



# STUDY GUIDE

TRUE FOR YOU  
BUT NOT FOR ME

---

**KEY TERMS:** truth                      opinion                      intolerant  
relativism                      reality                      common sense

<b>NOTE-TAKING COLUMN:</b> Complete this section <u>during</u> the video. Include definitions and key terms.	<b>CUE COLUMN:</b> Complete this section <u>after</u> the video.
<p>What was the rationale for the 69-year-old man petitioning the court to legally change his age to 49?</p> <p>What is the motto for Harvard university, and what does it translate to?</p> <p>What did Oprah Winfrey state at the 2018 Golden Globe Awards?</p>	<p>What is truth?</p> <p>What are the problems and consequences of believing in and speaking in terms of truth being relative?</p>

## DISCUSSION & REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- At the beginning of the video, Professor Copan asks, “Is there such a thing as truth? Or is everything, including truth, a statement of personal opinion or preference? In other words, is truth relative?” How would you answer Professor Copan’s questions? If truth can be relative, does that mean that the definition of truth can be relative too? Explain.
- Later in the video, Professor Copan shares with us that, “In a viral video, a 5-foot, 9-inch American Caucasian male asks students at the University of Washington to acknowledge that he’s Chinese, or six-foot-five, or a woman. Some hesitate, but no one will tell him what he’s saying is not true – that he’s not what he says he is. That would be mean and intolerant. This ‘true for you but not for me’ relativism is disconcerting because it requires the acceptance of obvious contradictions, denial of reality, and common sense. Rather than adjusting our lives to the truth, the truth has to adjust itself to us.” Why do you think that the University of Washington students were unwilling to acknowledge the obvious, objective truth about the Caucasian male making the video? Why do you think that some people automatically equate acknowledging objective truth with being mean and/or being intolerant? Explain. Do you think that attempting to ‘adjust’ truth to fit a particular perspective is better for people in general than accepting truth and learning to cope with it? Why or why not?
- Professor Copan points out that, “At its root, truth is a match-up with reality. A story, statement, or belief is only true if it lines up with what’s real. It’s like a socket wrench fitting perfectly onto a bolt. Reality is the truth-maker; reality makes something true. To say ‘the earth is flat’ or ‘the moon is made of green cheese’ is false. Why? Because it doesn’t match up with reality,” and further that, “...you can have ‘your experience’ or ‘your perspective.’ But there is no such thing as ‘your truth’ or ‘my truth.’ There is only the truth; that which is true for everyone.” Why do you think that some people mistakenly conflate opinion, perspective, personal history, and/or political agenda with truth? What’s necessarily wrong with conflating personal opinion, etc... with truth, and what can some of the negative consequences be that come from operating in such a way? Do you agree that objective truth is universal? Why or why not?
- Next, Professor Copan answers the last question by stating, “...here’s another problem with ‘your truth: If ‘your truth’ is truth, anyone who doesn’t hold that truth must be wrong. This sounds a lot like narcissism. And it’s intellectual bullying. ‘Believe ‘my truth’—or else.’ Not exactly a positive pro-truth message. Yeah, truth is going through a tough time.” What do you think Professor Copan means by ‘intellectual bullying?’ Explain.
- Towards the end of the video, Professor Copan explains that, “Truth can’t be relative. If it is relative, it’s not truth. To say ‘there is no truth for all people’ is to declare a truth for all people. In effect you’re saying, ‘It’s true that there is no truth!’ And to declare that both your and my opinions are true even if they contradict one another is to speak nonsense. Truth isn’t opinion or preference. It’s not subjective or relative. It is inescapable because reality is inescapable.” Do you agree with Professor Copan’s thesis? Why or why not? Since Professor Copan argues that truth is commensurate with reality, then his argument holds that reality too is objective, not subjective. Do you agree? Why or why not? Explain.

## EXTEND THE LEARNING:

### CASE STUDY: Bill C-16

INSTRUCTIONS: Read the article “Canada passes radical law forcing gender theory acceptance,” then answer the questions that follow.

- Which legislative body passed Bill C-16, and what was the vote count? What does Bill C-16 do? What do the critics of Bill C-16 argue? Who is Justin Trudeau, and what is his position on the bill? Who is Jack Fonseca, and what is his position on the bill? Who is Jordan Peterson, and what are his points in regard to the outcomes of the bill being passed? What did Professor Peterson insist that he won't use? What does the attorney D. Jared Brown say could happen if someone refused to use genderless pronouns?
- Do you think that government bodies should be legislating 'relative' truth? Why or why not? What might the negative short-term and long-term consequences be, and perhaps unintended consequences as well, of the government controlling and compelling speech that doesn't comport with objective reality? Explain.
- How does this article relate to points made in the video by Professor Copan? Explain.



# QUIZ

## TRUE FOR YOU BUT NOT FOR ME

---

1. A 69-year-old man in the Netherlands petitioned the court to legally change his age to \_\_\_\_\_ because that's how he felt.
  - a. 29
  - b. 39
  - c. 49
  - d. 59
  
2. Why is 'true for you but not for me' relativism disconcerting?
  - a. Because it requires the acceptance of obvious contradictions.
  - b. Because it requires denial of reality.
  - c. Because it requires denial of common sense.
  - d. All of the above.
  
3. At its root, truth is a match-up with reality. A story, statement, or belief is only true if it lines up with what's real.
  - a. True
  - b. False
  
4. What does the motto of Harvard University, *Veritas*, translate from Latin to English as?
  - a. Knowledge
  - b. Truth
  - c. Wisdom
  - d. None of the above.
  
5. Truth isn't \_\_\_\_\_.
  - a. opinion
  - b. preference
  - c. subjective
  - d. All of the above.



# QUIZ - ANSWER KEY

TRUE FOR YOU  
BUT NOT FOR ME

---

1. A 69-year-old man in the Netherlands petitioned the court to legally change his age to \_\_\_\_\_ because that's how he felt.
  - a. 29
  - b. 39
  - c. 49
  - d. 59
  
2. Why is 'true for you but not for me' relativism disconcerting?
  - a. Because it requires the acceptance of obvious contradictions.
  - b. Because it requires denial of reality.
  - c. Because it requires denial of common sense.
  - d. All of the above.
  
3. At its root, truth is a match-up with reality. A story, statement, or belief is only true if it lines up with what's real.
  - a. True
  - b. False
  
4. What does the motto of Harvard University, *Veritas*, translate from Latin to English as?
  - a. Knowledge
  - b. Truth
  - c. Wisdom
  - d. None of the above.
  
5. Truth isn't \_\_\_\_\_.
  - a. opinion
  - b. preference
  - c. subjective
  - d. All of the above.

<https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/breaking-canada-passes-radical-law-forcing-gender-theory-acceptance>



Lianne Laurence

---

## Canada passes radical law forcing gender theory acceptance

OTTAWA, June 15, 2017 (LifeSiteNews) — Canada's Senate passed the Justin Trudeau Liberals' transgender rights bill unamended this afternoon by a vote of 67 to 11, with three abstentions.

The bill adds "gender expression" and "gender identity" to Canada's Human Rights Code and to the Criminal Code's hate crime section. With the Senate clearing the bill with no amendments, it requires only royal assent in the House of Commons to become law.

Critics warn that under Bill C-16, Canadians who deny gender theory could be charged with hate crimes, fined, jailed, and compelled to undergo anti-bias training.

Foremost among these critics is University of Toronto psychology professor Dr. Jordan Peterson, who along with lawyer D. Jared Brown, told the Senate committee that Bill C-16 is an unprecedented threat to freedom of expression and codifies a spurious ideology of gender identity in law.

Peterson was invited to the committee by Manitoba Senator Don Plett, who voted against the bill.

Plett unsuccessfully proposed amending Bill C-16 to add: "For greater certainty, nothing in this Act requires the use of a particular word or expression that corresponds to the gender identity or expression of any person."

Immediately after news of Bill C-16 passing, Twittersphere erupted with hateful attacks against Plett.

Senators who voted against the bill along with Plett are David Tkachuk, Yonah Martin, Richard Neufeld, Leo Housakos, Betty Unger, Norman Doyle, Tobias C. Enverga, Thanh Hai Ngo, Lynn Beyak, and Denise Batters. They are all Conservatives.

Senators who abstained are Anne Cools (independent) and Conservatives Larry Smith, and Michael MacDonald.

Prime Minister Trudeau praised the bill's passage as "great news."

Great news: Bill C-16 has passed the Senate – making it illegal to discriminate based on gender identity or expression. #LoveisLove

— Justin Trudeau (@JustinTrudeau) June 16, 2017

But Campaign Life Coalition, the political arm of Canada's pro-life movement, condemned the passage of Bill C-16.

“This tyrannical bill is nothing but social engineering to the nth degree, all in the name of political correctness,” Campaign Life’s Toronto vice president Jeff Gunnarson told LifeSiteNews.

Jack Fonseca, Campaign Life's senior political strategist, said the bill will be used to attack Christian belief.

"Mark my words, this law will not be used as some sort of ‘shield’ to defend vulnerable transsexuals, but rather as a weapon with which to bludgeon people of faith and free-thinking Canadians who refuse to deny truth,” he told LifeSiteNews.

Peterson tweeted that Canadians will come to "seriously regret" the bill's passage.

Senate passes Bill C16 without amendment 67 for 11 against. Compelled speech has come to Canada. We will seriously regret this.

— Jordan B Peterson (@jordanbpeterson) June 15, 2017

Peterson told the Senate committee last month that he believes “ideologues” are “using unsuspecting and sometimes complicit members of the so-called transgender community to push their ideological vanguard forward.”

“The fact that it’s potentially illegal for me not to participate in that is something that I think is absolutely dreadful. It puts a shudder in my heart as a Canadian that we could even possibly be in a situation like that,” he said.

Peterson became Canada’s preeminent critic of the Liberal bill after he produced three videos opposing the enforcement of gender ideology, one of which blasted Bill C-16, which he said “requires compelled speech.”

He has also vowed that, come what may, he will not use “genderless pronouns” such as “zir” and “ze” for those who self-identify as gender non-conforming when requested.

Lawyer Brown told the Senate Committee the federal Liberals have made it clear they will follow Ontario’s lead when implementing Bill C-16. And Ontario Human Rights Code guidelines “mandate” the use of genderless pronouns on request, he said.

“Mandating use of pronouns requires one to use words that are not their own that imply a belief in or agreement with a certain theory on gender,” he added.

“If you try to disavow that theory, you can be brought before the Human Rights Commission for misgendering or potentially find yourself guilty of a hate crime. To sum up, on the subject of gender, we’re going to have government-mandated speech.”

Those who refuse to go along could be “brought before the federal tribunal,” Brown said.

If the tribunal assesses a penalty such as a fine or “non-monetary remedy, such as a cease and desist order or an order to compel them to do something,” and the person refuses, “they will find themselves in contempt of court and prison is the likely outcome of that process until they purge the contempt,” he added.

Gunnarson said the law indicates that more pro-family politicians are needed to help govern the country.

“We need to step up our efforts to seek out and elect sensible pro-life and pro-family candidates,” he told LifeSite News.

“The Catholic leadership especially needs to flex their muscle, call their parishioners to action and help to bring about a revolt,” he said. “The passage of C-16 is one of many bad bills that will bring about the fall of our nation.”