

With profound appreciation, I address HB 61 today before you, Chair Manning, Vice Chair Bird, Ranking Member Robison, and Members of the House Primary and Secondary Education Committee. My testimony is in full support of the preservation of girl's and women's sports.

I have lived almost my entire life under the provisions of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, specifically Title IX. I have witnessed the progressive improvements and opportunities created for girls regarding education and athletics. As a former coach and athletic director in various states, I have ensured the opportunities and benefits for my athletes under the law. Respectfully, our US Supreme Court wrongfully opened a re-invention of this act by redefining terms leading us to the need for HB 61 today. In *Bostock v. Clayton County*, Justice Gorsuch opened an umbrella-type definition and let the current definition and use of the term, sex, cover what was not intended by the authors of the 1964 legislation. In doing so, the US Supreme Court used legal maneuverings to cast a more expansive shadow resulting in changes to the competitive landscape for biological females.

It is fascinating to watch supporters of transgender male athletes, including the International Olympic Committee, defend transgender male "rights" to compete against biological females by using science. Unfortunately, science no longer enjoys elite status based on ontology and epistemology. Segments of the scientific community are now corrupted by money and ideology. That said, their science is both damning and limited. The IOC parameters for the fair competition of transgender males in female sports highlight and demonstrate the distinctions between biological males and females. Let's not miss this point. They are fully aware of the inequities of males competing with females. However, their science and resulting parameters seek to minimize the difference. They do not talk about the vast differences between biological males and females in lean body mass, upper and lower body muscle mass, grip strength, lung capacity, and heart capacity. These differences show up mightily in athletic training and competition.

If science is offered as a defense for permitting transgender males to compete against biological females, then let's first answer whether any of these inducers or testosterone limiters change the DNA, the essential building block, of the athlete. If not, then the athlete remains essentially the same, and mixed competition becomes decidedly biased towards transgender males.

I recently visited with one of my former high school athletes from over thirty years ago. She graduated from both high school and college but did not play post-secondary sports. By her admission, she was not an athlete. However, she loved being on the team, getting in the game, and contributing to the score when we had a lead. She told me that that was the happiest time in her life. She loved the work ethic required of the sport. In addition, she loved the community of the team. She participated in this life-shaping activity because no transgender boy was vying for her spot on the team.

My daughter played volleyball in high school. She was a good player on a great team that went deep in the state tournament. She was part of the team fabric. She kept the team loose and connected. She made sure everyone felt safe and included. Team chemistry is necessary but

not sufficient to win in athletics. How could team chemistry develop on a girls' volleyball team when most of the group would not trust or feel safe around transgender males? As a protective dad, I would not let her play with a transgender male on a competitive team. That would be sad. It would be a lost opportunity for my daughter and a loss for the dozens of female athletes that she has subsequently coached in the sport over the years.

I ask you to consider the impact of not saving women's sport from transgender males. A recent graduate of our school, Grove City Christian, is a two-time state champion in track. She also placed second in another event at the state meet. She is a dedicated and talented athlete. In her first championship event, the 100-meter hurdles, she would have come in 9th place if racing against males, factoring in the longer distance for males. In the 100-meter dash, arguably the most straightforward gender comparative race, her second-place time for women would have been almost two seconds behind the top male. In her second title event, the 300-meter hurdles, she would be 4.64 seconds behind the male winner even though he would have to jump six inches higher on every hurdle. She would still be a phenomenal person and athlete without her titles and accolades. But would she still have a college scholarship to the University of Cincinnati to continue her education? Would she even be noticed?

I thank you for your time and consideration in the protection of women's sport. However, actual science and logic must prevail in this area. We all know that women's sports must be preserved, not just for the purity of sport or records, but for the opportunities, safety, and life-long lessons afforded to those who participate.

Respectfully submitted,

David J. Arrell  
*Superintendent*  
Grove City Christian School