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Have yourself replaced as soon as possible and come back here, after which we shall think about the way to make a new place for you in society.
— Monsignor’s advice to Herculine Barbin

In 1966, Gene Compton’s eatery in San Francisco’s Tenderloin district was the site of the first recorded incident of transgender resistance to police harassment.1 The Compton Cafeteria riot broke out after police assaulted a drag queen inside the establishment; she responded by throwing coffee at them. This incident sparked an immediate reaction from other gender-variant, gay and lesbian people who frequented the restaurant. Rioters smashed windows, destroyed furniture, and set fire to a car.2 This act of resistance to the state regulation of lived expressions of sex/gender identity lasted for the entire day, and picketing followed for another week. Those subjugated by norms regulating their sex, gender, sexuality, and occupation (many were sex workers) fought back against the disciplining of their lives. The well-known Stonewall Riots in New York three years later were also led by trans people, as well as by butch lesbians and drag queens, fighting diligently against the police for the right to transgress sex/gender binaries in public spaces free from discrimination and violence.
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Who were these trans activists? Their collective militancy in the face of police brutality seems a distant memory when compared to much contemporary trans theorizing and politics. Why have we not inherited this legacy? What barriers to radical theorizations of gender variance and politics must be stormed to open emancipatory queer futures for trans people? How have possibilities for debate concerning these futures and strategies to shape them been foreclosed by efforts to construct *proper trans social subjects* that can integrate successfully into mainstream North American society? This essay addresses these questions by discussing the integral links between regimes of sex/gender and exploitative economic relations of production as mutually constitutive systems of domination. While various strands of feminist commentary, along with scholarship from within critical sexuality studies, have demonstrated the intersectional relations of power among heteronormative gender roles, sexuality, and the demands of capitalist (re)productive regimes of accumulation, these vital correlations have not been made explicit by most trans researchers and activists.

Scholars within trans studies rarely contextualize trans identities, subjectivities, and activism within historical and contemporary capitalist relations. Much scholarship seeks to save trans identities from invisibility, as well as to counter the ongoing reproduction of the heteronormative binary of sex/gender through detailed analyses of the vast array of existing trans identities. There is a tendency within this commentary to reify trans identities as solely matters of sex/gender and to challenge state and institutional dominance over trans people by emphasizing the necessity of self-determination of sex/gender. Such advocacy of self-determination is often coupled with arguments for human rights protections. Progressive scholars must question the theoretical and political implications of putting forward individualistic strategies of sex/gender self-determination, especially within the contemporary neoliberal context, where the minimalist state and a free-market economy demand individual self-sufficiency.

While some texts address the impacts of capitalist socioeconomic relations on trans people’s lives, a critical analysis of the exploitative labor relations that comprise the logic of capital remains lacking. Although poverty, which often results from the marginalization of many trans people from the legal labor force, is a major theme, impoverishment is most often comprehended as a barrier to the full realization of sex/gender identities and their embodied expressions. When employment within the legal wage labor economy is addressed, the tenor of discussion is often assimilatory. The necessity of integrating some trans people into the labor force, and of protecting the employment status of others, appear to foreclose critiques of capitalist productive relations and of the embeddedness of trans subjectivities within capitalist systems of power. Likewise, critical analyses of the impact of capitalist productive relations on trans subjectivities are rarely offered. Also underexamined are the ways in which hegemonic capitalism’s socioeconomic and political relations are reproduced vis-à-vis the transsexual body.
This essay addresses these lacunae in trans studies literature by specifically addressing the ways in which medical experts, transsexual individuals, and contemporary trans researchers, activists, and allies seeking justice for gender variant people contribute to the construction of transsexual subjectivities in ways that reinforce dominant exploitative class relations. The mediation of transsexuality through capitalist productive relations carries implications extending beyond trans individuals ourselves. I argue that an emphasis on the transsexual as an economically productive body has important effects on the shaping of transsexual subjectivities and of political strategizing for emancipatory futures. Constructions of transsexuals as viable social subjects by medical experts, transsexual individuals, researchers, and allies were, and continue to be, shaped significantly by discourses of productivity emerging from and reinforcing regimes of capitalist accumulation. To move toward achieving social recognition, the transsexual body must constitute a productive working body, that is, it must be capable of participating in capitalist production processes. This legacy impacts the trajectories of political organizing to achieve social justice for trans communities.

To make this argument, this essay is divided into three sections. The first analyzes early medical approaches to the treatment of transsexuals including those made by influential doctors hostile to transsexuality (e.g., David O. Cauldwell), as well as by those considered compassionate (e.g., Harry Benjamin). Close attention is paid to the ways in which transsexuals are characterized in terms of their class, social status, and creative and employment potential. The second section highlights early trans theorization and activism spearheaded by trans people and their allies. I assert that these efforts were primarily directed at engaging with medical experts to depathologize transsexuality. This approach emphasized respect for transsexuals in order to enable increased access to state-based social services, human rights protections, and public spaces. An underlying goal of these initiatives to achieve sociopolitical, legal, and economic validation for transsexuals was to establish their worth as citizens. Appeals to mainstream society to accept transsexuals as legitimate subjects often emphasized their valuable contributions to society through their labor. The third section focuses on contemporary theorizations of transsexual identities and politics within a neoliberal context. I pay particular attention to subtexts emphasizing worthiness, value, and productivity in order to demonstrate the complicity of trans theorists and activists in naturalizing the exacerbated gendered labor relations characteristic of the neoliberal order that seeks to increase profits through decreasing wages.

The analysis offered in this essay is anchored in critical political economy. As defined by Gary Browning and Andrew Kilmister, this approach “rests on two main pillars; the drawing of links between the economic and other areas of social life and the recognition of the economic when these links are drawn.” Critical political economy centers on the productive sphere of capitalism while simultane-
ously working to cultivate a wider understanding of productive relations. This is achieved through analyzing the numerous components that comprise the sphere of the productive including the home, public space, and communities, as well as other vectors of power such as sex and gender. In addition, power operates discursively as meaning is created and circulated throughout society. For example, discourses of productivity naturalize the exploitative labor relations characteristic of capitalism; despite this naturalization, these discourses influence the treatment and conceptualizations of the transsexual body.

Clearly, sites of commodity production do not produce all meaning. Nor can we claim that all facets of life are determined by exploitative class relations, which maximize profit through the extraction of increasing amounts of surplus value. Social meanings are not created through direct and one-dimensional transference from the workplace to the bodies and consciousness of members of society. Embodied identities, such as transsexuality, are the result of complex amalgamating relations of domination, exploitation, and agency. Defining critical political economy as such begs the question: Why write an essay directing attention toward subtexts of value, worth, and citizenship within medical texts, transsexual narratives, and political agendas that correlate directly with participation in the legally paid labor economy? To be sure, regimes of accumulation—such as Fordism or late capitalism—do not, on their own, shape transsexual existences. That the organization of (re)production wields a significant influence on the social construction of sex and gender is a rudimentary point of feminist political economy. The construction of transsexual identities vis-à-vis capitalist productive relations serves to enrich our understanding of the ways that sex/gender are constructed as regulatory regimes. In addition, considering transsexual subjectivities in light of past and contemporary regimes of accumulation opens new opportunities for theorizing trans identities and for strategizing an emancipatory politics that resists systemic oppression and enriches the lives of trans people.

**Medically Constructing Transsexual Bodies That Work**

Early discursive and physiological constructions of transsexual bodies by medical experts and their patients exemplify the reciprocal relationship between economic regimes of accumulation and sex/gender categories. Trans researchers, notably Sandy Stone and Jay Prosser, have established that medical professionals wielded enormous power over the range of possible ways that gender-variant individuals could express gendered identities. This was particularly the case in North American locations, such as the Canadian province of Ontario, where the state funded hormone therapy and sex reassignment surgeries (SRS). Gender Identity Clinics (GICs) required that gender-variant individuals seeking medical transition submit to numerous physical and psychological evaluations to qualify for state-funded SRS. Thus qualification for paid SRS depended on a process that pathologized transsexual people as suf-
ferring from a set of mental maladies known first as “gender dysphoria” and later as “gender identity disorder.”

Because they served as conduits between transsexuals and the physical expression of their sex/gender identities, doctors and psychological professionals exerted considerable authority over their patients. The reinforcement of heteronormative categories of sex, gender, and sexuality through these engagements has been well documented; however, the economic facets of these diagnoses and recommendations for treatment are less well analyzed. By assessing their transsexual patients in terms of their aptitudes, earning potentials, education, and class backgrounds, medical professionals also strengthened hegemonic discourses of citizenship and productivity that buttressed the economy.

Four economic themes appear as subtexts in medical discourse on the treatment of transsexuality. The first concerns the class backgrounds of transsexual patients. Medical experts required detailed information from individuals or their families regarding their class as defined by occupation and social status. This information often appears in the writings of medical doctors as they grapple with the meaning of gender variance. For example, in documenting “Case 131” concerning Count Sandor, a female-bodied person living as male, Richard von Krafft-Ebing noted that Sandor hailed from an “ancient, noble and highly respected family of Hungary.”

The writings of the prolific American sexologist David O. Cauldwell (1897–1959) offer an additional example of the way class background factored into physicians’ comprehension of transsexuality. Cauldwell characterized “psychopathic transsexuality” in terms of delayed development, sexual immaturity, and frivolity. For him, one’s class location played a clear role in fostering this disorder; asserting a higher prevalence of transsexualism among “well to do families,” he explained that impoverished people, consumed by the obligations of providing bare necessities for themselves and their families, did not have the means or time for such “deviant” pursuits. For Cauldwell, then, poverty served as a deterrent to transsexualism. The link between one’s propensity toward expressing gender variance and class location is demonstrated further in his account of “Earl,” a female-to-male (FTM) transsexual patient, whom he identified as having been born a “normal female” into a prominent and wealthy family. Noting that one of Earl’s maternal relatives was a doctor whose son became a lawyer and that his paternal grandfather was involved in politics and civic affairs, Cauldwell interpreted Earl as one who squandered his life; in other words, he understood Earl’s potential to cultivate his talents and contribute to society as thwarted due to his fixation on expressing his masculine identity. Indeed, Cauldwell asserted that such fixations would most likely result in Earl engaging in criminal activity.

Class discipline also received emphasis within medical literature. The majority of gender-variant individuals who enlisted medical experts for substantive assistance were white, middle-class, able-bodied male-to-female trans people more likely
to be able to finance medical transition. This class location emerged as a prominent component of the pathologization of transsexual identities. It is here that the productive body intersects with the creation of pathology as a disciplinary technique. Doctors who opposed any medical intervention enabling one to change sex did so in part because they believed that this transition would thwart the industrious potential of the middle-class, able-bodied (presumed) male and (re)productive potential of the (presumed) female. Because they understood the economic value created by individuals through their labor as a social concern, some medical professionals refused to support deliberate medical interventions that would compromise capable bodies.

Transsexuals were disciplined partially because their sex/gender variance violated social codes that contributed to the growth, development, and global expansion of the domestic economy. Like other citizens, doctors often internalized the social expectations of the upper and middle classes that undergirded hegemonic discourses of productivity. The Hippocratic oath extended beyond their professional obligation to heal individual patients to encompass a broader sense of civic duty. In other words, doctors understood their professional obligation to restore health to individuals as part of a broader imperative to act as moral, upstanding citizens. As physicians, their value lay in contributing to the vitality of the nation. In the case of physicians who adamantly refused to engage in medical transition processes, this contribution was realized through re legitimizing the normatively sexed and gendered body (i.e., one biologically genetically determined) as “the” productive body.

These sex/gendered dimensions of class discipline were clearly elucidated by Cauldwell, who highlighted the civic duty of doctors to ensure the wealth of the nation through the provision of healthy (re)productive bodies. For Cauldwell, this social responsibility trumped all other considerations, including the self-identity of transsexual patients whose understandings of sex/gender he interpreted as destructive to society. He positioned the transsexual individual who requested or demanded medical help as an adversary to the ethical, law-abiding citizen; writing in 1949, he asserted that “the psyche is already ill and sanity is seriously involved when an individual develops a compulsion to be rid of his natural organs and places his insane desires ahead of the rights of others.” Cauldwell proved so adamant in his understanding of sex reassignment surgery as mutilation that he claimed that “it would be criminal of a doctor to remove healthy organs.” The criminal nature of the surgical act is rooted in Cauldwell’s belief that to operate on the transsexual body is to destroy its capacity for a (hetero)sexual life by thwarting the individual’s reproductive potential.

It is important to note that even experts who supported medical intervention as a treatment for transsexuality sounded the theme of class discipline. Unlike their peers who reinforced hegemonic sexed/gendered bodies as productive subjects through their refusal to assist in transition procedures, doctors who advocated for “sexual reassignment” through hormonal therapy and surgeries contributed to the
economic vitality of the nation through the construction of a working body. Based on their understanding of the so-called dysphoric condition as largely unresponsive to psychotherapy, medical experts asserted the necessity of physiological interventions to construct a sexed body that reflected the self-image held by transsexuals. They grounded this hormonally and surgically assisted transformation in a social context framed in part by conceptualizing the national value ascribed to individuals in terms of their productive capacity.

While critiques by trans scholars of the gatekeeping function of medical professionals have offered compelling analyses of the investment of medical experts in heteronormative sex/gender categories, they have paid scant attention to the ways in which professionals understood these categories in relation to economic production. Prosser, for example, has directed attention to the construction of hegemonic sex/gender categories through diagnostic criteria and requirements of transsexual patients prior to their receiving hormone therapy and SRS. He explains that “narrativization as a transsexual necessarily precedes one’s diagnosis as a transsexual; autobiography is transsexuality’s proffered symptom.”

Prosser explains that medical experts have analyzed such narratives to ensure that supposedly proper gender norms of behavior were understood. Other scholars raise concerns regarding the reinforcement of heterosexuality by GICs: while transsexuals were required to divulge explicit details of their heterosexual fantasies, they were prohibited from acting on these fantasies prior to sex reassignment. As Jason Cromwell explains, doctors governed the production of heterosexual subjects by refusing to approve surgery for transsexuals who were gay, bisexual, or lesbian.

Yet the valorization of the maleness or femaleness of post-transition transsexuals hinged in part on understandings of their productive capacity. Value was ascribed to the actual contribution of one’s labor power to the economy. The economic element of the “real-life test” illustrates this point. As an integral component of the Benjamin Standards of Care developed to anticipate the kinds of psychic and social challenges that the transsexual patient might encounter, the real-life test was administered by GICs to monitor the ability of the transsexual patient to live entirely as a demonstrable member of the opposite sex. If deemed successful in this endeavor by the team of doctors and psychologists managing the case, the individual was approved for hormone therapy and SRS. The real-life test functioned as an oppressive appraisal of endurance that disciplined transsexuals through the reiteration of their sex/gender variance as problematic and abnormal. Transsexuals were forced to undergo the real-life test before hormone therapy modified their appearance and thereby made it easier to pass as a man or woman. Medical experts believed that the individual who succeeded in withstanding the daily harassment and discrimination that accompanied the real-life test demonstrated a genuine dedication to pursuing transition and therefore deserved to be diagnosed as transsexual.

It is important to understand that the real-life test had an economic com-
ponent that cannot be conceptualized entirely as an exercise in sex/gender endurance; the test also monitored the future occupational capacities for the postoperative subject. The real-life test contained a facet of economic rehabilitation that required transsexual patients to obtain employment while living full time in their self-identified sex/gender. Regardless of the personal intentions of medical experts, the employment requirements of the real-life test worked to legitimize sex/gender divisions of labor that buttressed the use of gender to maximize profits.

Within the context of heteronormativity during the post–World War II era, the ability of the male body to be economically industrious signified “authentic” manhood. Some clinical understandings of FTM transsexuals made increasingly apparent the connection between supposedly genuine maleness and productive capacity. The willingness of many FTM transsexuals to demonstrate their masculinity through an avid participation in the labor market trumped their nonnormative, nonreproductive embodiment of masculinity. According to the prominent sexologist John Money,

There is a general consensus among professionals in transexualism that female-to-male transexualism is not an exact homologue of male-to-female transexualism. Whereas the gender coding of the male-to-female transsexual is prevalently that of the attention-attracting vamp, not the devoted Madonna, the masculine gender coding of the female-to-male transsexual is prevalently that of the reliable provider, not the profligate playboy. Throughout Europe, America and the English speaking world, clinicians of transexualism agree that a successfully unobtrusive sex-reassigned life is more prevalent in female-to-male reassignment than male to female reassignment even though the success of the female-to-male sex-reassignment surgery leaves something to be desired, namely an erectile penis.

For Money and other medical professionals, the binary system of sex/gender naturalized the devaluation of women, as well as of nonnormative masculinities (i.e., effeminate gay men or FTM transsexuals who do not pass as men). This sex/gender–based degradation, which resulted in systemic oppression, was not practiced only by governmental and institutional bureaucracies. It was also appropriated within spheres of capitalist production, and it is within sites of commodity production where we can witness the amalgamation of exploitation with relations of domination. Oppressed sex/gender and sexual minorities such as women, trans people, gays, and lesbians have always been overrepresented within low-wage, part-time, nonunionized, and precarious sectors of the labor market.

The naturalization of these gender relations is reflected in the writings of doctors who discuss how they judged the “authenticity” of their patients’ claims to sex/gender identities. For instance, the influential sexologist Harry Benjamin questioned whether male-to-female patients realized fully that they would likely be
unable to maintain their vocation and would experience lower job status and lower wages as women. The success of their sexual reassignment was measured partly through their complacency (an ideal mark of femininity) and their willingness to assimilate into these gendered and exploitative relations.

Social parasitism represents another theme in the medical literature that demonstrates the link between processes of wealth accumulation and the construction of productive bodies. This theme, too, reveals the linkages among transsexualism as pathology, discourses of citizenship, and the economic welfare of the nation. Often medical professionals identified transsexualism as a mental disability—a preoccupation with sex/gender identities and expressions that impeded the ability of transsexuals to contribute to society. As such, they configured the transsexual as threatening and dangerous. The writings of Cauldwell exemplify this pejorative conceptualization of transsexuality. He included “parasitism” as one of the characteristics of psychopathology and marked this quality as abhorrent in his discussion of “psychopathia transsexualis.”

Cauldwell characterized transsexuals as “sex destructionists” and characterized such destruction as a social act. Those suffering from this “self-hating psychosis . . . turn destruction on themselves [and] impose on society by becoming burdens to it.” Cauldwell understood transsexuals as socially burdensome in part because he claimed that they refused to participate in the labor economy. In relation to the case of Earl discussed above, Cauldwell wrote: “By now we were beginning to learn something of the real Earl. We knew that her [sic] ambitions were to live parasitically. She [sic] would not work.”

Medical professionals’ concern with social parasitism extended beyond employment; many believed that the propensity of gender-variant individuals toward social dependence also manifested in the leeching of public resources, especially those provided by state-funded institutions such as prisons and mental hospitals. Cauldwell advised one gender-variant individual who self-identified as a closeted homosexual and a transvestite to continue to live contrary to his identity for society’s sake. Cauldwell explained that “if he continues to live his life in such a way as not to openly offend society he is a far more valuable citizen than hundreds (or thousands) of others who, because they are incapable of psychologically adjusting themselves, eventually land in public institutions.”

Doctors who reinforced the supposed knowledge that sex is immutable advocated punitive actions when transsexuals proved adamant about expressing freely their chosen sex/gender. They believed not only that disciplinary measures would promote emotional stability for gender variant individuals, but also that these measures would have a restorative effect on society. In response to a family requesting advice on dealing with a FTM transsexual relative, Cauldwell positioned gender variance as pathological with probable negative social implications. He proposed cutting this youth off from material resources as punishment.
Cauldwell argued that increasing the vulnerability of transsexuals would eventually construct a productive body:

Should the young women [sic] here involved be put fully on her own and refused financial assistance the results . . . although unpleasant for a number of people, might be the best in the long run for all concerned and this may be considered to include society as a whole. Just as it is said of people who are regarded as wayward, there always is a possibility that these individuals will in time settle down and become significantly well adjusted to avoid causing serious social concern.34

Analyzing critically the ways in which transsexualism as a category of sex/gender variance was isolated from other nonnormative gender identities such as transvestism (presently labeled “cross-dressing”) reveals the concrete presence of such productive logics and the significant role they played in medical approaches to the treatment of transsexuality. For doctors like Cauldwell and Benjamin, cross-dressing was not as threatening because it was understood as an erotic fetish. Medical experts asserted that many cross-dressers were heterosexuals and professionals and often were happily married men with families and stable employment. Their desire to derive pleasure from dressing in feminine attire was interpreted as an activity that could be contained easily within private spaces (i.e., their own homes or at gatherings with other cross-dressers). Benjamin explains that “the typical or true transvestite is a completely harmless member of society. He derives his sexual pleasure and emotional satisfaction in a strictly solitary fashion.”35 For Benjamin and other sexologists, cross-dressing represented a nonnormatively gendered practice that contributed only to a facet of one’s identity, rather than an all-encompassing compulsion that impinged on one’s ability to perform the roles of husband, father, and/or worker.

Such was not the case with transsexuality. Doctors described transsexual individuals as consumed by the need to align their bodily sex and gender identity. Therefore, a hierarchy of gender-variant identities existed among medical experts, with transsexuals occupying the bottom echelons of this taxonomy. Regardless of their views concerning the mutability of sex and the scientific facilitation of transitioning, the majority of medical professionals classified transsexuals as the most damaged — and damaging — among nonnormatively gendered individuals. Frequently borrowing terminology from psychological professionals, doctors degraded transsexuals as narcissistic, destructive, and self-loathing.36 This characterization extended beyond the frame of individual abnormality to encompass socially corrosive forms of deviance.

A reading of the medical literature reveals a dominant belief that transsexuality, framed as a mental disorder, renders the body unproductive. According to this
literature, the sex/gender “preoccupations” of transsexual individuals undermined their productivity and created states of dependency. The transsexual burdened society rather than contributing to it. Thus, given their broad social commitment to healing, most doctors would not condone a decision to live as a transsexual. They maintained that if untreated, this disorder would likely have a devastating impact on the transsexual individual. Medical commentaries, including those of Cauldwell and Benjamin, interpreted problems faced by gender-variant individuals—including depression, substance abuse, and self-mutilation—not as evidence of the personal implications of unrealized desires to embody one’s sex/gender identity but, rather, as evidence of the social and economic threats that such individuals posed to a broader public. Discourses of economic productivity contributed to the degradation of transsexuality and the systemic erasure of transsexual individuals. Within a heteronormative capitalist society organized around binary sex/gender and exploitative labor relations, transsexuality did not work.

Initiating Trans Resistance: Transsexuality Can Work!
The creation of transsexual subjectivities is a multidimensional process arising through an engagement with dominant societal institutions. In this way, transsexuals are not entirely victims of external authority. They internalize power and participate actively in disciplinary techniques that lend meaning to the transsexual body as productive. The efforts through which transsexual people seek validation for their sex/gender identities and embodied expressions have economic components. The emergence of transsexual voices in and beyond academe echo hegemonic socioeconomic and political discourses grounded in conceptualizations of citizenship defined through laboring bodies. In a manner that resonates with medical practitioners’ concerns regarding the practical capacity of transsexual bodies that impacts their ability to exist as responsible citizens, transsexuals also articulate understandings of their sex/gender identity grounded in the logic that buttresses wealth accumulation. Regarding (trans) citizenship, the scholar Aren Aizura asserts that “citizenship here means fading into the population . . . but also the imperative to be ‘proper’ in the eyes of the state: to reproduce, to find proper employment; to reorient one’s ‘different’ body into the flow of the nationalized aspiration for possessions, property, [and] wealth.”

Aizura’s claims are demonstrated in transsexual autobiographies, for example, which reveal a tacit commitment to a gendered logic of capitalist production. These autobiographies are often written by transsexual participants in gender-identity programs to gain a “favorable” diagnosis necessary to undergo transition. The underlying logic of economic productivity presented in these autobiographies makes Gramscian “common sense” to both expert and patient. Whether transsexuals individually subscribe to this particular notion of productive citizenship is not at issue here. It was common knowledge among patients at GICs that only a particular transsexual narrative—one that subscribes to hegemonic and heteronormative cat-
egories of sex/gender — will be accepted as a reflection of genuine transsexualism.\textsuperscript{38} Yet even if some individuals produce these rigid narratives only for functional purposes, the rearticulation and circulation of these narratives serves to embed transsexuality within a discourse of productive citizenship.

It is important to read these early autobiographies with an eye toward connections drawn between the reinforcement of supposedly proper gender roles and the structures of the wage labor economy. Such connections are frequently obscured given that transsexual clients of GICs did not address employment directly.\textsuperscript{39} Nevertheless, the understood need to make social contributions is reflected in the tenor of transsexual autobiographers’ expressions of their future aspirations. The prospects of life after medicalized transition are often expressed in assimilatory terms. These writings reinforce the understanding that genuine transsexuals are those who seek integration into mainstream society as “normal” — and productive — men or women. In his book entitled \textit{The Transsexual Phenomenon} (1966), Harry Benjamin quotes from the autobiography of a transsexual woman who explained that “we prefer the normalcy’s [sic] of life and want to be accepted in circles of normal society, enjoying the same pursuits and pleasures without calling attention to the fact that we are ‘queers’ trying to invade the world of normal people.”\textsuperscript{40}

While it could be suggested that the above quote privileges heterosexuality, other transsexual authors expose more clearly the economic elements of normality. Early transsexual biographies frequently narrated a trajectory of economic difficulty (and, in some cases, failure) prior to transition, followed by integration into society post-transition.\textsuperscript{41} For example, Christine Jorgensen, perhaps the most well-known transsexual during the 1950s, wrote of her frustration living as a shy, underweight man “who was unable to find a place in society where he could earn a living and move up in the world.”\textsuperscript{32} On returning to the United States post-transition, Jorgensen enjoyed a successful career as a public transsexual. Her self-image was embedded in an understanding of the productive potential of her transsexuality. For example, she described her invited addresses at charity events (i.e., voluntary labor) in terms of supporting her community: “It seemed to me an opportunity to prove myself a useful member of the community . . . [to make] some sort of contribution.”\textsuperscript{43} Of an appearance at Madison Square Garden, Jorgensen remembered that “the brief speech I addressed to the audience was a simple expression of the honor accorded me . . . and the opportunity to be a useful citizen of New York City.”\textsuperscript{44} Unlike the shy underweight man who could not secure an upwardly mobile position and career, Jorgensen became a financially independent and cosmopolitan woman who worked as a nightclub entertainer.\textsuperscript{45}

In addition to transsexual autobiography, research on transsexual lives reinforces the link between gendered dimensions of power and exploitative economic relations. When analyzed through the lens of critical political economy, efforts made by academic commentators to combat characterizations of transsexuals as deviant,
abnormal, criminal, and socially destructive do not achieve significant distance from the experts who articulate these characterizations. The urgency to gain social legitimacy for transsexuality often forecloses possibilities for critically theorizing the formation of transsexual subjectivities within a socioeconomic and political context. For example, prominent trans scholars and activists who have made historical arguments advocating the tolerance and social integration of transsexual people have often embedded these arguments within a socioeconomic framework that invokes a model productive citizen. Such literature seeks to challenge efforts of medical professionals to make transsexuality disappear, but it does so through the construction of productive bodies. Likewise, this literature attempts to validate transsexuality as a legitimate sex/gender identity by demonstrating the productive capacity of this identity. In the influential book *Transgender Warriors*, for example, Leslie Feinberg yearns for a society that resembles a past when trans people were “viewed with respect as vital contributing members of our societies.” Scholars like Jason Cromwell invoke the historicized lives of gender-variant people to argue that if historical individuals whose embodied lives did not subscribe to binary sex/gender systems were alive today, these would most likely define themselves as transsexual.

In both of these cases, the authors focus not on the discrepancy between historical actors’ sex/gender identity and their physical embodiment, but on their contributions as workers and dutiful citizens. Such historical narratives frequently speak to the convergence of gender and nation via accounts of the trans man as soldier. Other archival efforts make contributionist claims by focusing on transsexuals in professional occupations. In most of these cases, authors focus on the ways in which these historical figures passed as men or women until illness or death resulted in the discovery of their bodily incongruence. The message one can derive from such accounts is that rather than seeking to make “gender trouble,” these historical actors devoted their energies to their professions and families. Trans scholars also often succumb to working within dichotomous categorizations that effectively normalize heteropatriarchal and capitalist relations. When constructing transsexual subjectivities as deserving of social recognition, researchers and activists often employ hegemonic notions of “normal,” “healthy,” “able-bodied,” and “productive.” Therefore, since transsexuals are neither unhealthy nor mentally unstable, many of them heal the sick. They are not threats to the security of the country; they fight to defend their nations in war. They are not drains on the system; they are successful workers who provide for themselves and their families (in atypical cases, they are eccentric billionaires who fund the research of doctors like Benjamin, as did the FTM transsexual millionaire Reed Erickson). They are not freaks in carnival shows; they are successful entertainers.

This reactionary approach to achieving trans visibility, accessibility, and inclusion is problematic. To flip dichotomies so that the abnormal becomes normal, the unproductive becomes productive, and the uncreative becomes artistic is to plant
some dangerous seeds that jeopardize the state of trans theory and politics. This particular understanding of trans people privileges those within transsexual communities who have the potential to become respectable social subjects. One must acknowledge transsexual individuals who are excluded as subjects and continue to exist on the margins of society, including transsexuals of color, those who do not pass as men or women, those with illnesses or disabilities, those who are impoverished, those who are unable or unwilling to be employed within the legal wage labor economy and thus work in the sex trade, as well as those incarcerated in prisons or mental institutions. Their narratives largely remain untold.

Neoliberal Accumulation Strategies; or, Transsexuality, Inc.

The new millennium has marked the concretization of trans studies wherein trans people have become the subjects of scholarly inquiry rather than its objects. In many respects, trans scholars are setting the research agenda rather than responding to the commentary provided by medical professionals. Yet the need for legitimation that precipitates social recognition for trans people, particularly transsexuals who embody physically a reassigned sex, remains urgent. Transsexual people often live a marginalized existence in which they are unable to secure legal employment, housing, and meet other rudimentary needs. The urgency stemming from the dire circumstances in which many transsexual people find themselves fosters commentary that veers away from a critical analysis of the socioeconomic and political context that structures trans subjectivities and abjection. Much emphasis is placed on integrating trans people as nonnormatively sexed/gendered into heteronormative capitalist society. Such a focus reproduces problematic approaches to transsexuality, which began with medical doctors such as Cauldwell and Benjamin who pathologized transsexual individuals. Contemporary scholarship is haunted by the specter of pathologization due to the continuous reproduction of the heteronormative sex/gender binary system.

This specter emerges as especially troubling in our current neoliberal moment wherein claims to rights and equality have been easily subsumed within a discourse of economic productivity. While it is beyond the scope of this essay to provide a detailed discussion of the multiple facets of neoliberalism, two main pillars should be highlighted in relation to transsexual subjectivities. First, neoliberalism is defined according to an economic restructuring that marks the resurgence of the free-market economy. To increase the accumulation of wealth, concentrated efforts have been made to push wages downward. Such efforts have contributed to the significant growth of certain sectors such as the service sector, as well as to the expansion of “home work” and contract work, which are for the most part precarious, part-time, low-wage positions with few or no benefits. These developments have also produced ever-expanding pools of un(der)employed workers whose vulnerability creates conditions of desperation. Although capital’s appropriation of
other relations of power (i.e., colonization, race, sexuality, sex/gender) is not unique to neoliberalism, this current “policy project” has given new form to intersecting relations of dominance. Many transsexual individuals, people of color, nonstatus immigrants, migrant workers, and gays and lesbians who do not pass as straight are overrepresented in the above-mentioned hyperexploitative sectors of the economy.

The minimalist state constitutes the second major pillar of neoliberalism. According to the logic of the free-market economy, the role of the minimal state is to provide the infrastructure and support necessary for the accumulation of capital. Within a North American context, this has meant the dismantling of the welfare state. Programs that provided citizens with social assistance, unemployment insurance, and publicly funded health care have steadily declined, which has contributed to an environment hospitable to hyperexploitative labor relations and to an increased vulnerability of many segments of society, including many transsexual individuals. I will offer two examples most relevant to the critical political economic analysis of transsexual subjectivities. First, discourses concerning citizenship have shifted away from notions of social citizenship, wherein one has clear expectations of the state to provide for one’s well-being in cases of economic hardship. Neoliberal notions of citizenship do not carry these same expectations; instead, good citizens are defined as those who can contribute to their nation’s advancement in the global political economy. Related closely to dominant notions of the deserving citizen, as revived under neoliberalism, is a second discourse, which espouses the necessity of an individual to cultivate an “entrepreneurial spirit.” The onus has thereby shifted from the state to individual members of society who are expected to make adjustments and sacrifices to provide for their own material needs, as well as for those of their family and communities. This may include self-care (i.e., taking care of one’s physical and mental well-being), education, and training to obtain employment.

Discourses of the good, deserving citizen who cultivates an entrepreneurial spirit fuel a volatile context that Angela Harris refers to as the “cultural wars.” The anxieties of many middle- and working-class people resulting from neoliberal restructuring are alleviated through rendering the logic of capitalist accumulation strategies invisible. Instead of focusing on these strategies, media, state, and community institutions continuously construct socioeconomic and political discourses that represent segments of middle- and working-class populations as innocent victims and upstanding citizens while simultaneously (re)constructing others as enemies, threats, and drains on the system. It is through the predominance of these discourses among the majority of middle- and working-class society that transsexuality is rendered suspect. Therefore many commentators and LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) organizations deliberately emphasize the transsexual individual as a contributing member of society when appealing for recognition of trans subjects and for access to employment. The understanding of the transsexual body as productive provides the subtexts for differing representations of transsexuality.
For example, major newspapers have recently featured transsexuals who hold corporate positions. The Toronto Star published an article featuring Angela Wensley, a senior manager for MacMillan Bloedel Ltd., one of Canada’s leading forestry companies, who transitioned on the job. Geared toward an audience comprised mainly of businesspeople, academics, and other professionals, these articles focus primarily on values of capability and achievement. Wensley vows continued success as head of the corporation’s corrosion and materials engineering group in spite of being transsexual: “A lot of women in this company have told me they’re counting on me because I’m one of only a few here to make it above the glass ceiling. I’m afraid my career advancement is on hold . . . but I’m going to prove to them that not only am I as good as the man I was before, I’m better as a woman.”

This subtext of industriousness also permeates many contemporary transsexual autobiographies. Deirdre N. McCloskey’s autobiography Crossing: A Memoir (2000), serves as but one example. A professor of economics at the University of Iowa, McCloskey transitioned from male to female while maintaining her job and, by and large, the respect she had garnered as an economist. Transsexuality did not denote the end of McCloskey’s professional success. (Trans)gender dynamics are at work here as readers are informed both that women, even transsexual women, are fully capable of flourishing within such a male-dominated discipline. While McCloskey expected to lose her job, she maintained her influential position within the field, was hired at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and was appointed to the editorial board of a major journal for the discipline. Her accounts of success reflect a narrative of continuous productivity as she explains, “I’m getting a new urban life style, more money, and a lot more autonomy to do my work among the disciplines . . . I would not have got the job . . . if economists and others had somehow lost respect for me. If you want to change gender, get a job at a university, and publish a lot.”

Autobiographies by trans activists often follow a similar trajectory. For example, the internationally renowned activist Jamison Green’s book, Becoming a Visible Man (2004), serves to buttress the idea that transsexual embodiment can translate easily to economic success. As the leader of Female to Male International (FTMI), an international resource and activist-based group for trans men, Green is widely recognized. What is particularly interesting vis-à-vis his autobiography, however, is the way that the authenticity regarding his (trans)sex/gender identity and the realization of this identity through medical transition leads to his ability to occupy a leadership role within FTM organizing. He links the right to sex/gender self-determination directly to the capacity of transsexuals to be effective within broader public spheres.

Green discusses his gradual recognition of his male sex over many years and describes how the path to medical transition is mediated partially by economic anxieties. Green also concerns himself with the economic implications of transitioning, asserting that “most FTMs just are not prepared to become captains of industry” due to discrepancies in female socialization and education levels, to the negative
impact of visible gender variance on the job, to periods of un(der)employment, and to how women internalize their position within gendered sectors of the workplace. Similar to medical experts’ concerns regarding the prospects of transsexuals living economically productive lives, Green is also anxious that personal security with one’s male embodiment and masculine gender expression does not correlate directly with productive achievements. He explains that “employers are free to dismiss us because they feel our presence is too ‘disruptive,’ they apparently don’t believe it is possible for us to function efficiently.”

To prove to employers just how efficiently transsexual people can function, trans activists and allies stress the capacity of transsexuals to be loyal and diligent employees. For example, the Center for Gender Sanity makes a case for the value transsexual people add to economic operations through their labor. In Transsexual Workers: An Employer’s Guide (2003), Janis Wolworth makes the case for hiring transsexual workers, as well as for maintaining the employment status of those transitioning. It is here that (trans)sex and gender mediate economic needs to render the transsexual laboring body industrial, and in ways that are strikingly similar to how the neoliberal political economy renders all workers susceptible to decreasing wages, fewer benefits, and precarious positions (such as contract work). As Wolworth writes, “while in transition, transsexuals are strongly motivated to earn enough money to pay for the desired procedures and to maintain above-average performance in order to keep their jobs.” Furthermore, corporations can influence the construction of effective transsexual bodies through investing in procedures for sexual reassignment and instituting antidiscriminatory policies that protect gender identity and expression. She states, “Once transition is completed, a transsexual employee is likely to become more productive.”

Transsexual individuals can be viewed as viable neoliberal subjects: they have proven to be flexible and fluid, self-sufficient, and major contributors to their families, workplaces, communities, and societies. To many, emphasizing the normative potential of transsexuality has been a successful strategy to counter the marginalizing effects of pathologization. The legitimizing of the transsexual worker, however, does not offer serious challenges to heteronormativity, nor does it illuminate the conditions of hyperexploitation that structure neoliberalism. In fact, these narratives dovetail with hegemonic discourses concerning the upstanding citizen and the necessity of entrepreneurialism. The interest expressed by major corporations such as IBM demonstrates the ease with which capital continues to appropriate the oppressed minorities, such as sex/gender variants, into its accumulation strategies. As part of its “managed diversity” programs, IBM actively recruits trans people, racial minorities, Native Americans, gay men and lesbians, and women.

The changing tides of neoliberal restructuring amid the continuation of the heteronormative sex/gender binary has created a receptive atmosphere for transsexual incorporation into the productive spheres of capital. Unlike medical experts such
as Cauldwell who chastised nonnormative sex/gender identifications as frivolities that distracted from one’s potential as a laborer, corporate executives view these tenuous identifications as advantageous to present regimes of accumulation. Difference is appropriated not only as a market niche but also as a resource for capital accumulation when transsexual bodies are valorized socially because of the value their labor contributes to the economy. As explained to members of sex/gender minorities by IBM, “When you join IBM’s diverse team you are encouraged to share your unique perspectives and capabilities. At IBM we recognize individual differences and appreciate how these differences provide a powerful competitive advantage and a source of great pride and opportunity in the workplace and marketplace.”

**Toward Radical Futures**

Much like modern gay and lesbian movements that have veered away from liberationist approaches toward assimilatory goals, transsexuals have overwhelmingly responded to pathologization and erasure by cultivating social subjectivities that demonstrate their ability to contribute to economic progress. However, claims to self-sufficiency, morality, and a positive work ethic undermine the potential for a politics of resistance and create fractures within transsexual communities based on class, race, citizenship status, and ability (to name a few). Whose bodies are the most productive and most effortlessly absorbed into capitalist employment pools? Appealing to mainstream society through a rearticulation of dominant socioeconomic discourses comes at a cost to those within trans communities who cannot be easily assimilated into normative categories, such as those who do not pass as men or women or those who are physically or mentally ill or incarcerated.

A second division resulting from these assimilatory strategies extends beyond transsexual communities. This strategy within the context of neoliberalism distances transsexual people from other economic outsiders who are also configured as parasitic, abnormal, or deviant. Progressive trans scholars and activists ought to think through the complex ways that heteronormativity and capitalism impact the lives of many other individuals who are understood as improperly sexed/gendered such as single mothers, women and men of color, those on social assistance, and those engaged in sex work. Further, these efforts to normalize trans bodies as productive forego the possibility of establishing alliances with anticapitalist and antiglobalization activists who engage in queering all facets of political economy. While the urgent need for employment is undeniable for many trans people, it is important to ask: Whose interests are ultimately served by the formation of dutiful, self-sufficient, hardworking transsexual subjectivities?

Certainly, the lasting legacy of the medicalization of trans people demands our continued resistance. We also need to acknowledge the ways in which neoliberal prescriptions for thought and behavior have influenced the lived experiences that contribute to trans theory and activism despite transsexuals’ rich history of mili-
tant opposition to systemic power structures. The actions of the trans and gender-
noncompliant Compton Cafeteria rioters and of those who fought police at Stonewall ought to occupy a more significant place in the queer collective memory. In the midst of a political climate in which we are told that “there is no alternative,” their activism can still spark radical imaginations of a queer future.
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