



Dr. Jane Clare Jones @janeclarejones

25 Jun 20 · 6 tweets · [janeclarejones/status/1276057484311003136](https://twitter.com/janeclarejones/status/1276057484311003136)



So, I was thinking about the hilarity of the good doctor inventing single sex spaces for us, and I'm really struck by what a good example it is of how utterly in thrall they are to the idea of 'inclusion' as the only and total axis of moral worth.

He thought that because he was

'excluding' us from our own spaces then what he was proposing was 'bad' for us and we would experience it as bad.

That we wouldn't care, that our value system isn't structured by a sovereigntist 'inclusion/exclusion' matrix, and that we only care that female people have spaces that meet their needs, totally passes them by.

It's important (hello Brexit and Trump) to understand that sometimes humans get really attached to the idea of 'excluding' different others for mostly totally bullshit psychological reasons that doesn't address the actual problem.

It's also important to realise that sometimes we 'exclude' people from certain spaces because 'including' them stops the space serving the needs of the people the space is for.

A children's swimming pool that 'excludes' adults isn't an instance of bigoted sovereign othering.

A deaf school that 'excludes' hearing children isn't an instance of bigoted sovereign othering.

And a rape crisis centre that 'excludes' male people isn't an instance of bigoted sovereign othering.

None of these things are Trump's wall-building. They are providing services for people with specific needs which won't be met properly if other people are included.

And if you included those people and stopped properly meeting the needs of the people the spaces exist to serve, that would be unjust.

Viz. 'Inclusion' is not a synonym of justice.

...