#### Zero-sum DA. Treating “fairness” and clash under their model as zero-sum with our narrative of trans-antagonism is how abjection of maladjustment is constituted rhetorically.
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While it is not surprising that anti-trans activists of the Global North speak of rights in possessive terms, their insistence on a zero-sum model—in which trans gains are, ineluctably, cis losses—is notable. In Gender Hurts, Sheila Jeffreys claims that there is an insurmountably oppositional relationship between the rights of trans women and the rights of cis women.42 If trans women gain the right to use public spaces reserved for women, Jeffreys explains, then, by direct consequence, cis women will lose the right to privacy, dignity, and safety.43 Moreover, according to Jeffreys, transness in general ‘upholds the edifice of male domination’, making the existence of trans people ‘hostile to the rights of all women’.44 Although the possessive metaphor of rights does not necessitate zero-sum configurations like this, it does make them possible. This is because Anglophone cultures expect there to be coherence between conceptual metaphors.45 If we are used to the metaphor RIGHTS ARE POSSESSIONS, and if we believe that material possessions are sometimes arranged in finite, zero-sum economies, then we will be logically prepared to accept the metaphor RIGHTS ARE ZERO-SUM POWERS. In such circumstances, we might consider zero-sum rights talk to be literal and objective, as Jeffreys evidently does; we might even follow Judge Robert Bork, one of Ronald Reagan’s nominees for the US Supreme Court, in describing zero-sum rights as ‘a matter of plain arithmetic’46—despite knowing that the concept of rights is not numerical in any literal sense.

But possession can entail abundance as well as scarcity. We could just as easily imagine rights to be so plentiful that the danger of running out of them is negligible. To understand the internal dynamics of the possessive paradigm, it is important to identify the catalysts that drive zero-sum perceptions. One catalyst, I suggest, is the formation of identity through the constitutive exclusion of stigmatised Others, i.e., the sociogenic us/them construction that Wynter associates with coloniality. Putting it schematically, when possessive rights are combined with constitutive exclusion, the likelihood of zero-sum conclusions is increased. This is apparent in the discourse of trans-exclusionary feminists. For example, Jeffreys is scrupulous in withholding the terms ‘women’ and ‘female’ when referring to trans women, preferring phrases like ‘male-bodied transgenders and men who cross-dress’47 due to her reification of dichotomous categories of oppression: cis men are ‘the superior sex caste’ and cis women are ‘the inferior sex caste’, the immutability of these classifications issuing directly from ‘the fixedness of sex’.48 In this worldview, the category woman is constituted through the exclusion of man, and vice versa, making them oppositional. If sex is immutable and determines ‘caste’, then trans women are men, the very people who must not, by definition, have the right to access women-only spaces—the very people who must not, by definition, have the right to be categorised as women. Thus the women’s spaces such as public toilets that are the battlegrounds in this debate are metonyms for the ultimate space of womanhood: the category woman. For ‘men’ to gain access to this would produce a crisis of identity that must be avoided at all costs, as the vehemence of anti trans feminist discourse attests.

Indeed, the febrile register of this discourse implies a growing awareness of the untenability of the trans-exclusionary position, not least due to its racist and colonial associations, highlighting the broader stakes of zero-sum politics. Jeffreys et al. are all too aware that their account of sex as biological, immutably binary, and deterministic shares an ontology with scientific racism; their mentors, colleagues, and students have been telling them for a very long time now.49 They have also been informed of the inadequacy of their single-axis framework of oppression, effectively an instrument for the reproduction of white supremacy.50 And they will surely have been exposed to the well-known scholarship on the coloniality of gender, in which authors such as Oyèrónkẹ́ Oyěwùmí and María Lugones reveal binary immutable sex to be a culturally-specific and strongly gendered scientific construct—not the neutral and objective discovery of a universal natural order—that was violently imposed upon enslaved and Indigenous populations by European colonisers.51 Trans-exclusionary feminism of the Global North is, in other words, inseparable from white feminism; it is characterised by its refusal to accept that white women were and continue to be ‘ambiguously complicit both as colonizers and colonized, privileged and restricted, acted upon and acting’, as Anne McClintock puts it.52 For my purposes, sacrificial feminism is the term that spotlights the tangible harm that trans-exclusionary white feminists inflict upon their Others—trans, intersex, and queer people; disabled people; Black, Brown, and all racialised women; and women of formerly and presently colonised populations—to protect their own beleaguered stance.53 Given the volume and persistence of these criticisms, it is unsurprising that sacrificial feminists have become defined by the identities and histories they wish to disavow. For McClintock, drawing on Julia Kristeva, ‘the expelled abject haunts the subject as its inner constitutive boundary; that which is repudiated forms the self’s internal limit’.54 Haunted by their abjections, exclusions, and amnesias, denounced by their erstwhile comrades, sacrificial feminists today are defensive, angry, and desperate.

#### Using logic-games as a gotcha is transphobic.
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While traditional legal rhetoric will inevitably continue to play a role in U.S. jurisprudence, it should be decentralized as the exclusive, dominant method of legal reasoning and treated as simply one of many rhetorical tools at the courts’ disposal for resolving complex legal issues. Some actors, issues, and fact patterns can fit somewhat neatly into bivalent categories, and society benefits from consistency and predictability in the application of law. However, lawyers and judges should be clear-eyed about the limits of traditional legal rhetoric and the myth of its neutrality. Rather than robotically reducing complicated issues affecting complex human beings down to formulaic methods of problem-solving, advocates and jurists should expand their rhetorical toolkits. The legal profession should recognize that traditional legal rhetoric has no inherent superiority over rhetorical traditions that did not develop through the Western-centric, Classical-to-Enlightenment model the American legal system deifies. Rather, we should experiment with methods of reasoning that embrace complexity, prioritize peaceful community and coalition-building, and value truth and dignity above logical validity. Through the use of alternatives to traditional legal rhetoric, marginalized groups—particularly people who implicitly or explicitly reject cissexist, binary views of gender—can advocate for their rights in ways that play less into the hands of their oppressors. Trans rights advocates can use these rhetorics to vindicate trans folks’ right to access gender affirming healthcare without accepting the false premise that gender is always definable and static.
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The second, related issue is the proceduralism of most accounts of dialogue: the characterization of dialogue in terms of a particular set of communicative norms and the response, when conflict or friction arises, that the resolution of these can (and should) take place through a reinvigorated application of those same norms. It is clear from Ellsworth’s critique that this shields from questioning or criticism those norms themselves. Yet here we encounter a paradox (the first of several to follow), one that begins to turn the discussion of dialogue into a different, more productive theoretical vein. For if questioning the restrictive norms of dialogue is regarded as a good thing, is it not at least in part so that a fuller, fairer, more inclusive dialogue might be made possible? If persons choose to withdraw from a dialogue with those who do not or cannot understand them, is it not in part so that they are able to enter a dialogue with others who can understand them? If “analytic dialogue” seeks (rightly, I would say) to uncover the nonneutral, historically specific conditions under which its own interpretations proceed, is this not so that others might come to share the same understanding, at least in part, about these conditions? It seems strange indeed to imagine a dialogue in which every understanding emerges as entirely idiosyncratic and separate from every other or one that is so persistently pulling up the roots of its own genealogy that the participants never talk about the topic at hand.

#### BUG CHASING DA. Treatment and prevention increased the rate of trans youth with HIV because the only way to get shelter was to have AIDS.
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MS: I’m working on a new anthology called Between Certain Death and a Possible Future: Queer Writing on Growing up with the AIDS Crisis. I first thought of the idea when I realized that Sketchtasy was a generational novel about AIDS. So I’m starting with the premise that every queer person lives with the trauma of AIDS, and this plays out intergenerationally. Usually we hear about two generations—the first, coming of age in the era of gay liberation, and then watching entire circles of friends die of a mysterious illness as the government did nothing to intervene. And now we hear about a current generation growing up in an era offering effective treatment and prevention, and unable to comprehend the magnitude of the loss. But there is another generation between these two, a generation I belong to—one growing up in the midst of the epidemic, haunted by the specter of certain death, internalizing the trauma as part of becoming queer. So those are the personal stories Iwant to collect in this book. One thing I’m learning is that there are so many queer and trans youth who are dying of AIDS now. Especially young trans women and young gay men. Especially people of color. I’m hearing about this from New York and Seattle and Los Angeles, and I’m sure it’s happening everywhere. These are queer and trans youth with access to care. They are in the system. These have access to the treatment and prevention that is supposed to make HIV into a manageable condition, and yet, due to a wide range of issues that include homelessness, hopelessness, addiction, stigma, and trauma, as well as structural neglect, familial and societal homophobia/transphobia, and so many other challenges, this does not save them. I can’t help thinking that if we had a cure for HIV, they would still be alive. But instead of fighting for a cure, most AIDS service organizations talk about “ending AIDS” through access to testing, treatment, pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP), and health care, without even mentioning a cure. I cannot stop thinking about this. Sassafras Lowrey wrote a great piece for the book about coming of age as a homeless teen in Portland in the early 2000s, and then becoming the director of one of New York City’s largest LGBTQ homeless youth drop-in and street outreach programs, and, in the time Sassafras worked there, from 2010 to 2018, more and more youth were becoming positive. And Sassafras writes that the only way these youth could access services was to be HIV positive. And some of these kids, especially gay boys and trans women, were dealing with wasting syndrome and Kaposi sarcoma at a time when these conditions are not even supposed to exist in the United States. Some of these kids are dying of AIDS in their teens and twenties, just like in the 1980s. But do you hear anyone talking about this? In terms of trans politics in general, perhaps never has trans visibility been greater, and at the same time trans women, especially trans women of color, are brutally murdered at an astounding rate. Trans people are routinely kicked out of our families of origin, harassed in school and at work, persecuted by religious leaders and politicians, and attacked on the street simply for daring to exist. Trans people are often denied access to basic services like health care and housing, fired from jobs or never hired in the first place, and forced to flee the places where we grew up, simply to survive. And then so many trans people arrive in cities, seeking refuge, and find themselves marginalized again—without housing, strung out on drugs, HIV positive. But the media story is one of progress. Part of the media narrative involves a mainstreaming of trans identity, which is completely counter to the needs and desires of most trans people. The most obvious example of this is the fight for trans inclusion in the military. We are told that we don’t need housing or health care, we just need the right to fight in unjust wars. So the notion is that fighting for the right to murder people of color around the world for corporate profit will solve the problem of our own brutalization at home. But the US military is actually the problem—defund the military, and we could have everything we ever dreamed of—universal housing and health care and free, delicious, healthy food for everyone, a guaranteed minimum income, safe houses in every city and town for queer and trans kids to escape abusive homes, whatever we imagine, it would all become possible. But instead the issue is military inclusion. The same thing happened with gay inclusion in the military, starting in the early 1990s. But trans people don’t even have a fraction of the power that gay people had twenty-five years ago, so how did this grotesque shift in priorities happen so fast?