some kind of mental disorder, so we'll call it a phobia. It can't be the person has an honest disagree with me; it has to be transphobic. There always has to be a phobia in there.

Now, let me tell you something. I have no phobia of trans people. I don't stay in my home all day, thinking if I venture out, there's a remote chance I may run into a trans person. That is absurd. What I don't like is not trans people, per se, it's bullies. And if this isn't bullying, I don't know what is. DHS has been called on noncompliant parents. We've seen researchers into gender dysphoria have their lives and careers ruined, because they came to the wrong conclusions about how you should handle children who are in this kind of situation. They come to the wrong conclusion, so therefore, they're transphobic. Again, it can't be: well, they've honestly looked at the situation and they've come up with, in good faith, a different position from me. No, they must be mentally deranged, and they must have some kind of phobia. It's bizarre.

People have been harassed, careers ruined. There are countless therapists who say, *I wash my hands of cases like this because I know if I don't "affirm the child," in what the parent obviously wants, then you know what's going to happen to me. The thunder of condemnation is going to come down on me.* That's not a matter of, well, these are people who are being unjustly put upon, and they're just innocently fighting back. No, the whole style, the whole approach is entirely totalitarian.

And as I say, the coining of the word "transphobia" just gives the game away, that it can't just be that maybe we're in uncharted territory here, especially, for heaven's sake, with children. We are in uncharted territory, and there might be some people who take a conservative approach when you're dealing with uncharted territory with children. You would think that would be pretty common sense for most people.

Meanwhile, I'm in the libertarian world, and I would say 90% of people in the libertarian world want to block their ears and pretend this isn't happening because it's controversial and they're all terrified of the left, and they all want to jump on board whatever the left is telling us in the last 15 minutes is the latest thing we all have to agree with without asking questions about it. Well, and yeah, so they'll attack me for being the dissenting voice. Well, I don't

care. I don't care. Attack me all you want. This is stupid. Somebody's going to stand up and say: this is ridiculous. Most people realize this is ridiculous, and yet because we're all accustomed to letting the left bully and badger us into going along with whatever the latest thing is, nobody wants to say anything about it. Again, do you see it that way?

**JACOB:** Completely. Everybody's scared, because exactly what you just said is what happens. In fact, I was speaking with some colleagues and friends the other day. Careers get ruined, especially in academia and in science. My background is actually in biochemistry and a little bit in research. Careers get ruined. I mean, completely ruined if you want to dissent on the socially accepted scientific perspective.

But the problem is the "scientific perspective" is no longer scientific. It's backed by advocacy science. Dr. Stephen Levine was one of the expert witnesses at the trial, and he's been studying transgenderism, LGBT, the whole area for a very long time, not the first, but definitely in the top in terms of one of the first. And he testified that it's just becoming an advocacy avenue. The medical entity is all about advocacy now. It's not about facts. And so not only are we getting it from what should be trusted sources, but then you say the wrong thing in public, and wow, you're just a hater and a bigot and you're this awful human being, and nobody's going to stand up for you, because everybody is so afraid of the other repercussions on them.

And I think that's really scary, because this is a very small part of the population. The transgender individuals, the LGBT community, they're not a significant percentage of the population. And yet, that ideology is controlling everybody else in society, because by forcing us to be afraid to speak what we believe to be true, what we may have supported by scientific fact as true, and instead, we're too scared to speak up about it. And I think that that can lead to a really bad place, right? If we can't have good, civil dialogue, especially like you said about emerging issues, what was America founded on? We're just turning in, like you said, to complete totalitarianism, and not from the government but from our culture. It's being inflicted on us by the culture. And I think that there are only a lot more cases like this that are to come. I hope that this one sparks change and prevents future ones, but the ball's already started rolling, so to speak. And we've scared everybody who doesn't agree with it. We've scared them out of speaking. And I think that we've got to shake off that fear, and we've got to stand up for the truth.

**WOODS:** Now, of course, needless to say – it should be needless to say – why on earth would I have anything in particular against transgender people? I have nothing against these people. I wish them only the best. And I have nothing against any particular group of people. I wish everybody the best. I want everybody to prosper and be happy. So the transphobia thing is just absolute nonsense.

But what I would say is that people who are transgender, in a way, have a kind of special obligation to speak out loudly against this manipulation and exploitation of children in particular, because they more than anybody else know what's really involved and how you can potentially screw up a child this way. And I know that there's a handful of such voices out there, saying we have our own opinions on transgender issues, but we can certainly agree with you that this whole, *Well, the child is seven, and we've decided this is what we're going to do*, that that's insane. That's just outright insanity. But frankly, I don't hear a giant cascade of such voices, which is revealing and disturbing to me. The entire transgender community should be speaking out, because they have more credibility on this than anybody, because if

they say there's something wrong, then people would just have to sit up and listen. I'm not hearing that, and that is a profound indictment of that movement. We'll just put it that way.

**JACOB:** Yeah, I completely agree. And one thing I'll just add to that is one of the individuals who started the Save James website — there *was*; the judges ordered that it be taken down, but there was a website, SaveJames.com. And she said that when she started it, many transgender individuals actually reached out to her through the website and said, *Thank you for standing up for this child. Look, I'm transgender, and I made that decision, but this kid should get to pick when he's 18. His parents can't pick this lifestyle for him. Parents shouldn't be allowed to force something like this on their children.*

And so like you said, there are people out there who disagree with it, but it should be so much more of a resounding voice. We should all be able to rally around the fact that we want to defend children, right? I mean, childhood is so precious. We need to defend children. They need our protection. They're children. But we're just not seeing that. And I think that there's a lot to that. I think that if you look at how children are unfortunately being used for advocacy and for political gain, nowadays — I mean, look at Greta Thunberg — I think that that's part of what the left is trying to do now to make all the things acceptable, so to speak. And I think that that also is really scary. Like, let's look at the facts. Let's see what's going on. None of this come from a point of hate for transgender, LGBT people, right? We love them. We want the best for them, just like you said. And we may disagree on what's "the best for them," but at the end of the day, we care about the human being as a human being. But I think that's starting to bleed into forcing children to accept these things. I think that's really scary.

**WOODS:** Now, before I let you go, again, I want to hit a little bit more on this, just because this has been a source of criticism of the way some people covered the story. And that is to say that the father himself is not an exemplary person, and that he's misled people and the people who kind of want to believe his version of things have just gone along with all this. What can you tell us about that aspect of this?

**JACOB:** Yeah, so in the divorce and annulment proceedings, the court did find that Mr. Younger lied about certain things to Dr. Georgulas. Mr. Younger cites some documents that he has and evidence that show that that's not the case, but I think that that's not really the focus of this. Whether he did mislead Dr. Georgulas or not, I think the focus of this needs to be on the fact that there's a father trying to protect his son's choice. And I think that that's very important. It's a mother forcing a choice on this child and a father, who at the end of the day did testify: look, I just want him to be 18 to make this decision. Will I ever personally want to affirm him as a girl? No, but he needs to make that choice when he's 18.

And additionally, Mr. Younger, I had an interview with him right before the gag order was issued, and he addressed these points. And one of the things he said was, look, I'm not a perfect human being. I have — he called it a "checkered past." But he references maturity and growing up, but also that he's trying to, at his core, protect his kids. And so I think that, yes, it is important, people need to know, Mr. Younger does have a history. He's not this perfect angel parent, right? But neither is Dr. Georgulas, and we can't paint this heaven versus hell over here. It's a very complex, very difficult situation that is going on between these parents and these individuals. Neither one of them is perfect, but I think we need to kind of put that aside and not really focus on the individual parents, but let's focus on the kids and what's best for the kids.

So I would reference that interview if anybody wants to go check it out at LifeSiteNews.com, just to kind of see, because you're hearing a lot from other sources that he's an awful human being, but I think when you see him and when you speak with him – and I've actually personally seen him interact with his two boys – he's a very authentic, very well-rounded individual. What he's done in his past, what's happened in the past that, it happened. We can't deny that. But if you see him interact with those boys, it comes from a place of nothing but love. The way he speaks with the boys, the way he redirects them if they're doing something wrong, instead of yelling at them or getting upset with them, he sits them down and he talks to them. *Do you really think that this was the best way to do this? Can you tell me why?* And he walks them through their thought process and then his thought process of, *Here's what I think maybe I would have done. What do you what do you think?*

And so I think people need to remember both parties are human. Dr. Georgulas has some good qualities too, right? Depending on which media you read, she's either an angel or a demon, and vice versa for Mr. Younger. And I think we just need to remember that it's human beings in this case, and none of us are perfect.

**WOODS:** Well, Madeleine Jacob, I appreciate your time. I'll link to some of your work on this subject at [TomWoods.com/1522](http://TomWoods.com/1522), our show notes page for today. Thanks again.

**JACOB:** Thank you, Tom, for having me. I appreciate it.