



Dr. Jane Clare Jones @janeclarejones

24 Mar · 17 tweets · [janeclarejones/status/1374623760217702401](https://twitter.com/janeclarejones/status/1374623760217702401)



This exchange is a great demonstration of how TRAs have arrived at the conclusion we are the essentialists here.

And a great demonstration of how that relies on them interpreting our words exclusively through their ideological lens, even while the very core of what we're about

is the rejection of that ideological lens.

1. Once upon a time 'gender essentialism' meant 'thinking female people behave naturally in x or y way because they are female,' or 'thinking gendered behaviour arises naturally from being female.'

As we constantly point out, trans



ideology is gender essentialist, but it's a weird reverse gender essentialism. Where the trad conservative type of essentialism thinks 'women do x,' trans ideology thinks 'people who do x are women.'

2. The core of the conflict is, of course, about whether 'woman' is a



sex-based or gender based concept.

The TRAs are completely committed to the idea that 'woman' is a gender/social concept.

They therefore read the claim that 'women are female' not as we mean it, which is as an assertion that 'woman' is a sex-based concept, but as a claim that

the social role of 'woman' can only be occupied by female people.

Note again, the reverse causality. It's not 'only female people can do the woman gendered stuff' but 'the people doing the woman gendered stuff must be female.'

That's what they think we believe, which is why

they think we are against gender non-conformity.

Their concept of gender non-conformity isn't our 'humans of any sex should be allowed to behave in any way without labeling or social injunction and we should as far as possible get rid of gendered roles'.

Their concept of gender non-conformity has no thought of getting rid of the social roles, and indeed, reinforces them. Their concept rather is 'people of any sex should be allowed to perform any gendered role, and in fact, their identity should be defined by it.'

As we've often noted, this leaves the structure of gender intact, and removes any critique of the nature and function of those roles, and they way they developed to

uphold sex-based exploitation.

The only injustice in the system is that male ppl don't get to do the 'woman role'

and female people don't get to do the 'man role,' and people who identify with neither/both don't get to do the special 'not/both man/woman' role.

This is laid out explicitly in this 2014 piece from our old friends at Everyday Feminism.



The problem is not that the gender binary exists, but rather that gender is assigned non-consensually, and that anyone who steps outside of the culturally-defined boundaries are marginalized and experience systemic oppression and violence.

The problem isn't femininity or masculinity. It is *compulsory* femininity and masculinity tied to a value system that devalues all things feminine.

Denying the existence of [cis privilege](#), the analyses put forth by TERFs oversimplifies the lived experiences of women in a society that devalues those experiences.

What gets entirely lost here of course is the fact that gender functions to exploit/oppress female people, and the entire concept of oppression-as-double-bind... that is, that women get screwed by this system whether they comply or resist.

And indeed, the fact of gender as

oppression and double bind gets entirely written over with the facile concept of 'cis privilege,' that is, 'you are lucky enough to identify with your 'woman role' and therefore you are privileged and the oppressor.'

Rewriting female people's oppression as a privilege. That

takes some fucking gall.

As does the fact, that as this exchange shows, they **refuse** to understand, no matter how many times we say it, that when we say 'woman' we mean it a sex concept.

And they will be the most condescending obnoxious pious assholes while doing so.



Of course, when read through their lens, what this does is mean that they can impute that by accepting/asserting the word 'woman' for ourselves, we are accepting, indeed, identifying, with the woman role.

Which is precisely the opposite of what we are doing.

It's the most insane circular suffocating example of narcissistic thinking you could imagine.

'We have dictated that the word woman is redefined to mean gender role.

Even though the fundament of this conflict is that you reject this redefinition of the word woman as a gender

role, we will point blank refuse to even remotely grasp your assertion.

Furthermore, we will then interpret all your words and arguments through the lens of the definition you have explicitly rejected (while piously patronising you)

We will hence produce a massive pile of

gibberish which will will claim are your views, even though by interpreting everything you say through our definitions, we will have erased and/or actually reversed the meaning of what you were saying.

And we will then call you names for believing things that bear no relation to

you actual views, and which are entirely an artefact of our own narcissism, lack of good faith and othering, and then we will slap ourselves on the back for what marvellous people we are."

It's fucking wild.

...