

The question of the Trans struggle

Ermiya Fanaeian

June 2022

Perhaps it is especially important for us to begin realizing the Trans struggle as a political movement with goals that span beyond the individual, or the need to care for oneself. Perhaps it can be best understood to put the Trans struggle in the context of the material, and changing, world that is responsible for gender as we've known it. In the contemporary day of 2022, many began to approach the question of Trans liberation with skepticism, plenty of whom approach the question with antagonism, as there has been an attempt to suggest the goals of the Trans struggle are detached from the material world. A suggestion, from the ruling class, is that Trans people serve as nothing but a theory to consider, but never a reality to witness.

When we understand that Transness has in fact served as a reality in this world that is often agitational to the current social hierarchy and patriarchal order, we can then begin to understand the reactionary forces protesting against the Trans movement. To put it in the framework of Marx's theory of base and superstructure, and the analysis provided by many proletariat feminists, the bourgeois class has been responsible for our understanding of gender. When production was revolutionized from the home to the factory, our idea of gender began to become dependent on the nuclear family. As men were now a part of an economy that was no longer at home, this forced women to stay at home and bear the responsibility of taking care of children.

This new social structure served as beneficial for the bourgeoisie who needed workers to be dedicated to the creation of profit, and free from the distraction of a home life. As this new social structure became the normal function of economy and society, the ruling class sustained it by suggesting it was a result of “nature” and “god's will” rather than the material conditions that created, and institutionalized, it. For this, the understanding of gender today, as shaped by the ruling class, is not a matter of nature, nor is it immutable, rather it had a beginning to it that was once non-existent.

This historical context is rather important to understand the challenge faced by the Trans movement, and the possibility of a pro-Trans society, today. If the idea that gender is immutable, and a product of nature, has served as beneficial to the ruling class, then those who threaten this idea are framed as the enemy. Then the ruling class will continue to have enough resources, money, and power to outweigh any attempt to challenge the ideas of gender.

If gender is truly not biological, and in fact mutable, then this delegitimizes the beneficiaries of these lies. If woman can become man, and man can become woman, and gender isn't binary, what else have they been lying to us about? More so, what other fundamental aspects of society are capable of changing, and aren't as stable as we have been made to believe, if this is true for gender?

This allows for us to see Trans people as not the enemy, but rather a part of the proletariat that, if we stand in solidarity with, will weaken the true enemy. If all fingers are pointed at Trans liberation to blame, no fingers will be pointed at capitalist exploitation, the imperial core, the sex trade, or prisons. For this, the question as to

whether or not to support the Trans struggle should be easy for all working-class,
freedom, movements.