



**Dr. Jane Clare Jones** @janeclarejones

24 Jun 20 • 12 tweets • [janeclarejones/status/1275714151013326849](https://twitter.com/janeclarejones/status/1275714151013326849)



So I did a quick exasperated fisk of that NYT piece.



**Opinion | Sex Does Not Mean Gender. Equating Them Erases Trans Liv...**

Embracing the experiences of trans people means leaving old vocabularies behind.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/23/opinion/trans-gender-language-trump.html>

**Opinion | Sex Does Not Mean Gender. Equating Them Erases Trans Lives.**

Men menstruate. Some have even given birth.

Only if you accept your definition that 'man' is not a sex word and is \*only\* a gender word. The entire argument we are having is about redefining the sex classes as a gender classes. And as you are more than aware, a lot of people do not consent to their sex class being redefined.

You claim that this piece is about distinguishing sex from gender. But what it is actually about is taking sex-words, redefining them as gender words, and then trying to insist that people don't use sex-words. What this does is \*subsume\* sex under gender. It is therefore you who are, effectively, equating them. And you can only maintain the claim that it is who is doing that my conflating the conservative position with the feminist position.

Viz.

*Conservative accounts:* Sex determines gender. (No sex/gender distinction)

*Trans accounts:* Gender subsumes, determines and erases sex. (No sex/gender distinction, you just flipped it)

*Feminist accounts:* Sex exists, and if you want to believe in gender that's your call, but leave us the fuck out of it. (Sex/gender distinction)

Women with penises and prominent larynxes walk the streets and use the ladies' restroom. Nonbinary people wear binders and use they/them pronouns. It's 2020.

Ditto.

The Trump administration would like to turn back the clock. This month, the administration [finalized a rule](#) that would erase nondiscrimination protections for trans people in the provision of health care. The administration's mode of attack is linguistic. Trans people live in the space between "gender" and "sex," and the new rule aims to erase us by conflating the concepts.

You crowbarred your protections into sex-based protections because colonizing/redefining sex-classes as gender classes is the ideological aim of your political movement. In doing that, you made your protections vulnerable to someone simply asserting that 'man' and 'woman' were sex terms. It's interesting to me that the evident vulnerability of your protections hasn't made anyone question whether it might not have been a better idea to try and be protected as your own class. But of course you won't.

A full embrace of this new trans reality will mean leaving behind old vocabularies.

You mean the vocabulary that allows female people to name themselves as a class, to be protected as a class, and to organize as a class along the axis of their oppression? Yeah, that might be what we're fighting about.

Some changes are simple: We can speak of trans mothers and brothers and siblings as easily as of any other family member. Others are more contested. "They" as a singular pronoun is not without its detractors, [Shakespeare aside](#). And some words will need to be reconfigured entirely. The "feminine products" aisle offers tampons and pads and diva cups — tools for managing the biological function of menstruation. Again, some men menstruate. So why not simply call these menstrual products?

"Sex" is a biological framework, a panoply of possibility on its own.

What the actual fuck does this mean? Sex isn't a 'panoply of possibility.' It's two reproductive functions and then a tiny number of developmental disorders.

"Sex" needs precise words like "male" and "female" and "intersex" to describe the origins, components and functions of bodies.

U-huh..... BUT....

But we can't maintain this precision if we use words about sex to describe gender — the social and political roles and possibilities we take on as women, as men, [as something else](#) or [none of the above](#).

Right. So stick to gender words if you want and leave the sex words alone.

That is to say: Stop using "male" and "female" to refer to men and women. In fact, stop using sex-based words to refer to people at all. They're words for bodies, not for people with hearts and souls and minds.

So let me get this straight. You have redefined the sex-based words 'man' and 'woman' as gender words. And then you think you can insist that those gender words now have nothing to do with sex. And we're the ones doing linguistic trickery?

Also. Stop fucking telling people what they can and can't say.

Especially stop telling people oppressed on the basis of sex that they can't use the words to name the axis of their oppression.

And especially especially stop with this patriarchal Cartesian bullshit about the true essence of people being in their souls or whatever. As JK Rowling said, I am mentally unsexed. My heart is not sexed. And my soul, if I have one, IS. NOT. SEXED. The only thing about my person that is sexed is my body. I am a human being who happens to be female. That's it. And I do not consent to being redefined as a woman because I have a feminine fucking soul.

Anti-trans revanchists have centered their battles in wordplay — if you can call it that. J.K. Rowling, in a [recent tweet](#), noted that "people who menstruate" were once referred to as "Wumben? Wimpund? Woomud?" (She meant "women." There's that wordplay.)

God you are a load of po-faced idiots aren't you?

She also argued, "[If sex isn't real](#), the lived reality of women globally is erased" and "erasing the concept of sex removes the ability of many to meaningfully discuss their lives." Ms. Rowling's linguistic wizardry cloaks her political goal, to assign gender purely by sex, and therefore relegate trans-ness to a closet [under the stairs](#).

ARGHHHHHH. We're not trying to claim that gender should be assigned by sex. We're fucking gender abolitionists. Why are you incapable of understanding the most fundamental and basic point of feminism??? Do you really not understand, or are you just so committed to your ideology that you think constantly misrepresenting our position is really going to help you out in the long run? Do whatever you like with your gender. Seriously, we don't care. Just leave sex alone, and stop trying to redefine us by the mechanism of our oppression, and stop trying to force everyone to believe your religion.

It should be noted that trans people do not generally believe sex is not real; indeed, discomfort with the sex of our bodies is a frequent challenge for trans people.

No, you just want people to stop using sex words and to make all legislation gender-based and erase female people as a political class.

Ms. Rowling knows this, since she knows what the word "trans" means.

Yes, and trans people are people who transition to live being perceived as the opposite sex, or, more often, as someone who has transitioned. You are right, trans is meaningless without sex. And therefore, trans people are not the same as the class of people who actually are of the sex-class someone transitions into. Viz. Trans women are trans women, and were they not, then the entire political assertion 'Trans women are women' would be meaningless and would not even exist. Because weirdly, no one ever thought it necessary to mount a massive political campaign in order to impose the belief that 'Women are women.'

Words hold power, and it's no surprise that pushback to a rising trans presence has come in the form of definitional conservatism.

Words do have power, and so you have decided to perform the linguistic wizardry of redefining women's assertion that they do not want to be politically redefined as 'definitional conservatism.' We'd prefer to call it 'anti-colonization'

But the battle extends beyond language, and Ms. Rowling's semantic battle has been taken to new theaters by the Trump administration.

JK Rowling has nothing to do with Trump. The vast majority of GC British feminists are not in favour of what Trump did because we do not want your legal protections revoked. But, as I've said, we note that you made yourself vulnerable to this by trying to colonize and redefine sex-classes, when your protections would have been much more durable under your own specific category.

From our [schools](#) to our [hospitals](#) to [the federal work force](#), the administration has pursued new rules that define trans people out of existence. This is an attack on trans lives. As with Ms. Rowling, the language of the proposed rules is the language of bodies: the social roles of "man" and "woman" are the only two available, and we are all assigned one at birth according to our bodies. (Intersex individuals will note that false binaries are not limited to social roles.)

You are really insistent on not getting the point of what this demonstrates aren't you?

Last week, the judiciary offered trans people some relief. The [Supreme Court ruled](#), "An employer who fires an individual merely for being gay or transgender violates Title VII," which prohibits employers from discriminating based on sex. Aimee Stephens, a trans woman and a plaintiff in the case, was fired after notifying her employer she would be transitioning. As the court argued, she was fired because of her sex. The logic is impeccable. The only difference between a trans woman and a cisgender woman is the sex assigned to her at birth: Firing a trans woman but keeping a cis woman *must* be discrimination based on sex, which is illegal.

In finding for Aimee Stephens, the Supreme Court reinforced the centrality of bodies to the word "sex," while undermining the patriarchal belief that our bodies should determine our gender.

Right, it's patriarchal to think bodies determine gender. Ergo, feminists, like JK Rowling, do not think that. Which has never stopped you, as you do here, associating conservative views of gender with feminist ones and treating them as identical. So much for respecting people's identifications and beliefs. Oh, only your identification and beliefs matter? Cool. Got it.

Unfortunately, the protections depend on the language of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and remain as limited as the imaginations of its authors.

Damn that unimaginative Civil Rights Movement. Why didn't they understand that in 60 years time a bunch of people are going to need to erase the axis of female people's oppression in the name of progress?

While male and female people are protected classes,

Not for much longer if you get your way.

nonbinary or genderqueer people may not have enforceable rights — say, to a gender-neutral bathroom — under the act.

THEN. DO. THE. WORK. TO. GET. YOURSELF. PROTECTED. AS. A. CLASS. WITHOUT. ERASING. US.

Clarity in language provides social and linguistic accommodation for those of us traditionally denied both.

Trans ideology? Clarity? HAHAAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA.

The battle for civil rights *is* the battle over words.

Oh, I thought arguing about words was just 'linguistic wizardry.' So, when we argue about words we are using sleights of hands and when you redefine words you are Divine fucking Justice. Cool

Denying trans people passports because our gender doesn't match the sex assigned to us at birth limits freedom of movement.

Then we need to work out a solution so you can travel and female people still exist politically.

For trans immigrants and [asylum seekers](#), this restricts access to families abroad. Denying trans people access to bathrooms on the basis of sex denies us access to public spaces. (Can you imagine spending a day at school or work without using the bathroom? If you can't pee, you don't have access.)

Then we need to work out a solution so you can go to the loo and female people who feel vulnerable can do as well.

When you use words like "male" as shorthand for those privileged by the patriarchy, you leave trans women uncertain whether you have our backs or — like the Trump administration and J.K. Rowling — you are trying to write us out of existence.

This is mind-blowingly narcissistic and pretty much sums up exactly what the problem is here. Female people have been oppressed by male people for millennia. Male people until recently owned us like property. We had no legal personhood. We couldn't vote, or go to university, or have our own bank-accounts. We still do about 25% of the labour in this society UNPAID. 20% of us are still raped by MALES. We are underrepresented in every sphere of public life despite being MORE THAN HALF the population. But we can't name the power structure which has had us under its heel since the agricultural fucking revolution because ITS ALL ABOUT YOU and the function of women's analysis of their own oppression is ALL ABOUT YOU, and the point of our political organization is ALL ABOUT YOU. And you want to lecture me about gender??? It was your decision to put all your political eggs in the basket of colonizing us. You exist, as trans people, and if you were asking to be recognized "as trans people" and not "as us" then us asserting our existence wouldn't have any effect on you would it? All women are doing is saying 'no.' And the only people who think they are annihilated by other people saying 'no' to them are total utter narcissists.

It's impossible to dismantle the patriarchy while wearing a "pussy hat."

Thank you for your directives on how we should do our own liberation. We'll take your comments under advisement.

The anti-trans clique would pursue legal restrictions where nature has concocted something more anarchic.

WUT???? Nature has concocted what???? Two sexes??? Or a Facebook drop down menu with 51 gender on it????

But we are already here, being trans, at your job, on your block, in your bathroom.

Great. Our problem isn't you being here. Our problem is you trying to colonize our being with your being here.

And we deserve no less.

No less than what? Everyone agreeing to being redefined around your needs?

Rooting our social possibilities in our bodies is an abandonment of our humanity in favor of mere anatomy.

Patriarchal body-denigrating mind-over-matter techno-Platonist bullshit.

Apologies for typos. Quick and dirty this one. Now I am going to go and dig in the actual dirt like a good body-loving witch x

• • •