



DiGeSt

Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies

Exploring TERFnesses

Editorial

Mauro Cabral Grinspan, Ilana Eloit, David Paternotte, Mieke Verloo

DiGeSt Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies, Volume 10, Issue 2

<https://doi.org/10.21825/digest.90008>

Print ISSN: 2593-0273. Online ISSN: 2593-0281

Content is licensed under a Creative Commons BY

DiGeSt is hosted by Ghent University Website: <https://www.digest.ugent.be/>

Exploring TERFnesses

Editorial

Mauro Cabral Grinspan
Justicia Intersex & Université libre de Bruxelles
mcabralgrinspan@gmail.com

Ilana Eloit
University of Geneva
ilana.eloit@unige.ch

David Paternotte
Université libre de Bruxelles
david.paternotte@ulb.be

Mieke Verloo
Radboud University
mieke.verloo@ru.nl

In September 2022, the US chapter of the organisation Women's Declaration International announced the adoption of a Lesbian Bill of Rights by an 'international network of lesbian radical feminist organizations', including its own lesbian caucus (Women's Declaration, 2022a). This Bill of Rights aims 'to describe lesbian reality, lesbian rights, and lesbian political potential consistent with radical feminist principles'. While it enumerates a rather classic list of rights lesbians are entitled to, this document rapidly changes its focus when defining lesbians as 'females sexually attracted exclusively to other females' who are 'women (...) affected by the same biological, cultural, and political issues as every other woman'. It goes on by claiming that 'the enshrining of so-called "gender identity" in law has resulted in the erasure of lesbian-only spaces and the demonization of lesbians who, recognizing that homosexuality is based on sex, refuse dating and sexual relationships with men who say they are lesbians'. It finally resolves that 'recognizing that if not intervened upon, the majority of "trans-identifying" youth grow up to be lesbian, gay, or bisexual, the right to be free from conversion therapy includes the right to be free of indoctrination into gender identity ideology and its accompanying cosmetic medical procedures designed to disguise one's sex' (Women's Declaration, 2022a).

The opposition between the rights of lesbians and trans people's rights suggested in this document comes as no surprise for those who know the work of Women's Declaration International. Over the last years, this organisation has become one of the key players of anti-trans feminism at a global scale, and the Lesbian Bill of Rights is the latest addition to a long list of statements against trans people. Actually, WDI – formerly the Women's Human Rights Campaign (WHRC) – was itself set up with the purpose of spreading and promoting a document entitled the "Declaration on Women's Sex-Based Rights". Adopted in 2019, this Declaration denounces the substitution of sex by gender in international documents and advocates a return to an understanding of women's rights as anchored in sex, defined as the 'physical and biological characteristics that distinguish males from females'¹ (Women's Declaration, 2022b). On its website, WDI claims to be present in more than 40 countries across the world, and indicates that its Declaration has been signed by 36 200 people from 160 countries and over 500 organisations.

Hostility towards trans people and their human rights is not a new phenomenon (Califia, 1997; Namaste, 2000; Hines, 2019; Kubala, 2020; Saeidzadeh & Strid, 2020). In feminist circles, such animosity has been present since at least the 1970s and can be found in activist, academic and institutional settings. Over the past decades, it has been met with multiple responses from trans, feminist and transfeminist activists and scholars, creating a rich and complex field of investigation. Nonetheless, discussions on trans participation in feminist spaces and anti-trans hostility have never fully disappeared, as documented by research, for example, on the Michigan Festival or the Latin American Feminist Encuentros (Califia, 1997; Namaste, 2000; Berkins, 2003; Fernández, 2003; Serano, 2007; Cabral, 2008; Koyama, 2020). Furthermore, such antagonism has recently gained a new momentum, spreading across the world with tremendous force.

This observation raises a crucial question: why has feminist hostility towards trans people's rights made a come-back with such intensity? One can identify a few triggering factors, including the increased visibility of trans people in daily life, mainstream media and culture at large, the access to gender recognition based on self-determination, the expansion of trans-specific healthcare in a context of progressive depathologisation, the involvement of trans activists in political life, and the rising attention to trans people's human rights at the

¹ In a recent essay, Catharine MacKinnon (2023) argues that women do not have sex-based rights in the affirmative sense but (negative) rights to be free from discrimination on the basis of sex and that sex discrimination law is based on gender neutrality.

national, regional and international level². Moreover, feminist hostility towards trans people and their human rights must be located within a broader geopolitical context, characterised by the weaponization of gender by conservative forces, and social, moral and sexual panics around biotechnologies and the fear of transhumanism. All this leads to coincidences, synergies and sometimes collaborations between anti-trans feminisms and conservative actors, as shown, among others, by the strong racist and anti-migrant rhetoric pervading anti-trans opposition, the continuous association of trans people to the idea of a global conspiracy to abuse children and replace women or the identification of trans issues as a tool used by the elites to dominate the world by perverting, denying and ultimately dissolving reality. In this context, feminists appear as only one actor in the complex constellation of contemporary anti-trans activism (Clochec, 2023), although the rise of anti-gender campaigns and the politicisation of gender by conservative forces have undoubtedly offered new opportunities to the feminists who are willing to collaborate with these actors (Tudor, 2021; Bassi & Lafleur, 2022; Franklin, 2022; GATE, 2023).

Highlighting various forms of TERFness

The acronym TERF, which means Trans Exclusionary Radical Feminism, was coined by the Australian blogger Viv Smythe in 2008 to refer to a specific form of feminist hostility towards trans issues. However, in recent times, it has come to name many different forms of feminist hostility towards trans people. Especially in the United Kingdom, there is a fierce debate about whether TERF has become – or has always been – a derogatory term and whether it could be used as a label to describe an intellectual and social phenomenon (Hines 2019, p.147; Pearce, et al., 2020, p.683; Thurlow, 2022). In this special issue, we want to interrogate the limits of this acronym; by insisting on the varieties of TERFness, we intend to unpack the false impression of unicity that this term conveys. We also aim to explore the diversity of anti-trans positions within contemporary feminisms, and to delve into its complex and entangled meanings as well as to map the diffusion of this way of reasoning across a multitude of actors. At the same time, we see the expression ‘gender-critical feminism’ – a self-definition by some individuals and groups labelled TERFs by others – as problematic because it serves specific actors to ‘rebrand’ their anti-trans activism and to legitimise their own positions by presenting them as more moderate (Thurlow, 2022) or as doing critical work (Ahmed, 2021). While several authors in this special issue have suggested new expressions to address this phenomenon, we prefer to use the term TERFnesses based on the term TERF, because of its resonance in contemporary debates while insisting on its plurality. We try to disentangle diverse manifestations of TERFness (or more accurately anti-trans feminisms) and, in this special issue, we have identified three of them, with diverse roots and expressions, that play a crucial part in the current offensive on trans rights: certain specific currents within radical feminism, the tradition of difference feminism, and existing foundations of institutional feminism.

The first manifestation relates to specific currents within radical feminism that are inspired by authors like Mary Daly (1978), Janice Raymond (1979, 2021) and Sheila Jeffreys (1997, 2014)³. Often identifying themselves as ‘political lesbians’, these authors and activists

² It must be reminded these advances have historically been supported by numerous feminist groups around the world and regarded as fully compatible with key feminist principles (Heyes, 2003; Ahmed, 2016; Feminist Affirmation, 2021).

³ While Mary Daly’s and Janice Raymond’s work and biography have been widely studied, Sheila Jeffreys merits a mention because of a central role in current feminist mobilisations against trans people. Born in London, this activist and scholar counts among the founders of the Women’s Human Rights Campaign (WHRC). She was involved in radical feminist collectives such as the Leeds Revolutionary Feminist Group in the 1970s and contributed to the reflection on political lesbianism. She moved to Australia in the early 1990s to become a professor of political science at the University of Melbourne. A prolific author, Sheila Jeffreys has written more than 10 books on sexuality, feminism, lesbianism, prostitution or the sexual revolution, including the 2014 *Gender Hurts: A Feminist Analysis of the*

see trans people as a vehicle of patriarchy based on the reinforcement of gender stereotypes, and as a strategy to combat both the emancipation of women and the rise of lesbianism as a form of erotic bond and political resistance. Mostly worried about trans women, they see them as a threat for women-only spaces and activism, but also to women's bodies (Lamble, 2023). When considering trans men, the worries seem to be more about adolescent girls being misled by social media and peer pressure into 'untrue' gender dysphoria. More recently, they have been combatting queer theory as an attempt to erase women and a neoliberal instrument against feminism.

At the same time, investigating some of the paradoxes within radical feminist and lesbian theories, it is important to contest the idea according to which these theoretical currents would necessarily be anti-trans to provide new and 'reparative' readings of this scholarship from a trans-inclusive perspective (see for example Williams, 2016; Tudor 2019; Mackay, 2021). Indeed, transphobia is neither consubstantial to radical feminism nor to political lesbianism. Rather, it seems that radical feminism has been appropriated and monolithically reclaimed by some anti-trans radical feminists, while the positioning towards trans issues of many other radical feminists is more complex. This is the case, for instance, in the overlooked history of trans people identifying and engaging with second-wave feminism, that challenges common notions of a separation between cisgender women and trans people in the 1970s (Cousens, 2023). This is also clearly demonstrated by the trajectories of fundamental authors like Andrea Dworkin and especially Catharine McKinnon, who have repeatedly supported trans people and their human rights (Williams, 2015; Stoltenberg, 2020; MacKinnon, 2023). Similarly, in a fascinating article, Blase Provitola (2022) wonders where Monique Wittig would have stayed if she had lived contemporary debates on trans issues. Rather than speaking on her behalf, they highlight conflicting legacies in the French context, where Wittig's work has not only inspired materialist radical feminists (several of whom, like Christine Delphy, have adopted a TERF position) but also queer transfeminists like Sam Bourcier or Paul Preciado and more recently, scholars gathering under the banner of trans materialisms (Clochec & Grunenwald, 2021). As we see, if it is crucial to investigate the legacy of specific theoretical approaches to understand contemporary debates, we also need to bear in mind that there is no theoretical automaticity or inevitability, but political choices and concrete strategies, and it is therefore theoretically and politically crucial to better understand why some feminists with a specific theoretical background have turned into TERFs and others did not.

The second manifestation of TERFness derives from the long tradition of difference feminism (Gusmeroli, 2023), and its insistence on sexual difference as an ontological difference. From this perspective, the very existence of trans people contradicts the normative bind between bodies and identities, which is often anchored in a mystique of motherhood. In this context, the identification of menstruation, pregnancy and delivery as defining features of womanhood implies at the same time a denial of the existence of trans women because their bodies would be essentially different from female bodies and the existence of trans men because their bodies would be essentially similar to female bodies. This manifestation of TERFness thus sheds light on a particularly gendered focus where essentialised female bodies are the crucial reference point for their harmful political positioning, especially on the 'existence' of trans people. Moreover, the centrality of nature to the definition of sexual difference usually implies an equally central opposition to biotechnology, which helps

Politics of Transgenderism. This book builds upon earlier publications like her 1997 article "Transgender activism: A lesbian feminist perspective" and ambitions to update Janice Raymond's legacy to contemporary times, influenced by queer theory, postmodernism and medical entrepreneurship. The aim was to offer a feminist analysis of transgenderism the same way Raymond did it for transsexualism. The truth is that, long before the highly mediated voices of today, Jeffreys set the terms of the international debate up until now (for an early response, see Stryker & Bettcher, 2016).

understand why some feminists with ecological concerns have embraced the opposition to trans issues as early as from the 1970s (Daly, 1978; Della Sudda, 2022).

This line of thinking is sometimes influenced by psychoanalytical thought, especially Lacanian psychoanalysis (Robcis, 2013; Evzonas, 2020; Preciado, 2021), and intriguingly, it can also be associated with some expressions of feminist materialism (Binetti, 2021). Strikingly, these feminist positions on trans issues resemble religious approaches to gender, which also insist on sexual difference and sexual complementarity. This is, for instance, the line promoted by the Catholic Church, both in its critique of ‘gender ideology’ (Garbagnoli, 2016; Kuhar & Paternotte, 2017) and in the subsequent promotion of a ‘New feminism’ by John-Paul II. This approach was renewed in the recent ecological discourse promoted by popes Benedict XVI and Francis (Fassin, 2010; Case, 2017). Finally, some women close to conservative and far-right organisations who claim a feminist identity have also attacked trans rights on behalf of sex difference and a biological understanding of womanhood (Lewis & Seresin, 2022).

Beyond sex difference feminism, radical feminism, despite laying to a constructivist lineage, has also rigidly fixed the boundaries between male perpetrators and female victims, thus making sex inescapable in what socially defines a man and a woman, ‘neither of them able to leave this fate that lies in the body they were born with’ (Tudor, 2019, p.363). Biological sexual difference is understood – in both differentialist and radical feminist traditions – as the central reason and justification for women’s sexual exploitation. If women’s oppression is grounded in female bodies’ naturalness (rather than in the ways the female body is socially constructed and perceived), it thus becomes difficult to escape a biological definition of the category ‘women’ in the fight against patriarchal violence. Further, the ways in which lesbianism was constructed in US second-wave radical feminism as a ‘conscious woman identification’ (Rich, 1980), or the epitome of the woman-identified woman, also laid the groundwork for gender essentialism in lesbian feminist thinking.

The third manifestation of anti-trans feminism we have identified is connected to institutional or state feminism, understood as a reformist approach to change laws and policies through collaborations with political parties, administrations, governments and international institutions. At the heart of this road to TERFness is a longstanding conflation between sex and gender in institutional feminism, which has often understood ‘gender’ as the institutional equivalent to ‘women’. Gender equality policies and laws are based on the fundamental existence of two binary categories, although these can be seen as biologically given or as socially constructed through different life experiences of women and men. These double roots of binary categorization are a crucial component of ongoing support and success. The use of ‘gender equality’ in such policies enables the support of a wide range of feminists and non-feminists alike. This conflation is generally taken for granted and follows the tradition inaugurated by Ruth Bader Ginsburg to avoid arousing male judges when pleading cases of sex discrimination at the US Supreme Court (Case, 2012, 2019).

A more fundamental strategy of what Judith Squires (2000) calls displacement of the binary sexual and gender categories has not materialised so far in gender equality policies and institutional feminism. This absence enables the conflation of sex and gender while keeping the sex and gender binary intact, and hinders a critical alliance with queer politics. As a result, many institutional feminists reject the inclusion of trans or intersex issues under the ‘gender’ umbrella and propose in some cases returning to ‘sex’ or ‘women’ as key normative categories in legal and policy documents. From their perspective, women’s rights are at risk by the combination of two threats: the expansion of gender into genders which turns women into a gendered group among many others, and the potential conflict between the rights of women and the rights of other gendered groups, in particular trans people.

This is exemplified, for instance, in countries where quota and parity laws were adopted in the 1990s and 2000s to improve women’s political representation, where these feminists are concerned that trans claims could endanger women’s rights as men – they say – could suddenly claim to be women to be elected. Debates on gender-based violence offer

another example. Institutional feminists usually invoke the UN Beijing Platform of Action as a mantra, although it does not include a precise definition of gender⁴. In Europe, gender has become a key category of the Council of Europe's Istanbul Convention on preventing and combating violence against domestic violence, in which it has been further defined. The use of this term and its definition have been used by conservative actors to attack this convention and for some states to withdraw or not to ratify it (Kriszán & Roggeband, 2021). These developments have led some institutional feminists to ponder whether 'gender' should not be replaced by 'women' as it is the main group they want to protect.

The opposition to the 2023 trans law in Spain offers clear examples of this form of anti-trans feminism (Solís, 2022; Willem et al., 2022; Platero, 2023 (this issue)). Indeed, many feminists involved in this campaign are close to the Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE), in which they had been feminist referents in the past. Some were still in office, like the former deputy prime minister Carmen Calvo, and tried to move their party against a bill proposed by their coalition partner. Others, like Amelia Valcárcel, Alicia Miyares or Ángeles Álvarez had at some point worked for the PSOE within political institutions as policy advisor, MP, regional minister or member of the Council of State (Valcárcel, 2019, 2023; Miyares 2021).

To conclude, it is important to bear in mind that these different manifestations of anti-trans feminism are not hermetically separated from each other, but are interrelated through political, theoretical and personal relationships across times and places. Anti-trans positions in diverse feminisms may resemble each other in specific locations, which often produces paradoxical effects. In the Spanish-speaking context, despite their declared hostility towards difference feminism, the writings of 'political' feminists Amelia Valcárcel and Alicia Miyares coincide with the oppositional writings of María José Binetti, which are grounded in the ontology of sexual difference (Valcárcel, 2019, 2023; Miyares, 2021; Binetti, 2021). This hostility also offers a common ground for actors as different as former Spanish leftist revolutionary Lidia Falcón and representatives of the far-right party VOX or the anti-gender organisation HazteOír, with whom some feminists have shared panels and even campaigns against the rights of trans people.

In the English-speaking context, specific writings are also read and appropriated differently, and both actors and arguments circulate again across different groups. For instance, Sheila Jeffreys presents herself as a socialist and a radical feminist and claims to be inspired by Janice Raymond's writings; while Raymond was herself deeply influenced by her mentor, the feminist Catholic theologian Mary Daly, who was a strong defender of 'female energy' as a form of sex difference to build her feminism. Hence, contemporary anti-trans radical feminism, that often claims to be atheist, ironically finds some of its roots in Catholic theology, while the Catholic Church is the institution that has invented the discourse against 'gender ideology' (Kubala, 2020; Wolf, 2020; Morgan, 2023 (this issue)). Interestingly, Sheila Jeffreys has herself decisively influenced Spanish anti-trans debates through translations of her writings, including *Gender Hurts*. Her thinking has deeply influenced several Spanish anti-trans feminists, who counts as institutional feminists. During her frequent visits to Spain, she has for instance met several times the philosopher Amelia Valcárcel, who, in addition to her many institutional positions, is often considered as one of the main exponents of liberal feminism in Spain.

Theoretical challenges

Investigating TERFnesses is not only insightful to study the rearrangement of feminist activism and cross-fertilisation across its various strands, but also for the theoretical questions raised in these debates. In this special issue, we start from the assumption that explaining the current situation requires a deeper exploration of the theoretical and political foundations of feminism. Indeed, far from being a side issue, these debates are likely to weigh on feminism

⁴ The Beijing Platform for Action shows the same problematic double roots of binary categorization.

and gender studies for a long time because they put the finger on unresolved tensions and interrogations, intersecting with older discussions that had been swept under the carpet, playing them again and anew. Therefore, to understand those debates, it is necessary to pay attention to specific intellectual genealogies and legacies, to examine their effects in the present and to study the ways in which they are reconfigured through these discussions. These objectives far exceed what we can do in this introduction, but we would like to highlight at least some of these areas of contention in hopes of inspiring further analysis.

A first paradox to be pointed out is that radical feminism and lesbianism are constructionist (i.e. anti-essentialist) theories for which sexual difference is seen as a marker of patriarchal and heterosexual oppression (Dworkin, 1974; Delphy, 1991; Wittig, 1992). However, TERF discourses reinstate biological sexual difference as the common basis for women's subjectivity and feminist activism. How can this return to a biological understanding of womanhood by radical feminists/lesbians be explained? And how does it open new avenues to challenge the traditional oppositions that have long structured the narrative politics and intellectual history of feminism such as constructivism vs. essentialism or materialism vs. liberalism? These observations echo Cynthia Kraus' argument about the 'naked sex' (2000) or 'the not-nothing of social constructionism', that would proceed from "epistemic covetousness" in many constructionist critiques of gender (2005). It would explain why, despite advocating gender constructionism, many feminists would 'remain passionately attached to a little something that is prior to any socio-historical process' (2005, p.339).

Second, gender as a concept and a theory has never been unanimously accepted within feminism and, most importantly, it has always been understood in extremely different ways. These divergences become crucial at a time when gender is attacked by actors located outside feminism and gender studies, especially to distinguish between 'enemies' and 'disagreements among friends'. They also shed a new light on the status of sex and the role of biology in defining women (Hines, 2019, 2020). Another line of contention, that does not necessarily overlap with the TERF debate, opposes individualistic understandings of gender, as the expression of a personal identity, to more structural accounts of gender hierarchies (Beaubatie, 2021; Clochec & Grunenwald, 2021). Finally, while anti-trans feminism has been accompanied by the emergence of new expressions such as 'gender-critical feminism', on the other hand some feminists have recently started using the term 'FART' which stands for Feminism-Appropriating Reactionary Transphobe (instead of TERFs). This new vocabulary highlights the ways in which symbolic struggles around the definition of gender and feminism structure these debates (Bassi & Lafleur, 2022).

Third, trans claims and activism raise the fundamental question of what makes a woman and who counts as a woman. Therefore, 'trans-inclusive discourses' are often opposed to allegedly preserve the unity of women and to maintain a unitary subject for feminism (Watson, 2016; Williams, 2020; Hines, 2020). For the same reason, these actresses generally think that gender relations transcend all other social relations and deserve a specific analytical and political status. This leads some of them to reject the concept of intersectionality and to fear that a stronger emphasis on diversity among women and in society will undermine gender equality. The weaponisation of women's vulnerability against gender non-conforming and racialised bodies as performing sexual violence in trans-exclusionary feminist rhetoric also reanimates the contested ground between single-issue and intersectional politics within feminist activism and theory (Tudor, 2023).

Fourth, other categories and their mutual interactions are also reconfigured through these debates. This is particularly true of gender and sexual categories and the ways they are articulated (LeMaster, 2023) but also of the complex links between homosexuality and transness. Advocating social acceptance of homosexuality is often used to counteract gender transitions: the normalisation of homosexuality is weaponised against trans people when it is argued that gender transitions would be a way to escape homophobia. This is even more ironic given how transsexuality was historically framed by sexologist and medical science as

a cure for homosexuality. Once homosexuality gets to be (re)defined as same-sex attraction, we also lose sight of the historical entanglements between homosexual, lesbian, gender non-conforming and trans subjectivities (Rubin, 1992).

Fifth, TERFness is often expressed through a specific range of affects such as fear, anger or hatred against trans people, creating a new reality: one in which anti-trans feminists would be fighting against an existential threat to feminism and its subject 'women' (Hemmings, 2021). Similar affects have long been used to oppose minoritarian voices within feminism seeking to address relationships of power (in terms of class, race or sexuality) among feminists. Affects can also be a useful entry point to study feminist affective investments into the subject 'women' despite theoretical deconstructions of the sexual binary. For instance, relying on Wendy Brown's concept of 'wounded attachment', Claire Thurlow (2023) has convincingly argued that TERF debates also express strong but wounded emotional attachments from some lesbian activists who, despite tenacious theoretical contradictions, see these debates as an opportunity to recreate a lost lesbian community (see also Sullivan, 2022). Their activism would therefore derive from nostalgic longings to networks of lesbian sisterhood that contribute to explain how the lesbian anti-trans movement is maintained over time.

Finally, to some extent, these debates play again the 1980s feminist sex wars, which opposed, mostly in the US, 'anti-pornography' feminists to 'pro-sex' feminists and in which the former argued that sexuality was intrinsically oppressive for women. With TERFs often opposing (any form of) prostitution, pornography or surrogacy and denying that these are implacably divisive issues within feminism, the trans debate raises again the thorny issue of sexuality, reformulates theoretical battles on the articulation between gender and sexuality, and interrogates the meanings of autonomy and self-determination.

This special issue

This volume brings together six articles addressing the variety of TERFness from diverse disciplines and methodologies, although these studies are all located in Global North countries: Canada, France, the United States and especially the United Kingdom. The strong prevalence of this country can be explained by the enormous wave of anti-trans feminism there, but we should also take into account the strength of academic responses.

The current convergence between anti-trans feminism, religious groups and/or far-right actors is addressed by three contributing authors. In their article titled "'I'm real, not you': the role of trans exclusionary women's and feminist movements in anti-gender and right-wing populist politics", **Claire House** explores the connections between the feminist anti-trans opposition in Canada and the United Kingdom and religious and far-right actors in both countries, highlighting their shared populist rhetoric. **Briar Dickey's** article, titled "Transphobic Truth Markets: Comparing Trans-Hostile Discourses in British Trans-Exclusionary Radical Feminist and US Right-Wing Movements", examines the discursive connections between conservative forces in the United States and anti-trans feminists in the United Kingdom, unpacking their thematic and rhetorical cross-influences and proposing a new nomenclature. Finally, in her article "Evangelicals, feminists, and the 'unlikely' discursive alliance at the heart of British transphobia", **Rebecca Jane Morgan** investigates the otherwise uncanny convergence between the same UK anti-trans feminists and the long tradition of conservative evangelicals on the defense of natural sex against 'gender ideology'.

The next two articles dig into feminist theoretical and historical genealogies to better understand our contemporary situation, seeking to answer the question raised above: why have some second-wave feminists turned into TERFs and others not? As the feminist anti-trans opposition claims for a return to biology, such a return appeals to both essentialism and materialism. In her article titled "Christine Delphy, an anti-essentialist TERF: Materialist feminism and the affective legacies of the MLF", **Katherine Costello** reconstructs and analyzes the intricate tensions between those positions in the work of French feminist theorist Christine Delphy. A different kind of tensions is investigated by **Cassandra Di Lauro** in her

article titled “What’s in a woman? An ethnographic study of southern Oregon lesbian lands”. Using personal interviews, she explores the past and present ideas, beliefs and affects configuring terms such as ‘woman’, ‘lesbian’ and ‘trans’ as historically produced identities, sexualities and territories in womyn’s communities in this part of the United States. In the last article, titled “Protecting children in ‘gender critical’ rhetoric and strategy: Regulating childhood for cisgender outcomes”, **Fran Amery** examines the rhetoric of the impossibility of the trans child in UK gender-critical discourses and the concrete actions undertaken in schools to prevent trans-inclusive education.

From the very beginning of this project, we were aware of the severe limitations posed by international publications in English to scholars and activists from the Global South and/or whose native language is not English. This became ever more salient when we received article proposals. Furthermore, the hegemony of Anglo-American scholars in the current literature on TERFness and anti-trans activism constitutes an obstacle to the understanding of mobilizations that are spreading fast across the globe. For these reasons, we have invited activists and scholars to contribute with shorter contributions to an open forum. It includes perspectives on current TERF campaigns in Italy (**Massimo Prearo**), Mexico (**Siobhan Guerrero Mc Manus & Julianna Stone Neuhouser**), Spain (**Lucas Platero**), France (**Éric Fassin**), Serbia (**Marija Radoman**) and Russia (**Yana Kirey-Sitnikova**). These contributions highlight the diverse configurations of the links between anti-trans feminist activism, institutional politics and anti-gender movements in these countries and call for nuances and contextualisations when addressing the TERF offensive at a global scale.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2016). An affinity of hammers. *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 3(1-2), 22–34. <https://doi.org/10.1215/23289252-3334151>
- Ahmed, S. (2021, October 31). Gender critical = gender conservative. Feministkilljoys blog. <https://feministkilljoys.com/2021/10/31/gender-critical-gender-conservative-1/>
- Bassi, S. & Lafleur, G. (2022). Introduction: TERFs, gender-critical movements and postfascist feminisms. *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 9(3), 311-333. <https://doi.org/10.1215/23289252-9836008>
- Beaubatie, E. (2021). *Transfuges de sexe : Passer les frontières du genre*. La Découverte.
- Berkins, L. (2003). *Un itinerario político del travestismo*. In D. Maffía (Ed.), *Sexualidades Migrantes. Género y Transgénero* (pp. 127 -138). Feminaria.
- Binetti, M. J. (2021). Del género a los bio/cis/tecnopost-géneros: el paradójico destino de una extrapolación sociologista. *Revista de Investigaciones Feministas*, 12(1), 199-2021.
- Cabral Grinspan, M. (Ed.) (2008). *Construyéndonos. Cuaderno de lecturas sobre feminismos trans*. Mulabi.
- Califia, P. (1997). *Sex changes: The politics of transgenderism*. Cleis Press.
- Case, M.A. (2012). After gender the destruction of man - The Vatican’s nightmare vision of the gender agenda for law. *Pace Law Review*, 31, 802–817.
- Case, M.A. (2017). Le patriarcat chez le pape François, et en particulier dans *Amoris Laetitia*. *Problèmes d’Histoire des Religions*, 24, 193-207.
- Case, M.A. (2019). Trans formations in the Vatican’s war on “gender ideology”. *Signs, Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 44(4), 639-664. <https://doi.org/10.1086/701498>
- Clochec, P. (2023). Les lesbiennes ne sont pas des femmes qui ne sont pas des trans. *3e Congrès International de l’Institut du Genre*, 6 July 2023.
- Clochec, P. & Grunenwald, N. (2021). *Matérialismes trans*. Hystériques & AssociéEs.
- Cousens, E. (2023). Entering the archive of second-wave trans feminist print culture: “The Journal of Male Feminism”. *Gender & History* (Published ahead of print). <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1468-0424.12703>

- Daly, M. (1978). *Gyn/Ecology*. Beacon Press.
- Della Sudda, M. (2022). *Les nouvelles femmes de droite*. Hors-d'atteinte.
- Delphy, C. (1991). Penser le genre: quels problèmes ?. In M.-C. Hurtig, M. Kail & H. Rouch (Eds.), *Sexe et genre : de la hiérarchie entre les sexes* (pp. 243-260). Presses du CNRS.
- Dworkin, A. (1974). *Woman hating*. Plume.
- Evzonas, N. (2020). Psychoanalytic transphobia or a generalized gender trauma. *Research in psychoanalysis*, 30(2). https://www.cairn-int.info/article-E_REP2_030_0103--psychoanalytic-transphobia-or-a.htm
- Fassin, É. (2010). The “tropical forests” of heterosexual marriage: Natural law and laws of nature in current Vatican theology. *Revue d’Ethique et de Théologie Morale*, 261, 201-222. <https://www.cairn-int.info/journal-revue-d-ethique-et-de-theologie-morale-2010-HS-page-201.htm>
- Feminist Affirmation. (2021). An affirmation of feminist principles. <https://www.feministaffirmation.org/>
- Franklin, S. (2022). Gender as a proxy: Diagnosing and resisting carceral genderisms. *European journal of women’s studies*, 29(1S), 132S-139S. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505068211065138a>
- Garbagnoli, S. (2016). Against the heresy of immanence: Vatican’s ‘gender’ as a new rhetorical device against the denaturalisation of the sexual order. *Religion & Gender*, 6(2), 187–204. <https://doi.org/10.18352/rg.10156>
- Fernández, J. (2003). Los cuerpos del feminismo. In D. Maffía (Ed.), *Sexualidades Migrantes. Género y Transgénero* (pp. 138-155). Feminaria.
- GATE (2023). *Impact of anti-gender opposition on TGD and LGBTQI movements: Global report*. GATE.
- Gusmeroli, P. (2023). Is gender-critical feminism feeding the neo-conservative anti-gender rhetoric? Snapshots from the Italian public debate. *Journal of Lesbian Studies* (Published ahead of print). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10894160.2023.2184908>
- Kraus, C. (2000). Naked sex in exile: On the paradox of the “sex question” in feminism and science. *National Women’s Studies Association Journal*, 12(3), 151-177.
- Kraus, C. (2005). Of “Epistemic covetousness” in knowledge economies: The not-nothing of social constructionism. *Social Epistemology*, 19(4), 339-355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02691720500145548>
- Hemmings, C. (2021). Unnatural feelings. The affective life of “anti-gender” mobilisations. *Radical Philosophy*, 2(9), 27-39.
- Heyes, C. (2003). Feminist solidarity after queer theory: The case of transgender. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture*, 28(4), 1093-1120. <https://doi.org/10.1086/343132>
- Hines, S. (2019). The feminist frontier: On trans and feminist. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 28(2), 145-157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2017.1411791>
- Hines, S. (2020). Sex wars and (trans) gender panics: Identity and body politics in contemporary UK feminism. *Sociological Review*, 68(4), 699-717. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026120934684>
- Jeffreys, S. (1997). Transgender activism: A lesbian feminist. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 1(3-4), 55-74. https://doi.org/10.1300/J155v01n03_03
- Jeffreys, S. (2014). *Gender hurts: A feminist analysis of the politics of transgenderism*. Routledge.
- Krizsán, A. & Roggeband, C. (2021). *Politicizing gender and democracy in the context of the Istanbul Convention*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Koyama, E. (2020). Whose feminism is this anyway? The unspoken racism of the trans inclusion debate. *Sociological Review*, 68(4), 735-744. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026120934685>

- Kubala, J. (2020). Teaching “bad feminism”: Mary Daly and the legacy of ‘70s lesbian feminism. *Feminist Formations*, 32(1), 117-136. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2020.0010>
- Kuhar, R. & Paternotte, D. (Eds.) (2017). *Anti-Gender campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing against equality*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lamble, S. (2023). Sexual peril and dangerous others: The moral economies of the trans prisoner debates in England and Wales. *Sexualities* (Published ahead of print). <https://doi.org/10.1177/13634607231201735%20>
- LeMaster, L. (2023). Anti-TERF: Trans feminisms against white nationalist projects- Introductory remarks. *Women’s Studies in Communication*, 46(2), 218-222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2023.2193535>
- Lewis, S. & Seresin, A. (2022). Fascist feminism: A dialogue. *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 9(3), 463-479. <https://doi.org/10.1215/23289252-9836120>
- Mackay, F. (2021). *Female masculinities and the gender wars: The politics of sex*. I.B. Tauris
- MacKinnon C. (2023). A Feminist defense of transgender sex equality rights. *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism*, 34(2), 88-96.
- Miyares, A. (2021). *Distopias patriarcales: Análisis feminista del “generismo Queer”*. Catedra.
- Morgan, R. J. (2023). Evangelicals; feminists and the “unlikely” discursive alliance at the heart of British transphobia. *DiGeSt: Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*, 10(2), 48-64. <https://doi.org/10.21825/digest.85310>
- Namaste, V. K. (2000). *Invisible lives: The erasure of transsexual and transgendered people*. University of Chicago Press.
- Paternotte, D. (2023). Victor Frankenstein and his creature: the many lives of ‘gender ideology. *International Review of Sociology*, 33(1), 80-104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2023.2187833>
- Pearce, R., Erikainen, S. & Vincent, B. (2020). TERF wars: An introduction. *Sociological Review*, 68(4), 677-698. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026120934713>
- Platero, L. R. (2023). Open Forum – Strange bedfellows: Anti-trans feminists, VOX supporters and biologicist academics. *DiGeSt: Journal of Diversity and Gender Studies*, 10(2), 124-130. <https://doi.org/10.21825/digest.89997>
- Preciado, P. B. (2021). *Can the monster speak? Report to an academy of psychoanalysts*. Fitzcarraldo Editions.
- Provitola, B. (2022). TERF or transfeminist avant la lettre? Monique Wittig’s complex legacy in trans studies. *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 9(3), 387-406. <https://doi.org/10.1215/23289252-9836050>
- Raymond, J. (1979). *The transsexual empire: The making of the she-male*. Beacon Press.
- Raymond, J. (2021). *Doublethink: A feminist challenge to transgenderism*. Spinifex Press.
- Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 5(4), 631-660.
- Robcis, C. (2013). *The law of kinship: Anthropology, psycholanalysis and the family in France*. Cornell University Press.
- Rubin, G. (1992). Of catamites and kings. Reflections on butch, gender, and boundaries. In J. Nestle (Ed.). *The Persistent Desire: A Femme-Butch Reader* (pp. 466-482). Alyson Publications.
- Serano, J. (2007). *Whipping girl: A transsexual woman on sexism and scapegoating of femininity*. Seil Press.
- Saeidzadeh, Z. & Strid, S. (2020). Trans* politics and the feminist project: Revisiting the politics of recognition to resolve impasses. *Politics and Governance*, 8(3), 312-320. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v8i3.2825>
- Solíis, R. (2022). *La batalla trans*. Bellaterra.

- Stoltenberg, J. (2020). Andrea Dworkin was a Trans Ally. *Boston Review*, online: <http://bostonreview.net/gender-sexuality/john-stoltenberg-andrea-dworkin-was-trans-ally>
- Stryker, S. & Bettcher, T. M. (2016). Introduction: Trans/feminisms. *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 3(1-2), 5-14. <https://doi.org/10.1215/23289252-3334127>
- Squires, J. (2000). *Gender in political theory*. Polity.
- Sullivan, M. (2022). *Lesbian death: Desire and danger between feminist and queer*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Thurlow, C. (2022). From TERF to gender critical: A telling genealogy?. *Sexualities* (Published ahead of print). <https://doi.org/10.1177/13634607221107827>
- Thurlow, C. (2023). Sisters, it's been a while! The emotional pull of the lesbian 'gender critical' movement and a failure of solidarity. *Journal of Lesbian Studies* (Published ahead of print). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10894160.2023.2229144>
- Tudor, A. (2019). Im/possibilities of refusing and choosing gender. *Feminist Theory*, 20(4), 361-380. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700119870640>
- Tudor, A. (2021). Decolonizing trans/gender studies: Teaching gender, race and sexuality in times of the rise of the Global Right. *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 8(2), 238-256. <https://doi.org/10.1215/23289252-8890523>
- Tudor, A. (2023). The anti-feminism of anti-trans feminism. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 30(2), 290-302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505068231164217>
- Valcárcel, A. (2019). *Ahora, Feminismo: Cuestiones candentes y frentes abiertos*. Catedra.
- Valcárcel, A. (2023). *La civilización feminista*. La esfera de los libros.
- Watson, L. (2016). The Woman Question, *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 3(1-2), 246-253. <https://doi.org/10.1215/23289252-3334451>
- Willem, C., Platero R.L. and Tortajada, I. (2022). Trans-exclusionary discourses on social media in Spain. In T. Krijnen et al. (Eds.). *Identities and intimacies on social media: Transnational perspectives* (pp. 185-199). Routledge.
- Williams, C. (2015). Gender. Sex. Sexuality. The TransAdvocate interviews with Catharine A. MacKinnon. *TransAdvocate*, online: https://www.transadvocate.com/sex-gender-and-sexuality-the-transadvocate-interviews-catharine-a-mackinnon_n_15037.htm
- Williams, C. (2016). Radical inclusion: Recounting the trans inclusive history of radical feminism. *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 3(1-2), 254-258. <https://doi.org/10.1215/23289252-3334463>
- Williams, C. (2020). The ontological woman: A history of deauthentication, dehumanization and violence. *Sociological Review*, 68(4), 718-734. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026120938292>
- Wittig, M. (1992). *The straight mind and other essays*. Beacon Press.
- Wolf, L. (2020). As origem católicas do feminismo radical. *Medium*, online: <https://medium.com/o-t-da-quest%C3%A3o/as-origem-cat%C3%B3licas-do-feminismo-radical-2e400de35cb>
- Women's Declaration. (2022a, September 4). *New Lesbian Caucus and Lesbian Bill of Rights*. WDI USA. <https://womensdeclarationusa.com/lesbian-bill-of-rights/>
- Women's Declaration. (2022b, September 4). *The declaration*. WDI USA <https://womensdeclarationusa.com/the-declaration/>