The Boundaries of Womanhood: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminist Opinions About Transsexuals

by
Monica Phillippina Rose Marie Kendel
B.A., University of Victoria, 1993

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree
of
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department of Sociology

We accept this thesis as conforming to the required standard

Dr. Holly Devor, Supervisor
(Department of Sociology)

Dr. David Gartrell, Departmental Member
(Department of Sociology)

Dr. Lianne McLarty, Outside Member
(Department of Fine Arts)

Prof. Annalee Golz, Special Member
(Department of Women's Studies)

Dr. Lynne Marks, External Examiner
(Department of History)

(c) Monica Phillippina Rose Marie Kendel, 1998
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy of other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisor: Dr. Holly Devor

ABSTRACT

Feminists of the past two and a half decades have been influential in the debates about the meaning of womanhood. Transsexualism as a state of being, and transsexuals themselves, have periodically presented challenging issues to the discussion. As a result, the boundaries of womanhood are being questioned and membership in sex and gender categories are being contested by transsexuals and non-transsexuals within feminist debates.

Conflicts arise when questions of transsexuals' womanhood come to the forefront, and one controversy centres on whether sex and gender statuses change for transsexuals. Do male-to-female transsexuals become women (if ever)? Do male-to-female transsexuals become female (if ever)? Should transsexual women be included in women-only events? The last question stirs the debate that has been brewing in feminist communities since the 1970s. And because women-only events are largely organized and attended by lesbians, lesbians have often been at the forefront of feminist debates about the womanhood of transsexual women. There has been much lively debate in the 1970s and again in the 1990s on the topic of transsexualism, however there has been little research specifically looking at feminist attitudes about transsexuals.

To expand our knowledge in these areas, the concepts of womanhood is explored from a feminist perspective. A context is provided with a review of radical feminist, radical lesbian feminist and lesbian separatist theories. Feminist literature on the issue of transsexualism is presented to show the many sides of the debate. Praxis of radical feminism is illustrated using the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival as an example of women-only space, a model of feminist-separatist utopia and a site where transsexual women have not been welcome. With this foundation, analysis of survey question results

are presented to determine whether feminist attitudes, as presented in the literature, aptly reflect non-lesbian and lesbian feminist perspectives on transsexuals' womanhood. This thesis concludes with a discussion of the findings and suggestions for further study.

Examiners:

Dr. Holly Devor, Supervisor
(Department of Sociology)

Dr. David Gartrell, Departmental Member
(Department of Sociology)

Dr. Lianne McLarty, Outside Member
(Department of Fine Arts)

Prof. Annalee Golz, Special Member
(Department of Women's Studies)

Dr. Lynne Marks, External Examiner
(Department of History)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES vii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS viii

DEDICATION ix

INTRODUCTION 1

BOUNDARIES OF WOMANHOOD 4

Radical Feminist Politics: Radical Feminism, Radical Lesbian Feminism and Lesbian Separatism 8

RAYMOND'S EMPIRE 19

Getting Personal: Targeting Transsexuals 26

Other Feminist Theories on Transsexualism 30

THEORY MEETS PRACTICE IN NO MAN'S LAND 36

Others Who Are Not Welcome: Extremely Butch and Extremely Femme Women 42

Transsexuals on Womyn's Land 47

Lesbian Feminists on the Issue of Transsexual Women 49

METHODOLOGY 57

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 65

Sex of Transsexual Women 67

Gender of Transsexual Women 69

Inclusion of Transsexuals In Women-only Events 71

Sex, Gender and Inclusion of Transsexuals Studied by Respondents' Year Born 72
Sex, Gender and Inclusion of Transsexuals Considering Whether Respondents Knew or Did Not Know Any Transsexuals 78
Analysis 82
CONCLUSION 95

NOTES 101
BIBLIOGRAPHY 108
APPENDIX A 116
Lesbians, Wimmin and Girls BEWARE! 117
APPENDIX B 118
Feminist and/or Lesbian Opinions About Transsexuals Survey 119

APPENDIX C 123
Sex of MTF by Lesbian/non-lesbian Feminist 124

APPENDIX D 125
Gender of MTF by Lesbian/non-lesbian Feminist 126

APPENDIX E 127
Include MTF by Lesbian/non-lesbian Feminist 128

APPENDIX F 129
Sex of MTF by Age of Lesbian Feminist 130
Sex of MTF by Age of Non-lesbian Feminist 131
Sex of MTF by Age 132

APPENDIX G 133
Gender of MTF by Age of Lesbian Feminist 134
Gender of MTF by Age of Non-lesbian Feminist 135
Gender of MTF by Age 136

APPENDIX H 137
Include MTF by Age of Lesbian Feminist 138
Include MTF by Age of Non-lesbian Feminist 139
Include MTF by Age 140

APPENDIX I 141
Sex by Known MTF Lesbian Feminist 142
Sex by Known MTF Non-lesbian Feminist 143
Sex by Known MTF 144

APPENDIX J 145
Gender by Known MTF Lesbian Feminist 146
Gender by Known MTF Non-lesbian Feminist 147
Gender by Known MTF 148

APPENDIX K 149
Include MTF by Known MTF Lesbian Feminist 150
Include MTF by Known MTF Non-lesbian Feminist 151
Include MTF by Known MTF 152

APPENDIX L 153
Comments From Survey #3591 154

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Age 65

Table 2: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists' Views of Male-to-female Transsexuals 66

Table 3: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists' Views of the Sex of Male-to-female Transsexuals 69

Table 4: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists' Views of the Gender of Male-to-female Transsexuals 70

Table 5: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists' Views on the Inclusion of Male-to-female Transsexuals in Women-only Events 71

Table 6: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists in Year Born by Sex of Male-to-female Transsexuals 73

Table 7: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists in Year Born by Gender of Male-to-female Transsexuals 75

Table 8: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists in Year Born by Inclusion of Male-to-female Transsexuals in Women-only Events 77

Table 9: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists Who Know or Don't Know Any Transsexuals by Sex of Male-to-female Transsexuals 78

Table 10: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists Who Know or Don't Know Any Transsexuals by Gender of Male-to-female Transsexuals 80

Table 11: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists Who Know or Don't Know Any Transsexuals by Inclusion of Male-to-female Transsexuals in Women-only Events 81

Table 12: Comparison of Lesbian & Non-lesbian Feminists by Sex, Gender and Inclusion of Male-to-female Transsexuals in Women-only Events 83

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to extend a heartfelt thanks to Kyle and Noah for their support and encouragement.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the courageous people who have dared to go beyond the dominant sex and gender norms. Specifically, I honour Leslie Feinberg, Ricki Anne Wilchens and The Transsexual Menace and the non-transsexual lesbian and non-lesbian feminists who recognize diversity as the root to freedom.

INTRODUCTION

> One of the most constraining questions that transsexuals, and in particular, transsexually constructed lesbian-feminists, pose is the question of self-definition -- who is a woman, who is a lesbian-feminist? But of course, *they* pose the question on their terms, and *we* are faced with answering it. Men have always made such questions of major concern, and this question, in true phallic fashion, is thrust upon us (emphasis in original, Raymond, 1994:113).

Does sex[1] change? Does gender[2] change? What are the boundaries of womanhood? Feminists of the past two and a half decades have been influential in the debates about the meaning of womanhood. Transsexualism as a state of being, and transsexuals[3] themselves, have periodically presented challenging issues to the discussion (Burkholder, 1991, 1992; Riddell, 1980; Stone, 1991; Gabriel, Autumn 1995, Summer 1995b; Rose, 1995; Wilchens, 1994). As a result, the boundaries of womanhood are being questioned and membership in sex and gender categories are being contested by transsexuals and non-transsexuals within feminist debates.

Conflicts arise when questions of transsexuals' womanhood come to the forefront, and one controversy centres on whether sex and gender statuses change for transsexuals. Do male–to–female transsexuals become women (if ever)? Do male–to–female transsexuals become female (if ever)? Should transsexual women be included in women–only events? The last question stirs the debate that has been brewing in feminist communities since the 1970s. And

because women–only events are largely organized and attended by lesbians, lesbians have often been at the forefront of feminist debates about the womanhood of transsexual women (Festival Forum, 1994; Responses, March/April 1992, May/June 1992; Boy or Girl?, 1992; Lindau, 1992; Malone, 1992; O'Leary, 1994; Penelope, 1993; Siegal, 1994; Sturgis, 1979; Walsh-Bolstad, 1993; Blackman, 1994; Douglas, 1979). There has been much lively debate in the 1970s and again in the 1990s on the topic of transsexualism, however there has been little research specifically looking at feminist attitudes about transsexuals (Walworth, 1993) with the recent exception of the "Feminist and Lesbian Opinions About Transsexuals" (Kendel, Devor, Strapko, 1997) (hereafter FLOAT) study.

Does the 1970s and 1990s feminist literature on transsexualism aptly reflect feminist opinion? Do feminists agree on the boundaries of womanhood for transsexual women? The study, "Feminist and Lesbian Opinions About Transsexuals", set out to explore these issues. Preliminary findings from 100 surveys in FLOAT suggested that lesbian and non-lesbian feminists did not agree on the boundaries of womanhood (Kendel et al, 1997:151-153). Nor do they agree on whether transsexual women should be included in women-only events (Kendel et al., 1997:154). To further explore these issues, selected questions from FLOAT will be revisited in this study to investigate the results of 1,261 surveys. [4] This data will be used to help answer the following: When considering the sex

and gender of male-to-female transsexuals, what are feminists' opinions about the boundaries of womanhood? Do lesbian and non-lesbian feminists agree on the inclusion of male-to-female transsexuals in women-only events? These questions are important because they can contribute to an understanding of the social meaning of womanhood. This work is important because the definition of womanhood is an issue for feminists -- and feminist opinion is influential in affecting larger social definitions of womanhood.

To expand our knowledge in these areas, the concepts of womanhood will be explored from a feminist perspective. A context is provided with a review of radical feminist, radical lesbian feminist and lesbian separatist theories. Feminist literature on the issue of transsexualism will be presented to show the many sides of the debate. Praxis of radical feminism will be illustrated using the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival as an example of women-only space, a model of feminist-separatist utopia and a site where transsexual women have not been welcome. With this foundation, analysis of several questions of the data will be presented to determine whether feminist attitudes, as presented in the literature, aptly reflect non-lesbian and lesbian feminist perspectives on transsexuals' womanhood. This thesis concludes with a discussion of the findings and suggestions for further study.

BOUNDARIES OF WOMANHOOD

> [I]f feminists cannot agree on the boundaries of what constitutes femaleness, then what can we hope to agree on? (Raymond, 1994:109-110).

Does sex change? Does gender change? What are the boundaries of womanhood? Before one can answer such questions, one needs to know what sex and gender are. Or more specifically, what is "female" and what is "woman"? Perhaps then, if we knew the answers, we could attempt to articulate the boundaries of womanhood.[5] However simplistic these questions may seem, the answers are not so clear. For example, often the terms sex and gender are used interchangeably when they actually have very distinct meanings. Specifically, sex evokes the biological aspects of the term "female" while gender encompasses the social aspects of the term "woman".

Feminism as a political theory is grounded in analyses of women's oppression. It assumes a subjectivity, an identity, it assumes the existence of "woman". Certainly women exist, but how is womanhood defined? One of the early feminist texts dedicated to the subject of womanhood, was de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* where she wrote: "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" (de Beauvoir, 1994:3). She suggested that womanhood is a social construct, where men create women as their subordinates. "What is a woman?... every female human being is not necessarily a woman; to be so considered she must share in

that mysterious and threatened reality known as femininity" (de Beauvoir, 1994:6). De Beauvoir exposed femininity as a compulsory presentation for females if they wished to be considered women. According to de Beauvoir, failure to fulfil the components of womanhood threatened women's membership in society. Here, links are made between biological sex, social gender and the politics of patriarchy. Womanhood is a complex interplay of these factors.

The notion that womanhood as a sexed and gendered construct was created by men raises important questions. What could men influence in the creation of womanhood? What are some of the dynamics of power that would promote this notion? A brief review of medical history reveals some man-made roots of the modern-day female. "In the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, science fleshed out, in terms acceptable to the new epistemology, the categories 'male' and 'female' as opposite and incommensurable biological sexes" (Laqueur, 1990:154). According to Laqueur (1990), although gender differences existed between men and women prior to this time, biological distinctions were being reformulated by learned men. Philosophical debates of the era were changing the social meanings of sex (1990:5). Women's reproductive organs had been previously believed to be an inferior form of the male organs, it was then determined that female organs were actually "different". Different, and still inferior. "The old model, in which men and women were arrayed according to their degree of metaphysical perfection, their vital heat, along an axis whose telos

was male, gave way by the late eighteenth century to a new model of radical dimorphism, of biological divergence. An anatomy and physiology of incommensurability replaced a metaphysics of hierarchy in the representation of woman in relation to man" (Laqueur, 1990:5-6). Epistemological and political influences created a "natural order" to maintain the hierarchical distinctions between the two sexes (Tong, 1989:3). To fortify the ideology, a variety of feminine characteristics were attributed to women to complete the package.

Whether it be the medical epistemology of the body or political intricacies of patriarchy that produced today's "woman", the tools that we have to understand womanhood include combinations of biological, social and political ones. Biological characteristics include: internal sex organs (uterus, vagina, ovaries), external sex organs (breasts, vulva, hips, body hair), hormones (estrogens, progestins, androgens), and chromosomes (XX). Traditionally, in a patriarchal model, women exhibit feminine characteristics such as motherliness, nurturance, submissiveness, gentleness, hysteria, weakness, etc. Sexuality also figures in the social realm and is assumed to be heterosexual. The political aspects of womanhood lie in the interpretations of the biological and social constructs where women are deemed to be inferior to men. These factors combine to make up a the dominant gender schema. "In North America, the dominant gender schema of the late twentieth century presumes that femaleness will result in feminine behaviour, which is characterized by an often highly sexualized

heterosexuality. In particular, feminine heterosexuality demands that those who would be women must be both sexually attracted to men and sexually attractive to men" (Devor, 1989:89).

The dominant gender schema is a model for power and control -- control by men over women. This paradigm has proven to be oppressive by reducing women to a biological role (e. g., women serve as sexual objects for men and as bearers of men's children), limiting options for gendered behaviour (e. g., women are deemed unable to achieve "traditionally masculine" qualities), and promoting compulsory heterosexuality. This model is imposed, managed, organized, propagandized, and maintained by socialization, persuasion, threats and force. Within this framework, there is little room to move -- women conform, or they pay the price of physical violence, sexual abuse, economic ruin, emotional abuse, ridicule, incarceration, etc. In fact, within the paradigm, these methods of coercion are always present -- they are simply intensified when norms are violated (French,1992).

Feminists, recognizing the dominant gender schema as an oppressive system, developed several critiques with the goal of eliminating inequalities between women and men. The umbrella of radical feminism is one politic where issues of sex, gender and sexuality are central to the analysis. "Radical feminists have no interest in preserving the kind of 'natural order,' or biological status quo, that

subordinates women to men. Rather, their aim is to question the concept of a 'natural order' and to overcome whatever negative effects biology has had on women..." (Tong, 1989:3).

Radical Feminist Politics: Radical Feminism, Radical Lesbian Feminism and Lesbian Separatism

The second wave of feminism emerged in the U.S. and Canada during the 1960s, broadening the focus of the women's Suffrage movement. The demand for the right to emancipation and safe working conditions for women expanded to include a variety of studies of women's oppression by grass roots and academic feminist communities. One such analysis was radical feminism. In the academic context, radical feminism surfaced in the late 1960s (Descarries-Belanger and Roy, 1991:11) and expanded with works by theorists such as Kate Millett (1990)[6], Shulamith Firestone (1970), Andrea Dworkin (1974), and Catherine MacKinnon (1989). The basic tenets of radical feminism were based in women's oppression by men and were grounded in issues of sex, gender and sexuality. On this point, Tong wrote: "Radical feminists should be credited with detailing the ways in which men, rather than 'society' or 'conditions', have forced women into oppressive gender roles and sexual behaviour" (Tong, 1989:95).

One of the early radical feminists was Firestone (1970). In the first sentence of

her landmark book *The Dialectic of Sex*, Firestone wrote: "Sex class is so deep as to be invisible" (Firestone, 1970:11). Stated differently, patriarchal hegemony has created and normalized a sex class hierarchy making it part of the "natural order". Under this model, women's "natural biological role" in society is to bear children and be subordinate to their husbands. Strongly influenced by Simone de Beauvoir, Firestone outlined critiques of women's roles in families. She suggested that liberation from the "fundamental inequality" of childbirth would lead to women's equality. As an early radical feminist theorist, Firestone was pivotal in shaping ideas of radicals in the women's movement (Schneir, 1994:245).

Similarly, Millett's *Sexual Politics* (1990) proved to be key in the formation of radical feminist thought. Millett politicized sex and gender systems by exposing how men use exaggerated biological inequality between men and women to maintain power over women. She suggested that men ensure their dominance over women in areas of sex, gender and sexuality as the foundation of patriarchal ideology (Tong, 1989:95-96). Millett wrote:

> Sexual politics obtains consent through the "socialization" of both sexes to basic patriarchal polities... a pervasive assent to the prejudice of male superiority guarantees superior status in the male, inferior in the female... temperament involves the formation of human personality along stereotyped lines of sex category... the limited role allotted the female tends to arrest her at the level of biological experience (Millett, 1990:26).

From these foundations, women as physical beings are segregated out, limited in action and deemed inferior to men. Radical feminists reject this notion and argue that biology is not destiny. Women, if not oppressed by men, are able to achieve as much as, if not more than, men.

Sexuality is the focus of works by radical feminist theorists such as Andrea Dworkin (1974), and Catherine MacKinnon (1989). Specifically, Dworkin made links between sexism and the hatred of women in her book *Woman Hating* (1974). She wrote: "The commitment to ending male dominance as the fundamental psychosocial, political, and cultural reality of earth-lived life is the fundamental revolutionary commitment..."(Dworkin, 1974:17). Using examples of pornography, Chinese foot binding and witch burnings, she made strong connections between men's objectification of females as sexual objects and the resulting annihilation of women (Dworkin, 1974:26). Catherine MacKinnon, a feminist legal theorist, provided a pointed view of sexual oppression of women in her treatment of men's roles as sexual oppressors. She wrote: "Male dominance is sexual. Meaning: men in particular, if not men alone, sexualize hierarchy; gender is one" (MacKinnon, 1989:127). In her book *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State* (1989), MacKinnon likened all sexual acts to rape and became a strong voice on the topic of sexuality as oppression. MacKinnon linked sexuality, violence and gender norms to highlight the control and power men wield over women (MacKinnon, 1989:145). MacKinnon spoke out fervently

against pornography and sexual violence against women, and made important contributions to U.S. and Canadian laws in areas of censorship and sexual assault legislation.

Radical lesbian feminism and lesbian separatism also emerged within and alongside radical feminism at the beginning of the second wave of feminism. As the titles imply, these politics are lesbian-centered and recognize heterosexuality and men's sexual domination of women as loci of women's oppression. Paralleling the works noted above were the passionate voices of Adrienne Rich (1984), Mary Daly (1990)[7] , and Valorie Solanis (1970).

Adrienne Rich made a strong contribution to radical lesbian feminist theory with her expose of compulsory heterosexuality as a site of male domination. In her influential article, "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence," she highlighted the unavoidable nature of heterosexuality and its role in erasing lesbianism as a choice. She suggested that:

> [E]nforcement of heterosexuality for women [is] a means of assuring male right of physical, economical, and emotional access. One of many means of enforcement is... the rendering invisible of the lesbian possibility... (Rich, 1984:416).

Her treatment of sexuality helped to explain patriarchal controls exerted on heterosexual women, and to reveal how their silence on lesbian issues made

them accomplices not only in lesbian oppression, but also in their own. She went further to propose that heterosexuality is enforced.

> The assumption that "most women are innately heterosexual" stands as a theoretical and political stumbling block for many women... partly because to acknowledge that for women heterosexuality may not be a "preference" at all but something that has had to be imposed, managed, organized, propagandized, and maintained by force, is an immense step to take if you consider yourself freely and "innately" heterosexual (Rich, 1984:416-417).

Rich hoped that the recognition of the enforcement of heterosexuality could open up allegiances between women, creating a broad-based alliance of women of all sexualities along the lesbian continuum. Rich pointed out that lesbian and non-lesbian women were expending energy being at odds with each other rather than focusing their efforts toward a common goal. She called for a joint effort to end oppression of women under patriarchy.

Mary Daly's *Gyn/Ecology* (1990) has been described as a "thunderbolt of rage" (Daly, 1990:back cover). Daly's lesbian separatist work cautioned that "women cannot survive if they remain in patriarchy" (Tong, 1989:102). Considered an extreme voice of radical lesbian feminism (Eisenstein, 1983:107), Daly identified "males" as the enemy of all females. She wrote: "The fact is that we live in a profoundly anti-female society, a misogynistic 'civilization' in which men collectively victimize women, attacking us as personifications of their own paranoid fears, as the Enemy. Within this society it is men who rape, who sap

women's energy, who deny women economic and political power" (Daly, 1990:28-29). She described men as having necrophilic attractions to women as victims who exist in a state of living death (Daly, 1990:59). She went on to expose men's role in ritual forms of woman abuse including: Indian suttee, Chinese foot binding, genital mutilation, witch burnings, and gynecology (Daly, 1990:107-312). She proposed the creation of an all-female separatist utopia.

> The rulers of patriarchy -- males with power -- wage an unceasing war against life itself.... we must understand that the Female Self is The Enemy under fire from the guns of patriarchy. We must struggle to dis-cover this Self as Friend to all that is truly female, igniting the Fire of Female Friendship (Daly, 1990:355).

In the spirit of the Fire of Female Friendship, large women-only events such as the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival sprung up in the 1970s across the U.S.

In the same vein as Daly, Valerie Solanis wrote a scathing piece entitled the "SCUM (Society for Cutting Up Men) Manifesto". Her article is an extreme example of radical lesbian feminism in its hatred for men. The following illustrates, Solanis' perspective:

> Life in this society being, at best, an utter bore and no aspect of society being at all relevant to women, there remains to civic-minded, responsible, thrill-seeking females only to overthrow the government, eliminate the money system, institute complete automation, and destroy the male sex.... The male is a biological accident: The Y (male) gene is an incomplete X (female) gene, that is, has an incomplete set of chromosomes. In other words, the male is an incomplete female, a walking abortion, aborted at

the gene state... (Solanis, 1970:577).

This diatribe illustrates a lesbian separatist tactic in the "war" against men where biological differences, right down to the "inferior" Y chromosome, become a way to form identity and create separation of females from males. Solanis, while raising the esteem of females, laid the blame for the woes of the world on mankind (Solanis, 1970:578-579). The "SCUM Manisfeto" serves not only to target males, but also to affirm the innate goodness of femaleness, right down to the XX chromosomes.

Radical feminisms are complex politics including a variety of arguments and theories ranging from radical feminism to radical lesbian feminism to lesbian separatism. Radical feminist politics postulate that "nature cannot serve as an explanation for the inferiorization of women" (Descarries-Belanger and Roy, 1991:13). The objectives of radical feminist politics focus on the "abolition of relations of oppression, of the patriarchal system; redefinition of social relations outside of biological constraints; shattering of traditional roles, models and institutions" (Descarries-Belanger and Roy, 1991:13). Stated differently, radical feminist politics is grounded in the belief that all women's oppression stems from issues of gender, sex and sexuality imposed under patriarchy. How does one make sense of transsexualism from this grounding? Are transsexual women also oppressed as women? By virtue of their existence, do they challenge the oppressive aspects of sex and gender, or do they reinforce them?

A radical lesbian feminist politic postulates that "compulsory heterosexuality is at the heart of oppression" (Descarries-Belanger and Roy, 1991:19). And its objective is the "abolition of compulsory heterosexuality; greater harmony in mother-daughter relationships; the search for greater autonomy [for women from men]; organizing of women to speak for themselves, live for themselves and produce for themselves" (Descarries-Belanger and Roy, 1991:19). A radical lesbian feminist politic is grounded in the belief that sexuality is the foundation of oppression between men and women, and true equality can only be achieved between equals -- i.e., by women for women. Could a transsexual woman be supported within a lesbian feminist politic? Could a transsexual woman be a lesbian? If a lesbian supports a transsexual woman, is she a traitor? What if a lesbian is sexual with a transsexual woman, would her radical lesbian feminism incorporate her experience in a positive way?

A lesbian separatist politic postulates that "lesbians are not women -- they are lesbians; lesbianism is the only way to achieve love between equals" (Descarries-Belanger and Roy, 1991:27). Its aphorism is that "men are the principal enemy... lesbianism is the only way to be liberated from male domination" (Descarries-Belanger and Roy, 1991:27). A lesbian separatist politic is grounded in the belief that males, and females who associate with males, are oppressors, and that lesbians can only find utopia among themselves. How could one embrace

transsexualism within lesbian separatism? Of all radical feminisms, lesbian separatism seems to be the least likely to welcome transsexual women within its politic. If you are a man or you associate with men, you are an oppressor. How could lesbian separatists see male-to-female transsexuals as anything other than oppressors?

Radical feminisms are very passionate politics, with lesbian separatists articulating the most extreme views. There are many nuances of radical feminism that involve at times contradictory analyses. For example, in some circumstances female biology is not questioned, but rather men's control of biology is the problematic. Others promote femaleness as a superior status, focussing on women's ability to bear children and exude motherly nurturance. Patriarchal devaluing of these female qualities is at fault. Others believe that biological differences are negligible and merely a patriarchal fabrication used to leverage power and control. Others focus on the interplay of sex/gender and sexuality, espousing a socialization theory of gender differences, or alternately proposing innate qualities being at the root of gender oppression. Some suggest androgyny as an option to resolve gender oppression where men and women are free to exhibit a full range of masculine and feminine characteristics and sexualities, while others are adamantly opposed to androgyny. Some embrace the "natural female" while rejecting the "naturally feminine". Some are exclusively lesbian-centered on the issue of sexuality; others recommend

celibacy, autoerotocism, or heterosexuality by choice. Some take a militant stance and believe that males are and will always be the enemies, others work to reduce stereotypes about men, as well as women, towards equality. Some believe in a separatist politic (women being self-sufficient and living and working separately from men) while others advocate for a harmony between all genders (Tong, 1989:2-5). What becomes apparent is that there is no *one* politic in radical feminism -- nor is there one understanding of womanhood. Not only are the theories at times contradictory, individual's application of the theories in the everyday world create complex combinations of understandings of womanhood and of women's oppression. Do transsexual women fit into these politics?

The divergence in these politics is accentuated when individual feminists try to make sense of the meaning of womanhood when considering the issue of transsexualism. Are transsexual women actually women? Are they allies or oppressors? For example, some feminists believe that transsexual women are still men (e.g., Daly 1990) -- consequently, as men they would be oppressors of women. Others believe that biology is what makes women -- but is biology based on chromosomal structures (e.g., Solanis 1970), or genitals, or a variety of combinations? The answer would determine one's application of radical feminism to questions regarding transsexuals. Some believe that socialization forms one's womanhood (e.g., de Beauvoir, 1994), but where would feminists who espouse this concept place transsexuals? These questions are most hotly

debated when considering the womanhood of male-to-female transsexuals and their inclusion in women-only events. Although there is a vast body of literature on the issue of womanhood within feminist politics, only a few feminists have specifically taken up the question of transsexualism. Some of their arguments are presented below.

RAYMOND'S EMPIRE

A variety of feminist commentaries have been written on the topic of transsexualism (Daly, 1990/1984; Greer, 1986/1974; O'Leary, 1994; Raymond, 1977, 1997b, 1994/1979; Steinem, 1977; Walsh–Bolstad, 1993; Jeffreys, 1993; Eichler, 1987/1980), many reflecting a negative attitude towards transsexuals. Generally speaking, the feminist debate focussed on transsexuals' womanhood. And much of the argument was couched in a radical feminist and a lesbian separatist politic. From this grounding, some feminists believe that transsexual women simply are not women -- "once a man, always a man" and the argument goes further to suggest that transsexuals are agents of patriarchy.

This rationale was presented in the late 1970s in the most popular and perhaps most hostile anti-transsexual text, Janice Raymond's *The Transsexual Empire: The Making of the She–male* (1994/1979). [8] Raymond's text continues to set the terms of feminist debate with a second edition published in 1994. Although Raymond prides herself on being the feminist referent on transsexualism, feminists are far from united on this issue, and some have shown their support for transsexuals (Baynes, 1991; Califia, 1980; Dworkin, 1974; Rubin, 1992; Siegal, 1994; Blackman 1994; Pratt, 1995; Bolin, 1988; Devor, 1989, 1997; Feinbloom et al., 1976). As might be expected, the discussion on the issue of transsexualism among feminists has often been heated. As a result, there have been divisions among feminists

which sometimes result in camps working against each other (Douglas, 1979; Responses, March/April 1992, May/June 1992; Festival Forum, 1994; Malone, 1992; Boy or Girl?, 1992; Walworth, 1995; Tayleur, 1995; Gabriel, 1995, 1995b, 1995c; Rose, 1977; Lindau, 1992, Woodhouse, 1989; Shapiro, 1991). This is evidenced by the volleying of retorts from one side of the debate to the other. Much feminist energy has been spent on the topic of transsexual women's womanhood, creating a spiral of bickering and ill will. Furthermore, members of transgendered and transsexual communities have been caught in the crossfire and have suffered from discrimination and hostility directed at them by some feminists (Burkholder, 1991, 1992; Riddell, 1980; Stone, 1991; Gabriel, 1995, 1995b, 1995c).

Janice Raymond's work on transsexualism began as a conference paper in 1972. She expanded her ideas and interviewed 15 male-to-female transsexuals to complete her Ph.D. dissertation in 1977 and finally published *The Transsexual Empire: The Making of the She–Male* in 1979 (Raymond, 1994:vii). Strongly influenced by Mary Daly's radical feminist politic[9], Raymond set out to critique the medical establishment for its contribution to transsexualism, and to show that the concept of transsexualism promotes gender stereotypes and serves to maintain the patriarchal status quo. Raymond's position was that:

> The conglomerate of medical and other professional practitioners who coalesce to institutionalize transsexual treatment and surgery on the medical model -- the transsexual empire -- become shapers of acceptable

> and permissible gender-related behaviour. For example, feminine and masculine stereotypes have become clinically institutionalized in the requirement that transsexuals prove they are true candidates for surgery by passing as members of the opposite sex.... The medical solution becomes a "social tranquilizer" reinforcing sexism and its foundation of sex-role conformity (Raymond, 1994:xvi-xvii).

Raymond has allies who appear to agree with her that transsexualism as a medical invention only serves to perpetuate stereotypes which oppress women. For example, Mary Daly (1990) exclusively quoted Raymond when referencing the issue of transsexualism. Daly wrote:

> In transsexualism, males put on "female" bodies (which are in fact pseudofemale). In a real sense they are separated from their original mothers by the rituals of the counselling process, which usually results in "discovering" that the mother of the transsexual-to-be is at fault for his "gender identity crisis". These patients are reborn from males... The rebirthing male supermothers include psychiatrists, surgeons, hormone therapists, and other cooperating professionals. The surgeons and hormone therapists of the transsexual kingdom, in their effort to give birth, can be said to produce feminine persons. They cannot produce women (Daly, 1990:68).

Daly echoed Raymond's analysis that transsexuals can adopt "man-made" feminine characteristics, however, they cannot become "real women". For example, Raymond and Daly argued that transsexuals epitomize a femininity (such as wearing make-up, frilly clothes, being weak, acting submissive to men etc.) reflecting a patriarchal model of womanhood. This patriarchal model is the same one that many feminists actively challenge as being oppressive because it limits options for women, keeping them subordinate to men. Raymond

suggested that transsexual women bolster stereotypical femininity by living out man-made concepts (Raymond, 1994:106). She expanded her critique to explain that lesbian feminists are woman-made -- that is, lesbian feminists embrace concepts of strong women who are self-determined, who challenge patriarchal limits of womanhood (e.g., challenging the limits of heterosexuality). According to Raymond, transsexuals who claim to be lesbian feminists are simply inferior to "real" lesbian feminists because they were created by men and not women (Raymond, 1994:106).

Gloria Steinem (1977:86), a co-founder of *Ms.* magazine and a leader in the second wave of the American feminist movement (Schneir, 1994:408) championed Raymond's work as a landmark doctoral thesis. In a parallel argument to Daly's, Steinem considered the concept of transsexualism to be contributing to the entrenchment of strict gender roles. Steinem characterized transsexualism as a "radical testimony to the power of sex roles in this gender-based political system called patriarchy" (Steinem, 1977:85). Feminist have argued that the physical distinctions between men and women have purposefully been stratified to secure men's dominance over women. This so called biological difference is then used more broadly as a rationale to limit women's choices in society, most notably in areas where men hold positions of power (e.g., government, organized religion, armed forces, medicine, academia, etc.) . A foundation of radical feminism is the recognition of social hierarchies

based on sex and gender. And many feminists challenge the notions of women's biological and related societal inferiority. Therefore, transsexualism is seen by such feminists to reify the patriarchal concept that the body is what makes a person what they are.

Steinem proposed that transsexualism perpetuates differences between women and men based on genital differences (Steinem, 1977:85). In this analysis, transsexualism is believed to enforce "biology as destiny" -- if transsexuals "change sex" to become women, it would presuppose that biology, and more specifically genitals, are what makes women women and men men. Ironically, another side to this argument would suggest that if biology were destiny, men could never become women because chromosomal structures are unchangeable. The fixedness of chromosomes could also be seen to maintain biological distinctions. In this circumstance, transsexualism could be seen to challenge patriarchal concepts of biology as destiny and to offer more choice in terms of gender self-determination. As chromosomes do not change for transsexuals, they can be seen to challenge the norms of biological destiny by changing their gender despite chromosomal underpinnings. However, it is not the differences between men's and women's bodies that is necessarily problematic, rather the hierarchies that are based on these distinctions, which serve to maintain the subordination of women, are the problem. Steinem does not reference chromosomal underpinnings in her critique of transsexualism for perpetuating

biological destiny, nor does she make distinctions between sex and gender when it comes to transsexuals. Plainly stated, according to Steinem, transsexual women reinforce sex-role stereotyping.

Steinem also agreed with Raymond's (1994:30, 99, 105-106) interpretation that transsexualism is a threat to feminism.

> [P]erhaps feminists ought to consider [transsexualism's] growth and celebration as part of a backlash against the feminist revolution;.... we ought to be very, very suspicious of the social reasons for transsexualism as well as for its big, star-spangled, commercial exploitation[10] .... Consciously or not they may be celebrating a victory for gender-based power divisions (Steinem, 1977:86).

The existence of transsexualism has been seen by some as the antithesis to feminism. Feminists reject institutionalized femininity, biology as destiny, objectification of the body, limitations of gender roles -- all of which are reified in the medical model of transsexualism. For example, historically, transsexual women needed to reflect a desire to be feminine in order to qualify for sex reassignment surgery. In a study of transsexual women, Kando found that "Transsexuals were found to be more feminine than the other gender groups and also more conservative in their endorsement of traditional sex definition (Kando, 1973:31). The requirement for femininity before surgery in effect entrenches femininity into the medical model of transsexualism -- an example of institutionalized femininity. This prerequisite then contributes to the meaning of

womanhood -- to be a woman, one must be feminine which in turn limits one's choices within a gender role. For example, feminine women are not supposed to hold powerful roles within a patriarchal society. Raymond argued that men control the creation of meaning of womanhood in theory and in practice -- from definitions of femininity right down to the embodiment of the man-made fantasy -- transsexual women (Raymond, 1994:30).

A lesbian separatist theorist, Sheila Jeffreys (1993) referenced Raymond in her discussion of transsexualism (Jeffereys, 1993:130). She also considered transsexualism to be in opposition to women's equality. Her analysis looked at transsexualism as the entrenchment of gender norms, hence countering work by feminists to break down gender stereotypes (Jeffreys, 1993:130). Similarly, Margrit Eichler (1987)[11] criticized the medical establishment and focussed on the victimization of those involved: "Individual transsexuals are casualties of an overly rigid sex role differentiation, and ... clinicians who perform sex reassignment surgery help maintain this overly rigid sexual dimorphism which is restrictive to every human being, whether female, male, or transsexual" (Eichler, 1987:75). She went further to describe the suffering that individual transsexuals experience, and explained how making the choice of transsexualism maintains strict gender norms -- the same norms that torment the transsexual into making the difficult choices in the first place.

> Transsexuals are people who suffer so deeply from the sex structure that they are willing to endure terrible pain and loneliness in order to reduce their suffering. This group of people would -- potentially -- be the most potent group of people pressing for changes in the sex structure, because their aversion to their "sex-appropriate" roles is apparently insurmountable. By declaring them, by surgical fiat, as members of the other sex, this change potential is diverted and becomes as conservative as it could have been revolutionary (Eichler, 1987:76).

Raymond also considered transsexualism to be a lost opportunity for activism (Raymond, 1994:172). Simply stated, if potential transsexuals were to challenge the limitations of a gendered society, they could become allies with feminists as social critics of a sexist society. However, because transsexuals choose to use the medical method to change their gender, they are seen to succumb to the model which is criticized as anti-feminist. Furthermore, because transsexuals adopt the medical model for gender transformation, they become targets for criticism by some feminists who see them as the embodiment of sexist ideology.

Getting Personal: Targeting Transsexuals

Germaine Greer (1986), in an article which was originally published in 1974, prior to Raymond's *Transsexual Empire*, critiqued the femininity of a transsexual woman named Jan Morris. Greer took on the individual person in her attack. She wrote:

> Jan Morris is a man who has eaten a great many pills, artificial hormones and the crystallized essence of the urine of pregnant mares, a man who

> has had his penis cut off, but a man nevertheless. It is only courteous to call him *she* because she wishes to be called so, and to be treated as a woman. In so far as femininity -- if not femaleness -- is a product of conditioning, Jan Morris is well on the way to being a woman.... James Morris seems to have thought, like a typical male, that his body was his penis, and that in getting rid of it he was changing over (Greer, 1986:189).

She went further to express her disdain and in so doing, she illustrated the fury that some feminists experience with man-made concepts of womanhood and with transsexuals' seemingly sudden membership in womanhood (Greer, 1986:191).

Making a similar assault, Raymond turned from her critique of medical institutions to personal attacks on transsexuals themselves. Her anger was especially sparked by transsexual women who participate in women-only activities. For a variety of reasons, she especially loathed lesbian feminist transsexuals. On this topic she wrote:

> [T]he transsexually constructed lesbian-feminist may have renounced femininity but not masculinity and masculinist behaviour (despite deceptive appearances).... Masculine behaviour is notably obtrusive. It is significant that transsexually constructed lesbian-feminists have inserted themselves into the positions of importance and/or performance in the feminist community (Raymond, 1994:101).

One specific target of her assault was Sandy Stone. In the 1970s, a woman-owned recording company named Olivia Records hired a transsexual woman, Sandy Stone, to work as a recording engineer. There was much debate about the

ethics of hiring Stone because Olivia Records was a women-only organization that promoted women-only music. Raymond and other women believed that Stone was not a woman, was taking a job away from qualified women, and should not have been present at women-only events (Raymond, 1994:201). There was considerable discussion in feminist periodicals about this issue. One women wrote: "I feel raped when Olivia passes off Sandy... as a real woman. After all his male privilege, is he going to cash in on lesbian feminist culture too?" (Unidentified author in Raymond, 1994:103).

Springboarding from this comment, Raymond suggested that "all" transsexuals rape by reducing women to objectified bodies, taking on the female form and then through deceit moving into positions of dominance in women's organizations (Raymond, 1994:104). Raymond likened all transsexuals to rapists because she believed that they insert themselves where they do not belong: "The transsexually constructed lesbian-feminist, having castrated himself, turns his whole body and behaviour into a phallus that can rape in many ways, all the time. In this sense, he performs *total* rape, while functioning *totally* against women's will of lesbian-feminism" (Raymond, 1994:112). Raymond believed that transsexuals sap "real" women's energy, and accused them of taking over women-only activities (Raymond, 1994:108).

According to Raymond, transsexuals "mutilate" women's reality so that

feminists believe that transsexuals are women (Raymond, 1994:119).[12] Furthermore, Raymond said that transsexuals deceive women by hiding their past and not disclosing that they are transsexual (Raymond, 1994:104). [13] According to Raymond, transsexuals pretending to be women go directly to women-only events to assimilate, confuse and seduce separatist women (Raymond, 1994:108-110). Raymond suggested that transsexuals may be "fooling" some lesbian feminists, but she noted that transsexuals are not peers to lesbian-feminists since they "are neither equal in 'quality or nature of status'" (Raymond, 1994, 118).

Perhaps Raymond's most vehement contempt for transsexuals is related to the challenge transsexualism presents to the meaning of womanhood. Who is a woman? According to Raymond, women are a combination of biological and historical experience -- experiences that transsexuals could never attain.

> Transsexuals, and transsexually constructed lesbian-feminists, drag us back to answering such old questions by asking them in a new way.... we know who *we* are. We know that we are women who are born with female chromosomes and anatomy, and that whether or not we are socialized to be so-called normal women, patriarchy has treated and will treat us like women. Transsexuals have not had this same history. No man can have the history of being born and located in this culture as a woman. He can have the history of *wishing* to be a woman and of *acting* like a woman, but this gender experience is that of a transsexual, not of a woman. Surgery may confer the artifacts of outward and inward female organs but it cannot confer the history of being born a woman in this society (Raymond, 1994:114).

According to Raymond, women are women because "we" all experience the fact of being born with XX chromosomes. This biological basis leads "us" to experience a common history (Raymond, 1994:116). She went further to suggest that women have the capacity not only to give birth, but to bear culture, harmony, and true inventiveness" (Raymond, 1994:107). These notions of womanhood, however attainable by "real" women, are not and could never be attained by transsexuals according to Raymond. This creative packaging securely seals out any "want-to-be women", and seals in all "real" women, no matter their race, cultural heritage, economic, physical ability or sexuality.

Other Feminist Theories on Transsexualism

Although Raymond appears to pride herself on setting the tone for feminists on the issue of transsexualism, there are feminists with other opinions. For example, the question of transsexualism as a social phenomenon is considered by Andrea Dworkin in the following statement:

> [I]t would be premature and not very intelligent to accept the psychiatric judgment that transsexuality is caused by faulty socialization. More probably transsexuality is caused by a faulty society. Transsexuals can be defined as one particular formation of our general multisexuality which is unable to achieve its natural development because of extremely adverse social conditions.
> There is no doubt that in the culture of male-female discreteness, transsexuality is a disaster for the individual transsexual. Every transsexual... is in a state of primary emergency as a transsexual.... [E]very transsexual is entitled to a sex-change operation, and it should be

> provided by the community as one of its functions. This is an emergency measure for an emergency condition (Dworkin, 1974:186).

Dworkin presented a compassionate perspective on transsexualism. She did not blame the individual as Raymond did, her critique was directed at the rigid social norms that enforce the binary sex/gender model. To this perspective Raymond responded by suggesting that those who advocate for transsexualism as an emergency measure actually promote the continued victimization of transsexuals while supporting the powers of medical institutions (Raymond, 1994:175). One might question Raymond's sincerity when she expresses concern for transsexuals. Pat Califia questioned whether Raymond was anti-medical intervention, or strictly anti-transsexual. Califia paralleled the issues of transsexualism to the feminist efforts to support women's choice on abortion and birth control and feminist contributions to the human rights debates for gay men and lesbians. She asked: "why can't feminists support the free determination of gender?" (Califia, 1980:135-136).

Why can't Raymond support free determination of gender? Or can she? Raymond suggested that for individuals born with ambiguous genitalia or chromosomal anomalies, genital surgery would be appropriate so long as they were surgically altered as children and their adult and childhood genders matched (Raymond, 1994;114-115). It seemed that in certain circumstances, medical intervention would be allowed by Raymond -- but gender by choice is

not one of those circumstances. On this point Baynes critiqued Raymond for not only her conception of sex as immutable, but also for her conception of gender as immutable. She wrote: "Why does she appear to approve, or at least accept, surgery carried out on those of intermediate sex? After all, their presence in our society constitutes a challenge to the notion of duality. Likewise, why should it be considered right to operate on persons of physical ambiguity, but wrong to operate on those who feel mental ambiguity?.... It would appear from this that she does view 'gender', like 'sex', as fixed and immutable" (Baynes, 1991:59-60).

Raymond's tidy packaging, seems to unravel when other feminists disagree with her. For example, it seems rather contradictory for Raymond to have used a radical feminist critique to challenge patriarchal boundaries while protecting her definitions of womanhood with a convenient combination of essentialism and social constructionism. One moment biology is not (even though transsexuals have bodies that appear to be like women's they cannot be women), and the next moment it is (women are women because they have XX chromosomes).

Critics of Raymond's work have noted this contradiction and called her to task for it (Shapiro, 1991, Woodhouse, 1989). For example, Shapiro (1991) described Raymond's "ethereal essentialism" combined with biological/historical experience to be "a somewhat unprincipled marriage of convenience between a social constructionist view of gender and an essentialist view of womanhood"

(Shapiro, 1991:259). Woodhouse also pointed out the contradiction in Raymond's assessment of transsexualism. She noted that, on one hand, Raymond proposed that transsexuals challenge oppressive gender division; on the other hand, Raymond celebrated the uniqueness of the essential woman.

> If it all boils down to some innate, essential quality, any attempt to change this state of affairs would be futile. In fact Raymond states that as sex reassignment surgery cannot change chromosomal sex, the transsexual does not really change sex at all. It would seem, then, that if chromosomes are the peg on which sexual divisions are hung we are left with scant possibility of any real change. The end product of Raymond's thesis is cultural feminism and a position which is... committed to preserving rather that annihilating gender distinctions (Woodhouse, 1989:81).

To Woodhouse and Shapiro's critiques, Raymond replied that "any serious feminist should be able to affirm the difference the body makes to one's history without being accused of being a raging essentialist" (Raymond, 1994:xxi). Raging or otherwise, Raymond sidestepped these issues. She argued from the meaning of womanhood to come from chromosomes, lived experience and spirituality -- and in the same breath, she condemned "patriarchy" for doing the same thing. For Raymond, transsexuals should have challenged patriarchy, not bent to it. By challenging gender norms, transsexualism could help undermine patriarchal gender boundaries that have historically restricted women. However, what does seem clear is that Raymond is unwilling herself to bend her strict gender attitudes to welcome transsexual women into womanhood.

Raymond's feminist critics pointed out many contradictions in her work, criticisms to which Raymond retorted with a volley of insults and accusations. Raymond strongly criticized feminists who accept transsexual women into the women's movement. She chastized her lesbian-feminist peers by calling them "liberals" who did not meet the muster of "true feminism". Raymond established her own hierarchy of feminism -- if you didn't agree with her, you were not a feminist. Raymond suggested that feminists who welcomed transsexuals were afraid of being labelled man-haters, and that if you were a true feminist, you wouldn't be afraid of the man-hater label. She patronized other feminists by saying that they experienced gratitude that transsexuals were willing to "pay with their balls" and therefore welcomed them into womanhood. Another lashing attacked other feminists' sexuality; she proposed that they were secretly attracted to masculine presence and were themselves suspect for heterosexual tendencies! Apparently, heterosexual tendencies are contrary to true feminism. And finally she accused them of being naive for underestimating the cunning of patriarchy (Raymond, 1994:110-113, 117). It seems evident that Raymond aimed to undermine transsexual women by direct attack and by attacks on supportive feminists. A transsexual woman summed up the hostility of Raymond's work, in the following:

> *The Transsexual Empire* is a dangerous book. It is dangerous to transsexuals because it does not treat us as human beings at all, merely as the tools of a theory; because its arguments may make things more difficult for transsexual women and men as they strive to come out; and

> because it seeks to create hostility towards us among women who have no actual experience of transsexual people.... I see its negativity as three-fold. Firstly, I mistrust its attitude to feminist culture... Secondly, its emphasis deflects attention from the most immediate problems, and tends to lead to scapegoating. Thirdly, its ideological dogmatism and anti-experiential viewpoint lead right back to the methods of patriarchy (Riddell, 1980:23).

THEORY MEETS PRACTICE IN NO MAN'S LAND

The previous review of literature reveals a variety of feminist perspectives on transsexualism which are all grounded in radical feminist politics. Many of those who embrace radical feminism, radical lesbian feminism and lesbian separatism attend women-only events such as the Michigan Women's Music Festival. Women-exclusive events are heralded as sites of affirmation, political activism, and socializing. They are also sites where transsexuals have met resistance from women who do not accept them as women. The following chapter explores women-only events as locations where theory meets practice with respect to feminism and transsexualism.

Women-only events, manifestations of a radical feminist woman-centered politic, are organized by women, generally by feminists and mostly by lesbians. The Michigan Womyn's Music Festival organized by the We Want The Music Collective (WWTMC) is one of the largest annual women-only event of its kind on the planet.[14] It is intended to be the realization of a lesbian feminist separatist utopia. "This is an event created for all womyn, one that is infused with primary energy of a strong and beautiful lesbian culture and spirit" (WWTMC, 1995:4). It grew out of the 1970s lesbian feminist movement, has been in operation since 1976, and has grown in size, some years taking in nearly 10,000 women (Card, 1995:11). The Festival[15] is a four-day event which takes place on a secluded

acreage near Hart, Michigan, U.S.A. The site, known as "Womyn's Land" becomes a temporary tent town offering workshops, craft booths, comedy, music, sports activities, dances, movies, parades, walking paths, Goddess rituals, support groups, communal outdoor showers, a foot race, food booths, coffee house, communal sleeping tents, camp fires, security, and a medical clinic -- all created by women, for women. The 1995 Festival catalogue described the environment: "To many, the Festival community is a safe and nurturing place, a respite from our lives at home, a space where we are in an environment defined and designed totally by womyn for other womyn.... The Festival is also a celebration of lesbian heritage. It is one of the few places where lesbian identity is the dominant culture..." (WWTMC, 1995:4).

As noted, Michigan is a site where many women feel safe to be seen and heard. Women's bodies are revered. A large percentage of the women in attendance go topless or nude in the heat of the day, and boisterous lesbian sex can be heard emanating through thin tent walls. Many women feel safe at Michigan expressly because there are no men on the Land. The following quote from a well know lesbian separatist sums up the sense of safety felt by lesbians among lesbians. "For me, Lesbian Separatism has always meant a consciousness, an analysis, and a commitment to the well-being and best interests of women in general and Lesbians in particular....When I see a man at a woman's event a portion of my feelings closes down. Conversely, when I know that I am in the exclusive

company of women I feel safe enough to 'open up'"(Dobkin, 1988:286-287).

Michigan, as well as being a safe place for lesbians and non-lesbian women, is also a safe place to critique patriarchy. Radical feminism is the dominant politic, and "male-bashing" is a popular topic of conversation. Some might say that this venting helps create a stronger bond between women against the enemy -- men. The following statement illustrates a lesbian separatist anti-male sentiment:

> If we are "live" lesbians and are even half-awake, we have righteous anger and the way to deal with it healthily is to direct it at those who are destroying us and the planet -- men.... [this way] we are freeing ourselves to relate with warmth and sensitivity to our own selves and to each other. By our defining the enemy as all males, we are freeing ourselves from forming any kind of energy draining and oppressive relationships with them, and do not give them even an impersonal friendliness in our daily confrontations with them (Gutter Dyke Collective, 1988:339).

Combinations of radical feminist, radical lesbian feminist and lesbian separatist politics are central to women-only events such as the Michigan festival. The basic premise being that women share one profound commonality -- all women experience patriarchal oppression -- and all men are agents of patriarchy. For example, consider the following:

> Separatism is shamelessly exclusive. The rules are simple:... provided you are a woman, you are a potential separatist... if you are a man you are irredeemably the enemy... Competitiveness, aggression, brutality and maleness are all one in the same. The Y chromosome, that mutated afterthought, was the cause of it all (Dixon, 1988:70).

Complex workings of the everyday world are developed from this politic. For example, women-only events such as the Michigan festival are one such manifestation. As such, the Festival operates under a myriad of unspoken rules and assumptions. For example, it is often assumed that women are safe in the company of other women, as one influential lesbian separatist wrote of women-only space:

> Lesbian- and wimmin-only spaces give us many joys and opportunities we can't get anywhere else in this world: they provide us with some respite from the dangers and anxieties of our lives in heteropatriarchy; the atmosphere and joy we experience reenergizes us and enables us to go on surviving and working for change; in them, we can creatively explore and develop Lesbian values and ways of relating to each other; we can talk, roam, play, and sleep undisturbed by male intrusiveness and interruptions; we don't have to listen to men or the sound of their voices; such spaces are the only ones in which girl children can run free without fearing male predation and violence (Penelope, 1992:57).

In this line of thinking, men present a threat to women simply because they are men -- all men are patriarchal oppressors. Consequently, men are not permitted admission to women-only events only for exceptional circumstances. For example, at Michigan, men come onto the Land to perform particular services (e.g., emptying the portable toilets), their access is kept to a minimum and is strictly monitored. Although women-only businesses are used as often as possible, occasionally men are also drivers of the delivery trucks. Men are always escorted by women staff and are required to honk their horns to announce their presence (WWTMC, 1995:13). Nevertheless, some women take

great offence that men are on the Land at all. The women who oppose men's presence on the Land are strict militant separatists. The following passage describes a strict separatism:

> Pure separatism involved a woman taking steps to remove men from her life. She must live with women, be a mother only to girl children. Male culture and all its manifestations is shunned. She must abandon all relationships with men, lovers, fathers and brothers. Sexually she is either celibate or lesbian. Politically and socially, her contact is confined to women. The music she listens to must be composed and played by women, the books she reads must have a woman author (Dixon, 1988:75-76).

Much of the framework outlined in the previous quote is applied to women-only events like Michigan. The Festival offers many models of separatist praxis. For example, in addition to the exclusion of men from the Land, boy children of women attendees are only allowed as long as they are under the age of three (and preferably clothed). Older boys attend the Brother Sun camp located off-site. Mothers can visit their sons, but the sons are not permitted on the Land to visit their mothers (WWTMC, 1995:9).

Alas, all is not well in paradise. Tensions arise when there are varying degrees of acceptance of separatist policy. This is evidenced by the debates that have surrounded the question of inclusion of women with boy children at women-only events (Penelope, 199255-56). Some members of the radical fringe of the separatist camp consider women with boy children to be accomplices in

patriarchy (Dixon, 1988:75). For example, Penelope wrote:

> It is common knowledge among festie-goers that mothers of sons, apparently not satisfied by their successful encroachment in the "wimmin-only" space of the Michigan Festival, have deliberately proceeded to violate the essential idea of wimmin-/Lesbian-only space by disguising their male children as girls and sneaking them onto the land! Such purposeful disregard for the implied rights of other wimmin and Lesbians to define and control our spaces violates our trust as well as our declared boundaries.... Many of us have been raped and/or assaulted by boys and men that other females felt "safe" with (Penelope, 1992:55-56).

One suggestion for dealing with the "violating" mothers was to mandate "strip searches" to prove that women were escorting girl children. At the time of this debate "panty checks" had not been instituted, however they had been hotly debated (Penelope, 1992:58).

Men's "voices" have also been banned from womyn's Land. The Michigan festival catalogue contains the following guidelines: "Please play music with all womyn's vocals -- that means no men's voices on the tape. We come here to enjoy a womyn-only environment and for these few days, we want to have only womyn's voices on the Land. It's not a judgment of music or men, but a strong desire to be surrounded by the sounds of womyn" (WWTMC, 1995:6). However, it has happened that some women have brought recorded music with them that included male singers. This serious faux pas shocked the Michigan Festival organizers who were dismayed that their own workers wouldn't understand that: "the sound of male voices at a *womyn's* music festival introduces men's ideas, values, and behaviours"(emphasis in original, Penelope, 1992:55).

The underlying assumption dictates that there is a common understanding and agreement on praxis of a strict lesbian separatist politic, according to which, anything "male" or "of men" (e.g., men, boy children, men singing) is automatically oppressive and therefore not welcome on women-only Land. Women who bring boys and women who bring "men's" music to the Festival are considered to be violators of some women's "implied rights". These boundary violations somehow put other women at risk -- exclusion of men is therefore described as a safety issue. However, the violations indicate that "pure separatism" is not supported by all women who attend women-only events.

Others Who Are Not Welcome: Extremely Butch and Extremely Femme Women

The women-only boundary definition used at the Michigan Festival goes further to also exclude some women. While all men are rejected from Womyn's Land, *most* (but not all) butch women are welcome. Generally speaking in a lesbian context, butch women are female, masculine and homosexual. In many ways, their gender identities are closer to traditional masculine than feminine ones. Many butch women are valued on the Land. This is evidenced by the glorification of women with beards, overt displays of muscle, and exhibition of macho behaviour. For example, most of the volunteer crew who build the

festival town (considered a privilege in Festival circles) otherwise work in male-dominated fields as electricians, carpenters, plumbers, and labourers etc. Many central festival worker roles are held by butches (e.g., fire keepers, tractor drivers, security guards and garbage removal crew). But there are limits to how butch one can be in lesbian space. For example, Leslie Feinberg writes: "And then there are people like myself, who were born female but get hassled for not being women enough. We've been accused of exuding 'male energy'"(Feinberg, 1996:118). Feinberg is a passing woman who is often considered to be a man. At the Michigan gates in 1994, Feinberg experienced the following as described by her partner Minnie Bruce Pratt:

> [Y]ou identify yourself as a butch lesbian. You speak of your transgendered existence between women and man, born female, but male [sic] in gender expression. You explain that you can't always live openly as a transgendered person, that you and I sometimes pass as husband and wife for safety. When you ask if you'd be welcome on women's land, at first the gatekeeper says, "We'd prefer you didn't come in" (Pratt, 1995:182).

If one is "too" butch (e.g., exhibiting traditionally manly traits), one becomes suspect -- not woman enough to be on womyn's Land. Although many butch women do attend women-only events, it is not clear where the boundary gets drawn. When is a butch woman not woman enough?

On the other end of the spectrum, extremely feminine women are also ostracized by some for exuding too much femininity. Generally speaking in the lesbian

context, femme women are female, feminine and homosexual. In many ways their gender identities are closer to traditional heterosexual feminine ones than to traditional lesbian stereotypes.[16] Below is an example of "femme bashing" by a well-known lesbian separatist:

> Of the "issues" that have disturbed and disrupted Lesbian communities during the past two decades, one, in particular, has the potential to destroy our efforts to mobilize Lesbians, to create a Lesbian movement grounded in a Lesbian stance: femininity.... Our identity as Lesbians is at stake. Whatever one chooses to call them, "lipstick Lesbians," "Dykes for spikes," or "femmes," they have appeared in our communities and our movement in a variety of guises, demanding our support and approval for their appearance and behaviour, asserting their "right" to wear make-up, high heels, and garter belts, to allow men to fuck them, and to exploit, use, and abuse Lesbians at will (Penelope, 1992:78).

Penelope reflects a politic that links traditionally femininity to oppression of women. She goes further to suggest that women who enjoy feminine gender presentation are not only oppressed by patriarchal frameworks, but they are also oppressors (Penelope, 1992:96).

Evidently, there are several contested boundaries at women-only events like the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival. There seems to be agreement that men should not be included in women-only activities, yet there are exceptions made for including men as labourers. Some concessions have been made to include boy children -- but with provisos. Music with men's voices is considered invasive, although it is not clear if music with male musicians would be allowed

(e.g., Ferron, a popular lesbian musician, toured and recorded with an all male band in the early 1990s. Would there be a dilemma playing her recorded music?). The exclusion of men, boys, and men's voices are legitimated for reasons of safety -- by virtue of their very presence they create unsafe environments for women (Penelope, 1992:56).

Elements of this fear of men also trickles over into a fear of masculine women. Perhaps "excessively" masculine woman are too much like men -- they exude "male energy". However, it is impossible to measure what male energy is, let alone determine how much is too much. Some lesbians might say that being seen with an extremely masculine woman threatens their identity as a lesbian -- they may be perceived as being in a heterosexual relationship -- by whom and to what end is not clear. Some might say that their energy is being sapped because manly women take advantage of the nurturance found in women-only environments. Perhaps mannish women take over, and insert themselves in positions of importance. No doubt, the reasons are as varied as there are feminists at women-only events. Many of the criticisms of extremely masculine women are used against transsexual women as well -- in some parallel ways transsexualism and mannish behaviour in women raises concerns for some feminists. A certain amount of butch is acceptable -- but the actual amount is undefined. What aspects of transsexualism, if any, would be acceptable for attendance at women-only events?

Feminine women also invoke strong reactions from some. Femininity raises questions about collusion with the enemy -- feminine women are spoken of as living man-made concepts (Daly, 1990:168). According to Daly, feminine women are brainwashed to alter their bodies in ways defined by men. She wrote about women engaging in destructive man-made preoccupations when she described feminine women's obsessive fixation with their appearance (Daly, 1990:233). According to Daly, aspects of femininity are linked to patriarchal oppression of women. Feminist analysis suggests that men create and promote strict concepts of beauty which limit and ultimately oppress women (Woolf, 1990). These may include the acquired need to use make-up, perfume, hair colour, hair removal, deodorizing; to conform to a slim body type; and to wear particular clothing. If one does not conform to these standards, one is ostracized (within patriarchy) for failing to be a woman (Daly, 1990:65-69). The concept of femininity is inextricably linked to compulsory heterosexuality, oppressive gender stereotypes and the sexual division of labour -- consequently, exhibition of femininity raises questions of women's allegiance. Is their first allegiance to lesbianism or patriarchy? Are feminine women too feminine to be at women-only events? Male-to-female transsexuals have been accused by Raymond (1994) and Daly (1990) of being ultra-feminine for seeming to embrace stereotypical images of women as their chosen representation. Are transsexual women too feminine to be welcome as well?

Transsexuals on Womyn's Land

Another category of people who are not always welcome at women-only events like Michigan are male-to-female transsexuals.[17] For example, the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival has been struggling with in its entrance policies. This issue was highlighted in 1991 when Nancy Burkholder, although initially permitted onto the Land, was expelled from the Festival because it was suspected that she was transsexual (Burkholder, 1993:4). Her presumed transsexuality therefore challenged the organizers to define what they meant by womanhood. The following describes Burkholder's expulsion from the Land:

> [A woman posted at the gate] said that the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival was a woman-only event and she wanted to know if I were a man. I replied that I was a woman and showed her my New Hampshire picture ID driver's license. Then she asked me if I were a transsexual. I asked her what was the point of her questioning and she replied that transsexuals were not permitted to attend the festival. She said that MWMF policy was that the festival was open to "natural womyn-born women" only (Burkholder, 1993:4).

The result of the interchange in 1991 was the expulsion of Burkholder, the creation of a policy and a revived feminist debate on the issue. This incident brought national attention to the expulsion of post-operative male-to-female transsexuals from lesbian communities and divided feminists into pro- and anti-transsexual camps (Gabriel, Winter 1994:12).

In 1992, the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival promotional material included a new policy which subtly stated that the Festival was for "womyn-born-womyn" only. To the uninitiated, this policy may have appeared to some to protect the sanctity of womyn's Land by keeping men away. Others might think that it was designed specifically to keep male-to-female transsexuals out since it first appeared in writing the summer following Burkholder's expulsion. Genetic females may consider the womyn-born-womyn phrase to be fairly innocuous, even warm and inclusive -- as if celebrating womaness from birth to womanhood. However, those words were a warning to transsexuals. If you were not born female, you were not welcome. After Burkholder's expulsion, the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival became a major site of confrontation between anti-transsexuals, transsexuals and transsexual supporters because of the "womyn–born–womyn only" policy. As one transsexual feminist wrote: "The protest against the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival's exclusionary policy is quite simply the front line in the struggle against the exclusion of transsexual womyn within the lesbian/feminist community" (Gabriel, 1995c:7).

Similar exclusionary scenarios were and are taking place in Canada and the U.S. For example, the organizers of the 1992 Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual March on Washington refused to include the word transsexual in their title, and attempted to exclude transsexuals from the march (Gabriel, September 1993:14). *Sinister*

Wisdom , a lesbian periodical, first included an anti-transsexual statement in their Spring/Summer 1993 edition stating: "*Sinister Wisdom* is a multi-cultural, multi-class, *womon-born* lesbian space. We seek to open, consider and advance the exploration of community issues" (emphasis added, *Sinister Wisdom*, 1993:1) . In February 1998, a Vancouver feminist organization lobbied the B.C. Human Rights office to challenge the inclusion of "gender identity"[18] as a prohibited grounds for discrimination. At the same time an anonymous flyer circulating in the Vancouver area included the following: "Lesbians, Wimmin and Girls BEWARE! Transsexuals Attacking Females... Like all males, transsexuals are: dangerous, abusive, intimidating, lazy, and MANipulative... help stop the well organized attacks on our lives, don't let transsexuals erase us or define us. Call or write... the B.C. Human Rights Commission"(Personal files, 1998). Around the same time, Vancouver lesbian dances were closed to transsexual women (Clancey,1998:7). One transsexual feminist described the "woman-born" policies of lesbian events to be the most blatant example of exclusion of transsexual women (Gabriel, September 1993b:14).

Lesbian Feminists on the Issue of Transsexual Women

Raymond's early work was influential in feminist writings on transsexualism in the 1980s, and only a few respected feminists provided alternate views on the issues. However, anti-transsexual feminist commentary enjoyed a new

popularity following the Michigan Womyn's music Festival's expulsion of Nancy Burkholder in 1991. Many of the arguments championed by Raymond found their way onto paper under different authorship (Walsh-Bolstad, 1994; Star Bear, 1992:8-9; Rebecca, 1992:9; Pat, 1994:8-9; Brandie, 1992:9; O'leary, 1994; Penelope, 1993; Colwell, 1992; Lindau, 1992). Many of the concerns raised by lesbians were specifically about transsexual women and their participation in lesbian-organized activities. Contrary to earlier writings where few pro-transsexual materials were written, in the 1990s there were several voices from non-transsexual and transsexual feminists opposing the anti-transsexual critiques (Heather, 1992:9; Laura, 1992:9, Margaret, 1992:9-10; Madison, 1992; Janet, 1992; Malone, 1992; Burkholder, 1991, 1992; Siegal, 1994; Blackman, 1994; Walworth, 1992; Beaty, 1992; Ogborn, 1992; Sundance, 1992; Feinberg, 1996; Pratt, 1995; Rubin, 1992).

One hostile anti-transsexual text was written by Walsh-Bolstad: "Can you define what a woman is? You may someday have to think about it, because men are trying to gain access to the lesbian community, claiming they are women.... At this point in time male transsexuals [sic] still depend on women to co-operate with them by allowing them into women's spaces. It is only a matter of time before transsexuals will be defining what a dyke is!" (Walsh-Bolstad, 1994). It appears that Walsh-Bolstad may have been concerned that transsexual women threaten her lesbian identity and may take over women's space. To this familiar

commentary, Blackman retorted by suggesting that the fear of transsexual women: "leads to exclusionary policies and artificial divisions that this community just doesn't need. The Michigan Womyn's Music Festival is a prime example of this sort of checker-boarding..." (Blackman, 1994:23).

A recurring theme in the 1990s writings by anti-transsexual lesbian feminists is their fear of being associated with transsexual women. Perhaps it is the possibility of a sexual encounter with a transsexual that threatens the very foundation of their lesbianhood -- their sexuality. What if a lesbian had sex with a transsexual woman? What if she believed that men could not become women? How would that affect her status as a lesbian? Many women-only events are prime sites where new relationships start up -- in fact, Michigan has a reputation as a "hotbed of lesbian sex". The Festival is: a) "women-only" and b) has a large majority lesbian population. These are perfect ingredients which allow one to go cruising for a girlfriend. When a transsexual woman is introduced into the mix, the ground rules for mating can change considerably. The way it might play out is that if a transsexual woman is assumed to not be a woman (as presented by Raymond an others), and a lesbian is attracted to her or has sex with her, then that lesbian could lose her lesbian identity.[19] The non-transsexual lesbian's actions could make her "heterosexual", "bisexual", or "multisexual". Fragile identities could be at peril of being shattered! One concerned lesbian wrote:

> [A transsexual woman] ... is still a male mind dressed in a female body... All training and experiences "she" has had in life come from a male perspective. All that has been changed is cosmetic.... (the transsexual's sexual preference remains the same. As a male, he related to straight, male-female, sex. As a trans, he still does -- it is not lesbian, it is not from woman to woman) (Brandie, 1992:9).

This statement suggests that lesbians need to be warned against intimacy with transsexual women because they may pay a high price for such encounters. Both a transsexual woman and her lesbian date may become targets of anti-transsexual hatred. The following is an example of a transsexual woman's experience:

> In the case of my lesbian date and myself... [it] seems to be those awful "men in dresses" with their penises cut off... and those traitorous bisexual bitches who pretend to be lesbians while they fuck those "former" men. It seems to me we have a Nazi-like concern for purity here. My XY chromosomes and infertility earns me the badge of the enemy no matter what I have in my heart, mind or panties. And my girlfriend is now a "bisexual" because she's fucked me a few times (Beaty, 1992:17).

Lesbians and the transsexual women whom they are dating become targets for harsh judgment by some separatist lesbians. Their critique resting again in the argument that transsexual women are not women, and therefore their lesbian dates are not lesbians. Identities based on sexuality can be grounded in assumptions about of sex and gender. In order to be a lesbian, women choose women as potential sexual partners. And although lesbian gender presentation is very broad (for example a lesbian can be very masculine) the statements above suggest that biological sex is what makes a woman a woman, and therefore, a

lesbian a lesbian.

Questions of sexual identity involve the complex concept of gender identity. Feminists, and lesbians in particular, have had to negotiate the meanings of "woman in order to establish a comfortable identity within womanhood. Furthermore, lesbians have had to piece together their womanhood by violating the sexual norms of the dominant gender schema. Therefore, many lesbians would have made a conceptual break between sex and gender in order to come to terms with their sexuality. According to the dominant gender schema, a woman's sex is female, her gender is as a feminine woman, and her sexuality is supposed to be heterosexual. In a challenge to that model, some lesbians develop their sexual identity by considering whether they need to be men in order to be in relationships with women. One such lesbian wrote:

> Well, if girls couldn't marry girls, if only boys could marry girls, I figured I must be a boy. I'd been offered no alternatives, so I had to be one or the other. Of course, my genitals certainly identified me as a girl, so I figured that god had made a mistake in my construction and I must be a boy *inside*.... My story so far is a story commonly told by lifelong Lesbians (Penelope, 1992:18).

Cooper (1992) described research from the 1970s that found that children who grew up to be lesbians were five times more likely to desire to be boys than heterosexual women and that 82% of lesbians had a tomboy phase as children (Cooper, 1992:66). In some circumstances, some lesbians have considered

transsexualism as an option:

> [B]ecause at one point in my life I believed that I was a man "trapped in a woman's body," [some think] I should now be a transsexual as a result of "gender dysphoria"... In this way, [they] utterly discount the reports of Lesbians like myself, the "statistically few," and seem incapable of comprehending our reports as crude attempts to understand how we could desire other women in a culture that repeatedly asserted that only men could desire women. I'm so glad my mother refused to let me have a sex-change operation when I asked for one at fourteen! It would have been a terrible mistake (Penelope, 1992:21).

In her process of coming to know herself as a lesbian, Penelope came to radical lesbian separatism, and developed a strong anti-male sentiment in her personal and sexual politics. It seems that some lesbian feminists use their own experience in negotiating the sex/gender/sexuality split as a basis for condemning transsexuals. Raymond herself explained her experience: "So I remember really hating my body, and I remembered wishing I were a boy. I think many of us who have obviously found different solutions, have at times wished we were boys. I think that transsexuals should also be able to find different solutions" (Raymond in Sturgis, 1979:14). The harsh sentencing of transsexuals by some lesbian feminists in part may be based in their own experience of having to make difficult choices when mapping their gendered identities in the world. For example Shapiro noted: "Some gays and lesbians view transsexuals as homosexuals who have found a particularly desperate and insidious way to staying in the closet" (Shapiro, 1991:252). Califia also raised this issue when she wrote of feminists excluding transsexuals from women's events

in the 1970s because they did not consider transsexuals to be women and thought they were men who could not accept their femininity and/or homosexuality (Califia, 1980:132).

When feminists consider their support for transsexuals, some women find themselves in a conundrum of competing loyalties. When considering the womanhood of transsexuals, some women find themselves torn between their allegiance to people of oppressed groups and their own personal politics. One such woman wrote that she was sympathetic to the plight of transsexuals and welcomed them into the gay community but she also supported the exclusion of transsexual women from the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival (Pat, 1994:8). Furthermore, when transsexualism prompts women to ask themselves, "what is a woman?", this question can have a very unstabilizing affect. For some women challenged with the concept of transsexualism, their understanding of womanhood becomes more blurred. For example, the co-editor of *Lesbian Contradiction* "Boy Girl? – Special Issue on Sex and Gender!"[20] wrote:

> Sometimes I don't think there is any such thing as a woman..... [T]he more we listen to various women explore what it means to them ... the more aware we become that the category "women" is not a neat, biologically-determined permanent reality, but a social reality created by human beings... we're [not] dealing... with eternal truth (Adams, 1992:1).

What is a woman? What are the boundaries of womanhood? These questions are more complex than they initially appear. Some feminists believe that

"woman" is "sex" -- a biological being, femaleness, body, chromosomes. Others believe that "woman" is "gender" -- a social being, a result of her experience, her history, her sexual orientation. Yet again, others believe that "woman" is a combination of some, all, or none of the above. Male-to-female transsexualism challenges the notion of womanhood, particularly when access to women-only activities is considered. Transsexualism begs the questions: Does sex change? Does gender change? If a man becomes a woman, is she woman enough to enter women-only space? These questions were explored in a preliminary study "Feminist and Lesbian Opinions About Transsexuals" (FLOAT) (Kendel, Devor, Strapko, 1997). A more in-depth consideration is presented below.

METHODOLOGY

In an attempt to answer these and other questions, 6,000 surveys were distributed in 1994 to women in Canada and the U.S. for a study entitled "Feminist and Lesbian Opinions About Transsexuals" (FLOAT)(Kendel, Devor , Strapko, 1997). [21] A review of initial findings based on 100 surveys was published in 1997. A total of 1,261 surveys were entered into a database. Analysis of the full data set has not been undertaken until now. In this research I am revisiting some of the questions reviewed in FLOAT to describe findings based on 1,261 surveys.

In 1994-95, I worked as a research assistant for Dr. Devor and co-authored of the FLOAT paper with her and Dr. Strapko. Dr. Devor managed the research and was key in setting the direction of the study and the creation of the questionnaire. The questions were designed to draw out what women, particularly feminists and/or lesbians, thought about transsexuals. Information gathered from the respondents included: demographics; involvement in feminist activities; sexual orientation; interest in being the other sex; if they were transsexual; reactions to transsexuals; number of transsexuals known; when they believed transsexuals changed sex; what they believed the sex and gender of transsexuals were; whether they would include transsexuals in feminist, women-only, and lesbian/gay activities; personal attraction/involvement with

transsexuals; what their peers might think of transsexuals; whether transsexuals should disclose that they are transsexual; and whether transsexuals should have human rights protection. Dr. Devor specifically designed the wording of the questions and did a pretest of the questionnaire at a women's festival at a university. I was not involved in the wording or early testing of the survey. I performed administrative duties including finalizing the survey requirements as defined by the University ethics committee,[22] graphic design and production of the questionnaire.[23]

The topic and timeliness of the survey stemmed from Dr. Devor's academic interest as a sociologist who specializes in issues of transsexuality, and the uprising of hostility towards transsexual women which was occurring in the early 1990s. Specifically, transsexual women were being expelled from women-only events such as dances at women's bars, and meetings within women's organizations etc. Because women-only activities are generally organized by feminists and most often by lesbians, there was an interest in surveying non-transsexual women who were feminist and/or lesbian to determine their attitudes about transsexuals. As a result, surveys were handed out at events where the participating population would mainly be women who were either feminists and/or lesbians. I personally distributed approximately 5,000 surveys (including 3,000 at the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival , in August 1994). The remainder were handed out at feminist and lesbian gatherings such as academic

conferences, and women's dances in the U.S. North East.[24] Canadian distribution (approximately 2,000 surveys) included in-person hand outs at an academic conference in Calgary, the Vancouver gay and lesbian Pride Parade, women's dances in Victoria, Vancouver and Nelson, and the Vancouver Folk Festival. Surveys were available for pick-up at the women's' bookstore in Victoria, and women's centres in Victoria and Vancouver. In the fall of 1994, an electronic distribution went out over the Internet to feminist and lesbian bulletin boards (such as the Women's Studies list, BoyChicks, Sappho, and Kinkygirls) from which 200 surveys were returned.

In total, approximately 1,400 surveys were returned by post and electronic mail including surveys from transsexual and non-transsexual men and women. Surveys returned by transsexual men or women, or non-transsexual men were not included in the data set. With these parameters, 1,316 surveys returned by non-transsexual women whom identified themselves as feminists and/or lesbians were entered into the database. Although the terms feminist and lesbian were not defined in the survey, membership in the categories was established if a respondent answered questions in SECTION E "If you are a feminist answer ..." and SECTION F "If you are lesbian answer...". Lesbian feminists were the respondents who answered both sections F and E. Only fifty-five of the non-transsexual women identified themselves as lesbian but not feminist. Because this number was relatively small for comparative purposes with the lesbian

feminists, I decided to focus this study on the respondents who identified as feminist -- either lesbian feminist (923 respondents - 73.2%) or non-lesbian feminist (338 respondents - 26.8%). The final tally entered into the database totaled 1,261 surveys by non-transsexual lesbian or non-lesbian feminists. Of 1,261 entered surveys, 426 were returned from the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival distribution, yielding a 14.47% return rate, and 33.7% of the entire sample studied here.

The survey was a four-page, 61-question mail-back questionnaire with a variety of answer options including multiple choice, fill-in-the-blanks and an invitation for additional comments. All Canadian surveys had a postage paid envelope for mail-back purposes, while the U.S. distribution did not include paid postage. Respondents were asked to circle their answers and to choose more than one answer if applicable. As surveys came in, they were sorted by number and stored in a locked filing cabinet at the University of Victoria. All the question were coded with identifiable abbreviations. Initially 100 surveys were entered into a database for a preliminary study. This early review of the data entry procedure allowed for corrections to be implemented during the full data set compilation. Specifically, because respondents could select more than one answer, there was a need to develop a coding system that would capture the complexities of their answers. For example, when asked "A male-to-female transsexual is a: woman, man, both, neither or other" some respondents chose

"woman" and "both". To accommodate the responses the category "woman both" was created.

The software used was SPSS for Windows 6.0. Crosstabulations were the statistics used to analyze the nominal data. The first 100 surveys were entered by myself and a research assistant. One of us would read out the answers from the surveys and the other would enter the results into a field. The full data set was entered by another research assistant whose work I supervised. The results of the first 100 surveys were used as the basis for the FLOAT study and allowed for the creation of initial pie-charts and graphs to illustrate the findings.

The findings of the first 100 surveys to some extent informed the direction of the analysis of the full data set. Specifically, based on feminist literature Dr. Devor had hypothesized that there might be a difference in findings between lesbian and non-lesbian feminists in their opinions about transsexuals. This presupposition did bear out in the FLOAT paper, for example it was found that lesbian feminists did make more a distinction between sex and gender than did non-lesbian feminists (Kendel, Devor, Strapko, 1997:152-153). However, the FLOAT paper did not make any specific connections to theory that might support these findings. Furthermore, Dr. Devor had suggested in discussion related to the FLOAT paper that there might be an age distinction in terms of attitudes about transsexuals. Specifically, she presupposed that feminists who

would have learnt their feminism in the 1970s might be less welcoming of transsexuals than the younger feminists who learnt their feminism in the 1980s or 1990s. However, there was no analysis related to age presented in the FLOAT paper. Another focus for the FLOAT study centered on whether knowing a transsexual made a difference to one's attitudes. The FLOAT paper revealed findings that suggested that attitude shifted from when one first met a transsexual to the time when the survey was taken. In this circumstance, FLOAT found a trend towards more acceptance of transsexuals (Kendel, Devor, Strapko, 1997:150). However, there was no further analysis presented to elaborate on this point.

The main focus of my current study is centered on determining if there were differences between lesbian and non-lesbian feminists' attitudes towards transsexual women. As a result, initially I assessed the strengths of relationships between respondents' lesbianism and opinions about transsexual women. I compared responses by lesbian feminists with those of non-lesbian feminists. The statistical analysis mainly focused on evidence of relationships and effect size since the sample was neither random or probabilistic because the total lesbian and non-lesbian feminist population estimate is not known. As the data is nominal and the tables are larger than 2x2, the strength of association was measured using the Goodman and Kruskal's tau. Goodman and Kruskal's tau is a PRE or a proportional reduction in error measure used with nominal data. The

PRE determines the magnitude with which the error is reduced when the independent variable (respondent's lesbianism) is used when making predictions. Stated differently, in the case of this study, the PRE measure will describe how much better the predictions of opinion on sex , gender and inclusion of transsexual women would be when knowing a respondent's lesbianism. The independent variable (x) is a respondent's "lesbianism"(lesbian feminist or non-lesbian feminist). The dependent variables (y) are responses to questions about: a) sex of transsexual women (Question 33), b) gender of transsexual women (Questions 34), c) inclusion of transsexual women into women-only events (Questions 40). The questions read as follows:

- **Q33 - What is the physical sex of a male-to-female transsexual? female, male, both, neither, other.**
- **Q36 - A male-to-female transsexual is a: woman, man, both, neither, other.**
- **Q40 - Would you include male-to-female transsexuals in women-only activities/ organization? yes, no, only if.**

As was suggested in FLOAT, I had anticipated a difference in opinion depending on respondents' lesbianism. However, I went further to consider the components of age (Questions #1) and whether the respondents knew any transsexuals (Questions 27 to 31)[25] to see if those aspects strengthened the findings. As noted above, I performed crosstabulations and used the PRE

measure to determine strength of relationships. For both age and whether one knew a transsexual, I initially ran crosstabs for all feminists and then I separated the lesbian from the non-lesbian respondents to determine if the individual groups differed from eachother. For all findings, summary tables are presented within the following section, and full crosstabs are presented in the Appendices. Finally, comments in surveys were reviewed to determine if there were any commonalities between respondents comments, survey question responses and feminist literature on the topic of transsexualism. Results are discussed below.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographics of the sample revealed a narrow range for age representation. The data breaks down as follows:

Table 1: Age

AGE IN YEARS	FEMINISTS SURVEYED	CANADIAN FEMALE POPULATION
19 TO 29	**28.7**	**14**
30 TO 39	**50.0**	**20**
40 AND OLDER	**21.3**	**43**

Note: Figures represent percentages of feminists by age at time surveyed (1994), as well as percentage of Canadian females by age for 1997 (Source: *Canada's Population by Age and Sex*, Strategic Projections Inc., 1997).

The age representation is not reflective of the populations of the U.S. and Canada which are more diverse. For example, estimates of the Canadian female population show that those who were 19-29 years of age make up approximately 14% of the population; those who were 30-39 years of age make up approximately 20% of the population; and those older than 40 make up approximately 43% of the population. The age distribution findings may be representative of the women who frequent the types of events where the surveys were distributed, however there are no estimates available to determine if this is actually the case. Furthermore, because the sample was not random, it cannot be

considered representative of lesbian or non-lesbian feminist populations. Interestingly, the full sample shows a very large representation of lesbians (923 lesbian feminists = 73.2% , 338 non-lesbian feminists = 26.8%). This may be due to the fact that many women-only events are mainly organized and frequented by lesbians. Specific research on feminists within the population would be needed in order to determine if this sample is representative.

When focussing on the questions related to sex and gender, preliminary findings in FLOAT showed that lesbian feminists made more of a distinction between concepts of gender and sex than did the non-lesbian feminists. These findings are represented in Table 2.

Table 2: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists' Views of Male-to-female Transsexuals (Percent)

	Lesbian Feminist	*Non-lesbian Feminists*
Sex of MTF = Female	**30**	**60**
Gender of MTF = Woman	**46**	**60**
Inclusion of MTF in Women-only Events	**48**	**72**

Source: Feminist and Lesbian Opinions About Transsexuals Survey (Kendel, Devor, Strapko, 1997:152-154).

As noted above, 30% of the lesbians believed that transsexuals change sex and 46% believed that transsexuals change gender; whereas 60% of the non-lesbian

feminists believed that transsexuals change sex and gender to the same degree (Kendel et al., 1997:152-153). The FLOAT findings also showed a difference between lesbian and non-lesbian feminist opinions on the inclusion of transsexual women in women-only events (Kendel et al., 1997:154). Seventy-two percent of the non-lesbians would include transsexual women whereas only 48% of the lesbians would include transsexual women in women-only events. When paired with the earlier set of questions, we see that a similar percentage of lesbians who believed that transsexuals change gender (46%) were also welcoming of MTF in women-only events (48%), even though only 30% of the lesbian believed that male-to-female transsexuals changed sex. Alternately, the non-lesbian feminists were more welcoming of transsexual women. Although 60% believed that transsexuals change sex and gender, 72% of the non-lesbian feminists stated that they would welcome MTF to women-only events. These initial findings set a direction for analysis of the full data set. Findings are presented below.

Sex of Transsexual Women

When considering the sex of transsexual women, the following question was considered: Q33 - What is the physical sex of a male-to-female transsexual? Possible answers to the question included: female, male, both, neither, other. The respondents were invited to circle their answer, and in some circumstance

they circled more than one answer. As a result, they created two combination categories -- "female both", and "male both". Definitions were not provided for the response categories female, male, both, neither or other. Furthermore, one can only assume the meanings of "female both" and "male both". For example, it is possible that "female both" category means that a male-to-female transsexual is of both sexes while belonging more to the "female" category. Likewise, it is possible that "male both" category means that a male-to-female transsexual is of both sexes while belonging more to the "male" category. As in the case of sex, new categories of "woman both" and "man both" were created in the responses related to gender. Interpretation of these categories would follow the same lines of logic as described above. Only a general definition for transsexual was provided at the beginning of the survey. It reads "[transsexuals are] people who have undergone a sex change".

Table 3 shows that there is little difference between the lesbian and non-lesbian feminists when considering the sex of transsexual women. The "female"(52.7% overall) category was most frequently chosen with "female both"(16.5% overall) and "male" (12.3% overall) with the next highest percentages. Goodman and Kruskal's tau for the data in Table 3 was only .00165. This effect size suggests that lesbianism has very little effect on opinions about the sex of transsexual women.

TABLE 3: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists' Views of the Sex of Male-to-female Transsexuals (Percents)

	Lesbian Feminists	*Non-lesbian Feminists*	*All Feminists*
Female	**53.8**	**49.4**	**52.7**
Male	**11.4**	**14.8**	**12.3**
Both	**7.9**	**12.1**	**9.0**
Neither	**6.8**	**5.6**	**6.5**
Female both	**17.1**	**14.8**	**16.5**
Male both	**.1**	**.3**	**.2**
Other	**2.8**	**3.0**	**2.9**
GK Tau=.00165	N=923	N=338	Total N=1261

Note: Columns may not sum to 100 due to rounding. See APPENDIX C for full data.

Gender of Transsexual Women

Table 4 describes the findings for question Q36 - A male-to-female transsexual is a: woman, man, both, neither, other. It shows that there is a small difference between the lesbian and non-lesbian feminists when considering the gender of MTF transsexuals. The "woman" (55.8% overall) category was most frequently chosen with "woman both" (14% overall), and "both" (10.9% overall) with the next highest percentages. Because lesbian and non-lesbian responses differ, one

might postulate that whether one is a lesbian or non-lesbian affects one's beliefs about the gender of transsexuals. Goodman and Kruskal's tau for Table 4 was only .00218 which suggests that there is very little effect of lesbianism on views about the gender of transsexual women.

TABLE 4: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists' Views of the Gender of Male-to-female Transsexuals (Percents)

	Lesbian Feminists	*Non-lesbian Feminists*	*All Feminists*
Woman	**54.3**	**60.1**	**55.8**
Man	**8.7**	**8.0**	**8.5**
Both	**10.3**	**12.7**	**10.9**
Neither	**7.3**	**4.7**	**6.6**
Woman both	**15.4**	**10.4**	**14.0**
Man both	**.3**	**.3**	**.3**
Other	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.8**
GK Tau=.00218	N=923	N=338	Total N=1261

Note: Columns may not sum to 100 due to rounding. See APPENDIX D for full data.

Inclusion of Transsexuals in Women-only Events

The following describes the findings for question Q40 - Would you include male-to-female transsexuals in women-only activities/organization? Possible answers included: yes, no, only if. The respondents were invited to circle "yes" or "no" and complete the "only if" section where applicable. However, combination responses were provided such as "yes only if".

TABLE 5: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists' Views on Inclusion of Male-to-female Transsexuals in Women-only Events (Percents)

	Lesbian Feminists	*Non-lesbian Feminists*	*All Feminists*
yes	**56.6**	**71.6**	**60.6**
no	**20.6**	**12.7**	**18.5**
yes only if	**9.0**	**5.0**	**7.9**
GK Tau=.01051	N=795	N=302	Total N=1097

Note: Only three categories are presented here for illustrative purposes. As a result, columns do not sum to 100. See APPENDIX E for full data.

In Table 5, 60.6% of the entire sample felt that they would include transsexuals into women-only events, 18.5% felt that they would not, while 7.9% qualified their inclusion of transsexual women. Lesbian feminists were less likely to

include MTF transsexuals in women-only events (56.6%) than were non-lesbian feminists (71.6%). Lesbian feminists were also more likely to exclude MTF transsexuals (no = 20.6%) than were non-lesbian feminists (no = 12.7%). Finally, lesbian feminists were more likely to qualify their answers related to inclusion of transsexuals (yes only if = 9%, other only if = 12.6) than were non-lesbian feminists (yes only if = 5%, other only if = 10.4). To measure the magnitude of this relationship, consider Goodman and Kruskal's Tau (.01051). This suggests a very weak relationship between the respondent's lesbianism and opinions of inclusion. Many other factors exist for feminists when considering opinions about transsexual women.

To expand on the findings as noted in Tables 3, 4 and 5, other factors were analyzed. Specifically, I was interested in determining if age made a difference in the respondents expressed beliefs about sex, gender and inclusion of transsexual women into women-only events (Tables 6, 7 and 8). Additionally, as identified in the FLOAT study, I set out to determine if attitudes towards transsexuals differed whether or not respondents knew any transsexuals (Tables 9, 10 and 11).

Sex, Gender and Inclusion of Transsexuals Studied by Respondents' Year Born

Table 6 presents findings related to the sex of transsexuals by age of lesbian and

TABLE 6: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists in Year Born by Sex of Male-to-female Transsexuals (Percent)

SEX OF TRANSSEXUALS	*Lesbian Feminists*	*Non-lesbian Feminists*	*All Feminists*
FEMALE			
overall by category	**54.1**	**49.1**	**52.8**
1965-1975	**50.2**	**53.3**	**51.5**
1955-1964	**56.4**	**50.0**	**55.2**
before 1954	**52.3**	**37.9**	**48.7**
MALE			
overall by category	**11.4**	**14.8**	**12.3**
1965-1975	**10.2**	**13.2**	**11.5**
1955-1964	**10.7**	**10.5**	**10.6**
before 1954	**14.6**	**25.8**	**17.4**
BOTH			
overall by category	**7.7**	**12.3**	**8.9**
1965-1975	**11.7**	**12.5**	**10.4**
1955-1964	**9.1**	**11.4**	**7.7**
before 1954	**6.5**	**13.6**	**9.8**
FEMALE BOTH			
overall by category	**17.1**	**15.1**	**16.6**
1965-1975	**20.0**	**14.5**	**17.6**
1955-1964	**16.0**	**17.5**	**16.3**
before 1954	**17.1**	**12.1**	**15.8**
	GK Tau=.00216	GK Tau=.01032	GK Tau=.00246

Note: Table 6 is a compilation of three tables. See APPENDIX F for full data. The four most chosen categories are presented here for illustrative purposes. As a result, columns do not sum to 100.

non-lesbian feminists. What is evident is that when considering age in combination with answers related to sex of transsexuals, we see that there are

differing opinions depending on the age group. For example, only 37.9% of the non-lesbian feminists who were born before 1954 believe transsexuals change sex, compared to 53.3% of the youngest non-lesbian feminists surveyed. They are also the largest group who believe that transsexual women do not change sex (25.8% = male). In the crosstabulations of age and belief about sex of transsexuals, I found that GK Tau was .01 for the non-lesbian feminists but only .002 for the lesbian feminists. Both are very weak effects, but they do suggest an interaction between age and lesbianism that is consistent with my examination of the percentage differences in the above table. Specifically, age is five times more a factor for non-lesbian feminists than it is for lesbian feminists when considering sex of transsexuals.

Table 7 presents findings related to the gender of transsexuals by age of lesbian and non-lesbian feminists. We see that there are differing opinions depending on the age group. For example, non-lesbian feminists born before 1954 are least likely (53.0%) to believe that transsexuals' gender is "woman". On the other hand, among the non-lesbian feminists, those most likely to believe in gender change are not the youngest group as might be expected, but the middle group born between 1955 and 1964 (64%).

TABLE 7: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists in Year Born by Gender of Male-to-female Transsexuals (Percent)

GENDER OF TRANSSEXUALS	*Lesbian Feminists*	*Non-lesbian Feminists*	*All Feminists*
WOMAN			
overall by category	**54.3**	**60.2**	**55.9**
1965-1975	**56.6**	**60.5**	**58.3**
1955-1964	**53.6**	**64.0**	**55.6**
before 1954	**53.8**	**53.0**	**53.6**
MAN			
overall by category	**8.7**	**8.1**	**8.5**
1965-1975	**2.9**	**9.2**	**5.6**
1955-1964	**9.5**	**4.4**	**8.5**
before 1954	**12.6**	**12.1**	**12.5**
BOTH			
overall by category	**9.1**	**13.0**	**10.9**
1965-1975	**7.8**	**13.8**	**10.4**
1955-1964	**11.6**	**9.6**	**11.3**
before 1954	**9.0**	**16.7**	**10.9**
WOMAN BOTH			
overall by category	**15.6**	**10.2**	**14.2**
1965-1975	**20.5**	**7.9**	**15.1**
1955-1964	**14.2**	**14.0**	**14.2**
before 1954	**14.1**	**9.1**	**12.8**
	GK Tau=.00353	GK Tau=.00646	GK Tau=.00150

Note: Table 7 is a compilation of three tables. See APPENDIX G for full data. The four most chosen categories are presented here for illustrative purposes. As a result, columns do not sum to 100.

For the non-lesbian feminist group, Goodman and Kruskal's Tau is .006 for the age-gender change relationship. For the lesbian feminist group, GK Tau is .003.

Both are very weak effects, but they do suggest an interaction between age and lesbianism that is consistent with my examination of the percentage differences in the above table. Both are very weak effects, but they do suggest an interaction between age and lesbianism that is consistent with my examination of the percentage differences in the above table. Specifically, age is two times more a factor for non-lesbian feminists than it is for lesbian feminists when considering gender of transsexuals. When adding the factor of age, figures in Table 6 and 7 support findings presented in Table 3 and 4 that non-lesbian feminists are less likely to believe transsexuals change sex and gender than are lesbian feminists.

Table 8 presents findings related to the inclusion of transsexuals by age of lesbian and non-lesbian feminists. Again, we see that there are differing opinions depending on the age group. For example, lesbian feminists born before 1954 are least likely (53.3%) to welcome transsexuals. However, lesbian feminists are fairly uniform in their attitudes about inclusion, with only a 1.8% difference between the lowest and highest percentages. The non-lesbian feminists are by far the most welcoming of all, particularly those born between 1955 and 1964 (77.2%). This cohort is also the group with the highest percentage of those who believe that transsexuals change gender (64% see Table 7). For non-lesbian feminists, Goodman and Kruskal's Tau between age and inclusion is .006, for lesbian feminists it is .005. Again, both effect sizes are very small, but they do suggest an interaction between age and lesbianism and inclusion that is

consistent with my examination of the percentage differences in the above table.

TABLE 8: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists in Year Born by Inclusion of Male-to-female Transsexuals in Women-only Events (Percent)

	Lesbian Feminists		*Non-lesbian Feminists*		*All Feminists*	
INCLUSION OF TRANSSEXUALS						
YES						
overall by category	**56.4**		**71.7**		**60.5**	
1965-1975	**57.1**	**67.8**		**61.6**		
1955-1964	**56.6**		**77.2**		**60.4**	
before 1954	**55.3**		**71.2**		**59.2**	
NO						
overall by category	**20.4**		**12.7**		**18.3**	
1965-1975	**11.7**		**15.8**		**21.1**	
1955-1964	**21.9**		**7.9**		**19.3**	
before 1954	**25.6**		**13.6**		**22.6**	
YES ONLY IF						
overall by category	**9.1**		**5.1**		**8.0**	
1965-1975	**11.7**		**5.9**		**9.2**	
1955-1964	**9.1**		**4.4**		**8.2**	
before 1954	**6.5**		**4.5**		**6.0**	
	GK Tau=.00582		GK Tau=.00673		GK Tau=.00273	

Note: Table 8 is a compilation of three tables. See APPENDIX H for full data. Only three categories are presented here for illustrative purposes. As a result, columns do not sum to 100.

Specifically, age is slightly more a factor for non-lesbian feminists than it is for lesbian feminists when considering inclusion of transsexuals. Although non-lesbian feminists statistics vary more than the lesbian feminists by age group, overall they are still most welcoming of transsexuals than the lesbian feminists.

Sex, Gender and Inclusion of Transsexuals Considering Whether Respondents Knew or Did Not Know Any Transsexuals[26]

TABLE 9: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists Who Know or Don't Know Any Transsexuals by Sex of Male-to-female Transsexuals (Percent)

	Lesbian Feminists	*Non-lesbian Feminists*	*All Feminists*
SEX OF TRANSSEXUAL WOMEN			
FEMALE			
overall by category	**53.8**	**49.4**	**52.7**
NONE KNOWN	**58.0**	**49.6**	**55.3**
KNOW AT LEAST ONE	**48.4**	**49.1**	**48.5**
MALE			
overall by category	**11.4**	**14.8**	**12.3**
NONE KNOWN	**12.8**	**16.5**	**13.9**
KNOW AT LEAST ONE	**9.5**	**11.4**	**9.9**
BOTH			
overall by category	**7.9**	**12.1**	**9.0**
NONE KNOWN	**7.9**	**12.9**	**9.4**
KNOW AT LEAST ONE	**8.0**	**10.5**	**8.5**
FEMALE BOTH			
overall by category	**17.1**	**14.8**	**16.5**
NONE KNOWN	**12.8**	**10.7**	**12.2**
KNOW AT LEAST ONE	**22.7**	**22.8**	**22.7**
	GK Tau=.00582	GK Tau=.00673	GK Tau=.00273

Note: Table 9 is a compilation of three tables. See APPENDIX I for full data. The four most chosen categories are presented here for illustrative purposes. As a result, columns do not sum to 100.

Table 9 suggests that knowing or not knowing a transsexual does make a difference to respondents beliefs. For example, only 48.4% of the lesbian

feminists who know at least one transsexual believe that transsexuals are females. This is the lowest percentage of all feminists. What is most notable is that the lesbian feminists who don't know any transsexuals have the highest percentage (58% = female) of those who believe that transsexual women are female. It is also interesting to note that almost 23% of both lesbian and non-lesbian feminists who do know at least one transsexual consider transsexual women to be "female both" compared with those who have no transsexual affiliation (approximately 12%).

For non-lesbian feminists, Goodman and Kruskal's Tau between affiliation and sex is .006, for lesbian feminists it is .005. Again, both effect sizes are very small, but they do suggest an interaction between affiliation and lesbianism and sex that is consistent with my examination of the percentage differences in the above table. Specifically, affiliation is slightly more of a factor for non-lesbian feminists than it is for lesbian feminists when considering sex of transsexuals.

Table 10 indicates that knowing or not knowing a transsexual makes a difference to respondents' consideration about gender. For example, only 50.4% of the lesbian feminists who know at least one transsexual answered that transsexual women were women. This is the lowest percentage of all feminists. Whereas

TABLE 10: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists Who Know or Don't Know Any Transsexuals by Gender of Male-to-female Transsexuals (Percent)

	Lesbian Feminists	*Non-lesbian Feminists*	*All Feminists*
GENDER OF TRANSSEXUAL WOMEN			
WOMAN			
overall by category	**54.3**	**60.1**	**55.8**
NONE KNOWN	**57.3**	**59.4**	**57.9**
KNOW AT LEAST ONE	**50.4**	**61.4**	**52.8**
MAN			
overall by category	**8.7**	**8.0**	**8.5**
NONE KNOWN	**9.0**	**9.4**	**9.1**
KNOW AT LEAST ONE	**8.2**	**5.3**	**7.6**
BOTH			
overall by category	**10.3**	**12.7**	**10.9**
NONE KNOWN	**10.3**	**17.4**	**12.5**
KNOW AT LEAST ONE	**10.2**	**3.5**	**8.7**
WOMAN BOTH			
overall by category	**15.4**	**10.4**	**14.0**
NONE KNOWN	**13.8**	**6.3**	**11.5**
KNOW AT LEAST ONE	**17.5**	**18.4**	**17.7**
	GK Tau=.00271	GK Tau=.01367	GK Tau=.00338

Note: Table 10 is a compilation of three tables. See APPENDIX J for full data. The four most chosen categories are presented here for illustrative purposes. As a result, columns do not sum to 100.

61.4% of the non-lesbian feminists who have some affiliation with transsexuals answered that transsexuals were women. The combination category of "woman both" was the second highest percentage which shows agreement between lesbian (17.5% = woman both) and non-lesbian (18.4% = woman both) feminists

who know at least one transsexual. For non-lesbian feminists, Goodman and Kruskal's Tau between affiliation and gender is .01, for lesbian feminists it is .002. Again, both effect sizes are very small, but they do suggest an interaction between affiliation and lesbianism and gender that is consistent with my examination of the percentage differences in the above table. Specifically, affiliation is 5 time more of a factor for non-lesbian feminists than it is for lesbian feminists when considering gender of transsexuals.

TABLE 11: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminists Who Know or Don't Know Any Transsexuals by Inclusion of Male-to-female Transsexuals in Women-only Events (Percent)

	Lesbian Feminists	*Non-lesbian Feminists*	*All Feminists*
INCLUSION OF TRANSSEXUAL WOMEN			
YES			
overall by category	**56.6**	**71.6**	**60.6**
NONE KNOWN	**56.1**	**70.1**	**60.3**
KNOW AT LEAST ONE	**57.1**	**74.6**	**61.0**
NO			
overall by category	**20.6**	**12.7**	**18.5**
NONE KNOWN	**21.6**	**17.0**	**20.2**
KNOW AT LEAST ONE	**19.2**	**4.4**	**15.9**
YES ONLY IF			
overall by category	**9.0**	**5.0**	**7.9**
NONE KNOWN	**8.2**	**4.0**	**7.0**
KNOW AT LEAST ONE	**10.0**	**7.0**	**9.3**
	GK Tau=.00040	GK Tau=.01065	GK Tau=.00111

Note: Table 11 is a compilation of three tables. See APPENDIX K for full data. Only three categories are presented here for illustrative purposes. As a result, columns do not sum to 100.

Table 11 reveals that when non-lesbian feminists know transsexuals, they are more welcoming of them into women-only events (74.6% = yes to inclusion when MTF known) compared to 70.1% who don't know any transsexuals. Conversely, non-lesbian feminists who do not know any transsexuals are more likely to exclude them from women-only events (17%) than are those who know a transsexual (4.4%). On the other hand, whether a lesbian feminist knows a transsexual does not seem to make a difference to their attitudes about inclusion. For non-lesbian feminists, Goodman and Kruskal's Tau between affiliation and inclusion is .01, for lesbian feminists it is .0004. Again, both effect sizes are very small, but they do suggest an interaction between affiliation and lesbianism and inclusion that is consistent with my examination of the percentage differences in the above table. Specifically, affiliation is 25 time more of a factor for non-lesbian feminists than it is for lesbian feminists when considering inclusion of transsexuals.

Analysis

Te results from the three questions related to sex, gender and inclusion of transsexuals can provide us with interesting insights about lesbian and non-lesbian feminist opinions of transsexuals and the boundaries of womanhood (see summary in TABLE 12). When considering both sex and gender, it was found

that there was a small statistically significant difference between lesbian and non-lesbian responses. When grouping lesbian and non-lesbian responses as a population of feminists, we see that 52.7% believed that the sex of transsexual women was "female" and 55.8% believed the gender of transsexual women was

TABLE 12: Comparison of Lesbian & Non-lesbian Feminists by Sex, Gender and Inclusion of Male-to-female Transsexuals in Women-only Events (Percent)

SEX	▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	52.7 All Feminists
FEMALE	▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	53.8 Lesbian Feminists
	▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	49.4 Non-lesbian Feminists
GENDER	▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	55.8 All Feminists
WOMAN	▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	54.3 Lesbian Feminists
	▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	60.1 Non-lesbian Feminists
INCLUSION	▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	60.6 All Feminists
IN WOMAN-	▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	56.6 Lesbian Feminists
ONLY EVENTS	▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮	71.6 Non-lesbian Feminists
SEX	▮▮	12.3 All Feminists
MALE	▮▮	11.4 Lesbian Feminists
	▮▮▮	14.8 Non-lesbian Feminists
GENDER	▮	8.5 All Feminists
MAN	▮	8.7 Lesbian Feminists
	▮	8.0 Non-lesbian Feminists
INCLUSION	▮▮▮	18.5% All Feminists
IN WOMAN-	▮▮▮▮	20.6% Lesbian Feminists
ONLY EVENTS	▮▮	12.7% Non-lesbian Feminists
REFUSED		

Note: Table 12 is a combination of three tables. Full data for sex can be found in Appendix C, gender in Appendix D, and inclusion in Appendix E. Selections from each table are presented here for illustrative purposes. As a result, columns do not sum to 100.

"woman". Let us consider the questions related to sex and gender with the inclusion of transsexual women. If one believes that transsexual women change sex and gender, then one may assume that a similar percentage would be welcome into women-only events. However, lesbians and non-lesbians differ in their inclusion of transsexual women. More than half of the lesbians (yes to inclusion = 56.6%) would welcome transsexual women in women-only events, while 71.6% (yes to inclusion) of the non-lesbian feminists would do the same. The results indicate a possible trend that lesbian and non-lesbian feminists are somewhat similar in their opinions about sex and gender of transsexual women but differ more so in their inclusion of transsexual women into women-only events.

It appears that lesbians are consistent in the application of their stated beliefs that sex (female = 53.8%) and gender (woman = 54.3%) change for transsexual women, because a similar percentage of the lesbians (yes to inclusion=56.6%) would welcome transsexual women into women-only events. Non-lesbians are less consistent in the application of their stated beliefs that sex (female = 49.4%) and gender (woman = 60.1%) change for transsexual women when considering transsexuals' inclusion into women-only events; 71.6% of the non-lesbians say yes to inclusion. This percentage is considerably higher than the number who consider transsexual women to be female or women. The survey tool is limited in its application because respondents were not asked specifically to say why they

made the choices they did. However, these findings do suggest that non-lesbians feminists are more welcoming of transsexual women into women-only events than are lesbian feminists.

Further review of these populations revealed that age was a factor which correlated with individuals' responses to the question of inclusion. Specifically, non-lesbian feminists born between 1955 and 1964 were the most inclusive of all feminists surveyed. A percentage of 77.2 non-lesbian feminists in that age range were welcoming of transsexual women (up by 5.5% more than whole non-lesbian feminist population surveyed), they were slightly higher than the average by 3.8% in believing that gender changed (64.0%), and only .9% higher in believing that transsexual women changed sex (50.0%). Furthermore, as noted above, the non-lesbian feminists who were born before 1954 had the lowest percentages related to sex (37.9% = female) and gender (53.0% = woman) of transsexuals for all feminists, but were not the least welcoming. This non-conformity presents several challenges to understanding the findings. Why would the non-lesbian feminists be both the most welcoming and yet the least likely to believe that transsexuals change sex and gender? How might one explain these findings? Perhaps the non-lesbian feminists surveyed born between 1955 and 1964 have to some extent normalized the issue of transsexualism as part of the culture that surrounded them when they were growing up in the 1960s and 1970s. Their teenagehoods would have coincided with the early popularization of

transsexualism in North America (see footnote # 9). The 1960s and 1970s were also a time of liberal politics, free love and experimentation with recreational drugs. The pendulum of liberal politics swung in and out of the 1970s, coming from the conservative post-war era to the conservative Reagan years. Perhaps non-lesbian feminists of this era are more liberal in their politics than their predecessors and their successors. And for the non-lesbian feminists born before 1954, perhaps their understandings about sex and gender are less flexible than for those born after 1955.

On the other hand, how might one explain why age does not seem to correlate with lesbian feminists beliefs about transsexuals? Some might suggest that radical feminism, and specifically lesbian feminism and lesbian separatism could strongly influence feminists' beliefs about men. That of all feminists, lesbian feminists would be most likely to embrace lesbian feminist and/or lesbian separatist politics. If that were the case, many lesbian feminists might consider transsexual women to still have some elements of manhood. As a result, lesbian feminists might be seen to be less welcoming of transsexual women than non-lesbian feminists. However, this speculation could only be explored with further specific questioning of respondents, by asking feminists to elaborate on the foundation of their beliefs about transsexuals?

It was found that knowing or not knowing at least one transsexual did seem

make a difference to one's beliefs about sex or gender of transsexuals, or whether one would welcome a transsexual woman into a women-only event for non-lesbian feminists. However, this correlation was only evident in some circumstances. For example, all the feminists showed a correlation between knowing transsexuals and believing that transsexuals were "female both". This choice is unusual as it demonstrates a radical departure from the strict binary sex categories of the dominant gender schema. It seems that meeting a transsexual broadens the options traditionally available when considering the sex of an individual. Unfortunately, the limitations of the survey instrument did not allow for further exploration of this topic[27] . Where one might expect to see a difference between those who know and don't know' transsexuals would be in the area of inclusion of transsexuals into women-only events. However, lesbians are not more welcoming if they know at least one transsexual whereas non-lesbian feminists are slightly more welcoming of transsexuals if they know at least one over when they do not know any transsexuals. Why would lesbian feminists be less welcoming than non-lesbian feminists? To further explore these questions, I turned to the comments provided in the surveys.

It is clear that there is a boundary that is drawn around the membership into womanhood, and it is evident by comments in the surveys that the reasons vary greatly. For example in response to the questions of inclusion, some feminists[28] wrote that they would welcome transsexual women into women-only events if

transsexual women satisfied some of the following: not sexist, cross-living, post-operative, have lived longer as women than men, lesbian identified, considered themselves to be women, had full surgery, if the whole organization decides to include them, if they passed. A recurring theme in the responses in opposition to transsexual women's womanhood and inclusion in women-only events focussed on transsexual women's history as men (See APPENDIX L - comments from survey #3591). One respondent who believed that transsexual women were "female", identified the gender as "neither", and would not welcome MTFs in women-only events wrote:

> I have known a few male-to-female transsexuals in my life and am currently friends with one. I do not believe that MTF transsexuals can ever be truly women, even after they have had sex reassignment surgery. A person is so much more than their physical body.
>
> The socialization process that nearly all men have undergone in their society, for the twenty to thirty years before their surgery, has instilled in them too many male habits, ideas, attitudes and beliefs ever to become truly female. Also, as long as the Y chromosome is present I believe a person is still male and if they stopped taking their daily dose of hormones, they would revert to being male, although surgically castrated (survey #1015).

Individual's comments and the findings from the surveys illustrated that feminists brought a variety of criteria to their decision making about transsexual women and whether they considered them to be female, women and whether they would welcome them into women-only events. Some placed more emphasis on aspects of biology (e.g., menses, ability to bear children). Others

considered their socialization to be what made them women (e.g. history as a girl). Some valued individual agency (e.g. self determination of gender). Spirituality was paramount for others. Many used some or all of the above when formulating their ideas about transsexual women. Often, context is what determined which transsexual would be welcome (e.g., a transsexual woman who passed well would be more welcome than one who did not). Many comments showed contradiction between written commentaries and responses to questions. Many women admitted to being confused by the issue of transsexualism. Further questioning would help reveal specifics about the challenges that the respondents faced when considering transsexualism and womanhood.

In the comments, it became evident that the feminists surveyed had very individual interpretations about womanhood as they applied it to transsexual women. What also came clear was that the respondents did not necessarily make a distinction between sex and gender as their use of terminology in their comments sometimes contradicted their survey responses. Several respondents commented that the survey challenged them to think about issues that they had not previously considered. These facts raised questions about the reliability of the results related to sex and gender given that there were only two questions related specifically to gender and sex respectively (Q# 33, 34, 35, 36). More in depth questioning would likely help clarify what feminists understand about sex

and gender as it applies to themselves and others.

A main specificity that was lacking in the survey centered on feminists' understandings of transsexuality. The survey did not define transsexuality more than stating that transsexuals were people who had "had a sex change". This specificity may very well shed some light on what aspects of transsexualism are less acceptable for feminists. Many feminists surveyed suggested that they did not know what transsexualism entailed. MacKenzie (1994:103-145) documented that many people formulate their ideas about transsexuals from popular culture (e.g. talk shows, movies), and do not make clear distinctions between cross-dressers, drag-queens, and transsexuals. For example, acceptance of transsexual women seems to vary for feminists depending if the transsexual woman is pre-operative or post-operative.[29] And many feminists qualified their inclusion of transsexual women by stating that surgery was a defining factor -- however the type surgery was not specified (e.g. castration, vaginoplasty, shaving of the Adam's apple etc.). Again, more in-depth research would be required to determine what feminists knew about transsexualism and how this influenced their opinions about transsexuals.

Although the comments did provide more insight on feminist thoughts about transsexualism, they did no show any clear patterns between lesbian and non-lesbian opinion to help determine why lesbians seem to be less welcoming. The

questions about the difference between lesbians and non-lesbians remain. Perhaps the answer can be found in the boundaries of womanhood. As the qualifier suggests, to be allowed into women-only events, an individual needs to be a woman. But when is one a woman? Does one need to be female to be a woman? According to the dominant gender schema, the answer is yes (Devor, 1989). As the schema is applied, when first perceiving an individual, gendered presentation is read and an assumption is made about the sex of the individual -- if someone looks like a woman, we assume she is female[30] . In most circumstances, this assumption is correct. In others, it is not. For example, although I am a woman and female from birth, I am regularly mistaken for a man. I am only five feet tall, have a slight to medium body, medium sized breasts, round hips, smooth skin, no facial hair, and I speak with a medium voice. Most misdesignations last for only a few seconds as the observer noticeably makes a further assessment of my presentation. Perhaps they assume that a person who wears loose fitting comfortable clothes (usually a shirt and pants), has short hair, is assertive and direct -- is a man. Their assumption is not all together incorrect, although I do not present myself as a man, I do present myself as butch, and in the dominant gender schema, butch = masculine, and masculine usually = man. I am butch but female -- I am a masculine woman. Again, the dominant gender schema assumes that a woman is female and feminine and a man is male and masculine. These unspoken rules apply in the everyday world under the dominant gender schema.

However, this schema is not dominant at women-only events, especially when they are organized by and for lesbians. For example, at a women's dance I would be recognized for what I am -- butch -- a female masculine woman. In this context, the gender boundaries are different. Under the dominant gender schema there are female feminine women and male masculine men. Under the lesbian centered gender schema the only constant is that everyone is female. This specificity is not overtly stated, nor is it defined -- but it is assumed. At lesbian organized women-only events, one could be a female masculine woman (i.e., butch), a female feminine woman (i.e., femme), in some circumstance it would even be appropriate to be a female masculine man (i.e., drag king) or even a female feminine man (i.e., gay drag king). The underlying assumption is that individuals who attend women-only events are 100% female no matter what their gendered presentation. Like the dominant gender schema, the lesbian centered gender schema operates as an automatic process. Few people would actually consciously consider whether someone is female, or not -- the assumption is unspoken.

How does the lesbian-centered gender schema apply to transsexual women at women-only events? Are transsexual women more masculine than female masculine women? Are transsexual women more feminine than female feminine women? Some might say so. For example, Raymond (1994) says that transsexual

women exude male energy, they take up too much space, they're hyperfeminine, too aggressive, too loud, are a danger to women, and don't share women's history (Raymond, 1994:99-119). Consequently, according to Raymond, transsexual women are not female, women or real lesbians as is witnessed by her most damning remarks towards "transsexually constructed lesbian feminists"(Raymond, 1994:99-119). But as pointed out earlier, if a female can transgress the norms of what it means to be a woman in the lesbian centered gender schema and still be female, why can't a transsexual?

Because lesbians are homosexual, they relate to other women in a different ways than do heterosexual women. Specifically, women are potential intimate partners. For many lesbians, and especially separatists, a masculine woman is considered very desirable company whereas a man would be very undesirable. Feminist politics come into play to explain why some lesbians (and some non-lesbian feminists) would have a strong dislike of men since men are identified as agents of women's oppression under radical feminist politics. This personal politic may very well have something to do with why lesbian feminists seem to be less welcoming of transsexual women (as they may still consider them to be men). On the other hand, many lesbians have had to bend societal rules about gender and sexuality in order to live as lesbians. Because of their own digression from the norm, one might think that lesbians would actually be more apt to be allies to transsexuals. Clearly, more specific questioning would be needed to

better understand beliefs and motivations in these areas.

CONCLUSION

Do transsexual women sex change? Do transsexual women change gender? A majority of feminists surveyed said that sex and gender do change. What are the boundaries of womanhood? This question cannot be answered so easily. Does the 1970s and 1990s literature on transsexualism within feminist publications aptly reflect feminists opinions about transsexuals? For some, the answer is "yes". Do feminists agree on the boundaries of womanhood? I would have to conclude that the answer is "no". As we have seen, these questions are more complex than they initially appear.

Radical feminist theories presented in this paper provide a context that explains why some feminists and specifically some radical lesbian feminists' harbour hostility towards men. Men, under patriarchy, are identified as agents of oppression of women. From this grounding, it seems clear that individuals who had lived as males would be suspect for their interest in becoming women. If one believes that men are by nature oppressors, then all men are suspect. Consequently, even though transsexual women live as women, they were once oppressors. For some feminists, the logic appears to be, once a man always a man. Furthermore, some feminists proceed from an assumption that these individuals enjoyed the benefits of being part of the superior gender class by virtue of their sex. However, as Brown and Rounsley (1996:30-95) report, the

lives of transgendered children and young adults are often a nightmare. They wrote: "[The transsexuals questioned] all report that their childhood years were a torturous experience as they struggled with the constant burden of trying to live up to the expectations of their family and society about the gender role they were *supposed* to play"(1996:30). Nevertheless, it seems that some feminists paint transsexual women with a broad brush as former men who were oppressors as men and continue to be oppressors as women.

This hostility towards transsexual women is born out in feminist praxis as lesbian separatists have barred transsexual women from entering large women-only events such as the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival. This exclusionary policy served as a boundary, bolstering a rigid gender schema -- not the dominant gender schema, but the lesbian centered gender schema. In this context, lesbian organizers felt justified in their exclusion of transsexuals for a variety of reasons. Transsexual women were thought to be a threat to other women because they were thought to: exude male energy, be opportunistic, be rapists, be deceptive, be inappropriately loud and overbearing, be too feminine, be too masculine, be too dangerous, etc. (Raymond, 1994). In a similar vein, other non-transsexual women were also considered outcast by militant lesbian separatists -- they were women who were too masculine, too feminine, women with boy children, women who listened to music with men's voices, women who had transsexual lovers, heterosexual women, bisexual women, women who

associated with men etc. (Penelope, 1992; Hoagland and Penelope, 1988). Ironically, critiques brought to bear on transsexual women resemble critiques that lesbians experienced by non-lesbian feminists at the beginning of the second wave of feminism. Where once the Lavender Menace was deemed to be a threat to the "women's movement", the Transsexual Menace is today experiencing a similar rejection by feminists and especially by lesbian feminists.

It is evident by the literature in feminist and lesbian periodicals that there are vocal opponents to transsexual equality. The 1990s writings reflected both pro- and anti-transsexual materials, whereas the earlier literature was heavily weighted by Janice Raymond's dominant negative perspectives. As a result, the willingness to speak in support of transsexual women as a 1990s phenomenon would suggest that there is a shift to a more positive culture in support of equality for transsexual women. In effect, the percentage of the respondents who welcomed transsexual women into women-only events were of a substantial majority within the non-lesbian feminist community (71.6% yes to inclusion) and a lesser majority among lesbian feminists (56.6% yes to inclusion). Feminists who maintain their opposition to transsexual women in the 1990s may be those who embrace more strongly a radical feminist analysis which was a predominant politic among separatists in the 1970s. However, this study was limited by the survey questions and did not ask whether the respondents were influenced by particular feminist writings about transsexualism, or which feminist politic they

embraced. It is likely, however that the feminists who were adults in the 1970s would have had the most opportunity to learnt from early feminist writings. They may also have been influenced by the liberal politics of the era. Does this make them more or less welcoming of transsexual women? It seems that age factors more prominently for non-lesbian feminists than for lesbian feminists when answering this question. Further study would benefit from questions that would consider political influences and personal application of these politics.

Many of the arguments presented both in support and opposition to transsexuals were mirrored in the feminist materials. However, it is unknown whether the respondents were influenced by any particular piece of literature, or for that matter which aspects of feminism they brought in formulating their opinions about transsexual women. And although the most damning anti-transsexual literature was produced by lesbian feminists and specifically separatists, it is unknown what percentage of the respondents who outright rejected transsexuals (18.5 % overall stated no to inclusion), consider themselves to be separatist. Furthermore, although the anti-transsexual voice was most consistent through the 1970s and 1990s (e.g. repeating the same arguments over that time and often referencing Raymond), it is evident from the statistical findings that there is only a small minority among those surveyed who might agree with Raymond. Despite this distribution of opinion, the anti-transsexual voice seems to be more prominent in the feminist literature. Stated differently, there appears to be more

commentaries in opposition to transsexuals than there are anti-transsexual feminists. These finding are somewhat encouraging for transsexual women in that there were many more allies than antagonists among those surveyed. However, what is disturbing is that supportive opinion which in theory could be expressed by 71.75 of the non-lesbian feminists and 56.4% of lesbian feminists, is overshadowed by negative attitude as reflected in the exclusionary policies of some women-only organizations (e.g. Michigan Womyn's Music Festival, etc.). The phenomenon of excluding transsexual women seems to have created an environment that appears to be more negative than it really is.

Transsexualism has evidently sparked many feminists to question where they draw the line when it comes to womanhood. As noted above, there are several aspects that feminists bring to their own understanding of being woman -- be they biological, sociological, or spiritual. How they apply these criteria to themselves may very well reflect how they apply them to transsexual women. What is clear is that the boundaries surrounding sex and gender are much more fluid than are available within the dominant gender schema which is based in a binary distinctions of female/male and woman/man. As Devor wrote: "On the one hand, humanity is naturally diverse. On the other hand, aggregate social consciousness and modes of social organization concerning sex and gender issues are unable to match the reality of that diversity. However, individual members of societies still must fit themselves into the categories of their societies

or become stigmatized social outcasts" (Devor, 1996:80).

This study has revealed a range of opinion expressed by those surveyed and by feminist writings on transsexualism. It has revealed that lesbian feminists are less welcoming of transsexual women than are non-lesbian feminists. And since lesbians are central organizers of women-only events, the key to acceptance of transsexual women within the feminist communities may very well be found among lesbian separatists. The question remains. What is it that prompts a few lesbians to perpetuate a cycle of oppression against another marginalized group? To decipher this conundrum, one may need to look more closely at the lesbian gender schema as a paradigm potentially as oppressive as the dominant gender schema. Although it is difficult from this research to draw any specific conclusions, there is likely some correlation between the exclusionary practices expressed by a vocal minority and a code of behaviour that some lesbians strongly embrace. Finally, I can only hope that as we learn to recognize diversity, we come to see how sex and gender rigidity serves to oppress others as well as ourselves.

NOTES

[1] When I use the term "sex" I refer to the biological classifications "male" and "female". Female biology includes: sex organs (ovaries, uterus, cervix, vagina, clitoris); and sex characteristics (breasts, hips, female-typical body hair and body fat, smooth skin, generally light bone structure and musculature); hormones (oestrogens, progestins, androgens); and chromosomes (XX). Male biology includes: sex organs (testes, seminal vesicles, Prostate and Cowper's glands); and sex characteristics (penis, scrotum, male-typical facial and body hair, deep voice, generally heavy bone structure and musculature); hormones (oestrogens, progestins, androgens); and chromosomes (XY).

[2] When I use the term "gender" I refer to the social classifications of man/boy and woman/girl. When I use the term "gendered presentation" I refer to self-portrayal as a man or a woman. For instance, a male-to-female transsexual would have a gendered presentation as a woman. Social norms presuppos that a female would have a gendered presentation as a woman, while a male in would have a gendered presentation as a man. However, it is the "gender attribution" made about an individual that usually leads to the presupposition that the witnessed gender matches the assumed sex; that is, a man is assumed to be male and a woman is assumed to be female (Devor, 1989).

[3] The term transsexual can refer to both male-to-female (MTF) and female-to-male (FTM) transsexuals. Since the feminist debate presented in this paper centres mainly around male-to-female transsexuals, transsexual women will be the focus of this paper. For the purposes of this paper, a transsexual woman is an individual who was assigned as male at birth and who later self-identifies as a woman. How individuals make this change is complex, diverse and deeply personal. Therefore, the means by which an individual came to her womanhood, whether she is pre-operative, post-operative or non-operative, or whether she lives full-time as a woman etc. are issues beyond the scope of this project. Unless otherwise indicated, when I use the term transsexual, I am referring to transsexual women. Although there are a growing number of female-to-male transsexuals and their realities may influence the discussion, this paper will mainly focus on transsexual women. When I am referring to female-to-male transsexuals, I will use the terms FTM, female-to-male transsexual or transsexual man.

It is estimated that at least .01% of the total population in the U.S. are post-operative transsexuals although to date there are no accurate statistics that account for the prevalence of all transsexuals which include pre-operative, non-operative and post-operative (Brown and Rounsley, 9:1997). The American Psychiatric Association *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* estimates that transsexuals make up less that 1 percent of the population (Brown

and Rounsley, 1997:249).

[4] The FLOAT paper was an initial study of feminist opinions, based on 100 surveys. The data was compiled using 100 randomly selected lesbian and non-lesbian feminist responses from early replies (see METHODOLOGY for more details). Subsequent to the FLOAT paper, another 1,100 surveys were added to the database. This paper is the first exploration of the entire data set totaling 1,261 surveys.

[5] The same questions also apply to the concepts of "male", "man" and "manhood". Because of the power dynamics inherent in patriarchal society, the arguments around the issue of manhood would be very different from those presented in this paper. Although the study of manhood, and the differences between the questions of manhood and womanhood are interesting, their foci are beyond the bounds of this thesis.

[6] Kate Millet originally published *Sexual Politics* in 1969 making her an early leader in the second wave of feminism.

[7] Mary Daly originally published *Gyn/Ecology* in 1979.

[8] *The Transsexual Empire: The Making of the She–male* was originally published in 1979 with a new edition released in 1994. Although transsexualism has been part of popular culture since the early 1970s, Raymond's book stands alone as the only feminist book dedicated solely to the critique of transsexualism. In her new introduction, she reiterates that transsexualism is a pressing issue for feminism (Raymond, 1994:xviii). The reissuing of her book has given the author an opportunity to respond to her critics -- those critiques (e.g., Stone, 1991; Shapiro, 1991; Woodhouse,1989) being evidence of the tensions surrounding this issue today. Raymond also uses her introduction to denigrate popular images of transsexuals in the films *Paris is Burning* and *The Crying Game* as well as to malign popular transgendered icons such as Boy George, RuPaul, Leslie Feinberg, and k.d. lang.

[9] Janice Raymond dedicated her 1994 edition of *The Transsexuals Empire* to Mary Daly: "With gratitude, awe, and love" (Raymond, 1994:vi). Raymond wrote: "I hope the dedication of this book adequately expresses the gratitude I owe to Mary Daly. Her friendship, wisdom, and creativity are inspiring and, more than anyone, she has sparked my creativity. It is difficult for me to separate my words and ideas from her own" (Raymond, 1994:ix). Mary Daly dedicated her 1990 edition of *Gyn/Ecology* to Janice Raymond.

Raymond also thanks Andrea Dworkin for her comments on the "Sappho by Surgery: The Transsexually Constructed Lesbian-Feminist" chapter as well as

Adrienne Rich' for her encouragement and recognition of Raymond's work (Raymond, 1994:viii-ix).

[10] Although Steinem does not specify the type of "star-spangled, commercial exploitation," it is likely that she is referring to two transsexual women who received media coverage in the 1970s. One of them was Jan Morris who wrote *Conundrum* (1974), a book describing her process of becoming a woman. She is also a well-published travel writer with many other publications to her name. A contemporary of Morris' was Renee Richards who had her sex reassignment surgery in 1975.

Richards was a Park Avenue doctor who played tennis as an amateur before and after her sex reassignment surgery, who gained notoriety when she threatened to sue the American Tennis Association when they announced that chromosome testing would be required to qualify in the Tennis Week Open (Seligson, 1977:75). Richards received considerable media coverage in the mid- to late-1970s, including television interviews and national U.S. magazine coverage. "Dr. Richards has certainly made a mark -- for herself and for thousands of transsexuals scattered in anonymity across the country. 'What is a woman?' has become the cocktail party subject of the year since she threatened to sue..., announced her intention to play in the Australian open in December, and applied to play on the women's circuit" (Reader, 1976:37).

[11] Margrit Eichler's article "Sex Change Operations: The Last Bulwark of the Double Standard" was an early feminist paper on transsexualism which first appeared in 1980 in her book *The Double Standard*.

[12] The warnings that Raymond raised about transsexuals' involvement in the women's movement hearken back to the perceived threat lesbians posed to the feminist movement in the early 1970s. Here some feminists marginalize transsexual women, whereas some feminists marginalized lesbians in the 1970s. Raymond believes that transsexuals are neither women nor feminists. Opponents to lesbians within the feminist movement considered lesbians to be a form of threat and embarrassment to the feminist movement to the extent that many mainstream feminists wanted to distance themselves from lesbians. In response to being ostracized from the feminist movement, some lesbians formed an activist group:

> Lavender Menace was a recently formed collective of lesbian feminists. Its name derived from a remark attributed to Betty Freidan -- that lesbians in the women's movement were a "lavender menace" that could ultimately hurt the cause (Schneir, 1994:160).

A transsexual activist group the "Transsexual Menace" formed in the early 1990s, and set out to challenge the women's movement on their exclusion of transsexual women.

[13] Hiding one's lesbian identity has been a survival technique used by many lesbians (Penelope, 1992:43). Ironically, the same survival technique is not tolerated when used by transsexuals. Many lesbians label transsexuals who do so as deceptive.

[14] I have been to the Festival in 1985, 1987, 1994 and 1995. My knowledge of much of the Festival mythology is based on personal observations and conversations that I have had over the years with other lesbians who have attended.

[15] The Michigan Womyn's Music Festival is also commonly known as "the Land", "Womyn's Land", "the Festival", and "Michigan." In this thesis I will also use many of these terms.

[16] Concepts of butch and femme are very complex! The elaboration of these identities is well beyond the bounds of this paper. The comparisons of butches to traditional men and of femmes to traditional heterosexual feminine women is by admission a very superficial example, however it is presented merely for illustrative purposes for those who are not familiar with butch and femme concepts. My apologies to those who might feel offended by such simplicities.

[17] Generally speaking, male-to-female transsexuals or transsexual women are individuals who are born physiologically male and who live as women. In the population of people who may call themselves transsexual, there are many variations of surgical, hormonal and cross-living combinations. For example, there are the pre-op, post-op or non-operative transsexuals as well as individuals who live as the other gender part-time or full-time (MacKenzie, 1994).

Generally speaking, a transsexual is an individual who, before sex reassignment surgery, feels like they are living in the wrong body. Before they engage in any sex reassignment surgery, they would often live as a member of the other gender for a period of time. Following a variety of surgeries and hormone therapy, a post-operative transsexual "has changed sex in all but one component: gonads and internal reproductive mechanisms are surgically removed; hormones and external genitalia are chemically and surgically redirected and restructured; only chromosomal sex [XY] remains the same" (Woodhouse, 1989:2-3).

Woodhouse's passage presented above implies that transsexuals actually change sex -- that is, they begin as one biological sex (e.g., male) and completely change to become another sex (e.g., female). Others believe that transsexuals change gender but not sex -- that is, they maintain their original sex (e.g., male) but change gender (e.g., male person becomes a woman) (MacKenzie, 1994:1-2).

[18] "Gender identity" was proposed to be included as protected grounds under the provincial *Human Rights Act* to protect transgendered and transsexual individuals from discrimination in the province of British Columbia. See APPENDIX A for: a letter to the B.C. Human Rights Office in opposition to gender identity inclusion; and a Vancouver area anti-transsexual flyer.

[19] The unstabilizing effect that transsexualism can present to one's sexual identity was documented in MacKenzie's book *Transgender Nation* (1994). The concern that some lesbians experience seems to also be shared by heterosexual men. MacKenzie wrote:

> [M]any Americans exposed to media representations of transgenderists and transsexuals confuse them with other groups of cross-dressers and report feeling overwhelmed and intimidated by their images. This was demonstrated in a... course I taught on "Sex and Genders in America". When I announced to the class that a male-to-woman transsexual was going to be a future guest speaker, a male football player blurted out, "I will have to hit her". As we explored his reaction during class, it became apparent that he was worried he might be sexually attracted to the speaker. Since the student's identity was based on traditional notions about masculinity and heterosexuality, he feared his sexual identity would be threatened if he were attracted to the speaker...
>
> After analyzing over 40 American TV talk shows and documentaries aired from 1985 to 1992 that featured transsexuals, transgenderists, cross-dressers, transvestites and female impersonators, it became apparent that my student's anxious response about the transsexual speaker's impending visit paralleled televised audience reactions to transgenderists and transsexuals and those frequently confused with them. The majority of televised audience members, like my student, exhibited varying degrees of discomfort and anxiety. Without exception, each program featured at least one audience member or call-in viewer who responded as if their personal identity were under sever attack (MacKenzie, 1994:109-110).

[20] This issue of *Lesbian Contradiction* followed on the heals of Nancy Burkholder's expulsion from the Michigan Womyn's Music Festival. Many articles in this edition specifically referenced transsexuals' attendance at women-only events like Michigan.

[21] See APPENDIX B for a copy of "Feminist and Lesbian Opinions About Transsexuals Survey."

[22] For ethical considerations, the survey cover letter it specified that: respondents

needed to be at lest 19 years of age, the survey was voluntary and anonymous, returning the survey was providing consent for use of responses in the research project, and that requests for further information should come under separate cover.

[23] The surveys were electronically numbered in order to track the distribution site of the surveys.

[24] Dr. Nancy Strapko distributed approximately 1,000 surveys in the northeastern U.S.

[25] If a respondent answered Questions 27 to 31, they were identified as knowing at least one transsexual. Those who did not answer these questions were identified as not knowing any transsexuals.

[26] Of the feminists surveyed in this study, 59.2% stated that they did not know any transsexual women while 40.8% knew at least one (due to the limitations of the survey tool, we only captured numbers of transsexuals known but did not identify the closeness of these relationships). Lesbians knew more transsexuals (401 or 43.4% of the lesbians knew at least one transsexual and 522 or 56% did not know any) while non-lesbian feminists knew fewer transsexuals (114 or 33.7% of the non-lesbians knew at least one transsexual and 224 or 66.3% did not know any).

[27] One limitation of the survey tool was in the lack of information which would distinguish between those who knew transsexuals on a personal basis and those who knew transsexuals as acquaintances. Brown and Rounsley recommended that people learn more about transsexualism in order to become more comfortable with the idea of transsexualism and transsexuals in their lives (Brown and Rounsley, 1997).

[28] Comments were varied and did not seem to reveal any patterns for either group. For example, negative comments about transsexuals were not more represented by lesbians than nn-lesbians. The comments at times contradicted the survey answers. These mixed responses may suggest that many feminists were grappling with the issues of transsexualism and womanhood, and that this was a new area of reflection.

[29] The question of surgery status is not only raised by non-transsexual feminists but is also being challenged by transsexuals themselves. For example, the New Women's Conference was being hosted for transsexual women which required that all participants be post-operative. The policy created much angry debate within the transsexual women's community in the mid 1990s (Wilchens, 1994; Walworth, Autumn 1994).

[30] Social norms presuppose that a female individual would have a gendered presentation as a woman while a male individual would have a gendered presentation as a man. However, when we first encounter an individual, we see their gender based on what we perceive. From there we make a gender attribution, that is, from a collection of information about their person, we decide if they are presenting themselves as a man or a woman. Once we attribute a gender to an individual, we go further to assume a sex. The gender attribution about an individual usually leads to the presupposition that the witnessed gender matches the assumed sex; that is, a man is assumed to be male and a woman is assumed to be female (Devor, 1989).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Jan. "Do Women Exist??" *Lesbian Contradiction: A Journal of Irreverent Feminism 39* (Summer, 1992), p. 1.

Baynes, Sylvia. "Trans–sex or Cross–gender? A Critique of Janice Raymond's The Transsexual Empire." *Women's Studies Journal 7* (1991), pp. 53–65.

Beaty, Christine. "Lesbians Who Date Transsexuals." *Lesbian Contradiction: A Journal of Irreverent Feminism 39* (Summer, 1992), p. 17.

Blackman, Perrin. "Lavender Retrospective." *Off Our Backs 24* (January, 1994), p. 23.

Bolin, Anne. *In Search Of Eve*. Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey, 1988.

"Boy Girl? – Special Issue on Sex and Gender!" *Lesbian Contradiction: A Journal of Irreverent Feminism 39* (Summer,1992), pp. 1-23.

Brandie. "Responses." *Lesbian Connection 14* (May/June, 1992), p. 9.

Brown, Mildred and Rounsley, Chloe Ann. *True Selves: Understanding Transsexualism -- For Families, Friends, Coworkers, and Helping Professionals*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996.

Burkholder, Nancy Jean. "A Kinder, Gentler Festival?" *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 2* (November/December, 1993), p.4.

Burkholder, Nancy Jean. "Transsexual Rights." *Off Our Backs 22* (January, 1992), p. 28.

_____. "Transsexual at Michigan." *Off Our Backs 21* (October, 1991), p. 17.

Califia, Pat. *Sapphistry: The Book of Lesbian Sexuality*. Tallahassee: Naiad, 1980.

Canada's Population by Age and Sex. http://www.s-p-inc.com/web1.html: Strategic Projections Inc., 1997.

Card, Claudia. *Lesbian Choices*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Clancey, Michelle. "Let's Set Up A Big Tent." *Xtra West 120* (March 19, 1998), p. 7.

Colwell, Kate. "Trying to Understand our Differences." *Lesbian Contradiction: A Journal of Irreverent Feminism 39* (Summer,1992), p. 18.

Cooper, Margaret. "Rejecting 'Femininity': Some Research Notes on Gender Identity Development in Lesbians." *Lesbianism.* Edited by Wayne Dynes and Stephen Donaldson. New York: Garland, 1992, pp. 63-72.

Daly, Mary. *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism.* Boston: Beacon, 1990.

_____. *Pure Lust: Elemental Feminist Philosophy.* Boston: Beacon, 1984.

de Beauvoir, Simone. "Introduction." *Feminist in Our Time: The Essential Writings, World War II to the Present.* Edited by Miriam Schneir. New York: Vintage Books, 1994, p.p. 6-20.

Descarries-Belanger, Francine and Roy, Shirley. "The Women's Movement and Its Currents of Thought: A Typological Essay." *CRIAW Papers 26* Ottawa: CRIAW, 1991, pp. 1-58.

Devor, Holly. *Gender Blending: Confronting the Limits of Duality.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.

_____. "Toward a Taxonomy of Gendered Sexuality." *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality 6(1)*, 1993, pp. 23-55.

_____. "Female Gender Dysphoria in Context: Social Problem or Personal Problem." *Annual Review of Sex Research: An Integrative and Interdisciplinary Review 7*, 1996, pp. 44-89.

_____. *FTM: Female-to-male Transsexuals in Society.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Dixon, Janet. "Separatism: A Look Back At Anger." *Radical Records: Thirty Years of Lesbian and Gay History.* Edited by Bob Cant and Susan Hemmings. London: Routledge, 1988, pp. 69-84.

Dobkin, Alix (1982). "Why Be Separatist? Exploring Women-only

Energy." *For Lesbians Only: A Separatist Anthology*. Edited by Sarah Lucia-Hoagland and Julia Penelope. London: Only Women Press, 1988, pp. 286-290.

Douglas, Cad. "Transpersons Transcendent." *Off Our Backs 9* (August/September 1979), p. 9.

Dworkin, Andrea. *Woman Hating*. Vancouver: Clarke, Irwin, 1974.

Eichler, Margrit. "Sex Change Operations: The Last Bulwark of the Double Standard." *Gender Roles: Doing What Comes Naturally?* Edited by E.D. Salamon and N. Robinson. Toronto: Methuen, 1987, pp. 67–78.

Eisenstein, Hester. *Contemporary Feminist Thought*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983.

Feinberg, Leslie. *Trans Gender Warriors: Making History From Joan of Arc to Dennis Rodman*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.

Feinbloom, Deborah Heller, Michael Fleming, Valerie Kijewski, and Margo P. Schulter. "Lesbian/Feminist Orientation Among Male–to–female Transsexuals." *Journal of Homosexuality 2* (1976), pp. 59–71.

"Festival Forum." *Lesbian Connection 16* (January/February, 1994), p. 8-9.

_____. *Lesbian Connection 14* (May /June, 1992), p. 9.

Firestone, Shulamith. *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*. New York: Quill, 1970.

French, Marilyn. *The War Against Women*. New York: Summit Books, 1992.

Gabriel, Davina Anne. "Mission to Michigan IV: No Room at the Information Table." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 10* (Autumn, 1995), pp.20-29.

_____. "Protest Against Michigan Womyn's Music Festival's Exclusionary Policy Will Continue This Year." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 9* (Summer, 1995b), p. 7.

_____. "Meet the New Boss, Same as the Old Boss." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 9* (Summer, 1995c), pp. 22-30, 65 .

_____. "Of Transsexuals and Transcendence." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 3* (Winter, 1994), pp. 12-16. .

_____. "From the Editor." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 1* (September, 1993), p. 3.

_____. "'We're Queer Too!': Trans Community Demands Inclusion." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 1* (September, 1993b), p. 13-17.

Greer, Germaine. "Review of Conundrum by Jan Morris." *The Madwoman's Underclothes: Essays and Occasional Writings 1968–85.* London: Picador, 1986, pp. 189–191.

Gutter Dyke Collective (1973). "This is the Year to Stamp Out the "Y" Chromosome." *For Lesbians Only: A Separatist Anthology*. Edited by Sarah Lucia-Hoagland and Julia Penelope. London: Only Women Press, 1988, pp. 338-339.

Heather. "Responses." *Lesbian Connection 13* (March/April, 1992), p. 9.

Hoagland, Sarah Lucia and Penelope, Julia Editors. *For Lesbians Only: A Separatist Anthology*. London: Only Women Press, 1988.

Janet. "Responses." *Lesbian Connection 13* (March/April, 1992), p. 10.

Jeffreys, Sheila. *The Lesbian Heresy: a Feminist Perspective on the Lesbian Sexual Revolution*. North Melbourne: Spinifex, 1993.

Kando, Thomas. *Sex Change: The Achievement of Gender Identity Among Feminized Transsexuals*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Kendel, Monica, Devor, Holly, Strapko, Nancy. "Feminist and Lesbian Opinions About Transsexuals." *Gender Blending,* Edited by Bonnie Bullough, Vern Bullough and James Elias. Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1997, pp. 146-157.

Laura. "Responses." *Lesbian Connection 13* (March/April, 1992), p. 9.

Lindau, Rebecka. "Transsexuals." *Off Our Backs 5* (May 1992), p. 22.

MacKenzie, Gordene Olga. *Transgender Nation*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1994.

MacKinnon, Catharine. *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Madison. "Responses." *Lesbian Connection 13* (March/April, 1992), p. 10.

Malone, Patricia. "Transsexual Rights." *Off Our Backs 22* (January, 1992), p. 28.

Margaret. "Responses." *Lesbian Connection 13* (March/April, 1992), pp. 9-10.

Millett, Kate. *Sexual Politics.* Garden City: Doubleday, 1990.

Morris, Jan. *Conundrum.* New York: Signet, 1974.

Ogborn, Anne. "Your Call for Submissions Furthers Oppression." *Lesbian Contradiction: A Journal of Irreverent Feminism 39* (Summer, 1992), p. 19.

O'Hatigan, Margaret Deirdre. "She's Baaa-aaack!" *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 6* (Autumn, 1994), pp. 24-25.

O'Leary, Claudine. "Commentary – Queer Politics." *Off Our Backs 24* (January, 1994), pp. 3, 8.

Pat. "Festival Forum." *Lesbian Connection 16* (January/February, 1994), p. 8-9.

Penelope, Julia "Lesbianville, U.S.A.?" *Off Our Backs 23* (October, 1993), pp. 8-9, 17.

_____. *Call Me Lesbian.* Freedom: Crossing Press, 1992.

Pratt, Minnie Bruce. *S/He.* Ithica: Firebrand Books, 1995.

Raymond, Janice. *The Transsexual Empire: The Making of the She–Male.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1994.

_____. "The Author Replies: Transsexuals Are Castrated Men". *Chrysalis 5* (1977), pp. 6-8.

_____. "Transsexualism: The Ultimate Homage to Sex–Role Power." *Chrysalis 3* (1977b), pp. 11–23.

Reader, Cynthia."Reborn Richards." *womenSports* (December 1976), pp. 34-37.

Rebecca. "Responses." *Lesbian Connection 13* (March/April, 1992), p. 9.

"Responses." *Lesbian Connection 13* (March/April, 1992), pp. 8–10.

_____. *Lesbian Connection 14* (May/June, 1992), pp. 9.

Rich, Adrienne. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." *Feminist Frameworks: Alternative Theoretical Accounts of the Relations Between Women and Men,* Second Edition. Edited by Alison Jaggar and Paula Rothenberg. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984, pp. 416-420.

Riddell, Carol. *Divided Sisterhood: A Critical Review of Janice Raymond's "Transsexual Empire."* Liverpool: News From Nowhere, 1980.

Rose, Elizabeth. "A Feminist Transsexual Speaks Out for Self-Identification." *Chrysalis 5* (1977), p. 6.

Rose, Lisa. "Sisters in Arms?: The Compatibility of Feminism and Male-to-Female Transsexualism." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 5* (Autumn, 1995), pp. 44-46.

Rubin, Gayle. "Of Catamites and Kings: Reflections on Butch, Gender, and Boundaries." *The Persistent Desire: A Femme–Butch Reader.* Edited by Joan Nestle. Boston: Alyson, 1992, pp. 466–482.

Schneir, Miriam. *Feminist in Our Time: The Essential Writings, World War II to the Present.* Edited by Miriam Schneir. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Seligson, Marcia. "Transsexual Chic: The Packaging of Renee Richards." *Ms.* (February, 1977), pp. 75-76, 85–86.

Shapiro, Judith. "Transsexualism: Reflections on the Persistence of Gender and the Mutability of Sex." *Body Guards.* Edited by J. Epstein and S. Straub. New York: Routledge, 1991, pp. 248-279.

Siegal, Thyme S. "Call for Transgender Tolerance." *Off Our Backs 23* (January, 1994), p. 23.

Sinister Wisdom 49 The Lesbian Body (Spring/Summer 1993), p. 1.

Solanis, Valerie. "Excerpts From the SCUM (Society for Cutting Up Men) Manifesto." *Sisterhood is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings From the Women's Liberation Movement.* Edited by Robin Morgan. New York: Vintage Books, 1970, pp. 577-583.

StarBear. "Responses." *Lesbian Connection 13* (March/April, 1992), pp. 8–9.

Steinem, Gloria. "If the Shoe Doesn't Fit, Change the Foot." *Ms.* (February, 1977), pp. 76, 85–86.

Stone, Sandy. "The Empire Strikes Back: A Posttranssexual Manifesto." *Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity.* Edited by J. Epstein and S. Straub. New York: Routledge, 1991, pp. 280–304.

Sturgis, Susanna. "An Interview With Jan Raymond." *Off Our Backs* (October, 1979), pp. 14–15.

Sundance, CB. "Who Determines Identity." *Lesbian Contradiction: A Journal of Irreverent Feminism 39* (Summer, 1992), p. 17.

Tayleur, Christine. "Letters to the Editor." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 9* (Summer, 1995), pp. 4-5.

Tong, Rosemarie. *Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1989.

"Trans-action News: Transsexual Protesters Allowed to Enter Michigan Womyn's Music Festival." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 6* (Autumn, 1994), pp. 9-11.

"Trans-action News:Transsexual Ban Costs Sydney Lesbian Centre Money and Community Support." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 8* (Spring, 1995), pp.11-12.

Walsh–Bolstad, Beth. "The New, Improved (Surgically Constructed) Woman/Lesbian?" *Off Our Backs 13* (November, 1993), pp. 14,23.

Walworth, Janis. "Letters to the Editor." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 10* (Autumn, 1995), p. 9.

_____. "Results of 1992 Gender Survey Conducted at Michigan Womyn's Music Festival." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 2* (November/December, 1994), pp. 13–14.

_____. "In Support of NWC Policy." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 6* (Autumn, 1994), pp. 44-45.

_____. "Genderphobia: Where Separatism Joins Patriarchy." *Lesbian Contradiction: A Journal of Irreverent Feminism 39* (Summer, 1992), p. 16.

Wilchens, Ricki Anne. "Why Post-op Transsexual Women Should Not Be Allowed at Michigan." *TransSisters: The Journal of Transsexual Feminism 6* (Autumn, 1994), pp. 31-33.

Woodhouse, Annie. *Fantastic Women: Sex, Gender and Transvestism.* London: MacMillan Education, 1989.

Woolf, Naomi. *The Beauty Myth.* Toronto: Random House, 1990.

WWTMC (We Want the Music Collective). *20th Anniversary Celebration: Michigan Womyn's Music Festival (Festival Catalogue).* Hart: WWTMC, 1995.

APPENDIX A

Lesbians, Wimmin and Girls

BEWARE!

Transexuals Attacking Females

Males masquerading as females (transexuals) are polluting our communities worldwide with their Lesbian-hating/Womyn-hating poison.

DON'T SWALLOW THE LIES!

CHECK OUT THE FACTS INSTEAD:

Some of us are born into the world as females, the rest males

A male on hormones and/or in a dress is *not* a womyn

Cutting off a male's penis *doesn't* make him a female

DON'T BE FOOLED WIMMIN

Like all males, transexuals are: dangerous, abusive, intimidating, lazy, and MANipulative

Like all males, transexuals have power over us and use it against us

In our city alone, they have:

Dragged Wimmin's organizations to court for defending wimmin-only spaces

Physically and verbally assaulted many Lesbians

Infiltrated Lesbian-only spaces such as those at the Vancouver Wimmins' Health Collective and the Gay and Lesbian Centre.

Destroyed Lesbian Coming Out groups by calling them "exclusive"

Told females gathered at the December 6, 1996 Memorial that, "There's nothing political about being a womyn"

The Transgendered Law Reform Project is being used to invade our organizations and force us underground

Don't be confused, transexuals can not understand or "share" our experiences

We are trained to be their caretakers

No male knows, what its like to be a girl, womyn or Lesbian

HELP STOP THE WELL-ORGANIZED ATTACKS ON OUR LIVES

DON'T LET TRANSEXUALS ERASE US OR DEFINE US

Call and Write Mary-Woo Sims at the B.C. Human Rights Commission

306-815 Hornby, Vancouver, B.C.

660-6811

Support organizations by, for and about females

Demand our right to male-free spaces

Spread the word, talk to your female friends!

FEB 13 1998
VANCOUVER, B.C.

Lesbians, Wimmin and Girls
BEWARE!
Transexuals Attacking Females

Males masquerading as females (transexuals) are polluting our communities worldwide with their Lesbian-hating/Womyn-hating poison.

DON'T SWALLOW THE LIES!

CHECK OUT THE FACTS INSTEAD:
Some of us are born into the world as females, the rest males
A male on hormones and/or in a dress is *not* a womyn
Cutting off a male's penis *doesn't* make him a female

~~DON'T BE FOOLED WIMMIN~~
Like all males, transexuals are: dangerous, abusive, intimidating, lazy, and MANipulative
Like all males, transexuals have power over us and use it against us

In our city alone, they have:
Dragged Wimmin's organizations to court for defending wimmin-only spaces
Physically and verbally assaulted many Lesbians
Infiltrated Lesbian-only spaces such as those at the Vancouver Wimmins' Health Collective and the Gay and Lesbian Centre.
Destroyed Lesbian Coming Out groups by calling them "exclusive"
Told females gathered at the December 6, 1996 Memorial that, "There's nothing political about being a womyn"

The Transgendered Law Reform Project is being used to invade our organizations and force us underground

Don't be confused, transexuals can not understand or "share" our experiences
We are trained to be their caretakers
~~No male knows, what its like to be a girl, womyn or Lesbian~~

HELP STOP THE WELL-ORGANIZED ATTACKS ON OUR LIVES
DON'T LET TRANSEXUALS ERASE US OR DEFINE US

Call and Write Mary-Woo Sims at the B.C. Human Rights Commission
306-815 Hornby, Vancouver, B.C.
660-6811

Support organizations by, for and about females
Demand our right to male-free spaces
Spread the word, talk to your female friends!

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA
P.O. BOX 3050, VICTORIA, B.C., CANADA V8W 3P5
TELEPHONE (604) 721-7572 FAX (604) 721-6217

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

FEMINIST AND/OR LESBIAN OPINIONS ABOUT TRANSSEXUALS

We are researchers in the Department of Sociology from the University of Victoria, in Victoria British Columbia, Canada and the University System of New Hampshire, U.S.A. We are gathering information about transsexuals (people who have undergone a sex change) in order to better understand what people think of transsexuals.

Would you be interested in completing an anonymous survey on this topic? You need not know any transsexuals in order to provide your opinions. **If you are interested** in providing your thoughts about transsexuals, please complete the attached survey at your convenience and return it by mail in the postage-paid self-addressed envelope which is provided. This survey is anonymous, and therefore we **do not** require your name on the survey. Your action of completing the survey and mailing it, indicates that you consent to this process. Your participation is of course entirely voluntary, and you are free to withdraw from participation at any time, without explanation.

If you are under nineteen years of age, we regret that we cannot legally solicit your responses and would ask that you not complete this survey. **If you are not interested** in completing the survey, we would like to thank you for your time. You have no obligation to return the survey or read any further.

Should you have any questions about the survey, or wish to communicate with the researchers, please feel free to write or phone us at (604)721-7577 at the University of Victoria, or at (603)535-2508 at Plymouth State College. If you write to us, please send a separate letter in order to preserve your anonymity. Thank you for your participation in this project.

NOTE: By filling out and returning the attached survey, you are providing consent to having your opinions used as data in our research project.

Dr. Holly Devor
Associate Professor
University of Victoria

Monica Kendel
Research Assistant
University of Victoria

Dr. Nancy Strapko
Associate Professor
Plymouth State College
University of New Hampshire

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA
P.O. BOX 3050, VICTORIA, B.C., CANADA V8W 3P5
TELEPHONE (604) 721-7572, FAX (604) 721-6217

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

FEMINIST AND/OR LESBIAN OPINIONS ABOUT TRANSSEXUALS

We are researchers in the Department of Sociology from the University of Victoria, in Victoria British Columbia, Canada and the University System of New Hampshire, U.S.A. We are gathering information about transsexuals (people who have undergone a sex change) in order to better understand what people think of transsexuals.

Would you be interested in completing an anonymous survey on this topic? You need not know any transsexuals in order to provide your opinions. **If you are interested** in providing your thoughts about transsexuals, please complete the attached survey at your convenience and return it by mail in the postage-paid self-addressed envelope which is provided. This survey is anonymous, and therefore we **do not** require your name on the survey. Your action of completing the survey and mailing it, indicates that you consent to this process. Your participation is of course entirely voluntary, and you are free to withdraw from participation at any time, without explanation.

If you are under nineteen years of age, we regret that we cannot legally solicit your responses and would ask that you not complete this survey. **If you are not interested** in completing the survey, we would like to thank you for your time. You have no obligation to return the survey or read any further.

Should you have any questions about the survey, or wish to communicate with the researchers, please feel free to write or phone us at (604)721-7577 at the University of Victoria, or at (603)535-2508 at Plymouth State College. If you write to us, please send a separate letter in order to preserve your anonymity. Thank you for your participation in this project.

NOTE: By filling out and returning the attached survey, you are providing consent to having your opinions used as data in our research project.

Dr. Holly Devor
Associate Professor
University of Victoria

Monica Kendel
Research Assistant
University of Victoria

Dr. Nancy Strapko
Associate Professor
Plymouth State College
University of New Hampshire

OPINIONS ABOUT TRANSSEXUALS

SECTION A:

1. **What year were you born?** _____
2. **What is your race? (e.g. Black, First Nations)** _____
3. **What is your ethnicity?(e.g. Irish/French)** _____
4. **What is your citizenship?** _____
5. **What is your sex?** _____
6. **What was your income last year (before taxes)?** _____
7. **What is your usual occupation?** _____
8. **What level of education have you completed?** _____
9. **What was the religious affiliation of the family in which you were raised?** _____
10. **What religion do you practice now?** _____
11. **Where do you live?** (please circle your answer)
    City. Town. Suburbs. Rural. Remote Outpost.
12. **Where were you raised?** (please circle your answer)
    City. Town. Suburbs. Rural. Remote Outpost.
13. **In which of the following feminist activities have you taken part?** (please circle as many as apply)
    None.
    Women's Studies student.
    Worker in feminist organization.
    Organize mass action/lobbying/political ed.
    Direct action.
    Teach feminism.
    Independent feminist
    Participate in mass action/lobbying/political ed.
14. **What is your sexual orientation? How many years have you felt this way? (e.g. lesbian 1983-94)**
    (please circle your orientation(s) and write the years next to your choice - you may choose more than one)

	years		years		years
Lesbian	_____	Heterosexual	_____	SM/Leather	_____
Bisexual	_____	Celibate	_____	Other _____	_____
Queer	_____	Gay	_____	Other _____	_____

SECTION B: ***For questions 15 through 25, please circle yes or no, or write your answer in the space provided.***

15. **Have you ever wanted to be the other sex?** YES NO
16. **Have you ever thought that you might be a transsexual?** YES NO
17. **Are you a transsexual?** ***(if no go to SECTION C, if yes continue)*** YES NO
18. **Are you a male-to-female transsexual?** YES NO
19. **Are you a female-to-male transsexual?** YES NO
20. **Have you been cross-living?** YES NO years _____
21. **Have you taken hormones?** YES NO years _____
22. **Have you had sex-reassignment surgery?** YES NO years _____
23. **Do you intend to take further steps toward sex reassignment?** YES NO
    If yes, what? _____
24. **Are you out as a transsexual?** YES NO years _____
    To whom? _____
25. **How many years have you identified as transsexual?** _____

SECTION C: ***For questions 26 through 28, circle the number of the answer that best fit your experience. You may choose more than one.***

1. Revolted 2. Hostile/angry 3. Unaccepting/not angry 4. Confused 5. Indifferent 6. Curious
7. Fascinated 8. Accepting 9. Ally/defender 10. Turned on 11. Don't know

26. **If you do not know any transsexuals, how do you feel about them in general?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

If you do not know any transsexuals, please go to SECTION D, otherwise continue.

27. **If you do know any transsexuals, what was your first reaction to meeting them?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

28. **How do you now feel about the transsexuals that you know?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

29. **How many male-to-female transsexuals do you know?** _____ years _____

30. **How many female-to-male transsexuals do you know?** _____ years _____

31. **If you do know any transsexuals, how did you meet them? (e.g.: at school, work, family member, etc.)**
_____

SECTION D: ***For questions 32 through 36 circle your answer or fill in the blank where applicable.***

32. **Transsexuals change sex:**
When they say so. When they start cross-living. When they take hormones. Never.
After surgery. When the law says so. Other_____

33. **What is the physical sex of a male-to-female transsexual?** FEMALE MALE BOTH NEITHER
OTHER _____

34. **A male-to-female transsexual is a:** WOMAN MAN BOTH NEITHER
OTHER _____

35. **What is the physical sex of a female-to-male transsexual?** FEMALE MALE BOTH NEITHER
OTHER _____

36. **A female-to-male transsexual is a:** WOMAN MAN BOTH NEITHER
OTHER _____

SECTION E: ***For questions 37 through 48 please circle yes or no, and complete the "only if" section where applicable. If you are a feminist answer 37 through 40; if not, go to SECTION F.***

37. **Would you include female-to-male transsexuals in feminist activities/organizations?** YES NO
ONLY IF _____

38. **Would you include male-to-female transsexuals in feminist activities/organizations?** YES NO
ONLY IF _____

39. **Would you include female-to-male transsexuals in women-only activities/organizations?** YES NO
ONLY IF _____

40. **Would you include male-to-female transsexuals in women-only activities/organizations?** YES NO
ONLY IF _____

SECTION F: ***If you are lesbian/gay answer 41 through 44; if not, go to SECTION G.***

41. **Would you include female-to-male transsexuals in lesbian/gay activities/organizations?** YES NO
ONLY IF _____

42. **Would you include a male-to-female transsexuals in lesbian/gay activities/organizations?** YES NO
ONLY IF _____

43. **Would you include female-to-male transsexuals in women-only activities/organizations?** YES NO ONLY IF _____

44. **Would you include male-to-female transsexuals in women-only activities/organizations?** YES NO ONLY IF _____

SECTION G:

45. **Do you think you could find yourself sexually/romantically attracted to a female-to-male transsexual?** YES NO ONLY IF _____

46. **Would you become sexually/romantically involved with a female-to-male transsexual?** YES NO ONLY IF _____

47. **Do you think you could find yourself sexually/romantically attracted to a male-to-female transsexual?** YES NO ONLY IF _____

48. **Would you become sexually/romantically involved with a male-to-female transsexual?** YES NO ONLY IF _____

SECTION H: ***For questions 49 through 58 circle the number of the answer that best fits your experience. You may choose more than one.***

1. Revolted 2. Hostile/angry 3. Unaccepting/not angry 4. Confused 5. Indifferent 6. Curious 7. Fascinated 8. Accepting 9. Ally/defender 10. Turned on 11. Don't know

49. **How do you think your closest friends might feel about female-to-male transsexuals?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

50. **How do you think your closest friends might feel about male-to-female transsexuals?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

51. **How do you think your wider social circle might feel about female-to-male transsexuals?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

52. **How do you think your wider social circle might feel about male-to-female transsexuals?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

53. **How do you think your family members might feel about female-to-male transsexuals?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

54. **How do you think your family members might feel about male-to-female transsexuals?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

55. **How do you think your co-workers might feel about female-to-male transsexuals?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

56. **How do you think your co-workers might feel about male-to-female transsexuals?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

57. **How do you think your political allies might feel about female-to-male transsexuals?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

58. **How do you think your political allies might feel about male-to-female transsexuals?**
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. Other_____

SECTION I: ***For questions 59 and 60 please circle yes or no, and complete "only if" where applicable.***

59. **Do you think that transsexuals should tell others that they are transsexuals?** YES NO ONLY IF _____

60. **Do you think that transsexual people should have the same human rights protection as everyone else?** YES NO ONLY IF _____

61. **Feel free to attach additional comments when you return this survey.**

Thank you for participating in this study.

APPENDIX C

SEX sex of mtf by
LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST feminists who are lesbian or non-lesbian

		LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST		
	Count Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	lesbian feminist	non-les feminist	Row Total
SEX				
female		497 74.8 53.8 39.4	167 25.2 49.4 13.2	664 52.7
male		105 67.7 11.4 8.3	50 32.3 14.8 4.0	155 12.3
both		73 64.0 7.9 5.8	41 36.0 12.1 3.3	114 9.0
neither		63 76.8 6.8 5.0	19 23.2 5.6 1.5	82 6.5
female both		158 76.0 17.1 12.5	50 24.0 14.8 4.0	208 16.5
male both		1 50.0 .1 .1	1 50.0 .3	2 .2
other		26 72.2 2.8 2.1	10 27.8 3.0 .8	36 2.9
	Column Total	923 73.2	338 26.8	1261 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	10.08008	6	.12132

Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau :					
with SEX	dependent	.00165	.00126		.05224

SEX sex of mtf by
LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST feminists who are lesbian or non-lesbian

SEX	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST: lesbian feminist	non-les feminist	Row Total
female		497	167	664
		74.8	25.2	52.7
		53.8	49.4	
		39.4	13.2	
male		105	50	155
		67.7	32.3	12.3
		11.4	14.8	
		8.3	4.0	
both		73	41	114
		64.0	36.0	9.0
		7.9	12.1	
		5.8	3.3	
neither		63	19	82
		76.8	23.2	6.5
		6.8	5.6	
		5.0	1.5	
female both		158	50	208
		76.0	24.0	16.5
		17.1	14.8	
		12.5	4.0	
male both		1	1	2
		50.0	50.0	.2
		.1	.3	
		.1	.1	
other		26	10	36
		72.2	27.8	2.9
		2.8	3.0	
		2.1	.8	
	Column Total	923	338	1261
		73.2	26.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	10.08008	6	.12132

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with SEX dependent	.00165	.00126		.05224

APPENDIX D

GENDER gender of mtf
by LRSBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST feminists who are lesbian or non-lesbian

	LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST		
Count Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	lesbian feminist	non-les feminist	Row Total
GENDER			
woman	501 71.2 54.3 39.7	203 28.8 60.1 16.1	704 55.8
man	80 74.8 8.7 6.3	27 25.2 8.0 2.1	107 8.5
both	95 68.8 10.3 7.5	43 31.2 12.7 3.4	138 10.9
neither	67 80.7 7.3 5.3	16 19.3 4.7 1.3	83 6.6
woman both	142 80.2 15.4 11.3	35 19.8 10.4 2.8	177 14.0
man both	3 75.0 .3 .2	1 25.0 .3 .1	4 .3
other	35 72.9 3.8 2.8	13 27.1 3.8 1.0	48 3.8
Column Total	923 73.2	338 26.8	1261 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	9.81310	6	.13275

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with GENDER dependent	.00218	.00151		.01147

GENDER gender of mtf
by LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST feminists who are lesbian or non-lesbian

GENDER	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST: lesbian feminist	LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST: non-les feminist	Row Total
woman		501 71.2 54.3 39.7	203 28.8 60.1 16.1	704 55.8
man		80 74.8 8.7 6.3	27 25.2 8.0 2.1	107 8.5
both		95 68.8 10.3 7.5	43 31.2 12.7 3.4	138 10.9
neither		67 80.7 7.3 5.3	16 19.3 4.7 1.3	83 6.6
woman both		142 80.2 15.4 11.3	35 19.8 10.4 2.8	177 14.0
man both		3 75.0 .3 .2	1 25.0 .3 .1	4 .3
other		35 72.9 3.8 2.8	13 27.1 3.8 1.0	48 3.8
	Column Total	923 73.2	338 26.8	1261 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	9.81310	6	.13275

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with GENDER dependent	.00218	.00151		.01147

APPENDIX E

INCLUDE MTF include mtf in wom... by
LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST feminists who are lesbian or non-lesbian

LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST

INCLUDE MTF	lesbian feminist	non-les feminist	Row Total
yes	522	242	764
	68.3	31.7	60.6
	56.6	71.6	
	41.4	19.2	
no	190	43	233
	81.5	18.5	18.5
	20.6	12.7	
	15.1	3.4	
yes only if	83	17	100
	83.0	17.0	7.9
	9.0	5.0	
	6.6	1.3	
other only if	116	35	151
	76.8	23.2	12.0
	12.6	10.4	
	9.2	2.8	
5.00 not stated	12	1	13
	92.3	7.7	1.0
	1.3	.3	
	1.0	.1	
Column Total	923	338	1261
	73.2	26.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	25.84998	4	.00003

Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau :					
with INCLUDE MTF	dependent	.01051	.00407		.00000

INCLUDE MTF include mtf in women-only events by
LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST feminists who are lesbian or non-lesbian

LESBIAN/NON-LESBIAN FEMINIST

INCLUDE MTF	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	lesbian feminist	non-les feminist	Row Total
yes		522	242	764
		68.3	31.7	60.6
		56.6	71.6	
		41.4	19.2	
no		190	43	233
		81.5	18.5	18.5
		20.6	12.7	
		15.1	3.4	
yes only if		83	17	100
		83.0	17.0	7.9
		9.0	5.0	
		6.6	1.3	
other only if		116	35	151
		76.8	23.2	12.0
		12.6	10.4	
		9.2	2.8	
not stated	5.00	12	1	13
		92.3	7.7	1.0
		1.3	.3	
		1.0	.1	
	Column Total	923	338	1261
		73.2	26.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	25.84998	4	.00003

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with INCLUDE MTF dependent	.01051	.00407		.00000

APPENDIX F

SEX sex of mtf by AGE age of lesbian feminists

SEX	AGE: 1975 to 1965	1964 to 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
female	103	286	104	493
	20.9	58.0	21.1	54.1
	50.2	56.4	52.3	
	11.3	31.4	11.4	
male	21	54	29	104
	20.2	51.9	27.9	11.4
	10.2	10.7	14.6	
	2.3	5.9	3.2	
both	18	35	17	70
	25.7	50.0	24.3	7.7
	8.8	6.9	8.5	
	2.0	3.8	1.9	
neither	15	36	10	61
	24.6	59.0	16.4	6.7
	7.3	7.1	5.0	
	1.6	4.0	1.1	
female both	41	81	34	156
	26.3	51.9	21.8	17.1
	20.0	16.0	17.1	
	4.5	8.9	3.7	
male both	1			1
	100.0			.1
	.5			
	.1			
other	6	15	5	26
	23.1	57.7	19.2	2.9
	2.9	3.0	2.5	
	.7	1.6	.5	
Column Total	205	507	199	911
	22.5	55.7	21.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	10.34584	12	.58565

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with SEX dependent	.00216	.00195		.46400

SEX sex of mtf by AGE age categories of lesbian feminists

SEX	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	AGE 1975 to 1965	1964 to 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
female		103 20.9 50.2 11.3	286 58.0 56.4 31.4	104 21.1 52.3 11.4	493 54.1
male		21 20.2 10.2 2.3	54 51.9 10.7 5.9	29 27.9 14.6 3.2	104 11.4
both		18 25.7 8.8 2.0	35 50.0 6.9 3.8	17 24.3 8.5 1.9	70 7.7
neither		15 24.6 7.3 1.6	36 59.0 7.1 4.0	10 16.4 5.0 1.1	61 6.7
female both		41 26.3 20.0 4.5	81 51.9 16.0 8.9	34 21.8 17.1 3.7	156 17.1
male both		1 100.0 .5 .1			1 .1
other		6 23.1 2.9 .7	15 57.7 3.0 1.6	5 19.2 2.5 .5	26 2.9
	Column Total	205 22.5	507 55.7	199 21.8	911 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	10.34584	12	.58565

Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with SEX	dependent	.00216	.00195		.46400

SEX sex of mtf by AGE age categories of non-lesbian feminists

SEX	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	AGE 1975 to 1965	1964 to 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
female		81 49.7 53.3 24.4	57 35.0 50.0 17.2	25 15.3 37.9 7.5	163 49.1
male		20 40.8 13.2 6.0	12 24.5 10.5 3.6	17 34.7 25.8 5.1	49 14.8
both		19 46.3 12.5 5.7	13 31.7 11.4 3.9	9 22.0 13.6 2.7	41 12.3
neither		6 33.3 3.9 1.8	7 38.9 6.1 2.1	5 27.8 7.6 1.5	18 5.4
female both		22 44.0 14.5 6.6	20 40.0 17.5 6.0	8 16.0 12.1 2.4	50 15.1
male both			1 100.0 .9 .3		1 .3
other		4 40.0 2.6 1.2	4 40.0 3.5 1.2	2 20.0 3.0 .6	10 3.0
	Column Total	152 45.8	114 34.3	66 19.9	332 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	13.72794	12	.31842

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with SEX dependent	.01032	.00699		.05821

SEX sex of mtf by AGE age categories

SEX	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	AGE between 1975 & 1965	between 1964 & 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
female		184	343	129	656
		28.0	52.3	19.7	52.8
		51.5	55.2	48.7	
		14.8	27.6	10.4	
male		41	66	46	153
		26.8	43.1	30.1	12.3
		11.5	10.6	17.4	
		3.3	5.3	3.7	
both		37	48	26	111
		33.3	43.2	23.4	8.9
		10.4	7.7	9.8	
		3.0	3.9	2.1	
neither		21	43	15	79
		26.6	54.4	19.0	6.4
		5.9	6.9	5.7	
		1.7	3.5	1.2	
female both		63	101	42	206
		30.6	49.0	20.4	16.6
		17.6	16.3	15.8	
		5.1	8.1	3.4	
male both		1	1		2
		50.0	50.0		.2
		.3	.2		
		.1	.1		
other		10	19	7	36
		27.8	52.8	19.4	2.9
		2.8	3.1	2.6	
		.8	1.5	.6	
	Column Total	357	621	265	1243
		28.7	50.0	21.3	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	12.70454	12	.39088

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau :				
with SEX dependent	.00246	.00171		.10509

APPENDIX G

GENDER gender of mtf by AGE age categories of lesbian feminists

GENDER	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	AGE 1975 to 1965	1964 to 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
woman		116	272	107	495
		23.4	54.9	21.6	54.3
		56.6	53.6	53.8	
		12.7	29.9	11.7	
man		6	48	25	79
		7.6	60.8	31.6	8.7
		2.9	9.5	12.6	
		.7	5.3	2.7	
both		16	59	18	93
		17.2	63.4	19.4	10.2
		7.8	11.6	9.0	
		1.8	6.5	2.0	
neither		16	33	15	64
		25.0	51.6	23.4	7.0
		7.8	6.5	7.5	
		1.8	3.6	1.6	
woman both		42	72	26	142
		29.6	50.7	18.7	15.6
		20.5	14.2	14.1	
		4.6	7.9	3.1	
man both		1	1	1	3
		33.3	33.3	33.3	.3
		.5	.2	.5	
		.1	.1	.1	
other		8	22	5	35
		22.9	62.9	14.3	3.8
		3.9	4.3	2.5	
		.9	2.4	.5	
	Column Total	205 22.5	507 55.7	199 21.8	911 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	20.70216	12	.05492

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with GENDER dependent	.00353	.00148		.08224

GENDER gender of mtf by AGE age categories of lesbian feminists

GENDER	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	AGE 1975 to 1965	1964 to 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
woman		116 23.4 56.6 12.7	272 54.9 53.6 29.9	107 21.6 53.8 11.7	495 54.3
man		6 7.6 2.9 .7	48 60.8 9.5 5.3	25 31.6 12.6 2.7	79 8.7
both		16 17.2 7.8 1.8	59 63.4 11.6 6.5	18 19.4 9.0 2.0	93 10.2
neither		16 25.0 7.8 1.8	33 51.6 6.5 3.6	15 23.4 7.5 1.6	64 7.0
woman both		42 29.6 20.5 4.6	72 50.7 14.2 7.9	28 19.7 14.1 3.1	142 15.6
man both		1 33.3 .5 .1	1 33.3 .2 .1	1 33.3 .5 .1	3 .3
other		8 22.9 3.9 .9	22 62.9 4.3 2.4	5 14.3 2.5 .5	35 3.8
	Column Total	205 22.5	507 55.7	199 21.8	911 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	20.70216	12	.05492

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with GENDER dependent	.00353	.00148		.08224

GENDER gender of mtf by AGE age categories of non-lesbian feminists

GENDER	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	AGE 1975 to 1965	1964 to 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
woman		92	73	35	200
		46.0	36.5	17.5	60.2
		60.5	64.0	53.0	
		27.7	22.0	10.5	
man		14	5	8	27
		51.9	18.5	29.6	8.1
		9.2	4.4	12.1	
		4.2	1.5	2.4	
both		21	11	11	43
		48.8	25.6	25.6	13.0
		13.8	9.6	16.7	
		6.3	3.3	3.3	
neither		7	5	3	15
		46.7	33.3	20.0	4.5
		4.6	4.4	4.5	
		2.1	1.5	.9	
woman both		12	16	6	34
		35.3	47.1	17.6	10.2
		7.9	14.0	9.1	
		3.6	4.8	1.8	
man both		1			1
		100.0			.3
		.7			
		.3			
other		5	4	3	12
		41.7	33.3	25.0	3.6
		3.3	3.5	4.5	
		1.5	1.2	.9	
	Column Total	152	114	66	332
		45.8	34.3	19.9	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	9.97325	12	.61831

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with GENDER dependent	.00646	.00497		.38210

APPENDIX H

GENDER gender of mtf by AGE age categories

GENDER	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	AGE between 1975 & 1965	between 1964 & 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
woman		208 29.9 58.3 16.7	345 49.6 55.6 27.8	142 20.4 53.6 11.4	695 55.9
man		20 18.9 5.6 1.6	53 50.0 8.5 4.3	33 31.1 12.5 2.7	106 8.5
both		37 27.2 10.4 3.0	70 51.5 11.3 5.6	29 21.3 10.9 2.3	136 10.9
neither		23 29.1 6.4 1.9	38 48.1 6.1 3.1	18 22.8 6.8 1.4	79 6.4
woman both		54 30.7 15.1 4.3	88 50.0 14.2 7.1	34 19.3 12.8 2.7	176 14.2
man both		2 50.0 .6 .2	1 25.0 .2 .1	1 25.0 .4 .1	4 .3
other		13 27.7 3.6 1.0	26 55.3 4.2 2.1	8 17.0 3.0 .6	47 3.8
	Column Total	357 28.7	621 50.0	265 21.3	1243 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	11.72054	12	.46838

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with GENDER dependent	.00150	.00110		.51202

APPENDIX H

INCLUDE MTF include mtf in women-only events
by AGE age categories of lesbian feminists

INCLUDE MTF	AGE: 1973 to 1965	1964 to 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
yes	117	287	110	514
	22.8	55.8	21.4	56.4
	57.1	56.6	55.3	
	12.8	31.5	12.1	
no	24	111	51	186
	12.9	59.7	27.4	20.4
	11.7	21.9	25.6	
	2.6	12.2	5.6	
yes only if	24	46	13	83
	28.9	55.4	15.7	9.1
	11.7	9.1	6.5	
	2.6	5.0	1.4	
other only if	37	57	22	116
	31.9	49.1	19.0	12.7
	18.0	11.2	11.1	
	4.1	6.3	2.4	
not stated	3	6	3	12
	25.0	50.0	25.0	1.3
	1.5	1.2	1.5	
	.3	.7	.3	
Column Total	205	507	199	911
	22.5	55.7	21.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	19.86972	8	.01084

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau :				
with INCLUDE MTF dependent	.00582	.00251		.00666

INCLUDE MTF include mtf in women-only events
by AGE age categories of lesbian feminists

INCLUDE MTF	AGE: 1975 to 1965	1964 to 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
yes	117	287	110	514
	22.8	55.8	21.4	56.4
	57.1	56.6	55.3	
	12.8	31.5	12.1	
no	24	111	51	186
	12.9	59.7	27.4	20.4
	11.7	21.9	25.6	
	2.6	12.2	5.6	
yes only if	24	46	13	83
	28.9	55.4	15.7	9.1
	11.7	9.1	6.5	
	2.6	5.0	1.4	
other only if	37	57	22	116
	31.9	49.1	19.0	12.7
	18.0	11.2	11.1	
	4.1	6.3	2.4	
not stated	3	6	3	12
	25.0	50.0	25.0	1.3
	1.5	1.2	1.5	
	.3	.7	.3	
Column Total	205	507	199	911
	22.5	55.7	21.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	19.86972	8	.01084

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with INCLUDE MTF dependent	.00582	.00251		.00666

INCLUDE MTF include mtf in women-only events by AGE age categories of non-lesbian feminists

INCLUDE MTF	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	AGE 1975 to 1965	1964 to 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
yes		103 43.3 67.8 31.0	88 37.0 77.2 26.5	47 19.7 71.2 14.2	238 71.7
no		24 57.1 15.8 7.2	9 21.4 7.9 2.7	9 21.4 13.6 2.7	42 12.7
yes only if		9 52.9 5.9 2.7	5 29.4 4.4 1.5	3 17.6 4.5 .9	17 5.1
other only if		15 44.1 9.9 4.5	12 35.3 10.5 3.6	7 20.6 10.6 2.1	34 10.2
not stated		1 100.0 .7 .3			1 .3
	Column Total	152 45.8	114 34.3	66 19.9	332 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	5.65881	8	.68539

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with INCLude MTF dependent	.00673	.00630		.35017

INCLUDE MTF include mtf in women-only events by AGE age categories

INCLUDE MTF	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	AGE between 1975 & 1965	between 1964 & 1955	1954 and ealier	Row Total
yes		220 29.3 61.6 17.7	375 49.9 60.4 30.2	157 20.9 59.2 12.6	752 60.5
no		48 21.1 13.4 3.9	120 52.6 19.3 9.7	60 26.3 22.6 4.8	228 18.3
yes only if		33 33.0 9.2 2.7	51 51.0 8.2 4.1	16 16.0 6.0 1.3	100 8.0
other only if		52 34.7 14.6 4.2	69 46.0 11.1 5.6	29 19.3 10.9 2.3	150 12.1
not stated		4 30.8 1.1 .3	6 46.2 1.0 .5	3 23.1 1.1 .2	13 1.0
	Column Total	357 28.7	621 50.0	265 21.3	1243 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	12.46506	8	.13163

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with INCLUDE MTF dependent	.00273	.00160		.09357

APPENDIX I

SEX sex of mtf by KNOWN MTF lesbian feminists who know mtf TS

SEX	KNOWN MTF: don't know any	KNOWN MTF: know at least one	Row Total
female	303	194	497
	61.0	39.0	53.8
	58.0	48.4	
	32.8	21.0	
male	67	38	105
	63.8	36.2	11.4
	12.8	9.5	
	7.3	4.1	
both	41	32	73
	56.2	43.8	7.9
	7.9	8.0	
	4.4	3.5	
neither	33	30	63
	52.4	47.6	6.8
	6.3	7.5	
	3.6	3.3	
female both	67	91	158
	42.4	57.6	17.1
	13.8	22.7	
	7.3	9.9	
male both	1		1
	100.0		.1
	.2		
	.1		
other	10	16	26
	38.5	61.5	2.8
	1.9	4.0	
	1.1	1.7	
Column Total	522	401	923
	56.6	43.4	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	23.76323	6	.00056

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with SEX dependent	.00777	.00369		.00000

SEX sex of mtf by
KNOWN MTF lesbian feminists who do or don't know mtf TS

SEX	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	KNOWN MTF: don't know any	KNOWN MTF: know at least one	Row Total
female		303	194	497
		61.0	39.0	53.8
		58.0	48.4	
		32.8	21.0	
male		67	38	105
		63.8	36.2	11.4
		12.8	9.5	
		7.3	4.1	
both		41	32	73
		56.2	43.8	7.9
		7.9	8.0	
		4.4	3.5	
neither		33	30	63
		52.4	47.6	6.8
		6.3	7.5	
		3.6	3.3	
female both		67	91	158
		42.4	57.6	17.1
		12.8	22.7	
		7.3	9.9	
male both		1		1
		100.0		.1
		.2		
		.1		
other		10	16	26
		38.5	61.5	2.8
		1.9	4.0	
		1.1	1.7	
	Column Total	522	401	923
		56.6	43.4	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	23.74323	6	.00058

Statistic		Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with SEX	dependent	.00777	.00369		.00000

SEX sex of mtf by KNOWN MTF non-lesbian feminists who do or don't know mtf TS

SEX	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	KNOWN MTF: don't know any	KNOWN MTF: know at least one	Row Total
female		111	56	167
		66.5	33.5	49.4
		49.6	49.1	
		32.8	16.6	
male		37	13	50
		74.0	26.0	14.8
		16.5	11.4	
		10.9	3.8	
both		29	12	41
		70.7	29.3	12.1
		12.9	10.5	
		8.6	3.6	
neither		14	5	19
		73.7	26.3	5.6
		6.3	4.4	
		4.1	1.5	
female both		24	26	50
		48.0	52.0	14.8
		10.7	22.8	
		7.1	7.7	
male both		1		1
		100.0		.3
		.4		
		.3		
other		8	2	10
		80.0	20.0	3.0
		3.6	1.8	
		2.4	.6	
	Column Total	224	114	338
		66.3	33.7	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	10.99099	6	.08866

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with SEX dependent	.00598	.00405		.06008

SEX sex of mtf by
KNOWN MTF feminists who do or don't know mtf TS

	KNOWN MTF		
Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	don't know any	know at least one	Row Total
SEX			
female	414 62.3 55.5 32.8	250 37.7 48.5 19.8	664 52.7
male	104 67.1 13.9 8.2	51 32.9 9.9 4.0	155 12.3
both	70 61.4 9.4 5.6	44 38.6 8.5 3.5	114 9.0
neither	47 57.3 6.3 3.7	35 42.7 6.8 2.8	82 6.5
female both	91 43.8 12.2 7.2	117 56.3 22.7 9.3	208 16.5
male both	2 100.0 .3 .2		2 .2
other	18 50.0 2.4 1.4	18 50.0 3.5 1.4	36 2.9
Column Total	746 59.2	515 40.8	1261 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	30.26370	6	.00004

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with SEX dependent	.00643	.00268		.00000

APPENDIX J

GENDER gender of mtf by KNOWN MTF lesbian feminists who do or don't know mtf TS

GENDER	KNOWN MTF: don't know any	KNOWN MTF: know at least one	Row Total
woman	299 59.7 57.3 32.4	202 40.3 50.4 21.9	501 54.3
man	47 58.8 9.0 5.1	33 41.3 8.2 3.6	80 8.7
both	54 56.8 10.3 5.9	41 43.2 10.2 4.4	95 10.3
neither	31 46.3 5.9 3.4	36 53.7 9.0 3.9	67 7.3
woman both	72 50.7 13.8 7.8	70 49.3 17.5 7.6	142 15.4
man both	2 66.7 .4 .2	1 33.3 .2 .1	3 .3
other	17 48.6 3.3 1.8	18 51.4 4.5 2.0	35 3.8
Column Total	522 56.6	401 43.4	923 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	8.04851	6	.23457

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with GENDER dependent	.00271	.00221		.02026

GENDER gender of mtf by KNOWN MTF lesbian feminists who do or don't know mtf TS

GENDER	Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	KNOWN MTF: don't know any	KNOWN MTF: know at least one	Row Total
woman		299	202	501
		59.7	40.3	54.3
		57.3	50.4	
		32.4	21.9	
man		47	33	80
		58.8	41.3	8.7
		9.0	8.2	
		5.1	3.6	
both		54	41	95
		56.8	43.2	10.3
		10.3	10.2	
		5.9	4.4	
neither		31	36	67
		46.3	53.7	7.3
		5.9	9.0	
		3.4	3.9	
woman both		72	70	142
		50.7	49.3	15.4
		13.8	17.5	
		7.8	7.6	
man both		2	1	3
		66.7	33.3	.3
		.4	.2	
		.2	.1	
other		17	18	35
		48.6	51.4	3.8
		3.3	4.5	
		1.8	2.0	
Column Total		522	401	923
		56.6	43.4	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	8.04851	6	.23457

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with GENDER dependent	.00271	.00221		.02026

GENDER gender of mtf by
KNOWN MTF non-lesbian feminists who do or don't know mtf TS

	KNOWN MTF		
Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	don't know any	know at least one	Row Total
GENDER			
woman	133 65.5 59.4 39.3	70 34.5 61.4 20.7	203 60.1
man	21 77.8 9.4 6.2	6 22.2 5.3 1.8	27 8.0
both	39 90.7 17.4 11.5	4 9.3 3.5 1.2	43 12.7
neither	9 56.3 4.0 2.7	7 43.8 6.1 2.1	16 4.7
woman both	14 40.0 6.3 4.1	21 60.0 18.4 6.2	35 10.4
man both		1 100.0 .9 .3	1 .3
other	8 61.5 3.6 2.4	5 38.5 4.4 1.5	13 3.8
Column Total	224 66.3	114 33.7	338 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	26.75012	6	.00016

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with GENDER dependent	.01367	.00488		.00011

GENDER gender of mtf by
KNOWN MTF feminists who do or don't know mtf TS

	KNOWN MTF		
Count / Row Pct / Col Pct / Tot Pct	don't know any MTF	know at least one MTF	Row Total
GENDER			
woman	432 61.4 57.9 34.3	272 38.6 52.8 21.6	704 55.8
man	68 63.6 9.1 5.4	39 36.4 7.6 3.1	107 8.5
both	93 67.4 12.5 7.4	45 32.6 8.7 3.6	138 10.9
neither	40 48.2 5.4 3.2	43 51.8 8.3 3.4	83 6.6
woman both	86 48.6 11.5 6.8	91 51.4 17.7 7.2	177 14.0
man both	2 50.0 .3 .2	2 50.0 .4 .2	4 .3
other	25 52.1 3.4 2.0	23 47.9 4.5 1.8	48 3.8
Column Total	746 59.2	515 40.8	1261 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	19.59320	6	.00327

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with GENDER dependent	.00338	.00180		.00027

APPENDIX K

INCLUDE MTF include mtf in women-only events
by KNOWN MTF lesbian feminists who do or don't know mtf TS

INCLUDE MTF	KNOWN MTF: don't know any mtf	KNOWN MTF: know at least one mtf	Row Total
yes	293	229	522
	56.1	43.9	56.6
	56.1	57.1	
	31.7	24.8	
no	113	77	190
	59.5	40.5	20.6
	21.6	19.2	
	12.2	8.3	
yes only if	43	40	83
	51.8	48.2	9.0
	8.2	10.0	
	4.7	4.3	
other only if	66	50	116
	56.9	43.1	12.6
	12.6	12.5	
	7.2	5.4	
not stated	7	5	12
	58.3	41.7	1.3
	1.3	1.2	
	.8	.5	
Column Total	522	401	923
	56.6	43.4	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.47948	4	.83027

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with INCLUDE MTF dependent	.00040	.00075		.5309

INCLUDE MTF include mtf in women-only events
by KNOWN MTF lesbian feminists who do or don't know mtf TS

		KNOWN MTF	
	Count Row Pct Col Pct Tot Pct	don't know any mtf	know at least one mtf	Row Total
INCLUDE MTF				
yes		293 56.1 56.1 31.7	229 43.9 57.1 24.8	522 56.6
no		113 59.5 21.6 12.2	77 40.5 19.2 8.3	190 20.6
yes only if		43 51.8 8.2 4.7	40 48.2 10.0 4.3	83 9.0
other only if		66 56.9 12.6 7.2	50 43.1 12.5 5.4	116 12.6
not stated		7 58.3 1.3 .8	5 41.7 1.2 .5	12 1.3
	Column Total	522 56.6	401 43.4	923 100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	1.47948	4	.83027

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau :				
with INCLUDE MTF dependent	.00040	.00075		.8309

INCLMTF include mtf in women-only events
by KNOWN MTF non-lesbian feminists who do or don't know mtf TS

INCLUDE MTF	KNOWN MTF: don't know any	KNOWN MTF: know at least one	Row Total
yes	157	85	242
	64.9	35.1	71.6
	70.1	74.6	
	46.4	25.1	
no	38	5	43
	88.4	11.6	12.7
	17.0	4.4	
	11.2	1.5	
yes only if	9	8	17
	52.9	47.1	5.0
	4.0	7.0	
	2.7	2.4	
other only if	19	16	35
	54.3	45.7	10.4
	8.5	14.0	
	5.6	4.7	
not stated	1		1
	100.0		.3
	.4		
	.3		
Column Total	224	114	338
	66.3	33.7	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	13.71704	4	.00826

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with INCLUDE MTF dependent	.01065	.00512		.00623

APPENDIX L

INCLUDE MTF include mtf in women-only events by
KNOWN MTF feminists who do or don't know mtf

INCLUDE MTF	KNOWN MTF: don't know any mtf	KNOWN MTF: know at least one mtf	Row Total
yes	450	314	764
	58.9	41.1	60.6
	60.3	61.0	
	35.7	24.9	
no	151	82	233
	64.8	35.2	18.5
	20.2	15.9	
	12.0	6.5	
yes only if	52	48	100
	52.0	48.0	7.9
	7.0	9.3	
	4.1	3.8	
other only if	85	66	151
	56.3	43.7	12.0
	11.4	12.8	
	6.7	5.2	
not stated	8	5	13
	61.5	38.5	1.0
	1.1	1.0	
	.6	.4	
Column Total	746	515	1261
	59.2	40.8	100.0

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	5.76291	4	.21757

Statistic	Value	ASE1	Val/ASE0	Approximate Significance
Goodman & Kruskal Tau : with INCLUDE MTF dependent	.00111	.00099		.23028

APPENDIX L

20 Aug 1994

The Goddess Recycles!

Of course I support anything that will end discrimination and oppression of transgendered people -- am one of those who make sure those words get onto documents along with the usual Lesbian Gay and Bisexual. The place where I get absolutely confused is at Women Only events, more specifically any that include freedom from clothes, most specifically Michigan. Women Only space is so incredibly precious and rare. I do recognise that safe space for transexuals is even rarer. I'm also aware of a trend among young alternative males to "wish they were lesbians" The step from that to SAYING "I'm a transexual lesbian " so you can get into e.g Michigan seems too easy. One solution would be a post-op m to f transsexuals only policy, panty checks and all. What a HORROR panty checks would be. And yet the certainty that everyone at Michigan grew up as woman feels so crucial to the enormous freedom that I experience there.

Interestingly, prior to the march in support of transsexuals at this years Michigan, I was feeling quite strongly supportive of allowing m to f transsexuals in. There was one person on the demo who felt unmistakably male -- not butch, in fact not at all butch, but male. And I was quite taken aback by the intensity of my reaction -- I just hated it, felt invaded by his gaze -- though all he looked was scared, poor person. I don't know how we do this. Hate also the thought that if we do allow them in, my delight in the glorious butches there will be much diluted by not being sure that's who they are. And how will it affect their comfort and sense of safety?? Goddess knows there are few enough places a really butchy dyke can feel truly welcome. If we are no longer sure that they aren't m to f transsexuals how is that going to affect our precious butches?? F to m transexuals, because they were socialised as women feel absolutely different and entirely welcome.

I continue to struggle with this important and difficult issue. In the meantime I am so entirely thrilled by the way the increased visibility of transgendered people makes us all examine our ridiculously rigid rules about what gender really is.

Vive genderfuck!

VITA

Surname: Kendel Given Names: Monica Phillippina Rose Marie

Place of Birth: Sudbury, Ontario, Canada

Educational Institutions Attended:

University of Victoria 1989 to 1998

Degrees Awarded:

B.A. (Honours) University of Victoria 1993

Awards:

Government of the Northwest Territories' Undergraduate Student Award 1993

University of Victoria Fellowship 1993 to 1995

Publications:

Kendel, Monica, Devor, Holly, Strapko, Nancy. "Feminist and Lesbian Opinions About Transsexuals." *Gender Blending,* Edited by Bonnie Bullough, Vern Bullough and James Elias. Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1997, pp. 146-157.

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis: The Boundaries of Womanhood: Lesbian and Non-lesbian Feminist Opinions About Transsexuals

Author:

Monica Kendel
December 9, 1998