



The *Erasure* of

WOMEN

*Mindless Consensus of Woke White Women Dismantling
Female Sex-Based Protections*

- C
O
N
T
E
N
T
S**
- Executive Summary of Research
 - Executive Summary of Results
 - The Starting Hypothesis
 - Data Analysis: The Gender Consensus Gap
 - Rhetorical Strategies: How the Argument is Waged
 - ▷ The "Expert" Shield
 - ▷ Statistical Minimization
 - ▷ Threat Displacement
 - The "Enforcer" Dynamic: Aggressive Male Allyship & Profile Observations
 - Conclusion: The Erosion of the Female Category



Colteryahn For Indiana is with Will Colteryahn.

April 19 at 7:37 AM

READ THIS WORD SALAD FIRST

Transgender Athletes:

As the most transparent candidate running to represent HD-40; Avon and Plainfield and the only one willing to consistently speak with voters I think it's important to use every means of communication to not only tell you my policy position but also the "why" behind them.

Despite all the issues affecting Hoosiers, this is still one of the questions I'm asked most often especially by people who connect with my Hoosier-first message but haven't voted for a Democrat before. So I want to address it directly:

What are my views on transgender athletes?

If elected, my job is to represent my district and consider the needs of the entire state. I also believe people should be free to follow their heart and live a life that fulfills them. Our transgender neighbors deserve the same chance to live, learn, earn, love and play in our community as anyone else.

Decisions regarding participation should be made by the governing bodies of each sport, guided by independent experts in biology, kinesiology, and related fields. If experts determine there's an advantage in a particular sport, government shouldn't override them. If experts determine there isn't, government shouldn't override that either.

College and professional sports already have governing bodies. I don't see a role for state government unless there's evidence of harm or exploitation-and even then, decisions should rely on independent expertise, not politics.

Public school athletics already require more oversight, but that oversight must remain grounded in research and respect. For example, if an 8th-grade student transitions and makes a cross-country team (the sport and age group I coach) I don't see an issue. But I would listen to qualified experts if they said otherwise.

We also have to consider enforcement. If a 14-year-old girl moves to Avon, joins girls tennis, and someone questions her gender despite school and medical records confirming she's female, what happens? Do we demand new exams? Do coaches "inspect"? What recourse does she have if the accusations are wrong? Are we seriously going to ask all potential student athletes to have their gender specific biology reviewed prior to playing a sport? Who would conduct that test and what protections would be in place?

These are real questions that deserve serious thought.

And ultimately: do we want a part-time legislature spending time on an issue that affects almost no one? Fewer than 1% of people are transgender, fewer are students, and even fewer are athletes. States that track participation show numbers in the single digits, if any.

We must be careful to not look for problems that we think may exist. Government should be careful about making laws based on what we think might happen or where the political winds are blowing. We've seen this go wrong before. In the 80s, states passed laws because they believed daycares were tied to satanic activity and long investigations later proved it was baseless. In the 90s, states reacted to the "super predator" theory, which never materialized, and ended up overcrowding juvenile facilities and spending years fixing the fallout. Any legislation, especially aimed at a specific group but be implemented carefully and with sensitivity.

With so many major issues going unaddressed, it's fair to ask why this one gets so much attention. But if the public wants it examined, we should do so with compassion for the students involved and respect for expert guidance. It's the same standard we should apply everywhere else.

In summary: I'm not anti-sports, I'm not anti-women, and I'm not anti-trans. I'm pro-experts. Governing bodies; with input from experts in biology, medicine, gender, movement, and sports, should make these decisions. These decisions based on evidence and not politics.

This is why we need regular people in office. People with the conviction to stand by their principles and the humility to listen and learn from others.

As always, please reach out with any questions, concerns, or comments.

Will@WillColteryahn.com

1. Executive Summary of Research

This case study analyzed public discourse on a [Facebook policy post](#) by Indiana House District 40 candidate Will Colteryahn. His post addressed the inclusion of transgender athletes (mentally ill males pretending to be females) in female sports and locker rooms. The study tracked 176 unique comments from 111 unique posters, categorizing each by gender, stance (Support vs. Oppose), and rhetorical strategy. *The goal was to observe how different demographics engage with the dismantling of sex-based boundaries in athletics. This data was collected on April 20, 2026.*

Public Discourse



Biological Men in Women's Sports & Locker Rooms

2. Executive Summary of Results

The data reveals a stark, *statistically significant divide along gender lines*. Despite the issue directly impacting female opportunities and privacy, 92% of female posters supported the candidate's "inclusive" policy. Conversely, the opposition was almost entirely male-driven, with men providing 99% of the initial logical and biological pushback. The discourse was characterized by high-level "emotional gaslighting" and "credentialism" used to silence those advocating for biological fairness. See Appendix A.



92% of female posters **supported** the candidate's "inclusive" policy



99% of those who **opposed** the candidate's "inclusive" policy were male posters.

3. The Starting Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study was that the push for biological males to enter women's sports is ironically enabled and championed by women themselves, while men (often parents or coaches) are the primary demographic willing to speak publicly in defense of the biological sex binary and the original intent of Title IX.



*Push for biological males to enter women's sports is **enabled and championed by women***

4. Data Analysis: The Gender Consensus Gap

The following table illustrates the final tally of the 176 interactions analyzed. While the opposition to the candidate was 99% male, the male demographic itself was divided.


DEMOGRAPHIC	SUPPORTIVE OF CANDIDATE	OPPOSED TO CANDIDATE	SUPPORT %
FEMALE POSTERS	59	5	~92%
MALE POSTERS	52	62	~45%
TOTAL UNIQUE POSTERS	111	67	62%

Observation on Male Support:

While approximately 45% of male posters supported the candidate's position, the nature of this support warrants closer scrutiny.



- Observational data of these profiles showed a high concentration of accounts with no profile photo (anonymous accounts).
- Among the segment that did have photos, the aesthetic was predominantly categorized as "feminine male feminist" types or individuals exhibiting what many would describe as a "creepy" or "deviant" visual presentation, suggesting a specific sub-culture of male support rather than a broad cross-section of the local male population.



Mentally ill man pretending to be a woman

"feminine male feminist"

5. Dishonest Rhetorical Strategies

A. The "Expert" Shield

The candidate and 90% of female supporters deferred to "Experts," "Governing Bodies," or "Science" without defining what that science actually says.

Purpose: To make the average parent feel "unqualified" to have an opinion on the fairness of their own daughter's sports.

Result: It moves the power into the hands of unelected boards and transgender activist groups.

B. Statistical Minimization

Transgender cultists argued that because trans athletes are a "small percentage," the issue is a "distraction."

Purpose: To avoid answering the moral question of whether a biological male has an advantage.


Result: It implies that an injustice is acceptable as long as it only happens to a few girls at a time.

C. Threat Displacement

Female posters argued that "cisgender" men are the "real threat" to women, not mentally ill males pretending to be women in locker rooms.

Purpose: To frame male dissenters as predators for being concerned about female privacy and fairness.

Result: It creates a social environment where men who demonstrate common sense are shamed into silence.



90% of Women Deferred to:

- "Experts"
- "Governing Bodies"
- "Science"

6. The “Enforcer” Dynamic: Aggressive Male Allyship & Profile Observations

A critical find in this case study was the role of male supporters (notably Matthew Lawson and Ezra Ben David). While the women provided the “compassion” shield, these men acted as “enforcers.” See Appendix A.

Language Used: Terms like “cuck” were used to emasculate men who stood up for women’s sports.

Goal: To signal to other men that defending biological reality is socially “weak,” while supporting the “word salad” of the candidate is “intellectual” and “strong.”

Profile Consistency: This aggressive defense often came from the aforementioned “male feminist” or anonymous profiles, suggesting a performance of allyship that relies on attacking the masculinity of dissenting men.



Mike Catt

Todd Cassel the reason we have women's sports is because back in the day, women weren't allowed to play sports, and at that time, they said "you won't let us play, fine, we'll start our own team!" And the only rules about who were able to play in which leagues were the leagues themselves. It's a fucking game and politics needs to stay the hell out of it. Your kid isn't going pro anyway, so sit down, shut up, and be happy that they're having fun with their team.

“Your kid isn’t going pro anyway, so sit down, shut up, and be happy that they’re having fun with their team.”

7. Conclusion: The Erosion of the Female Category

The most significant finding of this case study is the near unanimous social pressure applied by women against those defending women’s rights. *Female posters often weaponized “kindness” to silence opponents*, rather than a concrete biological reality essential for “fairness.”

By *prioritizing the desires of mentally ill males* over the objective safety and privacy of the entire female population, these posters have signaled a reckless willingness to dismantle the very sex-based protections that allowed women’s sports to flourish over the last 50 years. The data suggests that the “transgender cultist” push is not being forced upon women in this Indiana district; it is being actively invited and defended by them, leaving men as the unlikely defenders of female biological reality.

The “transgender cultist” push is not being forced upon women in this Indiana district; it is being actively invited and defended by them.

3 final take aways



to save your state

It is a common refrain among red-state citizens to plead, “Don’t California my <insert state>.” While it is true that a subset of transplants flees the wreckage of failed Democrat policies only to vote for the same destruction in their new home, they are not the primary threat.

For every short-sighted transplant, there are far more grateful ones who relocate to a red state, value their new home, and vote to ensure the same fate doesn’t befall them. *The idiotic transplants will not be enough to turn Indiana blue, but your homegrown useful idiots will.*

Here are the three crucial takeaways for every Hoosier and red state resident that values freedom and safe communities:

1. The Useful Idiot Next Door

The call for “California policies” is coming from inside the house. Your local woke white suburban women and weak, white-shame-filled males are the primary engines for subversion in every suburb and town. Driven by weaponized empathy, they are the ones begging for the dismantling of your community. Whether it is lowering punishments for criminals (mostly black ones), climate alarmism, open borders, or forcing men into your daughter’s locker room, they will champion it all; and tell you it’s about “kindness.”

2. The GOP “Controlled Opposition”

Your state might have a GOP that is weak and spineless. Many of these [representatives worship “inclusive” slogans](#), desperate for a pat on the back from Democrats to be seen as “one of the good ones.” These “Republicans” have never faced real opposition and lack the guts to fight blue policies when they arrive wrapped in nice-sounding phrases like “empathy,” “compassion,” or “taking care of our neighbors.” They are not your protectors; they are the ones slowly opening the gate for your enemies while telling you everything is fine.

3. The K-12 Activist Pipeline

Most crucial of all: Your red-state government K-12 schools are actively brainwashing your children to “vote blue no matter who.” These are no longer centers for academics; they are Marxist indoctrination centers dedicated to turning your children into social justice activists. As seen in the early 2026 school walkouts to protect illegal aliens, your children have been trained to be activated for any radical cause; from BLM to transgenderism. The state is currently using your tax dollars to manufacture the very voters who will eventually destroy your way of life.

c o n c l u s i o n


The data in this report is not just a study of one Facebook post; it is a mirror held up to the future of Indiana. You are not being “invaded” from the outside; you are being sold out from within by a consensus of woke mind virus carriers and a cowardly political class.

Courage is the only cure. It is time to recognize that the traditional “***Hoosier Mentality***”—built on high trust and neighborly politeness—is being weaponized against you. That legendary Indiana kindness only works in a community of shared values; currently, it is being exploited by activists to silence your common sense. You cannot afford to be “polite” while your daughters’ sports, your children’s minds, and your community’s safety are auctioned off to the highest bidder of woke ideology.


**IF YOU DO NOT STAND UP
FOR YOUR CHILDREN TODAY
THEY WILL LIVE ON THEIR KNEES TOMORROW**



@couragehabit



COURAGEISAHABIT.ORG



[COURAGEOUS SUPPORTER](#)

APPENDIX A: BREAKDOWN BY POSTER

NAME	LIKELY GENDER	STANCE	RESPONSE COUNT	KEY ARGUMENT / STRATEGY
Will Colteryahn (Author)	Male	Support	4	Procedural deference to 'experts' and 'governing bodies'; frames enforcement as invasive 'body inspections.'
Trever Smith	Male	Support	1	Sarcastic; frames the candidate's approach as the only 'logic-based' one in Indiana.
J Eric Schronce	Male	Support	2	Cynical toward state government; dismisses opposition as uneducated/backwards.
P Lynn Harris	Female	Support	1	Emotional/Relational: Focuses on 'love' and 'neighbors'; uses 'Mind Your Own Business' (MYOB).
Robert Stacks	Male	Support	1	Political 'gotcha': mocks conservatives for only caring about science when it concerns trans issues.
William Keane	Male	Oppose	2	Direct confrontation; labels the policy 'trans-insanity' and a failure of leadership.
Matthew Lawson	Male	Support	6	Aggressive/Insulting: uses 'cuck' repeatedly; cites intersex outliers to dismantle the sex binary.
Mark Tabb	Male	Support	1	Sarcastic: mocks 'culture wars' and claims the issue is a manufactured distraction.
April Selvy Roth	Female	Support	1	Indifference: Admits she doesn't care about sports but likes the 'logical' framing of the post.
Brian Christopher Matthews II	Male	Support	1	Frames the government's focus on this issue as 'sickening' compared to 'real issues.'
Ana Yoder Coulter	Female	Support	1	Affirmation: Parrot's the candidate's 'live learn earn love' phrasing.
John Mannin	Male	Support	1	Strategic: Focused on 'flipping' the district and breaking the GOP supermajority.
James Walls	Male	Oppose	1	Procedural: Proposes biological sex on government IDs as an enforcement mechanism.
Abby Lex	Female	Support	1	Deflection: Challenges the logistics of child ID enforcement.
Jeremy Vonsenden	Male	Oppose	16	Biology/Fairness: Focuses on the physical advantages gained during male puberty; coaching background.
Justin Michael	Male	Oppose	2	Accuses the candidate of following 'crazy ideologies' over basic science.
Josh Gresham	Male	Support	4	Shaming: Tells opponents they are 'uneducated' and 'religious nutjobs.'
Kathie Mason	Female	Support	2	Medical/Intersex: Argues 'basic' biology is insufficient compared to endocrinology.

NAME	LIKELY GENDER	STANCE	RESPONSE COUNT	KEY ARGUMENT / STRATEGY
Jacki Lyn	Female	Support	1	Statistical: Claims trans population percentage matches genetic mutation percentages.
Tracey L. McKinney	Female	Support	3	Minimization: Asks for specific numbers to imply the 'problem' is too small to address.
Brian Stevens	Male	Oppose	3	Hypocrisy: Points out the contradiction in Democrats claiming to advocate for women while allowing males in sports.
Ezra Ben David	Male	Support	12	Intellectual Superiority: Aggressively attacks the education and intelligence of dissenters.
Caleb Rose	Male	Support	5	Statistical: Argues it's a 'non-issue' because it impacts so few athletes.
Ash Ley	Female	Support	2	Gaslighting: Tells opponents they are 'rage-baited' and 'emotional' while she is 'logical.'
Thea Frank	Female	Support	1	Biological Outliers: References the SRY gene to argue sex isn't binary.
Jason LaChar	Male	Oppose	7	Material Reality: Focuses on women's scholarships and fair competition being 'sacrificed' for PC culture.
Kelley Dougher-Stramiello	Female	Support	1	Small Government: Frames the policy as avoiding 'government waste.'
NoFucks Left ToGive	Male	Oppose	3	Locker Room Safety: Explicitly states the issue of minor daughters' privacy makes Dems unelectable.
Lucky Mal	Female	Support	2	Mama Bear: Long emotional appeal focusing on 'safety' and 'dignity' of trans children.
Pam Ferance Lenahan	Female	Support	3	Data/Elitism: Cites NCAA stats to dismiss the issue; calls opponents 'uneducated.'
Alvin Lui	Male	Oppose	1	Moral Threshold: Asks how many 'mentally ill males' must be in locker rooms before a line is drawn.
David Janocha	Male	Support	1	Personal Attack: Tells opponents to stop worrying about 'genitalia' and focus on their own families.
Ryan Phelps	Male	Support	1	Minimization: Claims the issues are 'non-existent.'
Jen Langford	Female	Support	1	Ad Hominem: Pivots to Trump's personal character to avoid defining 'woman.'
Brooke Huddleson	Female	Support	1	Political Moralizing: Argues Republicans can't claim to support women if they support Trump.
Lindsey Renee Hollander	Female	Support	1	Utopian Pivot: Suggests 'universal education' as the solution to lost sports scholarships.

NAME	LIKELY GENDER	STANCE	RESPONSE COUNT	KEY ARGUMENT / STRATEGY
Billy Stephens	Male	Support	1	General Affirmation: Calls the candidate 'level-headed.'
Micky Houston	Female	Support	1	Minority Rights: Frames the discussion as 'targeting minorities.'
Laurie Filsinger	Female	Support	1	Simple affirmation of support.
Bruce Bocian	Male	Oppose	1	Cultural Decay: Lists societal grievances and 'insanity' of the 'Twilight Zone.'
Holly Bartlett	Female	Support	1	Expert Deference: Argues it shouldn't be a government issue; trust the scientists.
Barbara Bixler	Female	Support	1	Personal validation: 'You sound like a good person.'
Kevin Kaplan	Male	Oppose	1	Direct jab at the dismissal of biological reality.
Amber Sampley	Female	Support	1	Social Harmony: 'Don't make neighbors your enemies.'
Nicole Crawford Zuzik	Female	Support	1	Minimization: Calls the national focus on this issue 'sad.'
Michael Oliver	Male	Oppose	3	Simplicity: 'You play sports in the sex you were born with.'
Jeff Gillespie	Male	Support	1	Minimization: 'Up in arms about a non-problem.'
Mary M. Hutchison	Female	Support	1	Intersex Deflection: Uses genetic variations to cloud the binary.
Rebecca Walters	Female	Support	1	Short affirmation.
Sherri Campbell	Female	Support	1	Thoughtful and fair.
Vicki Hoehn	Female	Support	1	Refreshing voice of reason.
Angela Kuhn Hastings	Female	Support	1	Simple agreement.
Chrissy Chapman	Female	Support	1	Common sense.
Ann Kelly	Female	Support	1	Reasonable person.
Joy Buse Garrett	Female	Support	1	Well said.
Feral Macy	Female	Support	1	Excited affirmation.
Keith Kimmerling	Male	Oppose	1	Biological Advantage: Uses blunt language to prioritize biology over 'feelings.'
Joe Miller	Male	Support	1	Simple agreement.
Jamie Rudman	Female	Oppose	2	Simple but high-energy rejection: 'BIG HELL NO' and 'derp derp derpity derp'
Tony Joslin-Lemire	Male	Oppose	4	The 'Definitions' Trap: Links the issue to gun control and challenges the definition of 'woman.'
Katie Lee	Female	Support	1	Whataboutism: Compares trans athletes to gun violence stats.
Cmdr Carr	Male	Support	1	Statistical debate on gun violence to move focus away from sports.
Laura Glancy Evans	Female	Support	1	Balanced take.
Kathy Hayzer Onyschak	Female	Support	1	Concise and intelligent.

NAME	LIKELY GENDER	STANCE	RESPONSE COUNT	KEY ARGUMENT / STRATEGY
Krys Wake	Female	Support	1	Affirmation.
Mandy Gooding	Female	Support	1	Appreciates 'strong leaders.'
Mary Charity	Female	Support	1	Logical; candidate needed everywhere.
Shyla Richards	Female	Support	1	Breath of fresh air.
Susan Engel Lampert	Female	Oppose	1	Breakthrough: 'Girls play girl sports boys play boys sports period.'
Sarah Lou	Female	Support	1	Simple thanks.
Amy King Harrison	Female	Support	1	Excited affirmation.
Gina Buran	Female	Support	1	Wants the 'common sense' to spread to Ohio.
Christa Becovitz-McKinzie	Female	Support	1	Simple affirmation.
Ashley Nicole	Female	Oppose	1	Single word disapproval: 'Ew.'
Janet Wall-Myers	Female	Support	2	Threat Displacement: Claims women are safer with trans women than with 'cis' men.
Gerald Pulliam	Male	Oppose	9	Evidence-based: Posted multiple links of bathroom harassment/ crimes.
Dan Angell	Male	Support	1	Patriarchy Narrative: Claims opposition is about men wanting to 'control' women.
Sarah Kirsch Holland	Female	Support	1	Affirmation via emoji.
Jennifer Stafford-Campbell	Female	Support	2	Mockery: Uses the 'Savannah Bananas' to mock the opponent's 'meltdown.'
Josh Auterson	Male	Oppose	1	Labels the posters 'cultural Marxists.'
Mike Catt	Male	Support	1	Diminishment: 'It's just a game'; tells parents to 'shut up.'
Brynna Gee	Female	Support	1	Anecdotal: Uses personal lack of fear to invalidate others' safety concerns.
Stacey Conley Arthur	Female	Support	3	Success Narrative: Claims it's only a problem when trans athletes are 'successful.'
Wendy York	Female	Support	1	Double Standard: Claims trans-men are never questioned, implying anti-male bias.
Cherri Burton	Female	Support	1	Agreement on the 'trans-girls only' complaints.
Sara Mollenkopf Goedde	Female	Oppose	1	One-word disapproval: 'Yikes.'
Juan Galt	Male	Oppose	1	Accuses the candidate/supporters of being 'groomers.'
Josh Beard Pickering	Male	Oppose	1	Direct rejection of boys in girls' sports.
Dustin Jordan Levitz	Male	Oppose	1	Blunt opposition: 'We don't need trans in schools.'
Curt Nieman	Male	Oppose	1	Questioning competency: Links biological recognition to legislative trust.

NAME	LIKELY GENDER	STANCE	RESPONSE COUNT	KEY ARGUMENT / STRATEGY
------	---------------	--------	----------------	-------------------------

Jay Kintigh	Male	Oppose	1	Skepticism of needing experts for 'obvious' things.
Bill Hoey	Male	Oppose	1	Single word insult.
Robert Watkins	Male	Oppose	1	Simple fix: play in respective birth-sex sport.
Troy Baker	Male	Oppose	1	Anatomical focus for categorization
Dustin Hopkins	Male	Support	1	Semantics: Challenges the logic of something 'not existing' being a problem.
Carole Lynne	Female	Support	4	Aggressive Defense: Attacks the character of dissenters to protect th candidate's 'science.'
Laurie Os	Female	Support	1	Character Attack: 'Every accusation is a confession.'
Moises Martinez	Male	Support	2	Epstein Deflection: Uses the Epstei case to claim Republicans are 'monsters.'
Vale Hettlinger	Female	Support	1	District Resident: Excited for 'reasonable' approach; feels seen.
Sarah Slaven	Female	Support	1	Safety Dismissal: Claims predators don't care about 'signs on walls.'
Justin Kugler	Male	Support	3	Credentialism: Cites his own marathon/cycling history to claim authority on sports.
Dave Kobus	Male	Oppose	1	Statistical Science: Argues results are indicator of biological advantage.
Rex Sharpe	Male	Support	1	Asks for specific number of trans women taking first place.
Susan Goeckner	Female	Oppose	1	Traditional stance: Girls play girl sports boys play boys sports.
Kyle Mossbrucker	Male	Oppose	3	Biological Absolutism: Hormones don't change sex; challenges 'one-way' dominance.
Sara Mollenkopf	Female	Oppose	1	Simple firm rejection: 'Yikes'.
Tim Hughes	Male	Oppose	5	The 'Laptop' Accusation: Implies connection between stance and personal deviancy.
Stacey Arthur	Female	Support	1	Success Argument: Claims people only care when trans athletes win.
Wendy York	Female	Support	1	Double Standard Defense: Claims trans-men are never questioned.
Cherri Burton	Female	Support	1	Echoes 'trans-girls only' narrative.
Dan Withers	Male	Support	1	Socio-Economic Shaming: Labels opposition 'Hatechristian' and corporate bowing.
Mark Mascoe	Male	Oppose	1	Mental Health Argument: Defines transgenderism as mental problem exacerbated by validation.