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Transforming theory: innovations in critical Trans Studies

PELLOTT EVANS


The field of Trans Studies has produced some of the most innovative, groundbreaking and exciting theoretical work of recent years. 2014 marked, according to *TIME* magazine, a ‘transgender tipping point’, with author Kathy Steinmetz optimistically claiming that ‘America’s next civil rights frontier’ was soon to be breached. The years since, however, have seen a remarkable backlash coinciding with the success of right-wing populism, not just in the US but in Brazil, Hungary, Turkey and Poland. Trans Studies and gender theory have borne the brunt of the right’s attack on what it sees as ‘cultural Marxism’ in universities.

Nevertheless, and perhaps even because of the marginalized perspectives it offers, critical Trans Studies has had a major impact in the areas of psychoanalysis, queer theory, rights discourse and biopolitics, as well as on wider analyses of state power and capitalism in the 21st century.

This article will offer an analysis of recent key texts in Trans Studies as well as an account of its development and tendencies, from experimentation with the ‘genre’ of theory
to pioneering and field-changing developments transforming the field of psychoanalysis or the analysis of contemporary biopolitics. Concurrently and throughout, it will argue that Trans Studies has, from its inception, demonstrated a light-footed agility of thought, betraying accepted conventions and sidestepping the rules of engagement. Far from being an inward-looking area of niche interest, or the minoritizing, academic wing of transgender identity politics, it continues to offer daring and innovative theoretical work that has profoundly shaped more established academic fields.

The ‘centripetal’ movement of Trans Theory: innovative methodologies and new perspectives

Trans Studies is almost necessarily interdisciplinary, although it holds particular strengths in certain fields: psychoanalysis, legal studies, literary studies and philosophy, for example. While some institutions have invested in Trans Studies as its own discipline, more often than not scholars invested in Trans Studies have made their mark within more traditional and established fields of study. In their analysis of intersectionality studies as an emerging field, Sumi Cho, Kimberlé Crenshaw and Leslie McCall describe two models accounting for the ways in which intersectional research moves throughout academic space. The first is described as ‘akin to a centrifugal process’ whereby ‘intersectionality travels from its groundings in Black feminism to critical legal and race studies; to other disciplines and interdisciplines in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences; and across countries and continents as well.’ This centrifugal model ‘adapt(s) to the different discursive and research protocols in these environments (...) begin(s) to conform to methodological standards and practices of each field and strive(s) to make central contributions to those fields’.
The second model is described as ‘more recognizably insurgent’ and likened to a ‘centripetal process’: that is, a movement towards the centre rather than the outward movement of centrifugal force:

Here, scholars interested in intersectionality strike out mainly in the margins of their disciplines and are often skeptical about the possibility of integrating mainstream methods and theories into their intersectional research. As they are less beholden to disciplinary conventions, their projects may draw on a variety of methods and materials, integrating them into innovative insights that might otherwise have been obscured.5

This second model reflects much of the recent work emerging from Trans Theory, whose innovation in terms of methodology and insight have not only made a brief splash or been of passing interest but can properly be described as field-changing for more established disciplines. To offer key examples: in queer studies, Paul B. Preciado’s Testo Junkie has, according to Tim Dean, singlehandedly resuscitated an increasingly stultifying field. Dean describes Preciado’s text as ‘the most important work of queer theory to appear in the last decade; those who have pronounced queer theory dead are in for a surprise when they read it’.6 In the field of psychoanalysis, Oren Gozlan’s Transsexuality and the Art of Transitioning received the American Academy & Board of Psychoanalysis’s book prize for 2015.7 The historian Susan Stryker is one of few academics to have received an Emmy award, for her 2005 documentary of the riot at Compton’s Cafeteria, San Francisco, in 1966, which was sparked by police intimidation of queer clientele.8
In addition to these examples of the impact trans academics have made, new works in Trans Studies have disrupted ‘disciplinary conventions’ and provided ‘innovative insights’ that have altered disciplines in a way that is distinctive of the centripetal process outlined above. Paul B. Preciado’s Testo Junkie is one example of a work that disrupts such conventions. His text offers a description of its author’s bodily experience upon starting to take pharmaceutical testosterone, as well as a political genealogy of testosterone and an analysis of contemporary ‘pharmacopornographic’ society. Preciado’s chapters alternate between personal narrative and highly theoretical accounts of the development of pharmaceuticals. Flouting accepted conventions of philosophical ‘genre’, Preciado continually inserts a fleshed-out, personal and embodied first-person pronoun into his theoretical work, undermining conventions of what is considered as being the ‘proper’ subject of academic enquiry. His work eviscerates the pretence of academic enquiry as neutral, objective and detached from lived experience, instead performing an embodied ‘autotheory’, ‘a body-essay’. Including hand-drawn sketches, diagrams and mind maps alongside his text, Preciado gestures towards the evolution of his thought processes as well as his body in sketching out his ideas. His work incorporates aspects of performance art and praxis into his text: this includes his self-described ‘experimentation’ with the ‘material-semiotic’ (to borrow Haraway’s phrase) pharmaceutical testosterone; taking on the voice of second-wave feminist performance artists and inviting his readers to follow subversive, ‘contra-sexual’ practical exercises drawing on work by queer performance artist Ron Athey in his earlier text, the Manifeste contra-sexuel (2000).

Equally challenging in its disruption of conventions of genre is Susan Stryker’s early essay in Trans Studies, ‘My Words to Victor Frankenstein above the Village of Chamounix’ (1994). This piece combines performance, personal diary and anecdote as well as a
psychoanalytically informed essay on the experience of gender dysphoria, also including details of Stryker’s outfit when she first gave the paper at a conference. Stryker’s approach would still be considered experimental today, more than twenty years later, even for what would now be termed an autoethnography. Crucially, Stryker manages to successfully pull off this meeting of genres, with Jacqueline Rose – a scholar of writers of the calibre of Marcel Proust and Sylvia Plath, no less – describing the ‘justly renowned, exhortatory moment’ in Stryker’s poem exploring the affective experience of gender dysphoria as ‘unsurpassed in anything else I have read’.13

Moving even earlier to another inaugural essay of Trans Studies by Sandy Stone, ‘The Empire Strikes back: A Posttransexual Manifesto’ (1991),14 Stone’s initial work (discussed further later in this piece) is also unapologetically personal, witty and even poetic in style. Her later work also displays an eclecticism in terms of its approach and its meeting (or blurring) of genres. Stone has since become a computer scientist and pioneer in the academic study of new media, as well as writing on performance art. In one particularly eccentric text on the French artist ORLAN, Stone ‘performs’ her argument, writing as though channelling the ghost of Canadian computer scientist Marshal McLuhan in order to discuss emerging digital technologies and ‘disembodied’ identity in ORLAN’s art work.15 Stone, Stryker and most recently Preciado all demonstrate a radical and experimental methodological approach in their work; not only including personal narrative and embodied experience, but also incorporating a variety of approaches beyond typical academic prose to do so.

Considering the ‘innovative insights’ of Trans Theory, theorists in this area often exploit a position of marginality to offer new and challenging perspectives: attacking dominant norms governing not only gender but also issues ranging from state security
initiatives to the production of pharmaceuticals or to the prison-industrial complex, as well as building on and adapting canonical theoretical work. Though discussing sexuality rather than gender, Eve Sedgwick diagnosed a ‘minoritizing view’, which imagines the ‘homo/heterosexual definition (...) as an issue of active importance primarily for a small, distinct, relatively fixed homosexual minority’.16 In contrast, she outlines the ‘universalizing view’, which sees ‘homo/heterosexual definition’ as, ‘on the other hand (...) an issue of continuing, determinative importance in the lives of people across the spectrum of sexualities’.17 Trans Theory has been key in reimagining transgender experience not through a minoritizing logic whereupon trans individuals figure as the object of study, diagnosed by sexology or psychiatry, but through a universalizing logic which asks what lessons trans experience may hold more widely. It is this universalizing move that has characterized Trans Studies from its inception.

In the field of psychoanalysis, Patricia Gherovici’s work epitomizes the move Trans Studies has made in shifting from object to subject of study, bringing new insights to the field in the process.18 Gherovici works against the power dynamic of the analyst and analysand, drawing on her clinical work with transgender patients to reconsider Lacan’s writing on sexual difference as well as his case notes of trans patients and exploiting the radical potential of his work for considering sex and gender fluidity. As Leo Bersani writes, Gherovici’s work asks not what psychoanalysis can proclaim about trans people or how it might diagnose them, but, rather, ‘persuasively proposes that transgenderism might provide new ideas for the clinic’.19

Gherovici sees radical potential in bringing Lacanian psychoanalysis together with Trans Studies, a result of Lacan’s separation of penis (as material organ) from phallus (as symbolic marker of gender). She suggests that the increasing visibility of transgender as a
phenomenon has been transformative of wider notions of sex, gender and sexual identity, claiming that ‘this evolution can reorient psychoanalytic practice’. While acknowledging the normative position analysts have historically taken by reading transsexuality as pathology, she claims that her own clinical experience offers a different perspective. Thus, rather than a model whereby trans individuals are diagnosed by psychoanalysts, Gherovici affirms that it is ‘psychoanalysis (that) needs sex realignment, and the time is now’. Her work offers a reassessment of key psychoanalytic concepts and models through a transgender lens: rethinking hysteria in relation to gender as ‘expressing a universal foundation of sexual uncertainty’ and therefore as ‘a powerful tool for the production of truth’; considering the ‘limits of the Oedipal model’ and castration anxiety through her own clinical case studies drawn from her work with trans patients; and emphasizing the creative function of the Lacanian *synthia* over the pathologicoal *symptom*, building upon Lacan’s formulation to rethink bodily transformation as life-permitting and inventive, ‘a reconciliation with life’.

Shanna Carlson also suggest that Trans Studies offers lessons for psychoanalysis, following Tim Dean in his interest in the disruptive, queer potential of Lacanian psychoanalysis. Yet unlike Dean, and along similar lines to Gherovici, Carlson sees the ‘divorcing of gender from unconscious sexuation’ as the ‘the logical consequence’ of reading Lacan. Analyst Oren Gozlan has reconsidered Lacanian psychoanalytic approaches to transgendered embodiment and the desire for surgery: Gozlan imagines trans surgery as signifying an alternative to heterosexual reproduction ‘a rebirth that resists an origin (...) a birthing of the self that is not tied to the phantasy of reproduction, whose aim is not unity via procreation or continuity through lineage’. Finally, drawing on the work of Didier Anzieu rather than Lacan, Jay Prosser has imagined Anzieu’s concept of the ‘skin ego’ as productive
for thinking through the corporeal construction of the ego as it relates to the particularly embodied experience and identity construction of trans individuals.29

These studies offer welcome alternatives to work in psychoanalysis that had often outlined totalizing and hostile accounts of transsexuality (see Catherine Millot’s Horsexe (1983) in particular).30 Not only this, but the field of psychoanalysis has been enlivened by trans theorists’ work just as it has been by queer theory; benefitting from new interpretations of canonical work as well as original theories derived from case studies and fresh perspectives from those it had previously pathologized.

Outside the field of psychoanalysis, Preciado’s work is not only innovative in terms of its methodology, but in imagining established theoretical concepts anew. As an example, Preciado draws on his experience of taking the pharmaceutical Testogel to build upon the Foucaultian concept of biopower. He uses the experience of topical testosterone gel sinking through his skin to re-work Foucault’s initial analysis, building on Foucault’s announcement of ‘the era of “bio-power”’31 to describe a ‘pharmacopornographic era’. Whereas Foucault imagines biopower as acting upon bodies, Preciado argues that power must now be understood as invading them, acting from within through, for instance, pharmaceuticals, or through excitation by commercially-driven pornography. Although Preciado writes from a marginalized position, he is clear that the lessons he takes should not be understood to apply to a fixed minority of trans individuals. That is, trans people are no more ‘constructed’ by pharmaceuticals, medical technologies and discourse around gender than anyone else: anyone who takes Viagra, has silicone implants, uses steroids, or the contraceptive pill. In a universalizing statement on the lessons of his ‘self-experimentation’, he writes: ‘You, you as well, you are the monster that testosterone is awakening in me’.32
Critical trans politics: institutionalization, marginality and the interrogation of ‘normal’

For Dean Spade, a ‘critical trans politics’ is one which ‘demands more than legal recognition and inclusion, seeking instead to transform current logics of state, civil society security, and social equality’. Spade’s work in legal studies takes transgender experience as the starting point for an analysis of wider state power, particularly in the US as it manifests in the prison-industrial complex or in state security initiatives such as identity documentation programmes, to give examples.

Spade is particularly critical of the minoritizing approach of merely adapting the status quo by, for instance, arguing for the creation of ‘inclusive’ prisons. His work instead adopts a universalizing strategy by arguing that the threat facing trans prisoners is just one example of the failures and violence committed by the state through the prison system.

Spade’s work in *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics and the Limits of Law* is thus described by Angela Davis as required reading not only for trans activists, but for ‘everyone who is interested in challenging capitalism, colonialism, racism and patriarchy’. Drawing on the innovations of Black feminist interventions in the field of legal studies, Spade’s work critiques the premises of a neo-liberal economy promising individual rights enshrined by law, arguing that a rights-based political economy as it currently manifests fails to live up to its promises for the liberation of minority groups. Rather, he argues, it acts as a smokescreen occluding the issue of wealth distribution.

Dean writes that his book ‘is about the strategies emerging from a population often identified by its failure to meet norms associated with gender’. This position of failure to meet normative values is reimagined as positive, identifying these ‘norms’ as something to be diligently guarded against through constant self-evaluation. As such, Spade ‘proposes a trans politics that tirelessly interrogates processes of normalization’.
Spade powerfully argues for the importance of drawing on trans experience – not because trans people hold any privileged access to a singular shared experience, essence or identity, but precisely because of the marginal position of trans people in society. He proposes:

Build(ing) from the space created by the insistence of government agencies, social service providers, media, and many nontrans activists and nonprofiteers that the existence of trans people is impossible and/or that our issues are not politically viable. *Normal Life* suggests these challenges are potential starting points for a trans politics that openly opposes liberal and neoliberal agendas and finds solidarity with other struggles articulated by the forgotten, the inconceivable, the spectacularized, and the unimaginable.37

How, then, does this fit with the increasing institutionalization of trans studies within the academy? The development of the field of trans studies has inevitably led to questions of canon formation and a critical analysis of the effects of institutionalization, even as the place of trans and gender studies within the academy is materially threatened.

Some universities, mostly in North America, have made considerable investments in the field. In 2016, the University of Victoria, Canada, inaugurated the first chair in transgender studies, held by the sociologist and sexologist Aaron H. Devor, as well as hosting the Transgender Archives, the largest collection of transgender research material held globally. There have now been two volumes of the *Trans Studies Reader*, both co-edited by Susan Stryker (firstly with legal theorist Stephen Whittle in 2006 and then with queer theorist Aren Aizura in 2013). There is now a journal dedicated to trans studies, the *Transgender Studies Quarterly (TSQ)*, founded again by Stryker, who continues to be a driving force in
building the field. *TSQ* is hosted by the University of Arizona, which launched a Transgender Studies Initiative in 2013, hiring a number of faculty with expertise in the area, and plans to launch an MA programme.

Since its inauguration in 2014, *TSQ* has published issues dedicated to ‘Archives and Archiving’; ‘Political Economy’; ‘Translation’; ‘Blackness and Decolonizing the Transgender Imaginary’; ‘Tranimalities’; ‘Trans*historicities’ and ‘Transpsychoanalytics’. These last three neologisms offer an indication that the increased institutional presence of Trans Studies has not thus far affected its ability to produce innovative challenges to accepted disciplines. What is at stake in these issues of the journal is not simply the discussion of transgender issues as and when they manifest within traditional fields: rather, it emphasises that Trans Studies can bring new perspectives, energy and methodologies that can significantly alter established disciplines. They insist on altering dominant and accepted wisdom, shifting debates and imagining them anew.

*Transgender Studies Quarterly* has also published the prison letters of CeCe McDonald, a black trans woman who was jailed after defending herself from a transphobic and racist attack in Minneapolis, 2012. In this way, *TSQ* is invested in the material and political situation of transgender people. It is this political groundedness, alongside sometimes utopian, radical thought that makes Trans Studies so exciting in offering new perspectives and methodological approaches.

*Reconsidering the beginnings of Trans Studies: from object to subject of study*

Knowledge of transgender as a category or class of people was, for much of the 20th century, supposedly the preserve of the medical establishment: from sexologists such as John Money
and Harry Benjamin, to psychiatrists including Robert Stoller and to psychoanalysts from Freud to Lacan. In 1979, Janice Raymond published *The Transsexual Empire*[^38], a critical analysis of ‘transsexualism’ (Raymond prefers ‘transsexualism’ to ‘transsexuality’ to denote its ‘operat(ion) as an ideology’)[^39] from a radical feminist perspective. Raymond attacked the medical establishment’s role in what she saw as a deliberate attempt to ‘undercut(...) the movement to eradicate sex-role stereotyping and oppression in this culture (...) fostering institutional bases of sexism under the guise of therapy’[^40]. In addition, her work accused individual trans women of infiltrating the women’s movement and inserting themselves into positions of power in order to divide and conquer the women around them[^41]. Sandy Stone, a trans woman and sound engineer who worked with the all-women collective Olivia Records was one of these women.

Over a decade later, Stone responded to Raymond’s attack with a remarkable essay, one which is widely considered as laying the foundations of critical Trans Studies. In the intervening years, and in the academic equivalent of a training montage from one of the *Rocky* films, Stone completed her doctorate with the best coach in town – Donna Haraway – and eventually published ‘The Empire Strikes Back: A Posttransexual Manifesto’ (1991). In this essay, Stone finally reacts, but her work is far from reactionary. She does not simply respond to Raymond’s somewhat paranoid account of the medical establishment’s role in the material and discursive construction of transsexuality for the precise purpose of infiltrating women’s space; rather, Stone’s move is to begin a new conversation entirely.

Drawing on the anti-essentialist underpinnings of Haraway’s seminal ‘Manifesto for Cyborgs’ (1985),[^42] Stone does not argue that transgender people do indeed belong as part of the coherent categories ‘men’ and ‘women’. Instead, she lambasts the very idea of these categories as neat and distinct, as founded on a shared, embodied authenticity (whether
genital, chromosomal or otherwise). Tearing apart societal myths of human identity easily located in and emanating from the sexed body, Stone too criticized the medical establishment as well as transgender (auto)biographies for perpetuating these ideas and ultimately occluding transgender experience and existence.

Rather than defensive in tone, as one might well expect, Stone’s essay is sharp and playful, thanking Raymond in her acknowledgements ‘for playing Luke Skywalker to my Darth Vader’. It is as adventurous in its style as it is in argumentation, often straying towards the poetic. Stone references Niels Hoyer’s 1933 ‘auto’ biography of Lili Elbe, which he put together after her death with the use of her diaries, commenting on the absurdity of the apparently straightforward sexed transformation of Lili Elbe (formerly Andreas Wegener) as is presented in the book:

The first operation...has been successful beyond all expectations. Andreas has ceased to exist, they said. His germ glands – oh, mystic words – have been removed.

Oh, mystic words. The mysterium tremendum of deep identity hovers about a physical locus; the entire complex of male engenderment, the mysterious power of the Man-God, inhabits the ‘germ glands’ in the way that the soul was thought to inhabit the pineal. Maleness is in the you-know-whats.

Stone’s biting account, with italics dripping in sarcasm, holds two fingers up to accepted wisdom surrounding gender – from the medical discourse surrounding transsexuality to trans (auto)biographies and beyond. As Stryker and Whittle comment, Stone does not respond with ‘an anti-feminist counter-attack on Raymond, but by undermining the foundationalist
assumptions that support Raymond’s narrower concept of womanhood'. In this way, Stone’s inaugural work of Trans Studies epitomizes the tactical move that still defines the field today: while work is produced from a marginal position, it does not follow dominant, minoritizing logic down the rabbit hole of identity politics. Rather, it pulls the rug out from underneath it.

Trans scholars’ success has frequently been to move beyond the terms of the debate we have been given: in Stone’s case, the radical feminist discourse of Raymond, as well as the sexological, psychiatric, psychoanalytic and legal discourses that have sought to define ‘transgenderism’. Authors in these fields generally (with the notable exception of Freud) saw transsexuals as a breed of their own, much like homosexuals – separate from a ‘normal’ general public and therefore an object of curiosity but without implications for society at large. Trans Studies, beginning with Stone, has made the move from this minoritizing logic to a universalizing view. Rather than considering what scientific experts can know about transsexuals, about the truth of their being, trans theorists ask what lessons the marginalized positionalities of transgender experience might be able to teach society as a whole. Spinning straw into gold, Stone’s initial work marks the point at which trans individuals move from being the object of study (by scholars in the medical and psychological disciplines named above), to the subject of theory, authors themselves.

Conclusion

Following the field’s spirit of political groundedness, any account of Trans Studies would be incomplete without mention of the material challenges to its status within academic institutions globally. Despite the notable investment in Trans Studies from certain academic
centres outlined above, the field has remained marginal to many others and has even been banned in certain countries. The far-right Hungarian Prime Minister, Viktor Orbán, last year banned gender studies programmes at Hungarian universities, notably the Central European University (CEU). His government withdrew funding and accreditation for existing courses and has dismissed gender studies as ‘ideology’. In Brazil, Damares Alves, Brazil’s new Minister for Women, Children and Human Rights in Jair Bolsonaro’s government stated that ‘Girls will be princesses and boys will be princes. There will be no more ideological indoctrination of children and teenagers in Brazil’. Pope Francis also refers to ‘an ideology of gender’ with the Catholic Church actively funding movements against gay marriage, same-sex parenting, reproductive technologies and the acceptance of trans individuals under this banner (see, for example, La Manif pour Tous in France; Pegida in Germany).

This political shift is reflected in the comments of now best-selling author Jordan B. Peterson who described Canada’s addition of gender identity and orientation to its Human Rights Act (Bill C-16, adopted in 2017) as an ‘unwarranted intrusion of a certain kind of postmodern ideology (...) with its roots in a kind of Marxist identity politics’. As noted earlier, Janice Raymond’s work also described transsexuality as an ideology, yet quite to the contrary these repeated accusations appear to be an attempt to dismiss transgender identities and thinking, a way of shutting down debate in the service of conservatism and normative values. Despite these accusations, Trans Studies is not a coherent, totalizing worldview seeking to impose its will on others but an approach that embraces critical, nuanced thinking and innovative approaches. Rather than an ontology, it would be better described as an epistemology: an attempt to open up enquiry rather than shut it down in the name of identitarian knowledge.
Some have argued that Trans Theory need not focus on reacting to its detractors, whether radical feminist, conservative or otherwise, allowing Trans Theory to emerge independently. Others take the approach of appropriating even seemingly hostile work for their own ends in what I have termed a ‘scavenger methodology’. If Trans Studies is to remain innovative, it must stay attentive to positions of marginality as Spade suggests, always interrogating the terms of debate. Stone’s guileful approach in ‘The Empire Strikes Back’ must remain a key strategy: embracing creativity and wit; mastering the art of the sidestep, the dodge and learning how to duck punches in order to counter from a different angle entirely.
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