

## Introduction to Dreger (2008) and Peer Commentaries

Kenneth J. Zucker

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Since I assumed Editorship of the *Journal* in 2002, we have published four peer-reviewed target articles on controversial topics, followed by peer commentaries, and a reply by the target article authors. The first two target articles were about pedophilia (Green, 2002; Schmidt, 2002), the third target article was about sexual orientation change (Spitzer, 2003), and the fourth target article was about the sexual dysfunction diagnosis of dyspareunia (Binik, 2005). The Green and Schmidt articles were followed by 19 peer commentaries; the Spitzer article was followed by 26 peer commentaries (which later morphed into an edited volume that included other essays from the *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Psychotherapy*) (Drescher & Zucker, 2006); and the Binik article was followed by 20 peer commentaries.

The target article by Dreger in this issue follows this newly spawned tradition. Dreger's article was peer-reviewed by three referees and then a call for commentaries was issued via various listservs and organizations. A total of 60 people expressed an interest in writing a commentary and, in the end, 24 commentaries were received. One commentary was not accepted by me for publication because its content did not have anything to do with the target article. The 23 published commentaries are followed by a reply from Dreger. I reviewed all commentaries and, by and large, made very minor editorial changes and, if there was a substantive issue, did so in consultation with the author. There is one production point to keep in mind when reading the commentaries: quotes from the

Dreger article do not include page numbers because the era of online first ahead of print makes it impossible, in advance, to know the page number of the print version.

In my Editorial introducing the target article by Spitzer (2003), I wrote that "a scholarly journal is a legitimate forum to address controversial scientific and ethical issues rather than leaving the complexity of the attendant discourse to 'the street'" (Zucker, 2003, p. 400). I hope the readers of this *Journal* will enjoy the walk as they read the talk. Just look all ways before crossing.

### References

- Binik, Y. M. (2005). Should dyspareunia be retained as a sexual dysfunction in DSM-V? A painful classification decision. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 34, 11–21.
- Drescher, J., & Zucker, K. J. (Eds.). (2006). *Ex-gay research: Analyzing the Spitzer study and its relation to science, religion, politics, and culture*. New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Green, R. (2002). Is pedophilia a mental disorder? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 31, 467–471.
- Schmidt, G. (2002). The dilemma of the male pedophile. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 31, 473–477.
- Spitzer, R. L. (2003). Can some gay men and lesbians change their sexual orientation? 200 participants reporting a change from homosexual to heterosexual orientation. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 32, 403–417.
- Zucker, K. J. (2003). The politics and science of "reparative therapy" [Editorial]. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 32, 399–402.

---

K. J. Zucker (✉)  
Gender Identity Service, Child, Youth, and Family Program,  
Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 250 College St.,  
Toronto, ON, Canada M5T 1R8  
e-mail: Ken\_Zucker@camh.net

# The Controversy Surrounding *The Man Who Would Be Queen*: A Case History of the Politics of Science, Identity, and Sex in the Internet Age

Alice D. Dreger

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

**Abstract** In 2003, psychology professor and sex researcher J. Michael Bailey published a book entitled *The Man Who Would Be Queen: The Science of Gender-Bending and Transsexualism*. The book's portrayal of male-to-female (MTF) transsexualism, based on a theory developed by sexologist Ray Blanchard, outraged some transgender activists. They believed the book to be typical of much of the biomedical literature on transsexuality—oppressive in both tone and claims, insulting to their senses of self, and damaging to their public identities. Some saw the book as especially dangerous because it claimed to be based on rigorous science, was published by an imprint of the National Academy of Sciences, and argued that MTF sex changes are motivated primarily by erotic interests and not by the problem of having the gender identity common to one sex in the body of the other. Dissatisfied with the option of merely criticizing the book, a small number of transwomen (particularly Lynn Conway, Andrea James, and Deirdre McCloskey) worked to try to ruin Bailey. Using published and unpublished sources as well as original interviews, this essay traces the history of the backlash against Bailey and his book. It also provides a thorough exegesis of the book's treatment of transsexuality and includes a comprehensive investigation of the merit of the charges made against Bailey that he had behaved unethically, immorally, and illegally in the production of his book. The essay closes with an epilogue that explores what has happened since 2003 to the central ideas and major players in the controversy.

**Keywords** Transsexualism · Transgenderism · Gender identity disorder · Autogynephilia · Identity politics · Institutional review board · Human subjects research

## Introduction

This is not a simple story. If it were, it would be considerably shorter. The basic outline goes like this:

In the spring of 2003, J. Michael Bailey, a psychology professor and sex researcher at Northwestern University, published a book called *The Man Who Would Be Queen: The Science of Gender-Bending and Transsexualism* with Joseph Henry Press, a National Academy of Sciences imprint (Bailey, 2003). A popularization of certain areas of sexology research, the book was quickly praised by some reviewers (e.g., Cantor, 2003; Kirkus Reviews, 2003; Osborne, 2003) and denounced by others (e.g., Beatty, 2003; McCloskey, 2003a; Mundy, 2003). Although the book discussed a wide range of topics, including male homosexuality and gender identity development in intersex children, it was Bailey's portrayal of male-to-female (MTF) transsexuals that caused a firestorm. That portrayal, based on Ray Blanchard's taxonomy of MTF transsexualism (elaborated below), drew ire from a number of prominent transgender activists who found it profoundly insulting to their senses of self and damaging to their public identities. They argued that the book was obnoxious, wrong and, most importantly, that it would seriously hurt transwomen and their loved ones in its misrepresentation of their experiences and identities (see Conway, 2003a).

As documented below, dissatisfied with the option of merely criticizing the book, a small number of transgender activists worked to try to ruin Bailey professionally and personally. Largely under the leadership of three prominent transwomen—Lynn Conway (a world-renowned computer

---

A. D. Dreger (✉)  
Medical Humanities and Bioethics Program, Feinberg School of  
Medicine, Northwestern University, 750 N. Lake Shore Drive,  
Suite 625, Chicago, IL 60611, USA  
e-mail: a-dreger@northwestern.edu

scientist at the University of Michigan), Andrea James (a Hollywood-based trans-consumer advocate and an entrepreneurial consultant on trans issues), and Deirdre McCloskey (a Distinguished Professor of Economics, History, English, and Communication at the University of Illinois at Chicago)—they organized charges of scientific misconduct against Bailey, including charges that he lacked informed consent from research subjects, that he failed to obtain Institutional Review Board (IRB) permission for human subjects research, and that he had sexual relations with a transsexual research subject. They successfully pushed for a top-level investigation of these charges at Northwestern University and for numerous press reports about Bailey's alleged misdeeds. They successfully arranged a protest against the book's nomination for a Lambda Literary Foundation (LLF) award and tried to get Bailey's colleagues (including his closest departmental colleagues) to turn against him or at least distance themselves from him. They devoted elaborate Websites to criticizing and mocking him and his book and anyone with any positive relationship with him. One activist in particular, namely Andrea James, also used the Web to publicly harass Bailey's children, his ex-wife, his girlfriend, and his friends.

In short, the controversy over Bailey's book got about as ugly as it could. So very intense have been feelings around the Bailey controversy that several people were frightened to speak to me when I sent them inquiries about it a good 3 years after the book's publication. A few people who heard I was interested in writing a history of the controversy even tried to talk me out of it. Most were concerned that I would suffer personal harassment for researching and publicizing this history, and a few worried that no good would come of it because it would only inflame tensions and further entrench the players. Although I expect that the first concern is legitimate given what I've learned, I believe that this history has the potential to calm and even quell some of the tensions that persist. This history is worth tracking, too, in order for scholars, journalists, politicians, funding agencies, university administrators, publishers, and others to appreciate what can happen in an Internet-rich age of identity politics when a university-based researcher takes a controversial public stand, especially if that stand relates to sex, gender, or sexuality.

I also believe that a scholarly history of this controversy is critically necessary to advancing both transgender rights and sexology, two things about which I care deeply. As I have researched the following history, I have run across many people who labor under erroneous beliefs about what happened, and those misunderstandings need to be corrected because they are adversely affecting many people's lives and actions. Perhaps most importantly, in this work I have encountered a substantial number of transgendered persons and scholars of sex (and some people who are both) who are not entrenched in an "us versus them" mentality, but who nonetheless have been repeatedly silenced, misrepresented, or

misheard by those who assume one must side with an "us" or a "them" since the backlash against *The Man Who Would Be Queen*. That continued, vigorously policed, "us versus them" partisan behavior is hurting science as well as individual trans people and it is time for it to stop. As I show here, the story of the controversy over *The Man Who Would Be Queen* is significantly more complicated than the on-the-street, "good versus evil" cartoon versions of it, and that matters for many people, individually and collectively.

This essay is divided into six sections: Part 1 explains my background and methodology; Part 2 provides a history of what went into the book ultimately entitled *The Man Who Would Be Queen*; Part 3 puts forth what I believe to be the only careful exegesis of the treatment of transsexualism in Bailey's book; Part 4 traces the backlash against the book and the book's author, including how the backlash began, who led it, how it morphed, and the form it ultimately took; Part 5 examines the merit of the charges made against Bailey that he had behaved unethically, immorally, and illegally in the production of his book; Part 6 constitutes an epilogue that sketches out what has happened since the backlash to the key players and ideas in the controversy.

## Part 1: My Background and Methodology

By way of background, since it matters to the story I am about to tell, let me explain that when Bailey's book came out in 2003, I had not heard of him except to know vaguely of the twin studies he had coauthored (Bailey & Pillard, 1991; Bailey, Pillard, Neale, & Agyei, 1993), and I knew relatively little about transsexuality. My work as an historian and patient advocate focused on intersex (i.e., congenital anomalies of sex chromosomes, gonads, and/or anatomic sex), particularly on the clinical treatment of intersex in childhood. In addition to being an Associate Professor of Science and Technology Studies at Michigan State University, I was an intersex activist. I became intimately involved in the intersex rights movement starting in 1996 when Cheryl Chase, the founder of the Intersex Society of North America (ISNA), read my first publication on the history of intersex and asked me to help change the then contemporary medical treatment system for intersex children (Dreger, 2004). By 2003, when Bailey's book hit the Web and the stores, I had served as the Chair and President of the Board of Directors of ISNA for 5 years. From then until I retired from ISNA in late 2005, I served alternately as Chair of the Fundraising Committee, Chair and President of the Board of Directors, and Director of Medical Education. I think it is fair to say I am generally considered one of the chief architects of the intersex patients' rights movement. My two books and numerous articles on the subject have consistently argued that the standard of care needs to be changed because—among other problems, such

as its lack of evidence-base and violation of generally accepted ethical principles—it is motivated by homophobia, sexism, heterosexism, and, more generally, fear of gender-blurring (see, e.g., Dreger, 1998; Dreger & Herndon, *in press*). Thus, although I am heterosexual and not intersex, I've often been considered (and consider myself) a queer rights activist as well as an historian of sex and gender.

As best I can recall, the first I heard of Bailey's book was via a phone call in 2003 from Lynn Conway, the person who—except for Bailey himself—turns out to have played the most important role in this story. I knew Conway because she was a generous donor to ISNA and because she had been personally supportive of Cheryl Chase, who had become my close friend as well as my collaborator. In my capacity as a leader of ISNA, I occasionally solicited donations from Conway and thanked her for her donations. Shortly after the publication of *The Man Who Would Be Queen* (hereafter *TMWWBQ*), Conway called to tell me it was a terrible and dangerous book, a book that called transwomen like her “perverts.” My recollection is that I gave her this advice: “All publicity is good publicity. Ignore Bailey and he'll go away. Don't feed his publicity machine.”

I believe it was a few months later that my friend and colleague Paul Vasey also called to talk to me about the book. I had met Vasey (a sex researcher at the University of Lethbridge) in February 2002 through a conference on sex and gender co-organized by Joan Roughgarden at Stanford University. Vasey was calling to ask me whether I knew I was listed as a supporter of Conway's anti-Bailey campaign on her University of Michigan Website (<http://www.ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway>), and whether I knew what was happening to Bailey and his family. I told him honestly this was all news to me, and while I was disappointed that someone was attacking Bailey's children online, it seemed to me that Bailey had stuck his hand into a buzzing hornet's nest and he should have expected to be stung. I then emailed Conway (p.e.c.<sup>1</sup>, August 12, 2003) to tell her she should not list me as a supporter of her campaign as I had not read the book and it was embarrassing to have my colleagues think I had formed an opinion about a book without reading it. She removed my name and sent me a reply encouraging me to support her campaign against the book (p.e.c., August 14, 2003). But by that point the whole thing seemed ugly enough that I had no interest in getting involved and being distracted from my work on intersex rights. I did read the book sometime around late 2003 or early 2004, and—judging by my marginalia—I found it generally lively and well written, unnecessarily snide or even contemptuous in places, lacking in evidentiary support (the book has “further reading” suggestions but no citations), and full of claims and ideas that I knew very little about. I marked it up copiously and put it down.

<sup>1</sup> “p.e.c.” stands for “personal email communication.”

In November 2004, four years into trying to balance motherhood with full-time university work and near-full-time volunteer intersex activism, I gave up my tenured position at Michigan State University so that I could devote more time to my activism, writing, and speaking, and to my family's domestic life. In 2005, I accepted a part-time faculty appointment in Medical Humanities and Bioethics at the Feinberg School of Medicine of Northwestern University in Chicago, and in February 2006, as Vasey was coming to Chicago to work with me on a project proposal about sexual diversity, he insisted it was time I meet Bailey. Bailey works on the Evanston campus of Northwestern, and I work on the Chicago campus, so we had no reason to meet through our ordinary work. Being good friends with both Bailey and me, Vasey was bothered that Bailey assumed me to be a senseless postmodernist beholden to political correctness and that I assumed him to be a homophobic, transphobic, sloppy scientist. What I knew about Bailey I knew partly from reading his book but mostly from hearing about him through the gender activist grapevine: he was supposed to have abandoned his wife and children, to have slept with a research subject, to have done human subjects research with no oversight, to be against sex reassignment surgery (SRS) for transgender people, and so on. It was only my enormous respect for Vasey, whom I knew as an openly gay man and a very good scientist, that made me agree to meet the infamous Bailey.

Upon our meeting over dinner with Vasey in Chicago's Boys' Town (the gay neighborhood near where Bailey lived) in February 2006, I was surprised to find Bailey to be apparently intelligent, open-minded, scientifically careful, and non-homophobic. As I recall, about an hour into our conversation I asked him point-blank whether it was true he had slept with a research subject, and he answered in a legalistic and exasperated fashion, saying that, even if he had, that would not have been a violation of IRB rules. Intrigued, in the next few days, I looked up Bailey's journal articles and his Website and discovered, besides an impressive peer-reviewed publication record, that Bailey appeared to have quite good relations with the children and ex-wife he supposedly had abandoned. What was the truth, I wondered?

In May 2006, knowing of my increasing curiosity in the matter, Bailey emailed me to let me know that Andrea James had been invited by Northwestern University's Rainbow Alliance to speak at the Evanston campus of our university (p.e.c., May 9, 2006). At that point, I had not done any serious investigation into the history of the controversy, so I asked Bailey to tell me who James was exactly. He explained that she was the person who was so angry about what he said in his book that she had put up on her Website (<http://www.tsroadmap.com>) pictures of his children with their eyes blacked out, asking whether his young daughter was “a cock-starved exhibitionist, or a paraphiliac who just gets off on the idea of it?” and saying that “there are two types of children in the

Bailey household,” namely those “who have been sodomized by their father [and those] who have not” (James, 2003a). I understood this was meant by James to be a parody of Bailey’s alleged treatment of transsexuals in his book (James, 2003a), but I was disgusted by this intimidation tactic, having myself been subject to intimidation by right-wing activists who didn’t like my pointing out how intersex challenges the assumptions inherent in anti-“same-sex” marriage legislation. I wrote to Northwestern’s Rainbow Alliance to express my dismay that someone of this sort would be invited to our university (p.e.c., May 11, 2006). I told them that, given her unethical tactics, I thought James was not the sort of person who was good for a scholarly institution nor the sort who was good for transgender rights. They did not respond. So, on May 13, 2006, I blogged about my dismay on my personal Website (Dreger, 2006).

This blog led to a torrent of email from every camp imaginable—indeed, many camps I had not imagined existed. Many sex researchers and Bailey’s daughter wrote to thank me for speaking out against James. Some transgender women wrote to tell me that, no matter what James had done, Bailey’s actions had been reprehensible and those were the actions to which I should direct my criticisms. Most interestingly to me, a surprisingly large number of transgender women wrote to tell me that they had been harassed and threatened by James for daring to speak anything other than the standard “I’m a woman trapped in a man’s body” story. Many (though by no means all) of those women found Bailey’s version of their identities inaccurate, oversimplified, and/or just plain obnoxious (and, from my rather vague memory of the book, I was inclined to agree), but they wanted me to know that they, too, thought James was harmful. Almost universally those who wrote to me—including sex researchers—asked that I not ever quote them or mention them by name. They feared being attacked by James, as Bailey and others had been.

When I posted my blog, I made a point of emailing James to tell her about it and to ask her to stop undermining progress in transgender rights with her incontinent attacks (p.e.c., May 16, 2006). She was none too pleased and sent me back a series of hostile emails, including one referring to my 5-year-old son as my “precious womb turd” (p.e.c., June 1, 2006). She also came to my departmental office (I was not there) and then emailed me, subject line “Mommy Knows Best,” saying, “Sorry I missed you the other day. Your colleagues seem quite affable, and not as fearful as you. [...] Bad move, Mommy. [...] We’ll chat in person soon” (p.e.c., May 27, 2006). At that point, concerned for my son and office colleagues, I forwarded the whole of the communications to my Dean, who put me in touch with university counsel, who—given James’s threatening tone and her history—recommended I alert campus police. I told the police I was not aware of James ever having been physically violent; she seems simply to harass and intimidate.

Since then, James has been trying to undermine my reputation as an intersex activist and scholar, which she explicitly warned me by email she would try her best to do (“I’ll do what I can to assist [...] in discrediting you”; Andrea James, p.e.c., May 27, 2006). By early October 2006, I found myself featured on the very first page of James’ massive attack and advice site (<http://www.tsroadmap.com>). There my name was linked to an erroneous account of my intersex activist history (Hinkle, 2006). As bizarre as this sounds, in trying to intimidate or exact revenge on me for blogging about her tactics, James has chosen specifically to focus her energies on undermining the emerging medical terminology of “disorders of sex development” as a replacement for the umbrella term “intersex” and all terms based on the root “hermaphroditism.” (“I am [...] going to do what I can to discredit your lame-ass DSD model”; James to Dreger, p.e.c., June 1, 2006.) Apparently, James hopes she can get my fellow intersex activists angry at me for helping to introduce the new terminology, a terminology some find pathologizing and regressive (Dreger & Herndon, *in press*). Intersex friends and allies tell me that, out of anger at me personally, James does now seem to be effectively sowing anger and dissension in the intersex world as she has done in the transgender world. I consider this development sad, but inadequate cause to be silenced.

I mention my own experience with James to help explain why I decided to devote as much time and energy to this scholarly history as I have. James’s expansive attempt to intimidate (and presumably silence) me simply for questioning her *once*—along with the unsettling experience of hearing bits of alternative histories from and so much fear among sexologists and transgender women—left me with a strong desire to know the truth about Bailey’s work and the controversy surrounding it. It reminded me too much of the history of modern intersex treatment—where claims about truth differed so radically among activists and sexologists—to leave the historical record unclear. So, early in the summer of 2006, I decided to undertake this scholarly history and began collecting available sources. I also began contacting people who I thought could give me useful unpublished sources, oral histories, and general advice about the project.

This article therefore draws on all of that material. Before I interviewed sources orally, I let them know I would take notes while we talked and that they could correct the notes however they wished before I would use them. They were invited to add, delete, or otherwise change whatever they wished in the notes, regardless of what they had actually said; this ensured they were represented accurately. (Oral-interview citations in the reference list thus include both the date of the interview as well as the date the corrected notes were returned.) If I interviewed them by email, I let them know I would feel free to quote from their responses unless they specifically indicated otherwise. (In-text citations referring to emails are marked “p.e.c.” and provide the date the email was sent.)

As is the case for all histories, this is a partial history based on available sources and including what this historian judges relevant and important. Unlike some histories, it has the added advantage of being extensively reviewed prior to publication. Before this article was even submitted for peer review, I solicited responses to drafts from 12 transgender activists and sex researchers in disparate disciplines. (Several of the pre-submission readers are both trans activists and sex researchers.) To the extent possible, I have sought input from all of the major players in this story, although I confess that I did not contact James for this project because, given our history, I did not feel safe doing so nor did I think productive dialogue with her was possible.

I did try contacting Lynn Conway through numerous emails to let her know that I was working on this project and to give her a chance to give me any input she wished. I also told her in my emails that I hoped that the Editor of the journal that eventually published my paper would give her and Bailey—whom I believe to be the two most important characters in this story—the opportunity to formally respond to my paper in the same issue. When I decided to undertake this work, I felt sure Conway would talk to me because she had spent so much energy on Bailey and his book and because we had had a cordial history. In addition to our positive fundraiser–donor relationship through ISNA, we had over the years also touched base about parallel efforts at our universities (Michigan State University and the University of Michigan) to ensure that our institutions’ anti-discrimination policies adequately protected transgender people. Several years ago, Conway also very kindly at my request came to my home to provide one-on-one peer support for a colleague of mine who was considering sex reassignment. (I made them lunch and then left them alone at my house to talk.) When she did not answer my numerous emails about this project, I sent letters to her office and home. Still I heard nothing, although I knew from new posts at her Website that she was still interested in Bailey’s doings. So I tried calling her at work, but her department told me she is now a professor emerita and no longer maintains a phone there. Consequently on August 16, 2006, I called her at home, because I wanted to be sure she had a chance to represent herself beyond the published record.

I finally reached Conway that way and we had a phone call that lasted about a minute. She surprised me by being extremely hostile at the outset. She also would not answer my simple question about whether she was willing to speak to me on the record. This confused me—why would she not just tell me whether or not she wanted to speak on the record?—and I said as much. She responded that it was very strange that I would call her at home. I told her how many other ways I had tried to reach her with no response before finally calling her home. She then said that I was stalking her and added that she would circulate this fact widely. Since it was at that point clear she didn’t want to speak to me, and since I was afraid of being

accused of stalking, I said goodbye and gave up. (This account is based on notes I made immediately following the call.) I take this interaction to mean Conway does not wish to provide input on this work. Fortunately, Conway’s extensive Website and the oral histories I have conducted with others provide substantial documentation about and insight into her role in this history.

I also invited Deirdre McCloskey to talk with me on the record about this history and told her I would be happy to consider any material she wished (p.e.c., December 30, 2006). McCloskey and I had met once, in 2001, when we both spoke on a panel with California State University, Northridge FTM philosopher Jacob Hale at the University of Illinois in Chicago. (I recall that, at the lunch we had together, she autographed my copy of her autobiography.) As part of this project, I sent her a list of specific questions regarding her role based on what I had learned from other sources, and she sent back very brief answers on which I draw here (p.e.c.’s, January 22, 2007). McCloskey refused to tell me anything more substantial unless I first proved to her, by showing her what I was writing, that I agreed with her positions (p.e.c.’s, December 31, 2006, and February 4, 2007). I explained that, as a scholar, I do not make that kind of deal with potential sources. As in my experience with Conway, I found myself confused as to why McCloskey would not want to clearly self-represent to me her critical role in what happened to Bailey following publication of his book. I can only guess they want attention paid only to Bailey and his actions, not to the history of the backlash against him and his book. In any case, as with Conway, for my account of McCloskey’s role I draw on the available sources—many of which happen to be posted on Conway’s site. To maximize fairness and accuracy, I gave McCloskey a list of the specific pages from Conway’s site that I was using to write about her, and asked McCloskey to correct any misrepresentations of her actions contained therein; she corrected none.

As this history shows, James, Conway, and McCloskey played pivotal roles in the controversy surrounding *TMW WBQ*, although their personal stories do not appear in the book, except insofar as Bailey briefly discusses McCloskey’s memoir in the “further reading” section (Bailey, 2003, p. 215). But two other women whose stories *did* appear in the book also came to play important roles in the controversy. These are Charlotte Anjelica Kieltyka (known in the book as “Cher Mondavi”) and the woman called “Juanita.” Before I ever had a chance to contact her, Kieltyka called me at my office in June 2006; she had read my blog about James as well as some of my writing on bioethics, and she was calling in the hopes I might help her continue her ongoing campaign against Bailey. I listened to her extensive concerns and then, on a later date, told her I had decided to work on this history and offered her the opportunity to go on the record with her memories and opinions. She chose to do so through a series of lengthy telephone interviews (totaling about 11 hours) and numerous

emails. As with all subjects, I let Kieltyka change and approve the written versions of our verbal interchanges so that they contained exactly what she was willing to have on the record. I reminded her frequently that all emails were on the record.

I have not spoken to the woman who is called “Juanita” in this history as she was called in Bailey’s book. As we shall see, “Juanita” is the woman who accused Bailey of, among other things, having had sexual relations with her when she was his research subject (Bailey, 2005). Even though she has gone by at least two pseudonyms (“Juanita” and “Maria”) in her many public dealings with Bailey, in my research I quickly figured out her real identity. Indeed, it was impossible not to figure out who she is, because Juanita has chosen before and since *TMWWBQ* to be so very public with her autobiography and her physical image. She even let Kieltyka take a semi-nude, erotic photograph of her, with her face veiled (Kieltyka, 2003a), a photograph Conway herself then reproduced and specifically identified as being of the “Juanita” of *TMWWBQ* (Conway, 2003b). (Conway says on her site she reproduced this photo of Juanita to counter what she sees as Bailey’s negative representations, by “show[ing] the inner grace and beauty of a young transsexual woman” [Conway, 2003b]. I’m not sure how it represents the subject’s inner qualities, but it certainly doesn’t leave much about her outer qualities to the imagination.)

Conway’s “Transsexual Women’s Successes” site provides five photographs of Juanita (this time with her face showing in plain view and her clothes on) along with a detailed autobiography of Juanita, including an oblique reference to her encounters with Bailey (Maria, 2004). Although the photographs and autobiography are reproduced under the name “Maria” on Conway’s “Successes” page, “Maria’s” autobiography obviously matches the already-published biography of Juanita in Bailey’s book. “Maria’s” face as shown in plain view on Conway’s site also obviously matches the face found in a feature story on Kieltyka and Juanita that was published with their consent in 1999 in the *Daily Northwestern*, the student newspaper of Northwestern University, an article to which no fewer than four sources (including Kieltyka) referred me. For that feature story, Kieltyka and Juanita gave the student reporter permission to use their photos as well as their real first and last names—pre-gender-transition as well as post (Gibson, 1999). The match between the representations in the *Daily Northwestern* article (February 1999), in Bailey’s book (April 2003), and on Conway’s page (April 2004) is the reason it became obvious to me who Juanita really is, although below I also document additional public real-name presentations by Juanita.

I also document that Juanita consented to all of those public representations. If Juanita has wanted to hide her real identity, she hasn’t tried very hard. Nevertheless, I’ve decided here not to give Juanita’s real name because she hasn’t chosen to publicly connect the dots as I have easily done (and as anyone

else researching this history would quickly do). For this history, I did try to contact Juanita through the email address provided in her autobiography on Conway’s site (I received no response to my email [p.e.c., December 16, 2006], not even an “undeliverable” postmaster response), and through Kieltyka (who told me she checked with Juanita and that Juanita didn’t want to talk to me [Kieltyka to Dreger, p.e.c., September 20, 2006]). I also tried to find her through public address lists, but her real name turns out to be common in the Chicago area, where I assume she still lives, and it seemed inappropriate to write to all women with her name seeking the one person for whom I was looking, particularly given that Juanita did not write back to the email and apparently told Kieltyka she didn’t want to talk with me.

In terms of other important sources, as I elaborate below, one journalist repeatedly refused to explain to me her odd part in this history. No sexologist refused my requests for interviews. I am grateful to the more than 100 people who answered my requests for information and help, particularly Charlotte Anjelica Kieltyka and J. Michael Bailey who each provided me enormous amounts of information and documentation, and tolerated impressively my sometimes uncomfortable questions.

## Part 2: The History of the Book that Became *TMWWBQ*

Chicago-based therapist Randi Ettner might be surprised to learn that she was the impetus for the book that became *TMWWBQ*. After Michael Bailey attended a reading by Ettner of her book *Confessions of a Gender Defender* (Ettner, 1996) at a local Barnes & Noble bookstore in June 1997, he was so frustrated by what he saw as gross inaccuracies in Ettner’s account of transsexualism that he decided he would write a book of his own (Bailey, 2006b; Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., August 22, 2006). By October 1997, he had begun writing notes for that book under the working title *Sexual Difference*. The draft dedication turned out to be, in retrospect, as ironic as they come: “For my children. May they learn life’s hardest lessons from books” (Bailey’s personal files; Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., August 22, 2006).

From the start, Bailey intended this book to be very different from anything he had published before. Whereas most of his previous work consisted of peer-reviewed articles for scientific journals, this book would be a popularization—based on certain sexological findings of his lab and others, but replete with vivid stories of people the author had met, stories provided to put a human face on those findings. Along with accessible, abbreviated accounts of key scientific studies, the book would also feature the author’s hunches, speculations, and personal opinions. It would include suggestions for further reading, but no other documentation (Bailey, 2006b). Thus, *TMWWBQ* was never envisioned as a work of science in any

traditional sense; instead, Bailey viewed the book as his chance to expose to the masses what he saw as the often politically incorrect truth about “feminine males”: boys diagnosable with “gender identity disorder” (GID); surgically feminized, genetic male children; male homosexuals; drag queens; heterosexual male crossdressers; and MTF transsexuals. Bailey also saw the book as an opportunity to make some money; when he was ready to sell the book, he engaged an agent, Skip Barker, who negotiated in November 2000 a contract and an advance from Joseph Henry Press (p.e.c., Bailey to Dreger, October 2, 2006). Joseph Henry Press is “an imprint of the National Academies Press [...] created with the goal of making books on science, technology, and health more widely available to professionals and the public” (Bailey, 2003, copyright page).

Bailey had originally considered also writing about “masculine females” (e.g., tomboys) in his book, but soon decided that that would have to wait for a second volume (Bailey, 2003, p. xii). But it was his long-term interest in masculine females that had led Bailey to meet one of the transwomen who would become a major character in *TMWWBQ* and in the controversy that followed: Charlotte Anjelica Kieltyka. Kieltyka, who lived in the Chicago area, called Bailey after seeing him in a 1993 *Dateline NBC* television segment on tomboys (Copaken, 1993). Kieltyka sought out Bailey to suggest that he might be interested in “the other kind of ‘tomboy’—those transsexual women named ‘Tom’ that were born a ‘boy’.... ‘Tomboys’ like me” (Kieltyka, 2006a). She explained to Bailey that, unlike the media stereotype of transsexual women, she was attracted to women, and that women like her “were NOT inconsistent with masculine lesbianism” (Kieltyka, 2006a). In their subsequent conversations, she also explained she had been a rather boyish boy and had worked as a car mechanic as well as being an artist.

Sometime in 1994, Bailey and Kieltyka met for the first time, at Bailey’s office. At their very first meeting, Kieltyka brought along “show and tell” items (Kieltyka, 2006c). These included realistic prosthetic vulvas complete with pubic hair. Kieltyka explained to Bailey how, before she had SRS, she used to tuck and glue her penis into her body (made easier by having been born with only one testicle) and glue on one of these vulvas to achieve the appearance of female genitalia. Kieltyka also explained how she had constructed realistic-looking prosthetic breasts and how, before her sex change, she wore these with female masks and wigs to achieve a feminine appearance she had found both erotic and transformative. Kieltyka told me that she saw “the cross-dressing with the mask [as] a kind of transitional thing—the fetish objects—the breasts and the plastic vagina—an important part of a ‘dress rehearsal’ [...] WITHOUT IT—without this fetish transformative phase—I would never have seen myself as a woman—never realize[d] that I was a transsexual woman.” She went on: “I needed to see myself, like an artist following a creative

path, realizing only after you created it; the realization [of being a transsexual] came after the creation” (Kieltyka, 2006b).

According to Bailey, Kieltyka came across as an intelligent, warm, creative, outgoing woman with a good sense of humor and a strong interest in telling people about herself. (This is all consistent with my experience in my extensive interviews with Kieltyka.) Kieltyka immediately and repeatedly told Bailey vivid details about her life, and she encouraged Bailey to accompany her to the local bars frequented by pre- and post-op transsexual women and drag queens where Kieltyka was familiar with many of the regulars (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., October 2, 2006). In his book, Bailey thanks Anjelica Kieltyka for “introduc[ing] me to the Chicago transsexual community and [teaching] me a great deal by being honest and open” (Bailey, 2003, p. xii).

Not long after their meeting, Kieltyka saw in Bailey a possible aide to the advocacy work she was doing with pre- and post-op transsexuals in the Chicago area. Kieltyka had been working with sympathetic clinicians at Cook County Hospital and elsewhere to get local transsexual women prescription feminizing hormones (as an alternative to black-market hormones) and to try to convince the hospital to restart its SRS program. She had also been referring and accompanying transsexual women to a support group at Good Samaritan Hospital run by Wanda Sadoughi, a psychologist who also sometimes provided letters to pre-op women in support of their requests for SRS (Kieltyka, 2006a). Why did these women need letters from people such as Sadoughi? Surgeons who followed the fourth version of the Standards of Care as laid out in 1990 by the Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association (HBIGDA) required two “favorable recommendation[s] for surgical (genital and breast) sex reassignment,” including at least one from a “doctoral level clinical behavioral scientist” (Walker et al., 1990, Sect. 4.7.5). Version Five of the Standards of Care, adopted in 1998, called for “a comprehensive evaluation by [two] qualified mental health professional[s]” (Levine et al., 1998, p. 28). Thus, during the time in question here, respected surgeons performing SRS typically required patients to produce evidence from two qualified psychological professionals that the applicant fit HBIGDA’s eligibility and readiness criteria for SRS.

Sometime around 1996, Kieltyka asked Bailey whether he would help out some of her friends and protégés by providing them with letters in support of their requests for SRS. Bailey was amenable to Kieltyka’s request. His understanding was that, so long as he made clear in his letters what his professional status was, there would be no problem reporting simply what he observed in terms of a pre-op transsexual woman’s gender identity presentation, her apparent understanding of the surgery, and her likelihood of adjusting well after SRS. Nowhere in his letters did Bailey say that he was these women’s therapist or that he counted under the HBIGDA



Standards of Care as a “qualified mental health professional”; in each, he simply stated his university position, said how many times he had talked with the subject, and included his c.v. (Bailey, 2006b; for examples, see Conway, 2004d). Whether or not a surgeon accepted his letter as an adequate recommendation would be up to the surgeon, just as it was up to the surgeon more generally which parts of the HBGDA Standards of Care he or she would follow.

Bailey’s letters were typically less than one page long and were based on a small number of interviews (usually two or three) conducted over a span of 6 months or more (Bailey, p.e.c.’s, October 2 and 3, 2006). Kieltyka often attended these interviews because she saw herself as an advocate for the transsexual women seeking letters (Kieltyka, 2006a). Bailey provided somewhere between five and ten of these letters, including one for Juanita (Bailey, p.e.c., October 3, 2006), and he neither sought nor received remuneration for these letters (Bailey, 2006b); like Kieltyka, he saw the work as a sort of voluntary public service to local transsexuals who were already living as women and who could generally not easily afford months or years of the psychological therapy that typically preceded the production of a psychologist’s letter regarding SRS. Bailey recalls, “I was definitely sympathetic” to the transwomen who asked him for letters of recommendation: “I had little doubt that they would be happy after SRS, and I sympathized with all they’d been through. I wrote the letters as a favor to them, the transsexual community, and to Anjelica [Kieltyka]” (Bailey, 2006b).

Kieltyka also arranged with Bailey opportunities to present to students in his Human Sexuality class herself, her history, and her understanding of transsexuality. She says her “lectures were an opportunity to do ‘outreach’; to educate AND entertain” (Kieltyka, 2006a). As in the case of other guest speakers, these presentations took place after the regular class session and were optional but heavily attended; between 1994 and 2003, a total of several thousand Northwestern University students saw Kieltyka’s annual appearances (Bailey, 2006b; Kieltyka, 2006b). In these presentations, held in a large auditorium to accommodate the class size, Kieltyka showed and explained a series of still images using overhead projection. She began with two pictures, first one “of an ‘erratic’ rock formation—sticking out in the middle of an incongruent landscape/environment,” and then one of herself as “a beautiful, attractive woman in the middle of an all guy and Catholic high school 30th reunion.” She saw herself in the second picture as being very much like the erratic boulder of the first, and she posed the question, “How did she get there? ... How did I get here?” (Kieltyka, 2006a).

To Bailey’s students, Kieltyka also presented a short video compilation she had made. The compilation included “before and after” shots of herself—for example, clips of her former self (Chuck) playing the hammered dulcimer with a local Irish folk group, and of her post-SRS self (Charlotte Anjelica)

sitting in a recording studio. In the recording studio segments, Kieltyka is seen surrounded by television monitors and recording equipment. She is wearing a white bikini, drinking a cocktail, and explaining her history (Kieltyka, 1999).

No doubt to the surprise of Bailey’s students that video compilation actually begins with a pornographic segment Kieltyka had made for herself pre-SRS. In it, as Donna Summer sings “Love to Love You Baby” in the background, Chuck appears as a nude woman through use of prosthetics, including false breasts, a glued-on vulva (with his penis glued up inside his body), a female mask, and a platinum blonde wig. The woman whom Chuck appears as masturbates through simulated finger-clitoral stimulation and through the use of a dildo attached to the floor; she straddles the dildo and thrusts up and down so that it looks as if the dildo is going in and out of her vagina. (It was actually going in and out of Chuck’s anus.) Kieltyka overlaid an audio clip from a porn video in this segment to provide the sound of a woman reaching orgasm. Immediately after this segment, the compilation cuts to a post-op scene of Anjelica standing topless in a bikini bottom and moccasins, looking radiant and being dramatically bathed in a rushing waterfall. She brushes back her long dark hair with her hand and motions to two nearby women unknown to her to also take off their tops. They decline (Kieltyka, 1999, 2006e).

Kieltyka explained to me that she used this video in Bailey’s class to show an important part of her profound transformation from man to woman. In producing the video,

I was freeing that woman that was trapped inside my body. Just as Michelangelo would free the image from the block of marble, or Pygmalia, the carving became the woman that he desired. I became the woman I desired, but it wasn’t a sexual desire, because when I knew and stepped out of the trans state, the ritual state, I knew that was me behind the mask. I could not use that video to masturbate to, because I knew it was me. I could not become aroused if I wasn’t wearing a mask. I had to become the other. (Kieltyka, 2006c).

She also said about the video:

It was a kind of a simulation, almost like a pilot learning to fly a commercial airline[r] first goes through a simulator until it becomes almost second[-]nature or instinctive—a simulator that was also a “stimulator” ...and the higher the stimulation[,] the greater the positive feedback[....] it was all religious; technical; psychological; artistic; sexual....even pornographic. (Kieltyka, 2006b; ellipses in original unless in brackets)

In other words, Kieltyka believes that the stimulation she felt in producing the video-simulation allowed her to understand she was a woman inside. To Kieltyka’s mind, the video also demonstrates that the prosthetics and women’s lingerie

she used to crossdress prior to her SRS are very much like fetishes in Native American cultures; she specifically likens them to the eagle feathers and animal furs used in certain Native American ceremonies. She is thinking of those Native Americans who “had animal fetishes that the individual[,] in their trans state or their ritual state, would don [...] and they would become those animals that had special powers within them. The person was transformed into or transubstantiation took place, using the fetish elements, they became those entities” (Kieltyka, 2006c). She explains that this is why, in the post-op waterfall scene that immediately follows the pre-op pornographic scene, she looked somewhat Native American, with long, dark hair and moccasins: “it was symbolic of a baptism, a kind of native American nature child, born again, emerging from the water like a Venus” (Kieltyka, 2006b; see also Kieltyka, 2006e).

Kieltyka has also explained how women’s “foundation garments” (bras, girdles, etc.) were truly foundational to her self, because they helped her understand who she truly is:

I saw [the foundation garments] as the foundation to a woman’s sexuality, and that was where I ultimately saw the vagina and breasts as powerful fetish elements[....] If I could create or recreate those powerful fetish objects for myself—within myself—[—]I would become the woman in appearance, most certainly, but also to correlate with my own identity that was buried and repressed for so many years—inside. It was substantive[.] (Kieltyka, 2006c).

Thus, as she explained to Bailey and his students, Kieltyka saw herself as undergoing not just a sex change, but a profound transformation which achieved an integration of material, emotional, and spiritual realities.

For his part, Bailey saw Kieltyka’s story as constituting an open-and-shut case of autogynephilia. “Autogynephilia,” a term coined by sex researcher Ray Blanchard in 1989, refers to the phenomenon of a person (in Blanchard’s formulation, a natal male) being sexually aroused by the thought of himself as a woman (Blanchard, 1989; see also Blanchard, 2005). Now Head of Clinical Sexology Services at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health in Toronto (formerly known as the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry) and Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Toronto, Blanchard has posited that autogynephilia constitutes an “erotic target location error” in which a male winds up with himself as the object of his heterosexual desire (Freund & Blanchard, 1993). Though she has often talked about her lesbianism, i.e., sexual attraction to women, Kieltyka also sometimes had sexual relations with men, and has described herself as being bisexual (Bailey, 2003, p. 159; Gibson, 1999). This in itself did not make her story inconsistent with Blanchard’s theory of autogynephilia; Blanchard (2005) noted that autogynephiles might present with a sexual history of heterosexuality (attraction to women),

bisexuality, or even asexuality. And with her elaborate and highly creative history of erotic crossdressing, Bailey saw Kieltyka as a perfect example of autogynephilia. Indeed, the more he learned of Kieltyka and of autogynephilia, the more it made perfect sense to Bailey that many of Kieltyka’s earliest sexual arousal experiences occurred when crossdressing and/or imagining herself as a woman (Allyn & Bacon, 2004; Bailey, 2003, p. 152; Kieltyka, 2006c).

In his work on transsexualism, Blanchard argued that there are actually two types of MTF transsexuals, with autogynephiles being one type and “homosexual transsexuals” being the other. In contrast to those identified as autogynephiles, homosexual transsexuals are understood to typically appear very effeminate from early childhood on (Blanchard, 2005). In Bailey’s words, “From soon after birth, the homosexual male-to-female transsexual behaves and feels like a girl” (Bailey, 2003, p. 146). People with this form of transsexualism are, by definition, sexually attracted to other males, though notably their attraction is generally to heterosexual men. Blanchard termed them “homosexual” in keeping with Magnus Hirschfeld’s taxonomic approach (Blanchard, 2005, p. 443), and he argued that MTF homosexual transsexuals who opt to undergo sex reassignment do so, in part, because being a woman makes more sense than trying to live as a very effeminate man attracted to heterosexual men. Blanchard’s theory is, therefore, one that sees erotic desire as a central component of MTF transsexualism and indeed an impetus to sex reassignment. In Bailey’s take on Blanchard’s theory, whether one is talking of “homosexual” or “non-homosexual” (i.e., “autogynephilic”) transsexuals, MTF transsexualism is fundamentally about *sexuality*—or more specifically, eroticism. Kieltyka’s class presentations, including her video compilation and pre-op crossdressing “props,” did little to persuade Bailey otherwise. The fact that she used the term “fetish” to talk about her “props” would only have added to his sense that her behavior represented classic fetishistic crossdressing—autogynephilia.

When she presented to Bailey’s Human Sexuality students, Kieltyka usually brought along friends who were also post-operative transwomen, some of whom had, through Kieltyka, sought out and obtained SRS-support letters from Bailey. According to Kieltyka, these women (including Juanita) joined her in part out of gratitude to Bailey for his earlier help. But Bailey did not seek a quid pro quo; that is, he never asked a woman who came to him seeking an SRS letter to present to his class or to do anything else in exchange (Bailey, 2006b; Kieltyka, 2006a). Indeed, all of the co-presenters were arranged by Kieltyka, and all presented to his students after their surgical transitions had been accomplished. Bailey paid them for their presentations the same way he compensated his other post-class speakers, out of designated university accounts. Although it makes sense that the transwomen who got SRS-support letters from Bailey might have been grateful to Bailey for his help, none of them was so grateful that she

declined the money he would offer for presenting. And, as with all of his after-class speakers, he let them present whatever they wanted; he did not require them or any other after-class speaker to say anything in particular. Most of them simply spoke plainly about what they saw as the relevant facts of their experiences and their bodies, and then they answered students' questions (Bailey, 2006b). None of Kieltyka's co-presenters gave the sort of elaborate, multimedia presentation Kieltyka did, and none did what Kieltyka chose to do twice: strip down to complete nudity at the end of her presentation, as a sort of grand finale (Bailey, 2006b; Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., October 3, 2006). According to Kieltyka, she stripped "to show that even 40[-]something-year[-]old transsexual women that were lesbian and 'butch' in the head but 'fem[me]' in the body could be 'show girls'—attractive and sexy" (Kieltyka, 2006a).

To Bailey's mind, the transsexual women Kieltyka brought for SRS-support letters and as co-presenters turned out to be perfect examples of Blanchard's "homosexual transsexuals" (Bailey, 2005). They passed easily as women, they were attracted to heterosexual men, and they had been identified by themselves and others as feminine since early childhood. They did not have the history of erotic crossdressing Bailey saw in Kieltyka, though they did report histories of numerous and often casual sexual relationships with heterosexual men. This again was in keeping with Blanchard's findings. Thus, the patterns Bailey saw in Kieltyka and her associates supported Blanchard's theory of the two types of MTF transsexuals and (importantly) flew in the face of the accounts of people such as Ettner who saw transsexualism as representing a single phenomenon, one that had nothing to do with eroticism and everything to do with gender identity (Bailey, 2006b; Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., August 22, 2006).

According to Ettner and many other gender therapists and theorists, the central problem pretty much any trans person faces is having a gender identity that doesn't match body type (Ettner, 1996, 1999). The primary reason for seeking SRS is to correct a mismatch between the transsexual's body and her gender identity, not to achieve any erotic goal. Mildred L. Brown, a therapist popular with many trans activists (including Conway and James), sums it up this way: "Transsexualism is not about sex, sexual behavior, or sexual orientation—it's about gender or, more specifically, gender identity" (Brown & Rounsley, 1996, p. 20). To this way of thinking, trans people suffer from a sort of trick of nature, whereby they have the brain of one gender in the body typical of the other. Thus, the trans person has a sort of neurological intersex condition, typically understood to be inborn. Blanchard and Bailey would likely agree that homosexual transsexuals appear to be somewhat neurologically intersex, given their male anatomies and their histories of effeminacy and attraction to heterosexual males (Bailey, 2003, p. 159), but both would reject such a claim from a person they view as autogynephilic (which in their

view would be all non-homosexual MTF people). And more importantly, both see eroticism and not some innate gender identity as the salient point. Both believe that eroticism is important in the explanation of and motivation for MTF transsexualism.

Although Kieltyka never saw herself as an autogynephile, judging by actions as well as copies of emails provided to me, the fact that Bailey saw her that way did not interfere significantly with their friendly relationship. Kieltyka told me recently that she and her transsexual friends "took it for granted that Bailey saw us the way we saw ourselves" (Kieltyka, 2006a), i.e., not as "autogynephilic" and "homosexual" in Blanchard's sense. Yet Kieltyka also distinctly remembers that Bailey considered her an autogynephile virtually from Day One: "I was aware that Bailey saw me as an example of autogynephilia, he thought so the very first day we met in his office" (Kieltyka, 2006b) when she showed him her pre-op crossdressing props. Certainly by late 1998, Kieltyka knew for sure that Bailey subscribed to Blanchard's theory and saw her as an autogynephile, because by that time she knew he was writing about her in a forthcoming book. After double-checking the facts of her story with her by phone, he showed her the draft section about her and let her fact-check it and comment on it (Bailey, 2006a; p.e.c.'s Bailey to Dreger, August 22, 2006 and November 21, 2006). Although she did not dispute the basic details about her life, she was upset that he was using her as an example of autogynephilia (Bailey to Blanchard, p.e.c., December 2, 1998; Bailey, 2005). So Bailey told her that he would change her name in the book (Bailey, 2005; Kieltyka, 2006c).

Relations between Kieltyka and Bailey remained relatively cordial after she saw the manuscript; this is supported by records of friendly toned emails and by the fact that Kieltyka kept willingly presenting to Bailey's class and otherwise associating with him. The friendly association kept up even after Bailey publicly labeled Kieltyka an autogynephile in no uncertain terms in early 1999 in an interview for the article that appeared in the *Daily Northwestern* on February 24, 1999. As mentioned in Part 1, that article featured the stories of Kieltyka and her friend Juanita. The author, Maegan Gibson, one of Bailey's former Human Sexuality students, enjoyed the benefit of the full cooperation of Kieltyka and Juanita, and thus she was able to report key features of their histories and romantic lives. With their permission, Gibson's article also reported Kieltyka's and Juanita's real pre- and post-transition first and last names and reproduced before and after transition photos—that is, photos of their faces from the time when they were legally and socially men along with present-day photos from their lives as women. When Gibson interviewed Bailey for the article, he explained to her that he was writing a book and that he saw Kieltyka as an example of autogynephilia and Juanita as an example of homosexual transsexualism. And

Gibson (1999) reported just that, as well as Kieltyka's clear objection to Bailey's classification of her.

Bailey did not formally interview Kieltyka for the book, though, as mentioned above, he did run a draft past her and she helped him fact-check and augment it (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., August 22, 2006). At no point did Bailey feel he needed to formally interview Kieltyka, given how much he already knew from her many class-related presentations and her extensive conversations and "show and tells" with him. As time went on, what he believed he knew about her was only confirmed over and over again in what she told him "in class, in my office, in restaurants, everywhere" (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., August 22, 2006). It was further confirmed by her published interview with Gibson in 1999 and her substantial participation in 2002 in a video made to accompany a human sexuality textbook. In that video, in which through Bailey's introduction Kieltyka participated voluntarily and for which she signed a full release to the publisher, she appears with her face unobscured, identifies herself as Charlotte Anjelica, tells her pre- and post-op story, and shows the prosthetic vulvas and female masks she used when she was Chuck (Allyn & Bacon, 2004).

For the book project, Bailey did rather informally interview two of the supposedly homosexual transsexual women he had met through Kieltyka, those identified in the book as Juanita and Alma. He let them know he was writing a book, and they met with him and talked with him about their experiences. Some of what he wanted to write about them he already knew simply from meeting them socially through Kieltyka, but he used the follow-up conversations to confirm details (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., November 21, 2006). Kieltyka (2006a) has contended that Bailey also drew on what he could have only learned from the SRS letter interviews. Bailey disagrees: "I never used the information that I got in those limited interviews for the book" (Bailey, 2006a). (This is discussed in detail in Part 5.)

Some may well wonder why Kieltyka developed and maintained such a friendly association with Bailey when he persistently subscribed to a theory about her identity that conflicted with her own understanding. And why did it take so many years for her to get so upset about his characterization of her that she would turn on him? This is discussed more fully in Parts 4 and 5 below. For now, let me just say in summary that Kieltyka has explained to me that she valued her relationship with Bailey, and, though she knew he consistently labeled her autogynephilic, she thought that over time she could educate Bailey about her own theory of transsexualism and change his mind with regard to his understanding of it and her. Indeed, when Kieltyka had first learned that Bailey was writing a book on the subject, she was glad she would be included and excitedly imagined that it would be something of a collaboration in which he would explore Kieltyka's ideas, including her analogy between the role of sexual fetishes in transsexual

transformation and the role of animal-part fetishes for similarly profound spiritual transformation in Native American rituals. (Kieltyka did not understand how this analogy would be seen as an offensive cultural appropriation to many Native Americans, including many Two Spirits.) She thought if she worked with Bailey long enough, she could get Bailey to understand (and write about) how gender identity, sexual orientation, and sexual identity could all be understood as distinct components of transsexual identity, and how fetishistic crossdressing could function as a stage of discovery and empowerment on the way to full transition (Kieltyka, 2006c, 2006d).

So, when Kieltyka saw the book draft in November 1998, she discovered—and was upset to discover—that Bailey was using her in the book as an illustration of autogynephilia. She recalls, "I felt trapped. But then he said this is a first draft, we can use any information to support your theory if you have support for your theory. If you can change my mind, that's all part of our relationship[...] What I saw was a misunderstanding or a misinterpretation, [and] I wanted the opportunity to change his mind" (Kieltyka, 2006b). Surely Bailey did see Blanchard's theory as a *theory*, but it seems to have held (and to hold) in his mind the sort of weight that the theory of universal gravitation does. That is because of what Bailey sees as the substantial scientific and clinical evidence for Blanchard's theory. It would take quite a lot of scientific counter-evidence—far more than Kieltyka could muster—to displace it. Indeed, the more Kieltyka told and showed Bailey, the more she seemed anecdotally to *confirm* Blanchard's theory (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., August 22, 2006; Bailey, 2005). Kieltyka's yearly presentations, the transwomen she introduced Bailey to at Northwestern and at local bars, the interviews with Gibson—all these seemed to Bailey only to reconfirm what he felt he already knew from the scientific literature—that all transsexual women fit easily into one or the other of Blanchard's two types (Bailey, 2005). Kieltyka and her friends seemed like obvious examples of the two types, and, as he worked on his book, he saw them as just that: perfect illustrations to use in the book.

As do a lot of researchers, as Bailey went through his daily personal and professional life, he was making mental note of other people he met who did or didn't match various theories he had come across in his work—including people who could put a human face on the other sexual varieties and sexological concepts he wanted to talk, teach, and write about. Other characters that made it into his book include: Edwin, a very effeminate gay man who worked at the cosmetics counter of a department store near where Bailey lived; Leslie Ryan, a mother who came to Bailey with her questions and concerns about her son Danny who often behaved very girlishly; Ben, "the leader of the 'gay guys panel' who [like Kieltyka] spoke to [Bailey's] human sexuality class" (Bailey, 2003, p. 63); and Stephanie Braverman, a middle-aged heterosexual

crossdresser who (like Kieltyka) after encountering a media report on Bailey's work contacted him "to 'educate'" him (Bailey, 2003, p. 160).

And, as a sex researcher with an active program, Bailey was doing scientific studies, the results of some of which would make it into his book. For example, he and his collaborators were looking at the occupations and avocations of gay men, the speech patterns of gay and heterosexual men and women, and the relative prevalence of feminine traits in gay men, drag queens, and MTF transsexuals (see, e.g., Barlow, 1996). These scientific studies were conducted with the approval of Northwestern's Social Sciences IRB, the committee charged with overseeing this type of human subjects research. (Which kinds of research require IRB approval is discussed in depth in Part 5.)

In the fall of 2002, Bailey submitted the final version of his manuscript to Joseph Henry Press, and in spring of 2003, the book came out in print and on the Website of the press (Bailey, p.e.c., October 5, 2006). The back cover of the print version included the following advance blurb from Harvard University psychology professor Steven Pinker:

With a mixture of science, humanity, and fine writing, J. Michael Bailey illuminates the mysteries of sexual orientation and identity in the best book yet written on the subject. [TMWWBQ] may upset the guardians of political correctness on both the left and the right, but it will be welcomed by intellectually curious people of all sexes and sexual orientations.

Meanwhile, psychology professor David M. Buss of the University of Texas opined: "Refreshingly candid, remarkably free of ideology, this book is destined to become a modern classic in the field. But readers should be prepared to have some cherished assumptions about human nature shattered." Anne Lawrence, physician, sexologist, and self-identified autogynephilic transsexual woman, remarked simply, "This is a wonderful book on an important subject." Needless to say, not everyone would agree. Nevertheless, as his book went to press, Bailey saw no hint that several of the transwomen with whom he had such good relations would, within just a few months, decide to turn against him.

### Part 3: What *TMWWBQ* Actually Said

If one is to understand the history of the controversy surrounding J. Michael Bailey's book, one must know what the book itself said, even though (as I will show) some of the reactions to *TMWWBQ* were based on incorrect assumptions about the book rather than its actual content. The analytic synopsis presented in this section reviews the contents of *TMWWBQ* relevant to this history—i.e., chiefly the portions

on GID and transsexualism—while simultaneously making special note of which parts (real and imagined) drew particular ire. Let me be clear that the following synopsis is not intended as a substitute for an actual reading of *TMWWBQ*. In researching this history, I was dismayed to discover how many people—including professional scholars—were ready to give me detailed opinions about the book while admitting they hadn't bothered to read it. I think it is fair to say, and I hope here to show, that *TMWWBQ* is an odd book in many ways, one that frequently doesn't do what you expect of it. Indeed, an examination of Bailey's collected works suggests this is generally true of his productions—they often don't match one of the standard, expected viewpoints—and I think this helps to explain a lot of the criticism he encounters from both progressives and conservatives who tend to adhere to clear-cut dichotomies of "facts" and opinions.

It is worth noting that a fair number of people were angered by Bailey's book before they ever even opened it. This was because of the cover, which features a black and white photo of the bare legs of a hairy, muscular man (shown from behind, from the knees down) standing, in a feminine pose, in pretty pumps. The book's title is superimposed on this picture. When I talked with him about the backlash against the book, Paul Vasey recalled being with Joan Roughgarden, a prominent transgender scientist, in February 2003 when she saw for the first time the book's cover, reproduced on a flier. Vasey remembers that, upon seeing the flier, Roughgarden immediately denounced the book and declared it a threat to the LGBT community (Vasey, p.e.c., July 3, 2006). Roughgarden could not have actually known what the book said, because it wasn't yet published (Vasey to Dreger, p.e.c., February 27, 2007). Just after the book was issued, in her blog, Becky Allison, M.D., a prominent transwoman, asked rhetorically, "Did I mention the cover art? A pair of big hairy legs in high heels. Are we having fun yet?" (Allison, 2003). On her Website, Andrea James remembered, "I winced the moment I saw Bailey's condescending title and cover art" (James, 2003a). Time after time, those I talked to about the book reported that the cover photo and title had immediately offended them or others. Even some of those generally friendly to the book found the cover a detriment. Bailey showed me an email from a stranger, a self-identified feminine gay man, who in a thoughtful email message in May 2003 said he "was put off by the title and cover, thinking it unlikely to be a serious study. [...] The cover and title do not do your fine work justice, in fact they work against you" (p.e.c. to Bailey, May 13, 2003). Even Blanchard told me, "I didn't like the cover. Mike sent me the two choices [before publication] that I believe he got from the publisher. My recommendation was to go with the one he didn't take" (Blanchard, 2006), namely a cover featuring three very similar faces, with one looking masculine, one feminine, and one androgynous.

Even though *TMWWBQ* is about a lot more than MTF transsexualism, and even though Bailey insists the cover and title were meant to allude to a whole range of people who might fit under the umbrella of “feminine males,” most critics (and indeed most readers) seem to have understood the cover and title to constitute a pejorative comment on transsexual women. Indeed, *TMWWBQ*’s title and cover explicitly contrasted with those books on transgenderism which adhered to the “woman trapped in a man’s body” narrative of transgender identity, or what I will call hereafter the “feminine essence” narrative. The feminine essence narrative is summed up by Bailey this way:

Since I can remember, I have always felt as if I were a member of the other sex. I have felt like a freak with this body and detest my penis. I must get sex reassignment surgery (a “sex change operation”) in order to match my external body with my internal mind. (Bailey, 2003, p. 143)

In keeping with their themes, books that favor the feminine essence narrative have tended to feature on their covers attractive head-to-toes photos of transwomen dressed relatively conservatively. Consider, for example, the front cover of Deirdre McCloskey’s *Crossing: A Memoir*, which shows a photo of the author dressed in dark suit (matching skirt and jacket) and pearls, seated with her legs crossed the way women often cross their legs, leaning back and laughing with both hands clasped to her upper chest (McCloskey, 1999). Even Kate Bornstein’s *Gender Outlaw: On Men, Women and the Rest of Us*, which presents a somewhat radical account of a trans life, has as its cover illustration a photo of the author dressed in a long dress with long sleeves, her hands laid flat, wrists crossed, just above her breasts, rather like a butterfly (Bornstein, 1994). Contrast the subject of Bailey’s book’s title (*The Man...*) and cover illustration (a hairy, muscular man). Bailey’s point seemed clear: the man who would be queen was really just a guy in size-thirteen pumps.

Those who, on the basis of his book’s cover and title, suspected Bailey of rejecting the feminine essence narrative and who *did* bother to venture into the actual content of the book quickly found their suspicions confirmed. In the Preface, Bailey bluntly insists that eroticism, not gender identity, is the salient point in MTF transsexualism: “One cannot understand transsexualism without studying transsexuals’ sexuality. Transsexuals lead remarkable sex lives” (Bailey, 2003, p. xii). He then provides a thumbnail foreshadowing of Blanchard’s taxonomy of homosexual and autogynephilic MTF transsexualism: “Those who love men become women to attract them. Those who love women become the women they love” (p. xii). Convinced he’s dealing with a fundamentally sexual phenomenon, Bailey shows no patience for the idea of women trapped in men’s bodies; he out-and-out denies the feminine essence narrative told by

many transwomen and pushed by therapists such as Ettner and Brown:

Supposedly, male-to-female transsexuals are motivated solely by the deep-seated feeling that they have women’s souls. Furthermore, the fact that some transsexuals are sexually attracted to men and others to women allegedly means that sex has nothing to do with it. However, in this case the exception proves the rule. Heterosexual men who want to be women are not naturally feminine; there is no sense in which they have women’s souls. What they do have is fascinating, but even they have rarely discussed it openly. (p. xii)

His book, he insisted, would be different. He would blast past the feminine essence narrative to the core truth of transsexualism: “[W]riters have been either too shallow or too squeamish to give transsexual sexuality the attention it deserves. No longer” (p. xii). So where MTF transsexualism was concerned, Bailey would happily play Galileo to Blanchard’s Copernicus, spreading, supporting, and fiercely defending a truth too often denied and suppressed because of self-serving identity politics.

Given Bailey’s lightning-quick summary of Blanchard’s theory in the Preface, and given that Blanchard’s taxonomy is not really spelled out clearly until page 146, the reader unfamiliar with the concepts of “autogynephilia” and “homosexual transsexualism”—and plenty familiar with the female essence narrative—may well find *TMWWBQ* a confusing book on the first pass. At least this reader did. After all, the first third of the book seems to carefully document what amounts to a feminine essence story. Part 1 (Chaps. 1–3), entitled “The Boy Who Would Be Princess,” tracks a boy Bailey calls Danny Ryan, an anatomically typical, pre-pubescent male diagnosable with GID.

In Bailey’s account, Danny seems to have had fairly feminine behaviors and interests from the very start (Chap. 1). Again in keeping with the standard feminine essence narrative, Bailey speaks unfavorably of psychological theories that would point to the Ryans’ parenting as the source of Danny’s femininity, hinting instead that, given how early and consistently it showed up, Danny’s femininity is probably inborn. To further make the case for biological etiology of gendered behavior and interests, in his general discussion of Danny, Bailey uses outcomes studies of sex-reassigned children to suggest that the tendency towards what we ultimately call gender is at least in many cases set before birth (Chap. 3). In short, Bailey seems to see the tendency towards masculine or feminine behaviors and interests as largely innate—and thus “gender identity disorder” (or at least early-onset mismatches between sex and gendered behavior) as largely innate.

But in a sign of his turn away from the standard feminine essence story of transgenderism—that holds that girlish male

children are really girls—Bailey sees as very important the fact that Danny’s uncle is gay and, like Danny, was feminine from an early age (pp. 12–13). Thus, Bailey strongly suggests that being a feminine boy and becoming a gay man are correlated, and that they share a common biological etiology. Indeed, Bailey refers to data showing that nearly all boys like Danny diagnosable with GID turn out not to be transsexual women, but to be gay men (pp. 17–20). Given the outcomes data on boys treated for GID, and given the self-reports of gay men with regard to their childhoods, Bailey speculates that Danny will end up a non-transsexual gay man (pp. 17, 34). This, of course, is part of what infuriated certain trans critics who adhere to the feminine essence story of MTF transsexualism—especially those who are attracted to women; they wanted to claim personal histories just like Danny’s, yet here was Bailey saying, in fact, that the vast majority of boys like Danny would just end up as fairly run-of-the-mill feminine gay men.

Still, at this point, the reader relatively new to the topic may wonder why Bailey would deny the feminine essence explanation to men who, as adults, do choose to change sex. Could they not have been, as they often claim, Dannys as children? After all, Bailey acknowledges that a very small number of boys with GID wind up to be transsexual women (pp. 19–20). Furthermore, he notes that outcome studies of boys treated for GID may be disproportionately missing those who *did* end up transsexual, “So maybe transsexualism is a more common outcome than some people believe” (p. 32). Why, then, would Bailey be reluctant to accept the claim of many transsexual women who say they have “always felt as if I were a member of the other sex” (p. 143)?

Interestingly, a close reading of Bailey’s book reveals the author’s persistent skepticism about many scientists’ and clinicians’ conception of gender *identity*, and an especially strong skepticism about the idea of an *innate* gender identity: “‘Gender identity’ [in the psychological literature] refers to the subjective internal feeling that one is male or female” (p. 22). But, Bailey insists, “most of us rarely, if ever, think about our gender identities” (p. 22). Most of us don’t go through our days with an articulated sense of being male or female, the way the psychological literature (including the *DSM*) would lead us to believe. While he acknowledges that we all—as children and adults—seem to have gendered *interests* and gendered *behaviors*, Bailey is doubtful that young children have “subjective internal feeling[s] that one is male or female” (p. 22). He asks, “how would a girl even know if she had the same inner experience as a typical boy?” (p. 50). Ultimately, Bailey concludes that “scientists have not fully appreciated how complicated a trait gender identity likely is, or how little we know about it. One expert told me, bluntly: ‘Gender identity is defined as ‘the inner sense of oneself as male or female.’ What the hell does that mean?’” (p. 50). It makes more sense to him that children naturally exhibit

“feminine” and “masculine” behaviors and interests, and that those are then categorized as feminine and masculine in such a way that children get the idea that they count as girlish or boyish.

So his doubt about the commonly held concept of a core gender identity is one reason Bailey remains dubious about claims by transsexuals that they change sex because they have always had a core gender identity that conflicted with their anatomical sex. He does, following Blanchard, acknowledge that “homosexual transsexuals” may be born with something like a neurological intersex—a kind of inborn feminized brain in a masculine body, so that from an early age they naturally exhibit feminine interests and behaviors: “From soon after birth, the homosexual male-to-female transsexual behaves and feels like a girl” (p. 146). Thus, Bailey distinguishes homosexual transsexuals from “autogynephiles” when he singles out the latter kind of MTF transsexual as “not naturally feminine” and in “no sense[...] hav[ing] women’s souls” (p. xii). But still, he just doesn’t think it is a gender identity problem that ultimately motivates people to change sex, even in the case of extremely feminine homosexual transsexuals: “Homosexual transsexuals are in their own way just as sexually motivated [to seek SRS] as autogynephiles” (p. 180).

“Princess Danny,” then, is used by Bailey *not* as an example of transsexualism—and certainly not as an example of the feminine essence origins of transgenderism—but rather to show that some boys are really quite feminine, that this is probably caused by something that happens before birth, and that these boys will mostly likely wind up gay. Indeed, in his final story about Danny, presented in the book’s Epilogue, Bailey portrays Danny as gay and very much “not a girl in boy’s clothing” (p. 214) and when I asked Bailey whether he knows about Danny’s identity today, he informed me, with little surprise in his voice, that Danny is now, in fact, out as a young gay man (personal communication, November 5, 2006). Thus, to Bailey, the story of Danny enables a discussion of how gendered behavior and gendered interests are often linked to sexual orientation—how it is that being gay often goes with being feminine in interests and behaviors. This explains why it is that, although many trans critics saw the story of Danny (Part 1 of the book) as comprising an integral part of Bailey’s story of transsexualism, Bailey insists he doesn’t really discuss transsexualism in depth until Part 3 of the book. The way he indexed the book confirms this; the index entries on transsexualism are almost entirely limited to the pages of Part 3.

So Bailey was rejecting the dominant (feminine essence) narrative of MTF transgenderism, and simultaneously rejecting the two dominant narratives of sex and gender identities, namely biological determinism and social constructivism. Or at least he was rejecting the standard versions of these theories. Biological determinists have tended to be fairly dualist (rejecting of gradations) with regard to gender; they assume two sexes

means two genders. Meanwhile, social constructivists have tended to talk about spectra of gender identities, believing that cultural variation leads to variations in gender identities. Given these two dominant narratives about sex and gender, a number of critics assumed that, if Bailey was rejecting the feminine essence narrative of transsexualism, he must be collapsing gender identity and sex—that is, he must be a biological determinist who assumes that, if you're born genetically male, your gender identity will clearly be masculine (in spite of whatever you ultimately claim). You might put on pretty pumps, but you're not kidding anyone. Although Bailey leans heavily towards a biological understanding of the origins of gendered behaviors, gendered interests, and sexual orientation, his account is not about two simple gender identities that map to two simple sexes. In fact his book is largely dedicated to—even arguably *all about*—the

under-appreciated complication[...] that gender identity is probably not a binary, black-and-white characteristic. Scientists continue to measure gender identity as “male” or “female,” despite the fact that there are undoubtedly gradations in inner experience between the girl who loves pink frilly dresses and cannot imagine becoming a boy and the extremely masculine boy who shudders to think of becoming a girl. (p. 50)

Bailey sees particularly in feminine gay men, many of whom were feminine boys, plenty of evidence that gender is not a one-or-the-other proposition.

In *TMWWBQ* as elsewhere, Bailey rejects social influence explanations of gendered behaviors and sexual orientations—i.e., he rejects the idea that upbringing can cause certain boys to act like girls or to turn out gay. For example, he says, “There is no reason to believe that we could alter Danny’s future sexual orientation even if we tried” (p. 20). Later he adds, “Essentialists believe that sexual orientation is an essential part of human nature. I am an essentialist” (p. 126). But Bailey does see a role for culture in our *experiences* of identity. He recognizes that boys and men who are homosexual or otherwise gender atypical can be made extremely miserable if they are prohibited from expressing their homosexuality and femininity (pp. 25–28). He acknowledges that, “In our world very feminine boys must contend with peers who despise sissies, fathers who get squeamish seeing them pick up a doll[...] For the most part, people do not just keep their attitudes to themselves but convey them to the boys” (p. 33).

With this comes an acknowledgment that more boys like Danny might become transsexual given a different cultural milieu:

Imagine that we could create a world in which very feminine boys were not persecuted by other children and

their parents allowed them to play however they wanted[...] As much as I would like to arrange such a world, I think it might well come with the cost of more transsexual adults. Maybe it would be worth it, though. It is conceivable to me that transsexuals who avoided the trauma and shame of social ostracism and parental criticism would be happier and better adjusted than the gay men whose masculinity came at the expense of shame and disappointment. [...] I can imagine that this world would be more humane than ours. (p. 33)

Similarly, Chapter 7, “Is Homosexuality a Recent Invention?”, rejects the idea that sexual orientation is simply socially constructed, but in his examples Bailey also makes clear that he understands that cultural setting strongly influences how one will live out one’s orientation. So he claims, “Transgender homosexuality is probably the most common form of homosexuality found across cultures” (p. 134). He defines this as “occur[ing] when one man takes on a feminine role, often dressing as a woman and taking a woman’s name, and [having] sex with masculine men” (p. 134). He sees this basic phenomenon—ultra-feminine homosexual males—as showing up in part because certain cultures tolerate it, but also because of biological variation that exists consistently throughout the human population: “The cross-cultural regularity of homosexual transsexuals and drag queens is highly suggestive of some fundamental biological influence that transcends culture” (p. 136). Culture constrains and/or amplifies what arises naturally.

Thus, while two common misperceptions are that Bailey rejects any idea of innate transsexuality and that he rejects any idea of culture mattering, in fact he’s placing what is called MTF transsexuality (the desire to change sex from male to female [p. 144]) on a spectrum of biologically induced male sexual variation, a spectrum that in our culture includes the people who are ultimately identified as feminine gay men, transvestites, drag queens, and transsexuals. Who lives out which role depends on the interaction of each individual’s biology, experience, and cultural milieu. This might again, to the novice, sound like a theory most trans people would welcome. But, in fact, it again involves a rejection of the standard feminine essence narrative; that is, it rejects the idea that some people are born “true transsexuals,” profoundly different from all other people in having the true gender identity of one sex in the body of the other. It also means crossdressers (whom Bailey claims are also erotically motivated) are not that different from the non-homosexual transsexuals—“They are all autogynephiles” (p. 164)—an idea really irritating to many transwomen who do not see themselves as autogynephiles and who sometimes see themselves as “true transsexuals” distinguishable from (and much more normal than) crossdressers. So, the fact that he speculates that



autogynephilic transsexuals, like homosexual MTF transsexuals, are essentially born, not made (pp. 169–170), would placate few transwomen who reject the idea that eroticism motivated their SRS or that they are in league with fetishistic crossdressers.

Although he is generally pessimistic about social progress—“Who can really hope to change society?” (p. 28)—Bailey also actively argues (progressively, I think) that there’s nothing really wrong with being a feminine male or a gay man, or, as he thinks is often the case, both. He sees as simple truths—simple truths well supported by scientific research—that gay men are more likely than straight men to enter certain feminine-identified professions and have feminine-identified interests (pp. 63–69), that gay men are more likely than straight men to remember acting or being identified as feminine as children (pp. 62–63), and that gay men are more likely than straight men to walk, stand, and sit more like women (pp. 73–76). He admits “that not all gay men are alike, and not all straight men are alike, and some gay men are very much like straight men (except, by definition, in their sexual orientation)” but he adds that this “does not invalidate the fact that there are some large differences between typical gay men and typical straight men” (p. 64). In Bailey’s view, critics who wrongly call him homophobic for noting these “stereotypes” are themselves just femiphobic—homophobic by virtue of being afraid and intolerant of femininity in men, which he suggests he is not (p. 59).

But Bailey’s tone with regard to transsexuals seems to be notably less tolerant—or at least significantly more uneven. It is not true, as some critics claim, that he denies transwomen their female identities by using the male pronoun to refer to post-transition women; in fact he consistently uses the same convention used by others like Deirdre McCloskey in her autobiography: “he” for pre-transition, “she” for post. Indeed, Bailey uses “she” as soon as a social gender transition happens, even if a woman has not had SRS (see, e.g., Bailey, 2003, pp. 149, 155). Nor, as noted above, does he deny the claim that transsexualism might be inborn; autogynephilic transsexualism like homosexual transsexualism “smells innate” to him (p. 170).

But there seems to be plenty else in the book to offend many transwomen and their allies. First, there is the running theme started in the Preface of the feminine essence narrative being a sometimes-willful lie told to cover up a sexual fetish, namely autogynophilia, and the associated theme that virtually all “non-homosexual transsexuals” are autogynephilic, no matter what they claim about themselves and their histories. Bailey says that autogynephilic transsexuals “sometimes misrepresent themselves as members of the other [type of transsexual. . . T]hey are often silent about their true motivation and instead tell stories about themselves that are misleading and, in important respects, false” (p. 146; cf. p. 173). To further emphasize how deceptive he thinks most non-homosexual (i.e., autogynephilic)

transsexuals are, he praises “Honest and open autogynephilic transsexuals [who] reveal a much different pattern” of gendered history than homosexual transsexuals (p. 147). He quotes transwoman Maxine Petersen, “the ace gender clinician at the Clarke,” as saying “Most gender patients lie” about the erotic components of their feelings and desires so that they can obtain the sex changes they reasonably fear they will otherwise be denied (p. 172). (Bailey implicitly admits this fear is well-founded: “some psychiatrists refuse to recommend for sex reassignment any man who has had even one incident of erotic cross-dressing” [p. 174].) One gets the clear sense from the book that all transsexual narratives are deeply suspect—or just plain false—unless they fit Blanchard’s theory and Bailey’s reading.

Bailey also speaks of transsexuality as being something for which a boy may be “at risk” suggesting it is a relatively bad outcome (see, e.g., pp. 30–31). His logic spins out this way: “[S]ex change surgery is major and permanent, and can have serious side effects. Why put boys at risk for this when they can become gay men happy to be men?” (p. 31). He also points to the possibility that autogynephilic transsexuals “might dedicate their lives to changing their sex to the point of apparent obsession, losing families, friends, and jobs in the process” (p. 144). The implication: best that these “risks” be minimized if possible. I think it is safe to say that few trans adults see their identities as a risk to be avoided, any more that most natal women see their identities this way, even though being a natal woman (like being a transwoman) invariably comes with biological and social challenges.

In parts of the book, Bailey talks more bluntly about transsexuality as if it is a disease, or at least a disorder: “I suspect that both autogynephilic and homosexual gender dysphoria result from early and irreversible developmental processes in the brain. If so, learning more about the origins of transsexualism will not get us much closer to *curing* it” (p. 207; emphasis added). He particularly singles out the non-homosexual transsexuals as having a paraphilia, namely autogynophilia:

Paraphilias comprise a set of unusual sexual preferences that include autogynophilia, masochism, sadism, exhibitionism[...], frotteurism (rubbing oneself against strangers[...]), necrophilia, bestiality, and pedophilia. Because some of these preferences (especially pedophilia) are harmful, I hesitated to link them to autogynophilia, which is not harmful. But there are two reasons to think that these sexual preferences have some causes in common. First, all paraphilias occur exclusively (or nearly exclusively) in men. Second, paraphilias tend to go together. [... A]lthough most autogynephiles are not sexual sadists, they are more likely to be sadists compared with men who are not autogynephilic. (pp. 171–172)

In this way, Bailey's portrayals of transsexuals often do not strike the average reader as flattering, even when he may intend them to be such or to be merely descriptive. He argues that "True acceptance of the transgendered requires that we truly understand who they are" (p. 176), but who he says they truly are seems unlikely to lead to general acceptance.

For instance, how many already-transphobic people would be inclined to be more accepting upon hearing from Bailey about the high rate of sex work, promiscuity, and petty theft among "homosexual transsexuals"? Bailey generalizes, "Most homosexual transsexuals have also learned how to live on the streets. At one time or another many of them have resorted to shoplifting or prostitution or both. This reflects their willingness to forgo conventional routes, especially those that cost extra time or money" (p. 184). He says of Juanita, "her ability to enjoy emotionally meaningless sex appears male-typical. In this sense, homosexual transsexuals might be especially well suited to prostitution" (p. 185). Even when he lists other occupations among transsexual women, the list is limited to fairly low-status professions: they work as "waitresses, hairdressers, receptionists, strippers, and prostitutes, as well as in many other occupations" (p. 142).

Bailey's portrayal of autogynephiles (by his schema, all MTFs except classic homosexual transsexuals) also seems unlikely to cause an outpouring of admiration or acceptance from the rest of the population, especially as he speaks of them (using physician, sex researcher, and transwoman Anne Lawrence's phrase) as "men trapped in men's bodies" (Chap. 9). He himself admits that autogynephilia is so "bizarre to most people" and "differs so much from ordinary experience that it cannot be understood simply" (p. 166). After all, "Autogynephiles are men who have created their image of attractive women in their own bodies, an image that coexists with their original, male selves. The female self is a man-made creation" (p. 168).

*TMWWBQ* includes two vivid portraits of supposed autogynephiles, and it is really not surprising that the two portraits are not the sort many transwomen want to publicly identify with. They both seem sexually strange, and perhaps pathetic. The first is of "Stephanie Braverman," a "50-ish married man" crossdresser (p. 160), who "insists [to Bailey] that the primary benefit of cross-dressing these days is relaxation" (p. 161), a claim Bailey doesn't believe for a second. Given Braverman's history of masturbating while cross-dressed, and given her confessed fantasy that Bailey "would treat her 'like a lady'—take her out to a nice restaurant and then out dancing" (p. 165), Bailey considers her a rather classic autogynephile.

The second supposed autogynephile represented in the book is included "less because she is representative than because she openly and floridly exemplifies the essential features of [...] autogynephilia" (p. 156). This is Bailey's account of Anjelica Kieltyka, identified in the book's account

of her as Cher Mondavi, né Chuck Mondavi. In *TMWWBQ*, details from Kieltyka's history allow Bailey to paint a portrait of the autogynephile as a young man and child—boyish, apt to experience occasional unexpressed wishes to be a girl, and prone to masturbating while crossdressed or while fantasizing about being a woman. Because it illustrates the phenomenon of autogynephilia, Bailey goes into particular detail about "a period in Chuck's life marked by a devotion to cross-dressing that was both obsessive and highly creative" (p. 153). This was the period that included the use of prosthetic breasts, vulvas, wigs, and female masks, and the period that involved the production of the pornographic video Kieltyka showed to Bailey and his many students. Bailey notes that Chuck also

constructed a "robot man" that could fulfill the fantasy of penetration. "Robot man" had a body, a penis made of a dildo, and even an arm that Chuck could manipulate to make it feel as if it was stroking his back. Chuck attached a mirror to his bedroom ceiling, and could view the image of the robot man on top of Chuck, dressed as a woman, "penis" in Chuck's anus. (p. 154)

Bailey goes on to tell of "Cher" being "born in 1991," a year before she got her SRS (p. 155). He relays Cher's insistence "that once Chuck became Cher, the sexual focus was no longer a self-image, but other people" (p. 156). But he doesn't think this claim exempts her from the category of autogynephilic transsexual. (Notably Kieltyka has never said Bailey got any of the details of her life story wrong in the book; her objections have been directed at his labeling of her as autogynephilic and his exclusion of her own understanding of what her history tells about her identity and about transsexuality.)

Bailey's remarks on the appearance of transwomen such as Cher are often germane to his discussion, but they too undoubtedly rubbed a lot of people the wrong way. Take, for example, this: "There is no way to say this as sensitively as I would prefer, so I will just go ahead. Most homosexual transsexuals are much better looking than most autogynephilic transsexuals" (p. 180). Bailey confirms this opinion when he describes his own sexual response (only) to homosexual transsexuals: "It is difficult to avoid viewing Kim from two perspectives: as a researcher but also as a single, heterosexual man" (p. 141). Later we read that, "When [Kim] came to my laboratory, my initial impression was reconfirmed. She was stunning. (Afterwards my avowedly heterosexual male research assistant told me he would gladly have had sex with her, even knowing that Kim still possessed a penis.)" (p. 182). His explanation of the appearance differential between homosexual and autogynephilic transsexuals points partly to homosexual transsexuals being born more feminine and more likely to transition early (i.e., before advanced masculinization), and partly to the sexual orientations that allegedly distinguish them: while homosexual transsexuals want to be able, post-transition, to attract heterosexual men, "The

autogynephile's main romantic target is herself" (p. 183). Thus, the homosexual transsexual who will have trouble passing is less likely to decide to transition than the autogynephilic transsexual who is willing to struggle even post-SRS with passing, since the former needs to pass for sexual gratification while the latter does not.

In keeping with his focus on the erotic motivations for SRS, Bailey's portrayal of individual homosexual transsexual women—including women identified as Terese, Alma, Maria, Kim, and Juanita—focuses on their sexual interests and activities. He sees "in important respects" the "story of all homosexual male-to-female transsexuals" in Terese's story: "Her early, extreme, and effortless femininity, her unambiguous preference for heterosexual men as sex partners, her (however brief) attempt to live as a gay man, and her difficulty in securing the right kind of guy prior to surgery, are almost universal among this type of transsexual" (p. 151). In contrast to his intimation about many autogynephiles, including Braverman, Bailey expresses virtually no skepticism about the stories of homosexual transsexuals, because they tell him stories consistent with his understanding of them. They confirm his presumption that they have male-typical high sex drives, high enough that they follow those sex drives even when it may not be in their apparent best interests. So he tells the story of Juanita who, finding herself bored and undersexed, separates from her husband and apparently idyllic life in the suburbs: "she missed the excitement of living in the city, and of dating new partners. She had also begun to work again as an escort—she had done this before meeting her husband" (p. 210). Bailey takes the opportunity of this story to add, "Nearly all the homosexual transsexuals I know work as escorts after they have their surgery. I used to think that somehow, they had no other choice. [...] I have come to believe that these transsexuals are less constrained by their secret pasts than by their own desires[...] including the desire for sex with different attractive men" (p. 210).

One might assume from this sort of passage that Bailey negatively judges homosexual transsexuals, but in fact he doesn't seem to think there's anything wrong with their choice of sex work, their high sex drives, or their identities. Similarly, though he labels autogynephilia a paraphilia, he is clear that it is "not harmful" in the way some other paraphilias are (p. 171). And while his portrayal of Braverman seems to have a certain tone of exasperation, his portrayal of Kieltyka is overlaid with his appreciation of her talents as an artist and her struggles as an unconventional person:

I think about what an unusual life she has led, and what an unusual person she is. How difficult it must have been for her to figure out her sexuality and what she wanted to do with it. I think about all the barriers she broke, and all the meanness that she must still contend with. Despite this, she is still out there giving her friends advice and

comfort, and trying to find love. And I think that in her own way, Cher is a star. (p. 212)

In this way, Bailey's portrayals of transwomen seem quite mixed in tone.

But there is one very interesting and important way in which Bailey *is* consistent in his consideration of transwomen: If one reads *TMWWBQ* without presupposition, it's clear that Bailey measures long-term "success" for transwomen specifically in terms of whether or not *they are happy*. He leaves no doubt that individual transwomen's happiness is what researchers and clinicians (and presumably the rest of us) should care about: "Surely the most relevant data [on SRS] are transsexuals' own feelings before and after transitioning. Are they glad they did it? By now, hundreds of transsexuals have been followed after changing sex, and the results are clear. Successful outcomes are much more common than unsuccessful outcomes" (p. 207). The way Bailey tells the stories of individual women only confirms this. For example, he relays that "Terese has blossomed since her surgery. [...] Depressed and in self-imposed isolation when I first saw her, she is flirtatious, energetic, and socially busy now" (p. 150). The story of Cher (Kieltyka) comes out basically the same way: "for the most part Cher has been happier than Chuck was. She is more outgoing and feels that she lives a real life now, instead of a fantasy life. Despite her negative experiences with her family, many other people have accepted her" (p. 155).

Similarly, when he talks about how a different cultural milieu might lead more Dannys to become women, Bailey names as a "more humane [world] than ours" that which leaves more people "happier and better adjusted" (p. 33). When he talks about treatment options for boys with GID who come to Toronto psychologist Ken Zucker's clinic, he imagines a randomized control trial that would "see if those Zucker treats are less likely to become transsexual. Or see if the boys Zucker treats are happier in some other way" (p. 34). Thus, while he acknowledges that being transsexual might interfere with happiness—given the costs and risks of transition—he also entertains the possibility that outcome studies will show SRS (and thus fully realized transsexualism) provides the greatest chance at happiness for some people. Happiness for the individual transwoman is the goal, *even if it means her family suffers* from her transition: "I do not think that this real suffering [on the part of family members] should be used to discourage transsexuals from sex reassignment" (p. 209).

Bailey's rejection of the feminine essence narrative has led a number of readers (and non-readers) to incorrectly assume that he has also rejected SRS. In particular, many I talked to assumed that, like psychiatrist Paul McHugh of Johns Hopkins University, Bailey thinks that having autogynephilia (considered a sexual disorder) should eliminate one from SRS candidacy. But, in fact, for autogynephilic as for homosexual

transsexuals, Bailey believes that, if the subjects will be happier with SRS, they should seek and obtain it. Indeed, he takes McHugh to task for forcing transsexuals to continue suffering by denying them SRS. “Given our present state of knowledge, saying that we should focus on removing transsexuals’ desire to change sex is equivalent to saying that it is better that they should suffer permanently from gender dysphoria than that they obtain sex reassignment surgery” (p. 207).

As I believe I have shown here, this book isn’t simply pro- or anti-gay or pro- or anti-trans. It isn’t simply socially constructivist or biologically determinist. It’s significantly more complicated than it at first appears, and much more complicated than its cover and title would lead one to believe. Most importantly for this discussion, *TMWWBQ* is not the book many people assumed it to be—particularly after the phenomenal backlash it received—nor is it the book many still claim it to be. But it is the book—real and imagined—that served as a flashpoint for the criticism and retaliation detailed in the next section of this history.

#### Part 4: The Backlash

It is clear from the historical record that many people reacted negatively to *TMWWBQ* before (or whether) they had even read it and, in her initial email about the book to Andrea James, Lynn Conway revealed that to have been the case with her, too. Conway—who would essentially become the architect-in-chief of the backlash—first sounded the alarm about *TMWWBQ* to James on April 10, 2003:

I just got an alert about J. Michael Bailey’s new book. It’s just been published and of all places it’s co-published by the National Academies Press, which gives it the apparent stamp of authority as “science” [...] As you may know, Bailey is the psychologist who promotes the “two-type” theory of transsexualism [...] Anyways—not that there is much we can do about this—but we should probably read his book sometime and be prepared to shoot down as best we can his weird characterizations of us all. (Conway, 2004a)

Why were people such as Conway so sure Bailey’s book spelled trouble? Surely, the cover and the title had something to do with it, as did their longstanding rejection of Blanchard’s theory. The fact that the book was a popularization directed at the masses—and not an obscure journal article—and that it had the imprimatur of the National Academy of Sciences reasonably added to the sense that it could have a substantial impact on how people would think about MTF transsexuals. In that initial email alert to James, Conway guessed, “Sadly, his book will probably become popular with people who ‘want to understand us’, and will seem sort of ‘empathetic’ towards us,

but if it is at all like his past writings, it will treat us all as rather pathetic objects of study—and of course he calls us all ‘transsexual men [sic]’” (Conway, 2004a).

In addition to all these concerns, I think it must also be the case that the extraordinarily strong reaction to *TMWWBQ* had something to do with trans activists’ knowledge of the long history of oppression against trans people—a history that has included criminalization, involuntary committal to mental institutions (as McCloskey learned firsthand [McCloskey, 1999]), denial of basic rights, active discrimination in housing and employment (as Conway learned firsthand [Hiltzik, 2000]), relentless harassment, mockery, and, not so infrequently, brutal assault and murder. And not just the murder of trans people themselves, but of their loved ones, too; the boyfriend of Andrea James’s close professional collaborator, Calpernia Addams, was murdered when his fellow soldiers found out his girlfriend was transsexual (France, 2000). My own experience suggests that there isn’t a single trans person who, when asked, can’t immediately recall instances of being concerned for her or his personal safety, job, lover, or family. Add to this the sense among many trans people that they have had their identities unnecessarily medicalized and pathologized, and the sense among many trans activists that they have been denied sympathy from and alliance with other queer rights leaders and feminists. (It’s not uncommon to hear trans critics of Bailey’s book liken it to Janice Raymond’s *The Transsexual Empire*, a book which accused transsexuals of undermining women’s rights and actively harming women with their supposed naive adherence to sexist ideas about what it means to be a woman [Raymond, 1979].) Given all this, it is not too surprising that people such as Conway would have been—as her early emails suggest—on high alert for possible new threats.

Yet, even with an understanding of this backdrop, it can be hard to fathom how the backlash against Bailey’s book could have reached the proportions it did. Several people have remarked to me that the controversy over *TMWWBQ* ultimately amounted to “a tempest in a teapot,” but if that is the case, the teapot Bailey’s detractors constructed grew to the size of a battleship.

There is a remarkable graphic on Andrea James’s “tsroadmap” Website that evidences this. Let me say, before I describe this graphic, that I don’t think this computer-generated image shows what James thinks it shows. She apparently thinks it proves the horrific scope of Bailey’s supposedly anti-trans claims and eugenical desires as revealed through the intensive “investigation” into Bailey that James and Conway co-led. I think the image reveals the depth and breadth the backlash against Bailey’s book took on. Entitled “J. Michael Bailey Connections,” the graphic in question purports to be “a diagram explaining the connections of all of the people in the Bailey–Blanchard–Lawrence investigation”—Bailey, Blanchard, and physician-researcher Anne Lawrence having been

lumped together, by this point, by Conway and James as a single, uniformly dangerous beast for their active support of Blanchard's taxonomy. In the diagram, a stark black background dramatically offsets an elaborate blossom of colored bubbles, each showing some institution or field of inquiry that James apparently believes to be associated (mostly nefariously) with Bailey and his alleged anti-LGBT scheme. The bubbles are color-coded, and a key to the coding is helpfully provided: cyan is used to indicate theories and fields; purple is for universities (no doubt as a tribute to Northwestern University, whose school color is purple and who is the worst of all offenders, judging by the size of its bubble); gold is for government entities; and red is for "sexology trade group[s]." The last category includes the International Academy of Sex Research (IASR), the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality (SSSS), and the HBIQDA, a group now known as the World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH). Names of individuals appear superimposed on their institutions' bubbles, and the names of all individuals and organizations are awarded font size commensurate with their importance in James's scheme. Thus, Bailey's and Kieltyka's names appear in a larger font, while, for example, the names of Eli Coleman and Walter Bockting (sex researchers at the University of Minnesota) appear in a smaller font (James, n.d.-a).

The central contention of this diagram is that "Bailey's theories and work as a pop psychologist are heavily informed by a combination of eugenics and sexology, put to work shaping public perception and policy of our community" (James, n.d.-a). The picture is thus presumably meant to capture how overwhelming and socially credentialed the forces against transwomen's rights seemed to be—how much the cards were stacked in Bailey's favor. Groups seemingly indicted by association with Bailey include the Kinsey Institute, the "National Academies of Science [sic]," and the "National Institute [sic] of Health." The fields of abnormal psychology, criminology, and evolutionary psychology are also called to task, as are a number of prominent sexologists, including, confusingly, several who have publicly criticized Bailey's book. The chart even features a few far-flung scholars who have told me they have no idea how they ended up in this picture. (I have explained to them the reasoning where I have understood it.) Looking at this graphic, I can see why in 2005—after 2 years of seemingly endless personal attacks, extreme accusations, and investigations—some of Bailey's sexology friends took to wearing t-shirts reproducing the graphic, as a sort of sympathetic joke. And I admit that, when Bailey showed me one of the t-shirts, seeing the graphic for the first time I assumed it to be a satire made up by an ally to cheer him up. I had no idea the graphic was real—that it was made by James herself and was meant to be serious.

The basic story of the florid explosion that is depicted by James and that I'm going to try to unpack goes like this:

Starting in April 2003, Conway and James spearheaded what they saw as a counterattack on Bailey's book. (I say "what they saw as a counterattack," because, although he understood his book would offend some people, Bailey never considered his book an attack [Bailey, 2006a].) Conway, James, and a group of allies used the power of the Internet and the press to try to undermine Bailey's professional reputation, undo any positive praise his book received, and make Bailey as personally miserable as possible. As they felt he had attacked them in the spaces of their public and intimate lives, they would try to do the same to him. Fairly early in the process, Anjelica Kieltyka (identified as "Cher" in *TMWWBQ*) joined forces with Conway and James. James—and Conway to a lesser extent—tended to take an "if you're not with us, you're against us" approach to their work. Thus, anyone who seemed to be on Bailey's side or refused to fully turn risked being labeled as part of the problem. This meant that even those who did not want to get involved often found it impossible not to be.

As I've learned from many hours of conversations with Anjelica Kieltyka, within a few months of the start of the backlash, the relationship between Kieltyka and the leaders of the "investigation" (including, by then, Conway, James, and Deirdre McCloskey) became strained. Kieltyka seems to have grown tired of Conway's and James's implicit message that she was to blame for a lot of Bailey's "abuse" of transwomen in Chicago because she had introduced him to those women and encouraged their interactions. As time wore on, Kieltyka also became personally adept at doing her own Internet searches. As a result of all this, Kieltyka increasingly became convinced that the real problem was much larger than Bailey's treatment of transsexuals—and thus, much larger than anything she might have enabled (Kieltyka, 2006a, 2006b; see also p.e.c. from Kieltyka to approximately 150 people, subject line "What's Wrong With This Picture—Scowcroft—Zeder—Conway???", September 2, 2005). Using clues she picked up from Bailey's other work—including an article he co-authored explaining how parental selection against offspring carrying a (theoretic) "gay gene" would not be inherently unethical (Greenberg & Bailey, 2001)—Kieltyka became convinced that Bailey was part of a much larger, right-wing, international effort to alienate and even "screen gays out of existence" using emerging biotechnologies, including gesture-recognition software and genetic engineering. She recalls, "I began to see that there was collusion," and that, while Bailey's treatment of transsexuals was very important, "the gay issue was more important" (Kieltyka, 2006a).

James's graphic from October 2003 thus appears to make reference both to the "if you're not clearly with us, you're against us" general mentality of the perceived counterattack as well as Kieltyka's emerging conspiracy theory about Bailey and an international, anti-gay, biotech program. Conway, James, and McCloskey apparently remained relatively cool

to Kieltyka's expansive theory; "they were surprisingly unimpressed" according to Kieltyka, and "it puzzled me but it did not discourage me" (Kieltyka, 2006a). She pressed on, although, to Kieltyka's dismay, Conway continued to resist pursuing and publicizing it. Eventually, this led Kieltyka to investigate Conway herself, and to become convinced Conway might actually be part and parcel of the international anti-gay program through her computer work; Kieltyka intimates Conway has developed technologies—including gesture-recognition software—that would support and thus profit from it (Kieltyka, 2006a; see also e-mail from Kieltyka to approximately 150 people, subject line "What's Wrong With This Picture—Scowcroft—Zeder—Conway???", September 2, 2005). Indeed, she believes there is "some possibility that Bailey was using this technology" in his "gaydar" research work "developed for Bailey by Conway and [Conway's former student Charles] Cohen" (Kieltyka, 2006a). What she found "finally made [her] think that [Conway] had a major conflict of interest and she was misdirecting this whole ad hoc trans investigation" into Bailey and his book (Kieltyka, 2006a). Kieltyka told me that nowadays she believes Bailey was just the "fall guy" in the scheme, a scheme in which Conway ranks much higher (Kieltyka, 2006a). The fact that Conway now refuses to speak to Kieltyka—and indeed recently accused Kieltyka of stalking her—only solidifies Kieltyka's sense that Conway is part of something she doesn't want Kieltyka and others to know about (Kieltyka, 2006a). But Kieltyka has pursued her inquiry, in spite of fear. She even called Cohen, Conway's former student and collaborator, to ask him about the gesture-recognition software; when Conway found out about this, she accused Kieltyka of trying to "out" her to her former student (Kieltyka, 2006a). (It's hard to imagine how Conway thinks she isn't "out," given that her university-based Website prominently features her cross-sex biography.) All this might sound crazy, petty, or amusing to some, but such a reading would minimize the actual damage done to people in the whole *TMWWBQ* affair.

So how did the backlash start? Within a couple of days of her first alert to James on April 10, 2003 (quoted above), Conway read the book, and found herself as appalled as she had expected (Conway, 2004a). She immediately understood the text as especially dangerous because it was fully cloaked in the social power of science and academia. Thus, within just a few more days, Conway called to arms as many allies as she could, insisting

this book is the equivalent for the entire transgender community of a Ku Klux Klan [sic] smearing of the entire black community by painting their entire lives and identities as nothing more than the obsessive pursuit of bizarre sex. Imagine what would have happened if the Academy had published a book such as this about African Americans. Their gates would be stormed and

the institution would fall. So how can they get away with doing this to us? They can't, unless we let them get away with it! (April 18, 2003, p.e.c. of Lynn Conway to Christine Burns, Joan Roughgarden, Sarah Weston, Emily Hobbie, Gwendolyn Ann Smith, Donna Rose, Susan Stryker, Jenny Boylan, Jamison Green, Stephen Whittle, and Shannon Minter; available at Conway, 2004a)

Conway officially opened an "investigation" into Bailey and his book and, along with Andrea James, started devoting a substantial amount of energy and Web presence to doing what they could to undermine Bailey and *TMWWBQ*. (I put "investigation" in quotation marks throughout this essay because, as I show, it quickly moved from an inquiry to something much more proactive.) A number of prominent trans scholars and activists immediately agreed with Conway that Bailey's book was serious trouble, and Conway rapidly posted many of their negative reactions (or links to them) on her University of Michigan site. Becky Allison, M.D., Joan Roughgarden, Ph.D., Ben Barres, M.D., Ph.D., Christine Beatty, and Christine Burns all provided expressions of disgust and dismay (see Conway, 2003a). Through fortunate timing, Roughgarden was able to attend a lecture by Bailey at her own university, Stanford, on April 23, 2003, and write a scathing review of it for the school newspaper (Roughgarden, 2003). The backlash against the book had thus begun in force.

Notably, not everyone in the LBGT world found *TMWWBQ* to be the moral and political equivalent of the pro-Ku Klux Klan film-fantasy "Birth of a Nation." After all, one of the blurbs on the book jacket came from Simon LeVay, a prominent gay scientist, and another from Anne Lawrence, a transwoman and physician (who subscribes to Blanchard's taxonomy and identifies herself as an autogynephilic woman). A reviewer for *Lavender Magazine* called the book "a highly readable and well-researched book. [...] Detailed, but never dry. A fascinating book" (Boatner, 2003) and a writer for *Out Magazine* declared the book "recommended reading for anyone interested in the study of gender identity and sexual orientation" (Osborne, 2003). In a review published by the Society for the Psychological Study of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Issues—a division of the American Psychological Association—James Cantor, an openly gay sex researcher who works with Blanchard, opined that "Bailey sympathetically portrays these peoples' experiences[...] Bailey's respect for the people he describes serves as a role model for others who still struggle to accept and appreciate homosexuality and transsexuality in society" (Cantor, 2003; see also Velasquez, 2004).

Certainly not all LBGT reviewers praised the book; perhaps revealing the continued fractured politics between the "G" and the "T" communities, trans reviewers were much more likely than gay reviewers to criticize the book. Jamison Green (a transman) and Deirdre McCloskey (a transwoman)

both panned it (Green, 2003; McCloskey, 2003a). Nevertheless, while the condemnation from Conway and those who joined her would come to suggest a unilateral denouncement of the book by all parties on the LBGT front, the reviews suggest otherwise. Positive reviews by queer people seem only to have made Conway and James angrier. Indeed, James was annoyed enough that she sought out writers of positive reviews and asked them to explain themselves, publishing their responses on her Website (see, e.g., James, 2003b).

Now, it's clear throughout the record of the backlash against *TMWWBQ* that what Conway, James, McCloskey, Burns, and other involved transwomen leaders detested and rejected most about Bailey's book was the idea of autogynephilia. After all, in Bailey's presentation of Blanchard's scheme, women such as they might be labeled autogynephilic—individuals with paraphilias whose cross-sex identification was not about gender but eroticism. Yet, I think it is worth noting that historically not all of these transwomen leaders had always rejected every shred of what might reasonably be classified as autogynephilia the way they would come to do post-*TMWWBQ*. McCloskey strongly denies that “autogynephilia” applies to her (and indeed recently informed my Provost she would sue me and my university if I dared to diagnose her with it [McCloskey to Dreger, two p.e.c.'s, copies to Lawrence Dumas, February 4, 2007]). But Bailey has pointed out that she does discuss in her autobiography a pre-transition arousability to the idea of becoming or being the other sex (Bailey, 2003, pp. 217–218; see also Rodkin, 2003), an admission that is hard to imagine her offering post-*TMWWBQ*. McCloskey is speaking here of Donald, her pre-transition self, in the third person:

When in 1994 he ran across *A Life in High Heels*, an autobiography by Holly Woodlawn, one of Andy Warhol's group, the parts he read and reread and was sexually aroused by were about Woodlawn's living successfully for months at a time as a woman, not her campiness when presenting as a gay genetic man in a dress. Donald's preoccupation with gender crossing showed up in an ugly fact about the pornographic magazines he used. There are two kind of crossdressing magazines, those that portray the men in dresses with private parts showing and those that portray them hidden. He could never get aroused by the ones with private parts showing. His fantasy was of complete transformation, not a peek-a-boo, leering masculinity. He wanted what he wanted. (McCloskey, 1999, pp. 18–19; for McCloskey's response to Bailey's reading of this, see Rodkin, 2003 and McCloskey, 2003b)

Anne Lawrence also recalls that, before the blow-up over *TMWWBQ*, one of the other transwomen who would become part of Conway's expanded “investigation” team admitted to Lawrence that the way she finally achieved orgasm after SRS

was to fantasize about forced feminization (Lawrence to Dreger, p.e.c., Nov. 28, 2006; see also Lawrence, 1998). And still a third member of the “investigation” team apparently for years had accepted the label of autogynephilia for herself and others. This was none other than Andrea James.

The evidence for this is unmistakable. In 1998, James had written to Anne Lawrence to congratulate her on her latest paper on autogynephilia and to talk about her own first- and second-hand experiences with autogynephilia. And it wasn't for lack of understanding the theory of autogynephilia that James wrote so favorably of it in 1998. I quote from that message at some length here, because I think it is important to see how radically James's attitude changed towards Blanchard, Lawrence, and autogynephilia from 1998 to the time in 2003 when she teamed up with Conway to devote enormous resources to discrediting Bailey, Blanchard, and Lawrence, and anyone else who spoke favorably of autogynephilia as an explanation.

In the email in question, dated November 9, 1998, James wrote to Lawrence with the subject line “Excellent paper!” to say:

I just read your autogynephilia paper [“Men trapped in men's bodies: An introduction to the concept of autogynephilia” (Lawrence, 1998)] and found it to be excellent, as expected. I'm sure you've gotten quite an array of responses, since TSs [i.e., transsexuals] are extremely reluctant to be categorized and defined by others. A definition is inherently inclusive or exclusive, and there's always going to be someone who doesn't feel they belong in or out of a definition. I got body slammed by the usual suspects in 1996 for recommending a Blanchard book. Sure, he's pretty much the Antichrist to the surgery-on-demand folks, and I've heard some horror stories about the institute he runs that justify the nickname “Jurassic Clarke.” However, I found many of his observations to be quite valid, even brilliant, especially in distinguishing early- and late-transitioning TS patterns of thought and behavior. I don't buy into all of Freud, either, but that certainly doesn't invalidate his many brilliant insights.

James went on to tell Lawrence that, “Now that I have received a lot of letters from TSs, I have found that your paper backs up my own experiences.” She gave some specific examples from MTFs she had known before moving on to talk about herself:

I have noticed in most TSs, and in “surgery addicts” especially, a certain sort of self-loathing, a drive to efface every shred of masculinity. *While I readily admit to my own autogynephilia*, I would contend that my drives towards feminization seem to have a component pushing me from the opposite direction as well [i.e., away from masculinity]. Now, if you think you've

caught a lot of shit about autogynephilia, just imagine what would happen if I used “TS” and “self-loathing” in the same sentence! Nonetheless, I see my own transsexual feelings paralleled in the words of people with other body dysphorias. (Andrea James to Anne Lawrence, p.e.c., November 9, 1998; emphasis added)

James signed the message to Lawrence “Take care, Andrea.”

How radically James’s attitudes towards Blanchard, Lawrence, and autogynephilia had shifted from the time of this 1998 communication to the time in 2003 when Conway called James to her side to vigorously deny Bailey’s claim that women such as them are autogynephilic. My point here is not to argue whether James, Conway, or anyone else is “autogynephilic,” but rather to note that the backlash against *TMWWBQ* became something of a purge where autogynephilia was concerned. Sharp “us versus them” division lines were drawn by Conway, James, McCloskey, and their compatriots, seemingly negating any possibility of productive dialogue about the claims made in the book with regard to possible erotic components of transsexuality.

In keeping with Conway’s simplistic “good versus evil” account of the book and backlash—wherein all true transwomen are non- and anti-autogynephilic (i.e., good) and all pro-autogynephilia researchers are anti-trans (i.e., evil)—Conway’s master “Timeline of the unfolding events in the Bailey investigation” asserts that, as soon as Anjelica Kieltyka received and read a copy of Bailey’s book, on May 3, 2003, Kieltyka “realize[d] he’[d] defamed and outed her” (Conway, 2006a). It is certainly true that, where “Cher’s” identity was concerned, Bailey left a trail of clues quite easy for a close-knit, Internet-savvy community of transwomen to uncover. (I discuss this further in Part 5.) But Kieltyka’s reaction to the book and to the immediate flare-up was more sanguine than Conway represents. Conway’s account has Kieltyka on May 3, 2003, totally distraught over Bailey’s behavior as soon as she saw the book:

Anjelica was shattered. She now realized that Prof. Bailey had intended all along to publish that old version of her story and to use her as his centerpiece “poster child for autogynephilia”. He had merely been humoring her for the past 3 years with “intellectual discussions”, keeping her thinking that he was open to new ideas and open to making revisions in her story.

The very next day, according to Conway,

Anjelica frantically began web searches to learn about the controversy now swirling around the book. She quickly learned that she was being defamed in the transgender community as the “poster child for autogynephilia”, and that Prof. Bailey’s caricature of her in the book was being used to defame other transwomen as

being “autogynephiles like Cher”. During her frantic searches, Anjelica came across Andrea James’ and Lynn Conway’s websites. She quickly realized that these sites were the key ones that were coordinating the trans community’s responses to the Bailey book controversy. She immediately e-mailed Andrea and Lynn, pleading for their help in clearing her name. (Conway, 2004b)

Thus, it would appear from Conway’s account as though Kieltyka immediately turned away from Bailey to look to Conway and James as her possible saviors. But Kieltyka’s memory and the historical record suggest otherwise. Certainly, Kieltyka now feels Bailey “did a bait and switch” on her by telling her for years after she saw his first draft that he remained open to her counterarguments, when, in fact, he never seriously doubted Blanchard’s theory or her status as an autogynephile (Kieltyka, 2006f). Kieltyka has told me, “He respected me like the colonist respects the native—he used me. There’s no two ways about it” (Kieltyka, 2006d). But Kieltyka didn’t contact Conway and James because she immediately hated Bailey for what she read in his book and was looking to jump to their side. Rather, she remembers:

AJ [Andrea James] and the rest of them wanted to lynch me, as they did Joan Linsenmeier [a colleague who helped Bailey with the manuscript] and anyone else connected with the book. They were about to hang me. I was told this by people that had frequented the Internet, and that’s why they gave me the link to contact Andrea James and Lynn Conway, because I was going to be hanged by them. (Kieltyka, 2006f)

So it’s true that Kieltyka was trying to save herself, but not at that point by simply rejecting Bailey and teaming up with Conway and James. In fact, in what could only be called a friendly email from Kieltyka to Bailey dated May 16, 2003—nearly *two weeks after* Kieltyka first read the published book and contacted Conway—Kieltyka spoke warily to Bailey of the likes of Conway. In the email, headed by the joking subject line “Cher’s Guide to Auto...Repair,” Kieltyka wrote to Bailey:

Dear Mike, Thanks for the Cantor Review [i.e., Cantor, 2003]....I followed up on the links to your difficulties with some hysterical women [an apparent reference to Conway and James] [...] when you wrote.... “I understand that Roughgarden is slated to review my book for Nature Medicine, and I am certain that this review will be as fair and accurate as her review of my Stanford talk”....I really appreciated the sarcasm.....just wear a bike [i.e., athletic] support to your next book signing or lecture....you can borrow mine, I don’t use it nor need it anymore.... Your friend, in spite of spite, Anjelica, aka Cher (Kieltyka to Bailey, p.e.c., May 16, 2003; ellipses in original unless in brackets)



Kieltyka added a postscript saying she was enclosing “two recent pictures of me in maskon mode”—i.e., she supplied Bailey two *more* photos of herself crossdressed pre-transition—and she added, “see maskon.com for some missing trans links.” Nearly a month later, Kieltyka wrote to Bailey’s Northwestern psychology colleague Joan Linsenmeier (who was starting to get caught in the backlash) to say “We have both been caught between larger egos with agendas and motivations and axes to grind, (and swing)... And yet, I have been able to keep my head, while all about are losing theirs and blaming it on Bailey, you, and me” (Kieltyka to Linsenmeier, p.e.c., June 13, 2006; ellipses in original). This hardly sounds like a woman who, right after reading the book in early May, considered herself simply wronged by Bailey and looking to fall into the arms of fellow transwomen who would join her in roundly denouncing Bailey and autogynephilia.

Nor did the women identified as “homosexual transsexuals” in Bailey’s book immediately react with disgust and dismay over the book. Indeed, regarding this, Conway’s timeline—an enormous, fully hotlinked spreadsheet that makes James’s “Connections to J. Michael Bailey” graphic look like a quick afterthought—leaves out entirely what I would consider one historically key event in May 2003. Shortly after the book came out, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* apparently decided to have its staff writer, Robin Wilson, compose a feature story on Bailey and his book (Wilson, 2003a). For the story, Wilson traveled to Evanston and Chicago, and on May 22, 2003, Bailey took Wilson out to the Circuit nightclub, along with Kieltyka and several of the women who appeared as “homosexual transsexuals” in Bailey’s book, including Juanita.

No question Kieltyka comes across in Wilson’s article as unhappy with Bailey’s book: “Ms. Kieltyka says the professor twisted her story to suit his theory. ‘I was a male with a sexual-identity disorder,’ not someone who is living out a sexual fantasy, she says” (Wilson, 2003a). But the other transwomen who went out to help promote Bailey and his book appeared downright supportive, judging both by Bailey’s recollection and Wilson’s account (Bailey, 2006a; Wilson, 2003a). Indeed, Wilson opined “they count Mr. Bailey as their savior.” She goes on:

As a psychologist, he has written letters they needed to get sex-reassignment surgery, and he has paid attention to them in ways most people don’t. “Not too many people talk about this, but he’s bringing it into the light,” says Veronica, a 31-year-old transsexual woman from Ecuador who just got married and doesn’t want her last name used. (Wilson, 2003a)

But if these women were, compared to Conway’s rather selective account, relatively slow to turn against Bailey, turn four of them did. Just about two months after the gathering at the Circuit, about one month after Wilson’s gossipy “Dr. Sex”

feature story on Bailey, Wilson would write a sober news article for the *Chronicle* entitled “Transsexual ‘Subjects’ Complain about Professor’s Research Methods” (Wilson, 2003b). Five months later, this would be followed up by another sober dispatch, “Northwestern U. Psychologist Accused of Having Sex with Research Subject,” that “subject” being Juanita (Wilson, 2003c).

So, given that Kieltyka did not immediately turn against Bailey once she saw the book (though there’s no question she was frustrated and disappointed with being called autogynephilic), given that the other transwomen were helping Bailey promote the book even after its publication, given that Wilson reported they saw him as “their savior” even at that point, what happened to turn these women’s warm feelings for Bailey into charges of scientific misconduct? Given the evidence, the answer is unequivocal: Lynn Conway’s and Deirdre McCloskey’s intervention.

According to Conway’s timeline, in early June 2003, Conway began taking “field trips” (Conway 2003b) to Chicago “to meet and begin interviewing Bailey’s research subjects” (Conway, 2006a). Kieltyka remembers these visits vividly, and recalls that, early in the process, McCloskey and Conway informed Kieltyka and her friends that, if they had not given informed consent to Bailey to research and write about them, it didn’t matter whether Kieltyka and friends wanted to file charges against him; McCloskey and Conway would do so (Kieltyka, 2006c). As it turns out, Kieltyka, Juanita, and two other women *did* decide to file complaints with Northwestern University. (That didn’t stop McCloskey and Conway from also doing so.) The sophisticated writing style and language of the formal charges compared to that of Kieltyka’s other writings and Juanita’s autobiography as it appears on Conway’s site suggests that Kieltyka, Juanita, and the two other complainants had help writing their letters to Northwestern. So I asked McCloskey what her role was in preparing the formal complaints made by the four women who claimed they were Bailey’s research subjects, and she replied “I helped write the letter some. I knew one of the women” (McCloskey to Dreger, p.e.c., January 22, 2007). She declined to elaborate (p.e.c., February 4, 2007).

Anjelica Kieltyka took the lead on the filings. On July 3, 2003, she submitted a letter to C. Bradley Moore, Vice President for Research of Northwestern, stating “I was a participant in a research study without being informed of that status. [...] I was unaware that I [or the women Kieltyka introduced to Bailey] were subjects of a research study, and I did not receive, nor was I asked to sign, an informed consent document” (Kieltyka to Moore, July 3, 2003; available at Kieltyka, 2003b). On July 14, 2003, a woman identified on Conway’s site as “Victoria” also filed a formal complaint that “I have been a participant in a research study conducted by Dr. Bailey without my knowledge and without my approval” (available at Conway, 2003c), although her story did not appear in

*TMWWBQ*. On July 23, Juanita filed a similar complaint (available at Conway, 2003d) and also filed a “sealed” complaint claiming that “On March 22, 1998, Northwestern University Professor J. Michael Bailey had sexual relations with me. I was one of his research subjects at that time” (available at Conway, 2003e). On July 29, McCloskey and Conway filed their own complaint, charging Bailey with “grossly violat[ing] the standards of science by conducting intimate research observations on human subjects without telling them that they were objects of study” (McCloskey & Conway, 2003). And on July 30 came a complaint from a transwoman who felt she had been similarly “researched” by Bailey and that Bailey had ignored evidence from her history that not all transwomen fit Blanchard’s scheme (available at Conway, 2003f).

Northwestern University first appointed a Provost-level inquiry committee to examine the charges against Bailey. Then, in November 2003, the university announced that the inquiry committee had found cause to continue the investigation, and so a Provost-level investigation committee was formed (C. Bradley Moore to Alice Dreger, p.e.c., August 1, 2006). Bailey bitterly remembers that the first he heard of Northwestern’s decision to move to a full investigation was from a reporter for the *Chicago Tribune*. He adds, “Obviously Northwestern told the complainants [...] and it was on the web probably before I knew about it. [...] I think Northwestern didn’t know what kind of people they were dealing with” (Bailey, 2006b).

Why did Kieltyka, Juanita, and the two other transwomen familiar with Bailey but not mentioned in the book decide to charge Bailey after years of good relations with him? Motivation is one of the most difficult things to document in historical scholarship, but I think it is fair to speculate that a number of factors may have been in play here. First, Conway, McCloskey, and perhaps also James seem to have convinced Kieltyka that she had—however unintentionally—hurt transwomen by helping Bailey “recruit” transwomen as “subjects” for his book (Kieltyka, 2006b). A letter from Kieltyka, Conway, James, and Calpernia Addams to the faculty of Bailey’s department in January 2004, speaks to the degree to which they saw themselves as the protectors of other, more vulnerable transwomen:

We are socially assimilated trans women who are mentors to many young transsexuals in transition. Unable to bear children of our own, the girls we mentor become like children to us. These young women depend on us for guidance during the difficult period of transition and then on during their adventures afterwards—dating, careers, marriages, and sometimes the adoption of their own children. As a result, we have large extended families and are blessed by these relationships. Through our ex-

tended families we know first-hand how Bailey’s junk science is hurting young trans women. [...] You may have wondered why hundreds of successful, assimilated trans women like us, women from all across the country, are being so persistent in investigating Mr. Bailey and in uncovering and reporting his misdeeds. Now you have your answer: We are hundreds of loving moms whose children he is tormenting! (Kieltyka, Conway, James, and Addams, to the Faculty members of the Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, January 7, 2004)

I don’t think there can be any doubt Kieltyka saw herself in that caring, protective role, and in charging Bailey, she must have wanted to get out of the position of being represented as the opposite—a sort of merciless pimp who turned over vulnerable transwomen to Bailey in exchange for chances to perform before his classes (Kieltyka, 2006a).

It also seems fairly clear that Kieltyka (if not the others) must have feared what might happen if she didn’t cooperate with Conway and the other “investigators.” After all, Kieltyka distinctly remembers initially contacting them specifically because they were “about to hang” her (Kieltyka, 2006f).

Recall too that, even before Conway’s “field trips,” Kieltyka had already been upset with Bailey’s portrayal of her as the poster-child for autogynephilia; the fact that many other transwomen read “Cher’s” story so negatively no doubt fueled Kieltyka’s sense of hurt. Indeed, Bailey’s continued use of Kieltyka as an example of autogynephilia—for example, at a lecture at UCLA on June 2, 2003 (see Conway, 2004b)—certainly added to her growing anger. Kieltyka now seems to hold nothing but contempt for Bailey and is convinced he was intentionally duping her all along; this again suggests she came to agree with Bailey’s other detractors’ assessment that Bailey had made a fool of her. Kieltyka recalls Juanita feeling similarly wounded because Bailey wrote about Juanita’s wedding with a snickering tone and included in the book “his opinion she got a divorce because she was too used to having sex with men and prostitution is well suited for her and the others” (Kieltyka, 2006f).

My conversations with Kieltyka also suggest that she and the other women who charged Bailey found a certain relief—perhaps even pleasure—in going from the powerless position of represented subject to the powerful position of active accuser. Through her Website, Conway in particular gave them a place to reconstruct themselves and their histories with Bailey. Thus, instead of appearing as Bailey’s collaborators in their annual presentations to his Human Sexuality class, they came to call themselves his victims. Juanita’s complaint of July 23, 2003 declared it “most disturbing and humiliating to find out that we were all misled by Dr. Bailey and misused [...] as part of his ‘Freak Show’ Demonstration of ‘Homosexual’

and ‘Autogynophilic’ [sic] Transsexuals” (see Conway, 2003d). (An odd claim, given that Juanita knew perfectly well that in 1999 Bailey had identified her as a “homosexual transsexual” in the newspaper article with which she fully cooperated [Gibson, 1999].)

Finally, although Kieltyka told me that the only money she received from Conway was to reimburse her for phone calls made as part of their collaboration, Kieltyka speculated to me that, in Juanita’s case, monetary reward for her aid to Conway’s “investigation”—including her sexual relations charge against Bailey—may have been substantially higher. Kieltyka adds “[Juanita] denied it, so I had no proof” (Kieltyka, 2006d). I asked McCloskey whether she knew if Conway financially compensated Juanita for making formal accusations against Bailey (p.e.c., January 22, 2007). McCloskey responded, “What an absurdity. Juanita is well-to-do” (p.e.c., January 22, 2007). It is certainly true that for at least several years before *TMWWBQ*’s publication, Juanita had been wealthy; in the 2002 human sexuality textbook video, she says that “when I was a she-male [and] I prostituted myself [...] I enjoyed it [...] eas[il]y making about a hundred thousand [dollars] a year” (in Allyn & Bacon, 2004).

Regardless of why they turned so dramatically, Kieltyka and her new allies ended up going after Bailey with virtually everything they could muster. Kieltyka used her artistic talents to provide Conway with a clever series of political cartoons on the theme of “The Sinking of ‘The Queen’” (see Conway, 2003g). And in July 2003, Kieltyka showed up at the meeting of the International Academy of Sex Research (IASR) in Bloomington, Indiana, where Bailey had decided to speak on the controversy over his book. Kieltyka tells me she went on “orders from” Conway “to confront Bailey” (Kieltyka, 2006a). Prohibited from entering, she remained outside to talk to anyone who would listen, handing out a flyer explaining in damning tones “How the sex research community will be hurt by J. Michael Bailey.” The hand-out elaborated briefly on how Bailey was guilty of “academic dishonesty,” “(still more) bad science,” “unethical behavior,” and “personal misconduct.” The flyer called on the sex research community to

censure J. Michael Bailey for his recent acts of junk science and groundless defamation. Do not invite him to speak at your institutions. Disinvite him if he is invited. Review his manuscripts and grant proposals with great caution and skepticism. J. Michael Bailey has brought further embarrassment to a research community that is still feeling the aftershocks of John Money’s John/Joan scandal.

“For more on this scandal,” the reader was advised to visit “tsroadmap.com/bailey”, Andrea James’s Internet exposé. (Copy of flier obtained from Bailey’s personal files.)

Kieltyka’s campaign seems to have caused some strain at the IASR meeting, but not to have resulted in much more than that institutionally within IASR. John Bancroft—then-Director of The Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender, and Reproduction—did stand up to admonish Bailey after his talk, saying “Michael, I have read your book and I do not think it is science” (John Bancroft, p.e.c., July 22, 2006). When I asked him about his remark—a shot heard round the world of the controversy—Bancroft explained that “my response might have been more measured” if Bailey had “allowed adequate time for discussion by the group” (John Bancroft, p.e.c., July 23, 2006). Bancroft elaborated:

My dislike of Michael’s book was that it promoted a very derogatory explanation of transgender identity which most TG people would find extremely hurtful and humiliating—hence the reaction of the TG community was not surprising. Whether based on science or not we have a responsibility to present scientific ideas, particularly in the public arena, in ways which are not blatantly hurtful. But in addition to that, Michael did not support his analysis in a scientific manner—hence my comment. (John Bancroft, p.e.c., July 23, 2006; edited February 27, 2007)

As it turned out, someone at the IASR meeting sent Conway a detailed report of Bancroft’s “not science” remark, and almost immediately her Website started prominently featuring Bancroft’s denouncement of Bailey. On the page about Bancroft’s remark, Conway likened it to “a similar moment back in 1954 when Joseph Welch faced Senator Joseph McCarthy and threw down the gauntlet with the statement: ‘Have you no sense of decency, sir, at long last?’” (Conway, 2003h).

But if Conway thought her publication of Bancroft’s remark would result in his becoming an active ally, she was mistaken. Bancroft told me “If I had known my remark would be made public, I wouldn’t have said it. We like to think of the Academy meetings as opportunities for sex researchers to openly discuss their ideas and criticisms with each other, and not the outside world.” Nevertheless, Bancroft maintains his concern for truly vulnerable trans people: “The Lynn Conways of the transgender world are the exception. They fight back, often in a self-defeating fashion. In this case, they went over the top and lost credibility in the process. But the majority in that world are less resilient and more vulnerable, and they get hurt” (John Bancroft, p.e.c., July 23, 2006; edited February 27, 2007).

Several people I spoke to about the IASR meeting told me that Bancroft’s remarks did not reflect anything like a consensus of the people in IASR (e.g., Pepper Schwartz to Dreger, p.e.c., February 3, 2007; Wallen, 2006). Indeed, several recalled that researcher Pepper Schwartz immediately responded to Bancroft’s remark with “a small speech about civilized discourse, collegial norms, and critical analysis rather

than name calling” (Schwartz to Dreger, p.e.c., February 3, 2007). Schwartz recalls she “said I was particularly troubled that this particular performance was more like the inquisition than a professional meeting and I wanted none of it” (Schwartz to Dreger, p.e.c., February 3, 2007).

Although she worked to get other organizations to act against Bailey, Conway also had not much success trying to use her influence with the National Academies to have Bailey’s book removed from the Web, investigated, and denounced. But Conway and her allies enjoyed more success with the HBIGDA. On July 14, 2003, Conway, McCloskey, Ben Barres and Joan Roughgarden of Stanford University, and Barbara Nash of the University of Utah wrote collectively to HBIGDA about “Bailey’s shockingly defamatory book.” They outlined “the investigations now underway” and “urge [d HBIGDA] to begin your own investigation into Prof. Bailey’s motives, methods, and activities” (available at Conway, 2003i). Walter J. Meyer, HBIGDA’s President, and Bean Robinson, HBIGDA’s Executive Director, responded in writing “on behalf of [HBIGDA’s] Officers and Board of Directors” on October 20, 2003 to note that, while Bailey was not a member of HBIGDA (and therefore was not for them to regulate), they found “it appropriate that an investigation into these allegations is being conducted by Northwestern University.” Meyer and Robinson went on to say

It is felt by many of our members that this poorly referenced book does not reflect the social and scientific literature that exists on transsexual people and could damage that essential trust. We hope that the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at Northwestern will consider the ethical issues that are involved and we will also be sending them a copy of this letter so that they are aware of our concerns. We are also preparing a separate letter to Northwestern University to express our concerns directly. (Meyer and Robinson to Conway, McCloskey, Barres, Nash, and Roughgarden, October 20, 2003; available at Conway, 2003j)

What exactly the “separate letter to Northwestern” said, I have not been able to determine; I have asked Meyer and Robinson for a copy of the letter and have been told no one at HBIGDA can find it (Tara L. Tieso to Dreger, p.e.c., September 12, 2006). Whatever it said, through this action, HBIGDA was seen both by Bailey’s allies and detractors as siding with Conway and her allies.

In utter disgust, Ray Blanchard resigned from HBIGDA on November 4, 2003. His letter stated as the reason “the appalling decision of the HBIGDA Officers and Board of Directors to attempt to intervene in Northwestern University’s investigation into the allegations made by certain members of the transsexual community against Prof. J. Michael Bailey.” Blanchard decried “such an intervention, undertaken without any effort by the HBIGDA to conduct their own systematic

inquiry or to learn all the relevant facts of the matter,” a move he felt “could only be prejudicial to Northwestern’s investigation.” Blanchard argued, “The HBIGDA would have been better advised to allow the Northwestern authorities, who are actually taking the trouble to investigate the allegations, to reach an impartial decision.” He expressed:

deep regret that I tender my resignation[...] I have long supported the goals of the HBIGDA. I have been involved in the clinical care of transsexual persons for 24 years. During the years 1983 to 1991, I conducted eight research studies on the therapeutic impact of hormonal and surgical treatment of transsexuals. [...] I published an additional article on the desirability of insurance coverage for sex reassignment surgery as recently as 2000. (Blanchard to Walter J. Meyer III and Bean Robinson, November 4, 2003)

As one might expect, Conway quickly announced Blanchard’s resignation in victorious tones: “Blanchard resigns in a huff from HBIGDA!” (Conway, 2003k).

Meanwhile, Conway remained particularly relentless in her drive to get Northwestern to take serious action against Bailey. On May 10, 2004, a full year after the book’s publication, she filed a new 49-page complaint with Northwestern. According to Conway’s Website,

the new complaint contain[ed] hard evidence implicating Mr. Bailey in, among other things, (i) deliberate failures to examine counter-evidence to the theory he was studying, (ii) open defamation of those who put forward counter-evidence to that theory, (iii) the making of “remote clinical diagnoses” of mental illnesses in persons he has not even met, (iv) libel, (v) flagrant abuses of the power of his office and (vi) the deliberate suppression of complaints by colleagues about such conduct. (Conway, 2004c)

And Conway et al.’s formal complaints were not limited to Northwestern University. In the spring of 2004, Conway, James, and McCloskey filed a series of complaints with the Illinois Department of Professional Regulation stating that, in providing letters in support of several transwomen’s SRS requests, Bailey had been practicing psychology without a license. The three also made the same complaint to Northwestern (see Conway, 2004d).

The charges of misconduct against Bailey are worth considering at length, and so I do that in the next part of this article, remaining here focused on the history of the backlash itself. But I will note here what I can of the outcomes of the formal complaints. It appears that the Illinois Department of Professional Regulation did not do anything with the complaint that Bailey was practicing clinical psychology without a license, presumably because he never took money for the SRS letters he wrote, nor did he offer or represent a therapeutic relationship

(Clinical Psychologist Licensing Act, 225 ILCS 15/1 et. Seq.). Northwestern University appears to have quickly rejected Juanita's charge of improper sexual relations, saying it "did not merit further investigation" (see Conway, 2003e); why they likely reached this conclusion is spelled out in the next section. Northwestern concluded the remainder of its investigation in December 2004 and "The investigation committee then made its recommendations to the Provost for an appropriate response" (C. Bradley Moore to Alice Dreger, p.e.c., August 1, 2006). Much to the dismay of Kieltyka, Conway, the press, and me (among others), the university has consistently refused to say what the investigation committee found or what specific actions they recommended. Northwestern's provost Lawrence Dumas will state only "that he had 'taken action that I believe is appropriate in this situation'" (quoted in Wilson, 2004). Bailey has also refused to say what the outcome of the investigation was, although he is willing to say that, if the investigation committee did its job correctly, then he was cleared (Bailey, 2005). It seems likely that if he agreed with the committee's findings, he would release the results.

When, for this history, I contacted C. Bradley Moore, Northwestern's Vice President for Research, to ask about the investigation, I received mostly the party line:

In his response to the investigative review, Provost Dumas noted that, "*Northwestern has established a protocol to help ensure that Professor Bailey's research activities involving human subjects are conducted in accordance with the expectations of the University, the regulations and guidelines established by the federal government and with generally accepted research standards.*" As with all employees and faculty members of Northwestern University, any other internal personnel actions are confidential. (C. Bradley Moore to Alice Dreger, p.e.c., August 1, 2006; italics in original)

But interestingly, Moore did add in his response to me this telling line:

*Even though the allegations of scientific misconduct made against Professor J. Michael Bailey do not fall under the federal definition of scientific misconduct, Northwestern utilized the procedures outlined in our ["Policy on Integrity in Research and Procedures for Reviewing Alleged Misconduct"] to review the allegations.* (C. Bradley Moore to Alice Dreger, p.e.c., August 1, 2006; italics added)

Thus, it would appear from Moore's statement to me that Northwestern found that Bailey did not trespass "the federal definition of scientific misconduct."

Any other clues as to how the Northwestern investigation turned out? The only notable change in Bailey's status at Northwestern is that he stepped down as department chair in

October 2004. Conway has called this a "quiet victory" (Conway, 2006a). But about this shift, Bailey and a Northwestern spokesperson have said "the change had nothing to do with the investigation" (Wilson, 2004; see also Bailey, 2006a; Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., July 22, 2006). Indeed, the timing of it is odd; one wonders why Bailey would have stepped down as a *result* of the investigation in October 2004, if the investigation wasn't *completed* until December 2004. Meanwhile, Bailey has maintained his title of full professor, has retained tenure, and keeps teaching and conducting human subjects research; he has taken no unscheduled leaves. All of this suggests that if Northwestern found Bailey had done something wrong, it wasn't enough to change his terms of employment.

Nevertheless, throughout the various investigations—including Northwestern's own—the press reports generally made Bailey look quite bad as they recorded charge after charge of misconduct (see, e.g., Barlow, 2003; Becker, 2003; Wilson 2003b, 2003c, 2004). From fairly early on, at the advice of a lawyer he retained to defend himself, Bailey refused to answer reporters' inquiries, and many may have read that refusal to respond as evidence of guilt. (I recall that I certainly did, watching casually from the sidelines in 2003 and 2004.) Oddly, it seems at least from this vantage point that virtually all of the reporters working on this story from 2003 forward did not do much to independently investigate the claims being made against Bailey, even when they had the opportunity; for the most part, they merely reiterated the charges. Perhaps that is because they did not know how to go about conducting an independent inquiry without Bailey's cooperation. But even given that possibility, one particular example of strangely shallow—even critically incomplete—reporting stands out, namely that done by Robin Wilson for the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. This is significant because the *Chronicle of Higher Education* is an essential source of academic news; it is the newspaper of record in the eyes of many university administrators and faculty, and thus Wilson's reporting undoubtedly helped to harm Bailey's professional reputation.

Remember that on June 20, 2003, Wilson published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* her "Dr. Sex" feature on Bailey and his book—a gossipy, in-person accounting that included the story of her excursion to the Circuit nightclub on May 22, 2003, with Bailey, Kieltyka, Juanita, and several of the other transwomen whose stories appeared in *TMWWBQ* (Wilson, 2003a). According to that June 2003 feature by Wilson, Kieltyka was openly disenchanted with Bailey's account of her as an autogynophile, but by Wilson's and Bailey's accounts, the night out in May had been friendly (Bailey, 2006a; Wilson, 2003a). Even Kieltyka did not contradict this account when I asked her (Kieltyka, 2006c). The transwomen who accompanied Wilson and Bailey to the club in May 2003 understood they were helping Bailey promote the

recently published book by meeting with Wilson—and why not, since, according to Wilson, “they count[ed] Mr. Bailey as their savior” (Wilson, 2003a).

Flash forward to July 25, 2003, a month after Wilson’s “Dr. Sex” feature, just two months after the Circuit excursion. Now the *Chronicle* prints Wilson’s sober third-person report, “Transsexual ‘Subjects’ Complain about Professor’s Research Methods” (Wilson, 2003b). Wilson posted a similarly grave third-person dispatch on December 19, 2003, “Northwestern U. Psychologist Accused of Having Sex with Research Subject” (Wilson, 2003c). Curiously, these two news items give absolutely no hint that Wilson herself had met at least two of the women charging Bailey, i.e., Kieltyka and Juanita. There is no mention of the fact that, in late May 2003, after the book’s publication, Wilson had joined Bailey, Kieltyka, Juanita, and others for that good time at Circuit, and that at the time there had been *no clue* that these women would ever file such serious and formal charges against Bailey. Now, it is certainly possible—as Kieltyka has told me—that it wasn’t until after Conway and McCloskey talked to Kieltyka and Juanita in early June that they realized they had been “abused” by Bailey (Kieltyka, 2006c). But why, one has to wonder, didn’t Wilson ask in July what was going on to have caused such a radical shift in relations? Why did Wilson not use her serendipitous insider knowledge—something any reporter would surely have been delighted to have on such a good story—to raise questions about why these women went so rapidly from being Bailey’s friends to claiming a long history of abuse at his hands?

Even stranger, Wilson’s (2003b) July article reported that Kieltyka “agreed to let the *Chronicle* print her real name,” as if this were new and terribly important when, in fact, the *Chronicle* had printed Kieltyka’s real name a full month before (Wilson, 2003a). Why was Wilson acting as if in July she and the *Chronicle* were completely new to this story? Genuinely baffled, I asked Wilson as much, and she repeatedly refused to go on the record with her reasoning for reporting in this way (Wilson to Dreger, p.e.c.’s, July 27, 2006 and February 7, 2007). I therefore asked her editor to explain (p.e.c.’s August 15, 2006 and September 5, 2006). After looking into the matter, the *Chronicle*’s editor Bill Horne would only say “we stand by the accuracy, and fairness, of Robin’s reporting and are not inclined to revisit decisions Robin and her editors made here with regard to what to include or exclude from those stories in 2003” (Bill Horne to Dreger, p.e.c., August 15, 2006). I simply cannot figure out what happened at the *Chronicle*. What I do know is that many academics (including reviewers of grant applications and manuscripts, and recipients of letters of recommendation for Bailey’s students) would likely have drawn a negative opinion of Bailey from Wilson’s July and December news reports.

Amazingly, somehow in the midst of all this controversy, Bailey managed to be vilified by both the right- and left-wing presses. Although the book received a warm review in the

ultra-conservative *National Review* (Derbyshire, 2003), the equally conservative *Washington Times* reported both the Northwestern investigation into Bailey as well as the disgust among certain House Republicans that Bailey’s sexual arousal studies received federal funding (McCain, 2003). Almost simultaneously, the ultra-liberal Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) claimed in their *Intelligence Report* that “many of those who praised” *TMWWBQ* “belong to a private cyber-discussion group of a neo-eugenics outfit, the Human Biodiversity Institute (HBI)” (Beirich & Moser, 2003). When I asked Kieltyka how the SPLC got involved in all this, she explained that she had learned of the SPLC’s interest in hate crimes against transgendered people, and that she had fed them information about Bailey’s role in what she increasingly understood to be a vast anti-gay collusion (Kieltyka, 2006c).

Bailey indeed does belong to the HBI “private cyber-discussion group”—the sort of online discussion group usually referred to by the less thrilling name “listserv”—and Bailey acknowledges that some of the most active members of the HBI list could legitimately be called right-wing (Bailey, 2006a); this would include the list’s founder, Steve Sailer. But Bailey denies being part of a well—or, for that matter, loosely—organized group that believes homosexuality is “a ‘disease’ that could eventually be eradicated” (Beirich & Moser, 2003). When in our interviews I mentioned the SPLC article to Bailey, his tendency was to look either bewildered or amused, even after I explained to him that Kieltyka saw the 2001 article he published with lawyer Aaron Greenberg, “Parental Selection of Children’s Sexual Orientation,” as clear evidence of his push for an anti-gay eugenics.

In that article, Bailey and Greenberg argued that “even assuming, as we do, that homosexuality is entirely acceptable morally, allowing parents, by means morally unproblematic in themselves, to select for heterosexuality would be morally acceptable.” They believe “this is because allowing parents to select their children’s sexual orientation would further parents’ freedom to raise the sort of children they wish to raise and because selection for heterosexuality may benefit parents and children and is unlikely to cause significant harm” (Greenberg & Bailey, 2001, p. 423). Bailey told me this article doesn’t make him anti-gay or eugenical. He is not trying to “improve” the human stock through the elimination of theoretical “gay genes” and, as for the question of the article’s attitude towards gay people, the paper clearly states:

[H]omosexuality, like heterosexuality, is ethically neutral. Because homosexuality causes no direct harm to others (other than those who take offense at it on irrational and/or inhumane grounds) and because homosexual behavior is crucial to the ability of homosexual people to enjoy their lives (as heterosexual behavior is to heterosexuals), homosexuality should not be morally condemned or proscribed. (Greenberg & Bailey, 2001, p. 424)

Bailey has insisted that, in this paper, he and Greenberg simply argued one thing: that parental rights could reasonably be understood to include genetic selection against—or for—a theoretic “gay gene” in the same way that parental rights are reasonably understood to include the right to raise children in parents’ religions. A close reading of the paper certainly seems to bear out Bailey’s claims about it.

Although it is clear Kieltyka believes the “collusion and possible conspiracy” is absolutely key to understanding the backlash against Bailey’s book and Conway’s role in it, it is difficult for me to sum up what Kieltyka sees as the evidence for a vast network of cooperation among supposedly anti-gay researchers, pundits, engineers, and politicians. I have found her theory confusing enough that at least three times I offered to put Kieltyka’s own account of it up on my personal Website, so that she would feel her theory has been accurately represented (Dreger to Kieltyka, p.e.c.’s September 3, 2006 and September 22, 2006; Dreger to Kieltyka, letter, September 6, 2006). She has not taken me up on the offer. I do know she is sure the scheme reflects the “God, guns, and (anti) gay” agenda of right-wing Republicans, and that it intimately involves members of and testifiers to the President’s Council on Bioethics, as well as members of and contractors to NASA and the Defense Department (Kieltyka, 2006a, 2006c, 2006d; p.e.c. from Kieltyka to approximately 150 people, subject line “What’s Wrong With This Picture—Scowcroft—Zeder—Conway???”), September 2, 2005). I believe I should also report—since Kieltyka mentioned it repeatedly—that her conviction that she had accidentally stumbled onto something really big was bolstered when she appeared on the KKK-related “New Nation News” Internet “shit list” (Kieltyka, 2006a, 2006d), and, most frighteningly, when she woke up one day to find a dead cat laid out on her doorstep, a cat who looked very much like her own dear pet (Kieltyka, 2006a, 2006b, 2006d). (She alerted the local police to a possible hate crime [Kieltyka, 2006a].) I should also note that, although Kieltyka insisted to me that Bailey is just the “fall guy” in the much higher-stake scheme she hoped I would point my attentions to—a scheme where Conway ranks significantly higher up than Bailey (Kieltyka, 2006a)—she is still really angry with Bailey for having used her story as an example of autogynephilia.

As mentioned earlier, Conway seems to have remained cool to Kieltyka’s wide-ranging findings that pointed to Bailey as being a collaborator in a massive anti-gay agenda shared by right-wing Republicans. But apparently James did not, because her 2003 graphic of “J. Michael Bailey connections” suggests that, at least in October 2003, James bought into Kieltyka’s grand unifying theory—or at least that she thought it a useful new form of rhetoric to use against Bailey (James, n.d.-a). But, in general, James took a more direct—though not less expansive—approach than Kieltyka. Thus, in an effort to

undermine *TMWWBQ*, James tried to discount, denigrate, or discredit anyone who was seen as supportive of the book. So her Website includes an appraisal of Simon LeVay—who works on the biological origins of sexual orientation and who blurbed Bailey’s book—calling him “a dilettante” and explicitly likening him to “the race scientists who influenced Nazism by emphasizing biological differences of ethnic minorities” (James, n.d.-b). James seems to have been unable to find anything usefully objectionable about co-blurber Steven Pinker; her page on him consists mostly of a cartoon of “Pinker and the Brain plotting their takeover of the intellectual world” and scattered “notes to address later” (James, n.d.-c).

James also sought to force anyone who might be on the fence to side with her or face the consequences. For example, in April 2003, when she discovered endorsements of *TMWWBQ* on Anne Lawrence’s Website, James sent Lawrence an email telling Lawrence, “I do not deny your legitimacy as a woman or ascribe motivations to you in order to make my own behavior and desires seem more acceptable, yet if you and Bailey feel entitled to do so to me, I will be forced to travel this low road as well and respond in kind.” She ended with a menacing tone: “I believe you find yourself at another crossroads as a community leader. You have a choice to make. [...] I strongly suggest you stake out the places where your opinion differs from Bailey’s, or you will find you have squandered even more of the goodwill and respect you used to have in abundance” (p.e.c., April 15, 2003). Once it became clear Lawrence was going to stick with the theory she found most correct, James mounted an extensive attack on Lawrence’s professional reputation, publicizing an incident where Lawrence was charged with professional misconduct. The fact that Lawrence was ultimately fully cleared appears nowhere on James’s “exposé” of the events (Lawrence, 2006a). Had Lawrence supported the feminine essence narrative over Blanchard’s taxonomy, one could easily imagine Conway, James, and the like circling wagons to protect their fellow transwoman. Lawrence’s supposed sin of professional misconduct is clearly not the issue; her allegiance to Blanchard’s theory is. (By contrast, nowhere on James’s extensive site in her favorable use of the work of pro-feminine-essence therapist Mildred Brown does James mention that “Brown paid off a former client to drop a \$2.5 million lawsuit that alleged a personally damaging and ruinous sexual affair” [Rendon, 1999].)

James and her allies reacted powerfully when a new site claiming to represent self-identified homosexual transsexuals sprang up. The “Transkids.us” site was organized by intersex activist Kiira Tria, whom I knew coincidentally through my intersex advocacy work in 1998–1999 and with whom I reconnected after my blog on James. When we reconnected, Tria told me that, following the publication of *TMWWBQ* and the enormous backlash against it, she set up the Transkids site as a way for transwomen she was helping out in Baltimore to

voice their stories and analyses—stories and analyses that largely supported Blanchard’s taxonomy and thus Bailey’s book. Tria and her friends prefer the term “transkids” to “homosexual transsexuals” “because their problems started so young” (Tria, 2006). In fact, Tria bonded with the transkids because she could relate to that aspect of their histories; Tria was born intersex and raised male, and at 14 wound up in the famous gender identity clinic led by John Money at Johns Hopkins University. Diagnosed by Money’s team as (in Tria’s words) a “failed male,” she was put through a sex reassignment Tria experienced as brutalizing (Tria, 1999).

Although Tria and the transkids knew the extent of the anger against Bailey, they never imagined that so much of it would be directed toward them for daring to defend Blanchard and Bailey. She recalls:

We had been working on the transkids.us site for several months and when it was done we announced it in various places. The very next morning, one of the transkids called on the phone in a panic, really scared, because overnight news of our website had caused such outrage on the Internet. Andrea James was saying “if you have any information about any of these people give it to me.” I looked at two of the forums, the worst ones, and the outpouring of hatred and violence was just unbelievable. It was frightening because I had never seen anything like that. They were saying things like we needed to be “infiltrated and taken out” or “vectored and destroyed,” all this military stuff! (Tria, 2006)

Tria told me, “We talked about taking the website down, because we didn’t want anyone to get hurt” (Tria, 2006). But in the end, they left it up and continued to post new material occasionally. The fact that the transkids have occasionally criticized some of Bailey’s book (see, e.g., Velasquez, 2004) did not seem to mollify James. James’ site still calls for readers to send in any “email, attachment or photo from” the transkids.us writers “for analysis by our investigators. We need to vector and expose this kind of online fakery before someone takes them seriously” (James, n.d.-d).

For her part, Deirdre McCloskey, too, led sections of the counterattack. We see this most clearly in the case of the LLF’s collision with the Bailey controversy. On February 2, 2004, the LLF announced the finalists for the Lambda Literary Awards, and included among the five books in the “Transgender/GenderQueer” category was *TMWWBQ*. Conway’s site on “the Bailey Investigation” tends to assume that all positive publicity for the book was the production of the publishers’ or Bailey’s agents, and the LLF case is no different. According to Conway’s master “Timeline,” Bailey’s publicists managed to get the book nominated for a Lambda award (Conway, 2006a).

But Jim Marks, then Executive Director of the LLF, corrected the record when I spoke with him. “The book was not

originally nominated by the publisher,” according to Marks. “It was added to the list by a member of the finalist committee and after the finalist committee had selected it, we went back to the publisher, who paid the nominating fee” (Jim Marks, p.e.c., July 22, 2006). Bailey remembers with annoyance that his publisher let him know about it only to tell him they assumed he didn’t want the book nominated. Presumably, by then, the publisher was weary of being attacked over the book. Bailey recalls, “My editor was always supportive, although I didn’t deal with him much after [the book] came out. The publicist was also very positive. But the people higher up definitely seemed torn between supporting me and appeasing the people who were giving them trouble” (Bailey, 2006b). Bailey responded that of course he wanted the book nominated, so the fee was paid, and the nomination became official.

Immediately after the nominations were announced, Deirdre McCloskey contacted Jim Marks to let him know she was outraged. Marks remembers, “I first realized that we had a problem on our hands when I got a vehement phone call from Deirdre McCloskey, Professor of Economics and English at the University of Illinois at Chicago. McCloskey insisted that we immediately remove the book from the list of finalists” (Jim Marks, p.e.c., July 22, 2006). In an email sent on the day after the announcement, McCloskey told Marks the nomination “would be like nominating *Mein Kampf* for a literary prize in Jewish studies. I think some apologies and explanations and embarrassment are in order” (McCloskey to Marks, p.e.c., February 3, 2004; available at Conway, 2005a). Marks wasn’t sure exactly what to make of this at first:

While I was a little taken aback by the campaign of a university professor to relegate a book to a kind of Orwellian non-history, we might have considered taking administrative action and removing the book from the list if McCloskey’s view had been universally that of the transgender community. The LLF was in some senses an advocacy organization. Its stated mission was to advance LGBT rights through furthering LGBT literature. We would clearly have grounds for removing a book that was in fact hostile to the Foundation’s mission. (Jim Marks, p.e.c., July 22, 2006)

But Marks soon learned that “McCloskey’s point of view, although widely shared, was not universally that of the transgender community. Among the torrent of e-mails we received, a minority came from transgender people who supported the book and urged us to keep it on the list” (Jim Marks, p.e.c., July 22, 2006). Marks recalled to me,

I had no expertise in this area (which is one reason we were blind-sided by the controversy). My main concern was maintaining the integrity of the nominating process; I didn’t feel like I could ask a finalist committee to take



the time and effort to select finalists and then simply overturn their decision without legitimate grounds. I informed the finalist committee of the controversy and asked them what to do. They re-voted and said, keep the book on the list. We did and sent the book out to the transgender panel of judges. (Jim Marks, p.e.c., July 22, 2006)

Following this decision to keep the book in the running, the pressure McCloskey, Conway, and others brought to bear on the LLF to remove Bailey's book from the running became intense. A worldwide online petition was started by Christine Burns, a leading trans advocate in the U.K., insisting "that the book [...] be withdrawn forthwith from the list of nominees at our collective request." It quickly reached nearly 1,500 signatures (see [http://www.petitiononline.com/mod\\_perl/signed.cgi?bailey](http://www.petitiononline.com/mod_perl/signed.cgi?bailey)).

In the style of the rest of her "investigation," in the LLF-nomination affair, Conway also encouraged her followers to take to task anyone who could be seen as helping Bailey. Thus, she listed on her site "Members of the Lambda Literary Foundation committee who selected Bailey's book," with this heading:

We thought you'd like to know who the gay men and lesbian feminists are who launched this attack on us. Following are the names, addresses, URL's and phone numbers of these people. We think that they should hear from you, so as to gain some comprehension of the scale of the pain they have inflicted on transwomen throughout the world. [...] Note: There is some evidence that the owners and employees of several of the book stores listed below have specific lesbian-feminist policies of welcoming only "womyn born womyn" (thus excluding transwomen) as customers in their stores. We suggest that our investigators out there quietly gather evidence about any discriminatory policies employed by stores listed below, for future publication on this site. (Conway, 2005a)

In a little over a month after McCloskey's first call to Marks, the pressure did result in what McCloskey, Conway, and their allies sought. By early March, according to Marks, a judge within the LLF "raised concerns, we went back to the finalists committee one more time, a member changed their vote and we withdrew the book from consideration" (Jim Marks, p.e.c., July 22, 2006). Only one vote had flipped, but it was enough to have the book removed.

In their public comments, those on the Finalist Committee disagreed about whether this action was tantamount to censorship. Kris Kleindienst is quoted in an LLF announcement as saying, "Removing the book from the list is not censorship. The book is widely available, has been widely reviewed and is

not about to be denied to the public. What we are doing is behaving in a responsible manner to make sure the list of finalists is compatible with the Foundation's mission." But Victoria Brownworth, along with other members of the committee, disagreed, saying "if we take the book off the list we are indeed censoring it. It doesn't matter what our reasons are" (Jim Marks to "distribution list," p.e.c., March 12, 2004, reproduced at Conway, 2005a).

Jim Marks's challenging experience with the controversy and his new critics did not end there. As was typical in the whole *TMWWBQ*-related affair, Conway's and James's site continued to track their perceived-enemy's actions. In 2005, in a link highlighted on Conway's site, James victoriously announced on her Transsexual Road Map site that Marks had been "ousted as Executive Director" of the LLF, claiming that the cause was "the mishandling of the Bailey matter, combined with late publication deliveries and financial woes" (James, n.d.-e). Marks says this is simply not true: "I did not resign [...] because of financial difficulties. The 12 month period from June 2004–May 2005 was the most successful year, financially and organizationally, that the Foundation had ever had." Instead what happened was that the LLF board decided to reorganize the Foundation in a way that Marks "did not think [...] was a viable business model and [he] resigned rather than try to implement it". He adds, "As far as I know, the controversy over [*TMWWBQ*] played no part in the decision of the board to reorganize the Foundation. When I resigned, it was over 15 months in the past and of no immediate relevance to the Foundation" (Jim Marks, p.e.c., July 22, 2006). James's and Conway's sites continue to say otherwise.

All of this was no doubt taking its toll, most especially on Michael Bailey. And I don't think there can be any doubt that, via their work with the press, their orchestrating of charges of scientific misconduct against him, and their encouraging of vocal objections at any public talks Bailey might give, Conway and James in particular were trying to make Bailey as miserable as they could. In my interviews with him, Bailey resisted admitting to misery, but conversations with his family and friends suggest the multi-year assault on so many fronts did wear on him. Because they believed he had rhetorically assaulted them, his enemies would seem to deny him any safe haven, however personal. At one point, Conway even decided to contact Bailey's close personal friend and departmental colleague, Joan Linsenmeier, to suggest that Linsenmeier tell Bailey he needed to be concerned for his personal safety. Linsenmeier told me about Conway's call:

I don't recall exactly what she said, but basically it was that some people with very negative feelings toward Mike knew where he lived, that this put him in danger, and that she thought I might encourage him to consider moving. [...] while she definitely scared me, this was

something I chose not to share with Mike at the time.  
(Joan Linsenmeier, p.e.c., August 17, 2006)

This sort of direct appeal to Bailey's colleagues would continue unabated for years. In September 2003, while Bailey was Chair of the Department of Psychology at Northwestern, James wrote to all of Bailey's departmental colleagues, feigning concern for him:

Northwestern's Psychology Department tacitly allows someone suffering from what the DSM calls alcohol abuse and dependence to run the department. As psychologists and friends, you must know that if Bailey continues his downward spiral, it's largely because you and your colleagues didn't step in. [...] I'm sure some of you will continue to respond with self-righteous indignation or with fear of me and my message. For the rest of you, I hope this little rock tossed through your window makes a real human connection. (Andrea James to the faculty of the Northwestern University Psychology Department, p.e.c., September 15, 2003)

Similarly, in January 2004, members of Bailey's department all received the previously mentioned letter from Kieltyka, Conway, James, and Calpernia Addams. The ostensible cause of the letter was to alert them to the SPLC report:

With this letter we wish to inform you that the *Intelligence Report* identifies J. Michael Bailey, the Chairman of the Department of Psychology at Northwestern, as a central figure in an elite reactionary group of academics, pundits and journalists now especially active in an insidiously noxious "scientific" and "scholarly" pursuit of institutionalized bigotry and defamation of transsexual women[. ...] We urge you to suspend disbelief. Read those SPLC *Intelligence Report* articles for yourselves. Then contemplate the role that some psychologists, including your Department Chairman, are playing in fostering hate and violence against young transsexual women. (Letter from Anjelica Kieltyka, Lynn Conway, Andrea James, Calpernia Addams to faculty members of the Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, January 7, 2004)

As late as 2005, Conway was still using this approach, choosing to write to Alice Eagly, who had replaced Bailey as chair of the department. Conway insisted that, because of Bailey, "the deep stain on Northwestern Psychology remains." But she offered a solution:

the internal culture of the Department could perhaps be improved over time if signals were quietly sent that it now at least tolerates open discussion of alternatives to Mr. Bailey's views [...] It might also be important to reflect upon what is being taught about transsexualism

to Northwestern's undergraduates in the large "sex courses" given by your Department's faculty members. (Letter from Lynn Conway to Alice Eagly, January 26, 2005)

Unlike Conway, James considered even Bailey's family and non-professional friends fair game in her own branch of the "investigation." So, in 2005, James obtained pictures of Bailey's girlfriend from 2003 and mounted a special page mocking her. It included a visual feature that morphed Bailey's girlfriend's face into Bailey's face from his high school yearbook picture—presumably implying Bailey is autogynephilic, though the exact meaning is unclear. Bailey's now-ex-girlfriend has asked James to take down the page to no avail; it is still the first page you get when you Internet-search that woman's name (Bailey to Dreger, personal communication, September 19, 2006).

In May 2003, James created a special portion of her site to go after Bailey's children. In her own words, this special page was "a very coarse and mean-spirited screed, designed to reflect what I consider [Bailey's] own motivations to be. [...] A taste of his own medicine." For this project, James took from Bailey's homepage photos of his son Drew and daughter Kate when they were in junior high and primary school, respectively. She then superimposed black bands over their eyes, presumably to mimic the dehumanizing pictures of trans people in the medical literature. Under the picture of Drew, using mostly a line from Bailey's book about transwomen, she added the caption, "There are also kids like 'Drew' who work as waiters, hairdressers, receptionists, strippers, and prostitutes, as well as in many other occupations." Meanwhile James labeled Kate's picture this way: "'Kate': a cock-starved exhibitionist, or a paraphiliac who just gets off on the idea of it? We'll find out in 12 easy questions!" In an update on this page, James delighted "that professionals are reading this page and acting with disgust." Indeed, the negative reactions she was getting made her decide to ratchet up her satirical analogizing of Bailey's book to his children. She now imagined "a classification system to categorize Bailey's children. There are two types of children in the Bailey household: Type 1, who have been sodomized by their father, or Type 2, who have not" (James, 2003a).

James did eventually take enough flak over her mockery of Bailey's children that she withdrew the special page about them. She claims on her site that she issued via Drew Bailey a sincere apology to him, his sister, and his mother (James, n.d.-f), but Drew Bailey says she did nothing of the sort, even after he contacted her to defend himself and his sister: "there was nothing in her response that could have been reasonably interpreted as a sincere apology" (Drew Bailey, 2006). In our conversation, Drew, now 22 years old, added, "Something [else] that really bothered me involved her characterization of our family dynamic. She said that my father had abandoned us,

that we were his ‘ex family.’ That really hurt because it is completely untrue” (Drew Bailey, 2006). I asked Michael Bailey if it is possible that Andrea James was referring to the terms of his divorce in speaking of his alleged “abandonment.” Bailey replied that the divorce had been friendly. When I asked if he had any evidence of that, he thought a moment, and remembered that he and his then-wife Deb had used the same divorce lawyer (Bailey, 2006a).

As it turns out, the Bailey clan remains quite close-knit in spite of the parents being divorced. Thus, James’ characterization of Bailey “abandoning” his family could only be called a misrepresentation at best. The Baileys are inclined to call it a vicious lie. By all accounts, the Baileys celebrate holidays together, are in constant close contact, and even vacation together. When I interviewed Deb Bailey in Evans-ton the day after she returned from a Maine vacation with her partner, her children, her ex-husband, and other close friends, she told me “It’s eleven years since we’ve been divorced and he still rides his bike [over], stops by, all the time to see the kids [...] and to see me.” She confirmed for me that she and her ex-husband had shared the same divorce lawyer, and indeed remembered somewhat sentimentally how they enjoyed each other’s company the day of the court divorce proceedings. She also remembered that, in 2003, when the stress of the book backlash was getting particularly intense, Michael Bailey came to her house to talk for hours about it with her. Deb summed it up this way: “Mike and I have an unusual relationship in that we care for each other a lot. Married was not a good thing, but friends is a fabulous thing, and I have only the utmost respect for him” (Deb Bailey, 2006).

While Bailey’s family and friends privately rallied around him, throughout the controversy over *TMWWBQ*, Bailey’s colleagues did not do much to visibly side with one party or the other. This may have been because—as John Bancroft suggested above, and Anne Lawrence seconds below—it became difficult, if not impossible, to put forth any kind of judicious critique of the book given the highly charged terms of the debate. One sexologist who did seem to take the side of Conway is Eli Coleman of the University of Minnesota. In response to the outrage coming from Conway and her allies, Coleman expressed his concerns about Bailey’s book and promised in an email he copied to Conway, “we will do all we can do to respond to this situation” (available at Conway, 2003i). Then, at the 2003 Ghent meeting of HBIGDA, Coleman criticized Bailey’s book as an “unfortunate setback.” At his 2005 lecture to the International Foundation for Gender Education, Coleman again “said pretty much what I said in Gent—that it was an unfortunate setback in feelings of trust between the transgender community and sex researchers.” He also specifically “said thanks to Lynn Conway that the concerns of the transgender community had been brought forth and articulated” (Coleman to Dreger, p.e.c., August 4, 2006). According to Conway, it is “courtesy of Dr. Coleman” that her

site shows a slide from Coleman’s IFGE lecture—namely a reproduction of *TMWWBQ*’s cover with the words “Unfortunate Setbacks” added above it (Conway, 2005b). When I asked him if he gave Conway the image, Coleman told me “I have no idea where she got the slide” (Coleman to Dreger, p.e.c., February 6, 2007).

A number of Bailey’s colleagues who might have been inclined to explicitly defend him suggested to me in conversation that they feared being both ineffectual and attacked; certainly his colleague Joan Linsenmeier found herself set upon by both Conway and James as a consequence of her public positive association with Bailey (see, e.g., James, 2003c). One sexologist suggested to me that some colleagues who might have otherwise defended Bailey publicly might have stayed out of the conversation because, in 2003 and 2004, as charge after charge of scientific misconduct piled up, colleagues might have believed “where there’s smoke, there’s fire.” But things have clearly shifted since then; Bailey is now quicker to call on colleagues to help, and they are quicker to respond. When the queer-community-oriented *Chicago Free Press* ran an anti-Bailey editorial in August, 2006 in response to a new tip from Kieltyka (“Bad Science,” 2006), Bailey asked his colleagues to write letters to the editor, and at least 18 immediately did (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., January 23, 2007).

Meanwhile, although strife within the trans (especially the transwomen) activist and support circles certainly predated the publication of *TMWWBQ*, the controversy over the book seems to have substantially exacerbated it. A number of the transwomen who wrote to me after my original blog on Andrea James volunteered that they had been harassed, intimidated, and sometimes electronically erased for speaking autobiographically of autogynephilia or positively of Blanchard, Bailey, or Lawrence. (All of these correspondents asked to remain anonymous for fear of further attack.) The heat around Bailey’s book appears to have entrenched for many people the “if you’re not with us, you’re against us, and you’ll be treated as such” mentality. Even transman/trans-advocate Jamison Green, who has publicly criticized *TMWWBQ* and Bailey (Green, 2003), has said,

I have been disappointed by some of the vitriolic attacks that Bailey received from trans people at the height of the controversy. I strongly feel that scholarly (and creative) work should be reviewed on its merits and that resorting to personal attacks on creators of published work is uncalled for at best and demeaning to the critic at worst. Such tactics actually undermine productive critical dialog[.] (Jamison Green, p.e.c., August 20, 2006)

And indeed the divisive shockwaves from the controversy over *TMWWBQ* are still reverberating within trans circles in ways that don’t seem productive or civil much of the time. Whether that will change remains to be seen, and will probably depend much on whether leaders and followers within

trans advocacy and activism can find a way to move forward while the “if you’re not fully with us, you’re against us” mentality remains. For his part, Green told me “I sincerely hope that one day intelligent people will be able to consistently exhibit civil behavior toward each other in all aspects of social interaction” (Jamison Green, p.e.c., August 20, 2006).

### Part 5: The Merit of the Charges Made Against Bailey

I think it is fair to say, given the historical evidence noted above, that the firestorm against *The Man Who Would Be Queen* was initially motivated by a few powerful transsexual women’s strong public rejection of Blanchard’s theory of MTF transsexualism. But as we have also seen above, that firestorm quickly came to be fueled by allegations that J. Michael Bailey had behaved in all sorts of unethical, illegal, and immoral ways in the production of his book. This move on the part of Bailey’s detractors—from questioning the message to questioning the messenger—effectively directed public attention away from the book itself and Blanchard’s theory towards *TMWWBQ*’s author. What then of the merit of the charges that Bailey behaved unethically, illegally, and even immorally in producing *TMWWBQ*?

In providing this history, it would be convenient to be able to simply report the merit of the charges made against Bailey as determined by some reliable investigatory body. But I am unable to do so. Besides the rather odd and brief inquiry made by the SPLC and those “investigations” of Bailey made by Conway, James, and their cohort—“investigations” which, as noted above and below, appear factually and ethically flawed in key respects—apparently the only formal, institutional investigation made of Bailey was that conducted by the Provost’s office of Northwestern University. No other group—including the National Academies, various professional organizations like HBGDA and IASR, and the Illinois Department of Professional Regulation—seems to have found reason to proceed with any deep inquiry into Bailey’s work, in spite of many calls to do so from Conway, James, Kieltyka, McCloskey, and others. And, as noted in the last section, neither Northwestern nor Bailey has publicly revealed the results of the university’s lengthy investigation, except insofar as: (1) Northwestern’s Vice President for Research has said that “the allegations of scientific misconduct made against Professor J. Michael Bailey do not fall under the federal definition of scientific misconduct”; and (2) Northwestern’s Provost has said that the university “has established a protocol to help ensure that Professor Bailey’s research activities involving human subjects are conducted in accordance with the expectations of the University, the regulations and guidelines established by the federal government and with generally accepted research standards” (C. Bradley Moore to Alice Dreger, p.e.c., August 1, 2006). It seems that if Bailey

were completely happy with the outcome of the investigation, he would release the results, but the apparent lack of change in Bailey’s university status following the December 2004 conclusion of the investigation suggests the university found nothing too damning. Still, I think it unscholarly to rely on such ambiguous evidence to deduce anything meaningful about Bailey’s conduct. Consequently, I consider here the allegations of misconduct made against Bailey with regard to the production of his book, and examine what the sources tell us about the merit of those charges.

Of the myriad charges organized and broadcast against Bailey by Conway, James, and McCloskey, arguably the two most serious have been (1) that Bailey conducted human subjects research that required Northwestern University’s IRB approval and oversight without seeking or obtaining that approval and oversight, and (2) that he had sex with the woman called Juanita in the book at a time when she was his research subject. These two charges turn out to be interrelated, so I’ll deal with them first, one right after the other.

*Did Bailey conduct IRB-qualified human subjects research without IRB oversight?* According to reproductions posted on Lynn Conway’s “Bailey investigation” Website, in their 2003 complaints about Bailey made to Northwestern, Anjelica Kieltyka, Juanita, and two other transsexual women whose stories did not appear in *TMWWBQ* all claimed that they were “participant[s] in a research study without being informed of that status” (Kieltyka to C. Bradley Moore, July 3, 2003, available at Kieltyka, 2003b; see also Conway, 2003c, 2003d, 2003f). Kieltyka’s complaint of July 3, 2003, went further, stating that she expected Bailey to be “found [...] in violation of University and federal policies” because, she implied, he had been conducting IRB-qualified human subjects research on her and her friends without IRB approval and oversight (Kieltyka to C. Bradley Moore, July 3, 2003, available at Kieltyka, 2003b). Indeed, by his own admission, Bailey did not seek or obtain approval from Northwestern’s IRB to talk with Kieltyka, Juanita, and other transsexual women about their lives for purposes of his writing about them (Bailey, 2005). But did Bailey need IRB approval and oversight in this case?

Answering this question requires both general consideration of the IRB regulations and specific consideration of Bailey’s relations with the people whose stories he recounted in his book. First the general: In the U.S., universities that receive federal funding are required to maintain oversight boards to ensure that qualified human subjects research is conducted in an ethical manner. To quote from Northwestern’s Office for the Protection of Research Subjects:

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) is designated by Northwestern University (NU) to review, to approve the initiation of, and to conduct periodic review of research involving human subjects or materials obtained from

human subjects. Federal law and/or NU policy mandates prior written and dated IRB approval of such research regardless of the funding source. (Office for the Protection of Research Subjects, [n.d.](#))

As Robin Wilson of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* noted in her July 25, 2003 news report of the first two charges made against Bailey, “According to federal regulations, a human subject is someone from whom a researcher obtains data through ‘interaction,’ which includes ‘communication or interpersonal contact between investigator and subject’” (Wilson, 2003b).

There’s no question Bailey obtained information about their lives from observing and talking with Kieltyka, Juanita, and the other transsexual women who did and did not appear in *TMWWBQ*. In that sense, they would seem to count as “human subjects,” presuming the information he gathered from them could be called “data.”

But, as Wilson and many other writers on the Bailey controversy have failed to note, the *kind* of research that is subject to IRB oversight is significantly more limited than the regulatory definition of “human subject” implies. What is critical to understand here is that, in the federal regulations regarding human subjects research, *research* is defined very specifically as “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge” (United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2005, Sect. 46.102, def. “b”). In other words, only research that is truly scientific in nature—that which is systematic and generalizable—is meant to be overseen by IRBs. Thus, a person might fit the U.S. federal definition of “human subject” in being a person from whom a researcher gains knowledge through interpersonal interaction, but if the *way* that the researcher gains the knowledge is not systematic and the knowledge she or he intends to gain is unlikely to be generalizable in the scientific sense, the research does not fall under the purview of the researcher’s IRB.

It is worth noting here, for purposes of illustration of what does and doesn’t count as IRB-qualified work, that I consulted with the Northwestern IRB to confirm that the interviews I have conducted for this particular project do not fall under the purview of Northwestern’s IRB. Although I have intentionally obtained data through interpersonal interaction, the interview work I have conducted for this historical project has been neither scientifically systematic nor generalizable. That is, I have not asked each subject a list of standardized questions—indeed, I typically enjoyed highly interactive conversations during interviews; I have not interviewed all of my subjects in the same way; I have negotiated with some of them to what extent I would protect their identities. This is a scholarly study, but not a systematic one in the scientific sense. Nor will the knowledge produced from this scholarly history be

generalizable in the scientific sense. No one will be able to use this work to reasonably make any broad claims about transsexual women, sex researchers, or any other group.

When I put my methodology to the Northwestern IRB, the IRB agreed with me that my work on this project is not IRB-qualified (Eileen Yates to Dreger, p.e.c., July 31, 2006), i.e., that, although I have obtained data from living persons via interactions with them, what I am doing here is neither systematic nor generalizable in the scientific sense. Had the IRB disagreed with me on this point—which, knowing the regulations, they did not—I would have pointed them specifically to the 2003 clarification by the U.S. Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP) that “oral history interviewing projects in general do not involve the type of research defined by [Department of Health and Human Services] regulations and are therefore excluded from IRB oversight” (Ritchie & Shopes, 2003). The Oral History Association sought this clarification in response to what many scholars have come to call “mission creep” on the part of IRBs, i.e., the move on the part of many IRBs to claim regulatory rights to work that was never intended by the federal government to count as human subjects research (Center for Advanced Study, 2005; see also American Association of University Professors, 2006). The Oral History Association and the American Historical Association have gotten fed up enough with IRB mission creep that they recommend historians like me not even consult with their IRBs when planning to take oral histories; they advise scholars instead to simply inform their Chairs and Deans of the 2003 clarification (Ritchie & Shopes, 2003). I went against their recommendation in this case and actively sought confirmation of exception from my own IRB partly out of project-relevant curiosity as to how the Northwestern IRB views these kinds of interviews, and partly out of fear of being charged with IRB violation in retaliation for producing this history.

In terms of how this all applies to the claim that Bailey was violating IRB regulations, one could argue that the 2003 clarification of the OHRP about oral histories came *after* he wrote *TMWWBQ*—that the clarification postdates his work. That is true, but the clarification about taking and relaying individual stories was not a new ruling. It was simply a *clarification* that oral histories were *never* meant to be overseen by IRBs. Moreover, I’m not sure we can even reasonably use the term “oral histories” to describe what Bailey did with Kieltyka, Juanita, and the other people whose stories were relayed in the book—that is, I’m not sure it counted as any kind of serious scholarship (which real oral-history taking is). The information about individuals that Bailey gathered for the book from Kieltyka, Juanita, Braverman, and others he obtained haphazardly—without any developed plan of research—from their occasional presentations to his classes, from their joint social outings, and from one-on-one discussions that occurred on an irregular basis. Bailey did conduct a few fill-in-the-blank

discussions with Kieltyka, Juanita, and others (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., August 22, 2006)—discussions during which, as I show below, they knew he was writing about them in his book, and with which they cooperated. But these fill-in-the-blank discussions can again hardly be called systematic or productive of generalizable knowledge. When I pressed him to consult or perhaps even turn over to me the notes he took from these conversations, Bailey admitted he had no organized notes that he had bothered to keep. Obviously, he never really thought of these discussions as research—systematic work meant to be productive of generalizable knowledge—any more than he ever imagined that the women who seemed eager to tell their stories and have him write about them might later charge him with abuse. Otherwise, he surely would have protected himself and his work by being significantly more organized. By comparison, for the systematic and generalizable psychological and sociological studies of transsexual women and others to which he occasionally refers in the book (e.g., Barlow, 1996), Bailey and his lab did seek and obtain IRB approval from Northwestern.

Historically speaking, the confusion over whether Bailey violated human subjects research regulations is somewhat understandable, both because many people are unfamiliar with the regulations and because of *TMWWBQ*'s style. In the book, the way in which Bailey refers offhandedly and irregularly to his methodology could lead some to believe that all of the information he relays therein is the result of scientific study. The total lack of citation and documentation makes it very difficult to determine to what extent Bailey's claims are based on peer-reviewed scientific evidence. It is true that *TMWWBQ*'s jacket boasts that it is “based on his original research” and “grounded firmly in the scientific method.” And indeed, in some places, Bailey does refer to some of his own actual scientific research. For example, at the opening of the chapter called “In Search of Womanhood and Men,” Bailey speaks of “my own recent research [that] has focused on the homosexual type” of transsexual (Bailey, 2003, p. 177). A couple of pages later, he similarly remarks that “In our study, we found that drag queens ranked between gay men and transsexuals on a number of traits related to femininity” (pp. 179–180). But, compared to the organized (and IRB-approved) studies to which he is referring in these two sentences, one would be hard-pressed to call what Bailey did to obtain and present the stories of Kieltyka, Juanita, and the other individuals about whom he wrote “science”—or even “research” in *any* scholarly sense. Indeed, both Conway and McCloskey have complained about just that—that what he was doing with these women's stories wasn't science—and I think they are absolutely right (McCloskey & Conway, 2003).

Clearly, what Bailey did in terms of learning and relaying the stories of Kieltyka, Juanita, and other transsexual women was neither systematic nor generalizable. Never did Bailey organize a series of specific questions to ask these women,

questions that might have been used, for example, to scientifically test Blanchard's taxonomy. Never did he seek a statistically representative sample of transsexual women in deciding whose stories to tell; again, his critics have complained about just this (see, e.g., Sauer, 2003). He simply picked people who came with good stories—people such as Kieltyka and Juanita—to put human faces on Blanchard's theory. He had no interest in scientifically investigating Blanchard's theory; at this point, he already believed it to be true because of what he had learned from the scientific literature, from colleagues, and from his prior experiences. Using stories in this way is not science—it doesn't even rise to the level of *bad* science, because it doesn't even pretend to test or develop a theory—and I think it is clear it does not rise to the level of IRB-qualified *research* by the U.S. federal definition.

Although *TMWWBQ* occasionally seems to brag about its scientific rigor—especially on its jacket—in the text Bailey frequently acts more like a science journalist than a scientist. He mixes up references to scientific studies he led and stories of individuals he met along the way—stories, remember, not just of transsexual women and crossdressing men, but also of the men on the annual “gay guys” panel of his human sexuality class, of “Princess Danny,” and of Edwin, the effeminate man at the cosmetics counter of Bailey's local department store. Bailey didn't get IRB approval to gather or write about *any* of these stories, because they were all anecdotes and not scientific studies. Given that he consistently obtained IRB approval for work he did that was IRB-qualified, there can be no doubt Bailey knew perfectly well the difference between the anecdotes he used to liven up his book and real systematic and generalizable science. If his readers do not know it, that has certainly been to his and his argument's advantage, but it does not mean he violated federal policy.

Given all this, *we have to conclude that, in his interaction with the people whose personal stories appear in TMWWBQ—of whom apparently only two (Kieltyka and Juanita) have complained to Northwestern University—J. Michael Bailey did not conduct IRB-qualified human subjects research without IRB oversight.*

What about the second seemingly damning claim, the sexual relations allegation? *Did J. Michael Bailey have sexual relations with a woman who was his research subject at the time?*

Although the answer to this question turns out to be relatively simple, this story bears careful unpacking. In a notarized affidavit reproduced on Conway's site, dated July 21, 2003, Juanita claimed:

On March 22, 1998, Northwestern University Professor J. Michael Bailey had sexual relations with the undersigned transsexual research subject. I am coming forward after I learned he divulged his research findings about

me in *The Man Who Would Be Queen*. (Available at Conway, 2003e)

Let's take the second sentence first: Juanita claimed she was coming forward *after* she learned Bailey "divulged his research findings" about her. This presumably was meant to explain why she had waited a full 5 years to make an issue of the alleged sexual relations: because she was so disturbed in July 2003 by learning that Bailey had written about her in the book, she decided to charge him with improper sexual relations that allegedly occurred one night in March 1998.

The facts say otherwise. Learning that he divulged his "research findings" about her in the book could not have been the impetus for Juanita's deciding in July, 2003, to charge him with improper sexual relations 5 years earlier. In fact, Juanita knew for many years what Bailey was *generally* writing about her in his book manuscript—indeed, she gave him permission to write about her—and she likely knew for months before the affidavit *specifically* what he had said about her in the published book.

First, what is the evidence that Juanita gave Bailey permission to write about her—and thus that she knew (for years) that he was writing about her in a book manuscript? Kieltyka—a witness extremely hostile to Bailey nowadays—told me in our interviews that the Northwestern investigatory committee convened in response to their complaints asked both her and Juanita "did you know Bailey was writing a book and did you give him permission?" According to Kieltyka, "Juanita said yes to both, she knew and she gave him permission" (Kieltyka, 2006f). In fact, this giving of permission is confirmed by Juanita's own "sealed" letter (now reproduced on Conway's site) to Northwestern alleging the sexual affair. There Juanita says:

after infrequent "social" meetings with Anjelica and I, Dr. Bailey informed us that he was writing a book about transsexuals and would like to include both of our "stories." Believing it to be similar to Dr. Randi Etner's book, *Confessions of a Gender Defender*, Anjelica and I gave our verbal consent once Dr. Bailey assured us he would show us what he was writing about us. (Available at Conway, 2003e)

In her "sealed" letter, Juanita goes on to say that what Bailey wrote about her "in an early draft was not objectionable, but *absolutely nothing like* the spurious and insulting description he wrote about my life that did become part of that most hurtful book of his" (from Conway, 2003e; emphasis added). Kieltyka tells me Juanita was specifically referring to her hurt feelings about what Bailey said about Juanita's wedding and divorce (Kieltyka, 2006c), material that did not appear in the early draft Juanita saw before publication, since Juanita's wedding and divorce post-dated the early draft.

Actually, given how little of Bailey's draft changed from what Juanita saw to what he ultimately published—given that the only substantive changes were about her wedding and divorce—the vast majority of what Bailey wrote about her could not have come as a painful surprise. And most assuredly, she could not have been fundamentally unaware that he was writing about her in his book, as the second sentence of her affidavit suggests. Additionally, and in critical contradiction to the way her complaints to Northwestern read (see Conway, 2003e), Juanita must have known for years that he was writing about her as an example of "homosexual transsexualism." Not only was that claim consistently in early drafts—that, after all, was the whole point of Bailey's writing about her—but in February 1999, in the *Daily Northwestern* article, student reporter Maegan Gibson reported that in Bailey's book manuscript (the relevant sections of which Gibson also saw), "He classifies [Juanita] as a homosexual transsexual and Anjelica [Kieltyka] as an autogynephilic transsexual" (Gibson, 1999, p. 5). Surely Juanita would have read this feature story about herself; she had been enthusiastic enough about the feature to provide Gibson with her own before-and-after-reassignment photographic portraits, her real before-and-after-reassignment names, and her life story—and so surely in February 1999, from Gibson's article she would have learned, if she really didn't already know it, that Bailey was classifying her as a homosexual transsexual.

Remember also, as noted in Part 4, that on May 22, 2003, several weeks *after* the book had come out, Juanita joined Bailey, Kieltyka, and others for the social excursion to the Circuit nightclub with Robin Wilson of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. In other words, fully 2 months before her affidavit, a document which, in its rhetoric, positions her as newly aggrieved by virtue of just discovering Bailey had written about her, Juanita actively helped Bailey *promote* his published book by going out and talking with Wilson about what Bailey wrote about her in the book.

To quote one last time the second sentence of Juanita's July 21, 2003, affidavit: "I am coming forward [to charge him with improper sexual relations of 5 years earlier] *after* I learned [Bailey] divulged his research findings about me in *The Man Who Would Be Queen*" (emphasis added). Given how many historical documents (including Juanita's own letter to Northwestern) contradict its premise, this second sentence of Juanita's affidavit seems to explain considerably less than the fact that said affidavit was witnessed by none other than Andrea James and Lynn Conway, and the fact that the letter presented to Northwestern along with the affidavit credited "Lynn Conway and Deirdre McCloskey, who have acted on our behalf to make Dr. Bailey accountable for his actions." I think the historical progression here is clear. Juanita knew for years that Bailey was writing about her in his book; she gave him permission and indeed actively helped him; she even

helped him promote the book after it came out. And then Conway, James, and McCloskey showed up in June and July 2003 to play what appears to have been a significant role in convincing and helping Juanita to charge Bailey with several forms of misconduct—significant enough roles for Kieltyka also to have bothered specifically naming Conway and McCloskey as key witnesses to Juanita’s claims in Kieltyka’s own July 2003 affidavit about the matter (Kieltyka affidavit, July 23, 2003; available at Conway, 2003e). For the record, I asked McCloskey, “What exactly was your role in preparing the formal, written charges made by the woman known as Juanita that Bailey had had sexual relations with her when she was his research subject?” She answered only “Not much” (p.e.c., January 22, 2007). She declined my request to elaborate (p.e.c., February 4, 2007).

Even if Juanita was not in July 2003 the shocked and disillusioned party that the second sentence of her affidavit suggests, what of the core claim as reported in the first sentence of the affidavit: “On March 22, 1998, Northwestern University Professor J. Michael Bailey had sexual relations with the undersigned transsexual research subject.” In her July 23, 2003 letter to Northwestern University’s C. Bradley Moore, charging Bailey with having had sex with her, Juanita recounted more precisely the alleged circumstances:

Dr. Bailey met Anjelica Kieltyka and myself earlier that same evening [March 22, 1998] into morning at “Shelter”, one of the night clubs frequented by female transsexuals. The date is well remembered because it was “Shelter’s” final night before closing for good. I arrived at the club with Ms. Kieltyka, but left with Dr. Bailey. Ms. Kieltyka can confirm this. Dr. Bailey then drove me back to my place, where the sexual relations occurred. [...] I have told no one about the sexual relations other than [sic] you, Dr. Moore, my best friend and confidante, Charlotte Anjelica Kieltyka, and Professors’ [sic] Lynn Conway and Deirdre McCloskey, who have acted on our behalf to make Dr. Bailey accountable for his actions. They will provide sworn affidavits supporting my claims. (available at Conway, 2003e)

Juanita is thus quite specific: She and Bailey had sexual relations on the night of March 22, 1998. What of Bailey’s response to this claim?

In his online self-defense piece, “Academic McCarthyism,” published in October 2005, Bailey countered with this: “her ‘complaint’ is not true. The alleged event never happened. If I ever needed to do so, I could prove this, but there is no reason why I should” (Bailey, 2005). Bailey’s reasoning for why he should not have to prove he didn’t have sex with Juanita was twofold: first, he “insist[ed] that Juanita was not a research subject” when she claimed they had sex; second, “there is nothing intrinsically wrong or forbidden about having sex with a research subject[....] Some of my colleagues

have had sex with their research subjects, because it is not unusual to ask one’s romantic partner to be a subject” (Bailey, 2005).

Temporarily putting aside the question of that twofold defense (Juanita wasn’t a research subject and there’s nothing intrinsically wrong about having sex with a research subject), I told Bailey I thought the reason he should prove he didn’t have the sexual relations Juanita claimed is because many people found the claim to be the nail in the supposed coffin of his professional reputation. I pressed Bailey to answer two questions for me: Did he in fact have sex with Juanita? And if not, why had he for several years—until his 2005 “Academic McCarthyism” self-defense—refused to publicly answer her charge?

He explained simply the delay in denying the charge: About the time Juanita’s sexual relations allegation appeared, Bailey’s lawyer had advised him to stop publicly answering any questions about the controversy. Indeed, the record confirms that the sexual relations allegation is not the only thing to which Bailey refused to respond starting in the summer of 2003; he did not defend himself publicly on *any* of the charges made against him until “Academic McCarthyism” in October, 2005 (Bailey, 2005). Bailey also explained to me that he understood that there was no way to answer Juanita’s claim without at some level legitimizing her claim; he believed (correctly I think) that acting as if what she claimed mattered by protesting repeatedly against it would only backfire and work against him in the court of public opinion (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., July 18, 2006). Could he really, in 2003, say “I did not have sex with that woman” and hope to have his public reputation thus exonerated?

Nevertheless, given that he had come around in 2005 to denying Juanita’s claim, I pressed him on what his denial (“The alleged event never happened” [Bailey, 2005]) really meant: Was he using a Clintonian definition of sex, or evading the central question in some other way? Did they have sexual relations on some other day, or perhaps have some kind of non-intercourse physical contact that a reasonable person could define as “having had sexual relations”? No, he said, he had never engaged in *anything* with Juanita that could reasonably be called sexual relations. He did admit to me that he had flirted with Juanita once or twice when they were out socializing, but he insisted that was the limit; he had never had or even attempted any sexual relations with Juanita (p.e.c.’s, July 19, 2006). I then pressed him for the proof that it never happened—the proof he alludes to in “Academic McCarthyism” (Bailey, 2005). And he produced it (p.e.c., July 20, 2006). When I read it, it struck me ironically as about the least sexy proof one could provide.

Bailey explained to me that, when Juanita made the sexual-relations charge to Northwestern in 2003, in order to defend himself, knowing it never happened, he immediately looked up his computer records to see whether he could prove his



claim. He quickly discovered that, on March 22, 1998, his ex-wife Deb Bailey had been out of town on her spring break and he was, by their annual arrangement, staying at her house taking care of their children, who were then aged 11 and 13. He provided me what he had offered Northwestern: records of back-and-forth conversations between him and Deb Bailey that week, covering all the mundanities of taking care of house and children (provided in p.e.c., Bailey to Dreger, July 20, 2006). In these, Deb Bailey reminded Michael Bailey to feed the fish, the hamster, and the cat, to clean out the litter box, to bring in the newspaper and the mail, to take the kids to their after-school activities, and so on. These documents evince at least that on March 22, 1998, Michael Bailey was single-parenting his two children (and their many pets) in Evanston. I asked him if he might have left the children in Evanston, perhaps with a sitter, and gone out with Kieltyka and Juanita to the Shelter nightclub into the small hours of the morning, but he was adamant that he would never have left his children to go out to bars while his ex-wife was across the country and it was his turn to parent (p.e.c.'s, July 19, 2006).

For confirmation, I put Michael Bailey's claims to Deb Bailey, and she checked her records and confirmed that on March 22, 1998, Michael Bailey was single-parenting in Evanston while she was away. She also (with some embarrassment) confirmed the elaborate household instructions she gave him for that period, independently providing me a copy of some of the same correspondence Michael Bailey had provided me. When I asked her if she thought it possible that Michael Bailey would have gone out to a Chicago bar when he was supposed to be taking care of their children in Evanston while she was away, Deb Bailey said she found it unfathomable given his record as a devoted and attentive father. She made it politely clear that she has no illusions that Michael Bailey is a saint, but she also finds it impossible to believe that he would have been out with Juanita on the night she claimed, especially given that there were plenty of other weeks of the year in which he could have done just that (Deb Bailey, 2006; Deb Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c. January 7, 2007).

If Michael Bailey is telling the truth—that he and Juanita never had sex—why does Juanita's account so clearly say otherwise? I asked Kieltyka to tell me what she knew about the alleged relations and the charge, since she supposedly had been with Bailey and Juanita on the night in question and she had been present for at least some of the sessions in which Conway and McCloskey apparently helped to arrange the charge (Conway, 2003e; McCloskey to Dreger, p.e.c., January 22, 2007). According to Kieltyka,

[Juanita] told me the day after Bailey drove her home from the Shelter nightclub that Bailey had tried to do something .... That they had “messed around”—She was being slightly evasive and uneasy so I left it alone. [Five years later, in the summer of 2003] when Lynn

Conway [was] over at my house, Juanita was there, and that's when she told the two of us that Bailey in fact had had sex with her. This was the first time that I found out it wasn't that he had “tried something”—it was that he had tried to have sex with her. But that he couldn't get it up. (Kieltyka, 2006c; ellipses in original)

This came as surprising and important news to me—that what Juanita had apparently meant in her affidavit and her sealed letter to Northwestern by “sexual relations” was “he had tried to have sex with her but that he couldn't get it up.” The story about what even happened seemed to keep changing. So I pressed Kieltyka further:

Dreger: Why did she say [in the affidavit and the letter] they had sex, if he couldn't get it up?

Kieltyka: What are you—his lawyer? What's your definition of sex?

Dreger: The fact that he tried? That's the definition of having had sex?

Kieltyka: What did Clinton have?

Dreger: Clinton got it up. [...] So you're saying she said he tried but he didn't get it up?

Kieltyka: Right.

Dreger: And she told that to Conway and McCloskey.

Kieltyka: Right.

Dreger: And then [in the formal charge] to Northwestern she said that they had had sex.

Kieltyka: I'm not sure what the letter says....I think it says “sexual relations”—just like El Presidente Clinton. [...] It all is a matter of a definition of what sexual relations is. Because there was fingering, that she was giving him a hand job, I don't recall exactly. Anyway [...] from the moment that Andrea James and Conway wanted to use the sex with a research subject as a way of getting Bailey, I wasn't enthusiastic[.] (Kieltyka, 2006c; ellipses in original unless bracketed)

Nevertheless, the national press *was* enthusiastic about this part of the Bailey controversy. Conway handed over the socially and professionally damning charge of “sexual relations with a transsexual research subject” to any reporter who would take it. And, while Bailey's accuser's identity remained protected almost as if she were a rape victim, while his accuser apparently remained privately inconsistent about what even happened, while Bailey felt unable to defend himself publicly because of his lawyer's gag order and the realities of post-Lewinsky sexual politics, many reporters broadcast the charge along with Bailey's refusal to respond (e.g., Barlow 2003; Wilson 2003c) to the serious detriment of Bailey's personal and professional reputation. By the time I came to this work in 2006, when I asked people what they knew about what Bailey had supposedly done wrong, the majority told me that he had had sex with a research subject.

Yet, given the facts, we must conclude that Bailey was right when, in 2005, he made the rather dull (and thus generally ignored) legalistic point that, all other questions aside, Juanita was simply not his research subject in March 1998, at least not in any meaningful sense of research. Even if Bailey had started thinking by March 1998 that he might eventually write something about her (which documents suggest was not the case until the summer of 1998 when she agreed to meet him over coffee to talk about her story for the book), I don't think this made her a "research subject." I don't think we can call everyone from whom a scholar may learn a story she or he eventually may recount a "research subject." Otherwise, given how often we scholars write about conversations we've had and observations of people we've met along the way, we're going to have to count nearly everyone we know and meet as an actual or potential research subject. (And in that case I confess I've repeatedly had sex with a research subject, namely my husband, about whom I've written quite often, and generally without first asking his permission—for instance, right now.)

I have come to conclude Bailey was also right when, in 2005, he made the point that no one—not even his friends and defenders—wanted to hear, i.e., that there's nothing necessarily wrong about sex with a research subject. Although I had the initial knee-jerk reaction shared by many—"sex with a research subject is verboten"—I've come to realize people's revulsion to sex-with-a-research-subject represents a more general (and irrational) revulsion to non-standard sexual relations. If a researcher abused a position of power to coerce a research subject into sex, that would be wrong, but sexual coercion is wrong regardless of the relationship, and it is certainly not the case that all researchers hold all subjects in disempowered (and thus potentially coercive) positions. Indeed, it is easy to imagine a situation where the reverse could be true, i.e., where a subject would hold real power over the researcher rather than the other way around. I have heard the claim that sexual relations will necessarily interfere with data collection because of the problem of dual relationships, but again, this isn't necessarily the case with all research. It's hard to imagine, for example, how data collection would be compromised if a researcher studying the effects of a particular drug on cholesterol levels had sex with one of the subjects whose cholesterol levels she was tracking.

In the specific case of Bailey and Juanita, I believe we have to conclude that, even if one *does* believe that sex with a research subject is *always* unethical (which seems seriously wrongheaded), and even if one believes Bailey and Juanita had sex on March 22, 1998 (which seems unlikely), the salient point here is that Juanita was not Bailey's research subject in March 1998, when she claims they had sex. *In other words, even if any sexual relations occurred between Bailey and Juanita on March 22, 1998, they were not improper relations by any reading of ethics-of-sex-with-research-subjects,*

*because Juanita was not Bailey's research subject in March 1998, when she claims the relations happened.*

Even after this conclusion, the curious may still wish I could tell them for sure whether the alleged sexual relations happened. I must leave it to readers to make what they will of what I have uncovered regarding the nature and timing of Juanita's story (or stories), and to also decide what to make of the roles of Conway, James, and McCloskey in the formal production and broadcasting of the injurious claim. From the vantage point of this inquirer, it certainly looks as if the allegation—particularly the choice of the conveniently vague phrasing "sexual relations" combined with otherwise highly specific details about the when, the where, and the who of the supposed event—amounted to a trumped-up attempt on the part of a small circle of Bailey's transwomen critics to damage his professional reputation. To some extent, it worked, in large part because it cleverly took advantage of the sex-negative attitude that pervades American culture, including the particular cultural phobias that surround transwomen such as Juanita. As Bailey remarked to me, "it was deeply ironic that Conway et al. were trying to sensationalize sex with transsexuals," but it seemed they would do even that to try to get back at Bailey for the claims he made in his book (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., July 19, 2006).

When Kieltkyka told me she "wasn't enthusiastic" about the sexual relations charge, it was to emphasize that what she found truly unethical was what she called Bailey's "bait and switch" tactics:

he was using friendship as a context for what he wanted, there was a duplicity, there was a deception. It was a misuse of our friendship and relationship. [...] And not only that, [...] saying that he was writing a book, and us agreeing [to that] on one set of values and terms, and for him to switch it, and to present it to us, and for us to understand we were misused, it was too late for us to do anything about it because he intended all along from the get-go to use that information. (Kieltkyka, 2006c)

On another occasion, Kieltkyka put the same sort of complaint to me this way: "It now seems Bailey ingratiated himself to me and the transwomen I brought to him: Entering our favor in order to take advantage of us.....gaining our friendship and confidence—playing a conjob on us.....using and abusing our vulnerability" (Kieltkyka, 2006a; ellipses in original).

What then of this claim of unethical behavior? *Did Bailey abuse the trust he established with the transsexual women about whom he wrote in TMWWBQ, essentially tricking them into revealing otherwise private information about themselves, so that he could use them as "poster children" for Blanchard's taxonomy in his book?*

The first thing one has to understand in considering this question is that the two women who complained about Bailey's

account of them in *TMWWBQ*, namely Kieltyka and Juanita, could not seriously be said to be deeply private and “living in stealth” as McCloskey and Conway insisted in their complaints to Northwestern’s Vice President for Research (McCloskey & Conway, 2003). At the risk of beating a dead horse, let me note again that, by the time *TMWWBQ* was published, Kieltyka and Juanita had presented themselves, their life histories, and their takes on transsexualism to a total of thousands of students at Northwestern University. Kieltyka had even concluded twice by stripping naked (she says to make the point that transsexual women can be extremely attractive even in the nude [Kieltyka, 2006a]). Juanita was apparently also not shy about appearing nude; after all, from at least June, 2003, to December, 2004, Conway’s site featured the semi-nude erotic photo of Juanita taken by Kieltyka (Kieltyka, 2003a). Remember also that, in 1998, Kieltyka and Juanita had given Maegan Gibson their true, pre- and post-reassignment first and last names, their pre- and post-reassignment photos, and their life histories to broadcast in the *Daily Northwestern* (Gibson, 1999). Before this, Kieltyka had revealed parts of her transsexual story to a local paper, *Berwyn Life*, and on a local cable channel (Kieltyka, 2006a). Then in 2002, in response to a request from Bailey, Kieltyka and Juanita again teamed up to talk openly about themselves, their bodies, and their sex lives for a video made to accompany a human sexuality textbook. In that video recording, besides both of them again allowing a publisher to use their true first names and unobscured faces, Kieltyka showed off her pre-transition, crossdressing, erotic-play props, and Juanita talked about making a living as a sex worker both pre-op (as a “she-male”) and post-op. In the video work, each of these women also openly recounted significant portions of what Bailey’s book would say about them a year later (edited version at Allyn & Bacon, 2004; uncut interview footage provided from Bailey’s personal files). Then, shortly after meeting Conway in the summer of 2003, Juanita let Conway put up five close-up photos of her along with her story—again matching much of what Bailey said about her in the book—on Conway’s Transsexual Women’s Successes page (Maria, 2004).

In short, Kieltyka and Juanita were not “stealth” shrinking violets whose stories were sneakily gathered and then first broadcast in 2003 by Bailey. Given how many times Kieltyka and Juanita willingly revealed themselves again and again, Bailey concludes “I believe the claim is absolutely false—the claim that they didn’t want any of this public” (Bailey, 2006a). Trying to explain away the repeated classroom presentations (for which, remember, Kieltyka and Juanita were paid), McCloskey and Conway claimed to Northwestern that “Professor Bailey enticed the women into his classrooms under the pretense of listening open-mindedly to their views” (McCloskey & Conway, 2003). But even if Bailey really had been faking open-mindedness throughout their relationships, he surely wasn’t forcing Kieltyka and Juanita to talk about

their lives and show themselves off again and again. To suggest, as McCloskey and Conway do, that these women had no agency in their work with Bailey, no ability to decline him, is to treat them as children. They were not.

Might there be some other sort of way in which Bailey abused the trust of the transsexual women about whom he eventually wrote in *TMWWBQ*? Kieltyka told me that Bailey had violated both trust and confidentiality by using what the transwomen she brought to him had told him in the interviews he conducted for purposes of writing letters in support of their SRS requests (Kieltyka, 2006c). Out of the four women who filed charges with Northwestern claiming Bailey used them as research subjects without their knowledge and approval, three had obtained letters from Bailey supporting their requests for SRS (Conway, 2003c, 2003d, 2003f). (Kieltyka was the fourth complainant; she was post-transition when she met Bailey.) The three women in question all claim in their complaints that Bailey used what he learned during their SRS-letter interviews for his “research.” What about this?

Bailey denies it. He points out that two of the women in question are not even mentioned in *TMWWBQ*; thus, it is unclear how they think he used their SRS-letter interviews for his so-called “research”. As for the third woman, namely Juanita, Bailey says he did not use her SRS-letter interviews for the book; he says he used what he learned from her outside the context of those interviews (Bailey, 2006a, 2006c). It is impossible to confirm whether this is the case. But what we do know is that, according to Kieltyka, Juanita acknowledged to the Northwestern investigation committee that Juanita knew Bailey was writing about her and that she had given her permission for him to do so (Kieltyka, 2006f), and that, according to Juanita, both Kieltyka and Juanita knew Bailey was writing about them and gave them permission to do so (see “confidential addendum to item 2, submitted in sealed envelope,” at Conway, 2003e). It is also clear that Bailey had plenty of contact with Juanita outside the SRS interviews—in her class presentations, in a book-related coffee appointment in August 1998, in their social outings, and in her participation in the 2002 video. Maybe he did use in the book what Juanita told him during the SRS interviews, but it doesn’t look as if he would have needed that material as a source. She seemed perfectly willing to be open about herself with him and others on many other occasions.

What then about Kieltyka’s claim that Bailey pulled a “bait and switch” by leading her and her friends to believe he would write about them favorably only to turn around and—to her mind pejoratively—label them either autogynephilic or homosexual transsexuals? Being used by Bailey as someone who “openly and floridly exemplifies the essential features of [...] autogynophilia” (Bailey, 2003, p. 156) is clearly the source of much pain for Kieltyka, understandably so since she was taken to task by some transwomen for “allowing” Bailey to “use” her as an example of a theory they find wrong,

harmful, and even disgusting. Kieltyka told me several times that she believes Bailey's portrayal of her as an "autogynephile" constitutes "subreption," i.e., a misrepresentation of her identity so absolutely gross as to constitute a virtual theft of her true identity (Kieltyka, 2006a, 2006b). It was Bailey's identification of her in this way, she suggested, that led to the change of her reputation in trans circles, from a devoted friend and advocate of transwomen to a source of potential or actual harm to those same women.

As I have already shown, Kieltyka and Juanita knew many years in advance of 2003 that Bailey was writing about their lives in a manuscript and also that he classified Kieltyka as an autogynephilic transsexual and Juanita as a homosexual transsexual. Kieltyka even admitted to me that "these terms 'homosexual' transsexual and 'nonhomosexual' transsexual [...] Bailey used [them] on the SRS letters" for Juanita and the other women, though, according to Kieltyka, "none of us noticed, let alone understood the implications of those classifications" (Kieltyka, 2006a). But at least Kieltyka had to have noticed and understood the implications by the time of Gibson's 1999 article, because there Gibson wrote, "Bailey believes Anjelica is an autogynephile, but Anjelica adamantly disagrees with the way he categorizes her. While she does believe autogynephiles exist, she doesn't consider herself one" (Gibson, 1999, p. 5).

Indeed, evidence shows that Kieltyka noticed and was bothered by her labeling as autogynephilic even sooner, in late 1998. In an email message Bailey wrote to Blanchard in early December 1998, Bailey told his colleague, "I showed the [relevant manuscript] section to Anjelica (the autogynephilic transsexual who is most in the book), and she is upset. Not that the facts were wrong, but she doesn't like my interpretation and the intimation that she is not a woman trapped in a man's body. I talk to her tomorrow; not looking forward" (Bailey to Blanchard, p.e.c., December 2, 1998). In fact, both Bailey and Kieltyka recall Kieltyka's being upset during that conversation—not about Bailey writing about intimate details of her life, but about his labeling her masculine and autogynephilic (Bailey, 2005; Kieltyka, 2006b). Then just a couple of months later, Gibson aired Bailey's classification of Kieltyka (Gibson, 1999). That couldn't have made Kieltyka any happier, and it surely couldn't have caused Kieltyka to think Bailey was budging on his claim about her identity.

Why, then, did Kieltyka keep associating with Bailey, year after year, even though he seemed to keep labeling her autogynephilic, a diagnosis of which she knew and to which she objected? I put this to Kieltyka—why did she keep going to his classes, socializing with him, introducing him to other transwomen, helping in response to his request regarding the human sexuality textbook video, and so forth, if she was upset with his labeling her an autogynephile?

Kieltyka had two parts to her explanation. First, to put it simply, she valued her relationship with Bailey and didn't

want to abandon it. She explained the same was true for many of the other transwomen she introduced him to: "all those years, all these women that volunteered to lecture [for pay in his classes] did it because they were still friends with me and also because they respected Mike Bailey and trusted him, [they trusted] that Bailey saw them the way they saw themselves" (Kieltyka, 2006b). Kieltyka in particular believed Bailey saw her as an intellectual and professional collaborator. In fact, as noted in Part 2, for some time she believed she would be something like a co-author on the book he was writing (Kieltyka, 2006b). She came to see "Bailey as a mentor or almost like the relationship between a grad student and a professor, or even like a daughter and a father" (Kieltyka, 2006b). She recalls "I was getting validation [from Bailey] as a researcher, as a field operator, as someone who had large contacts within the community. I felt I was working as a consultant and a collaborator" (Kieltyka, 2006b). Apparently, it didn't seem worth giving all that up over what she saw as his misdiagnosis of her.

The second reason Kieltyka says she kept working with Bailey, even after she knew he had labeled her an autogynephile in his manuscript and in Gibson's article, was this: After she expressed her distress over his diagnosis of her, he told her he remained open to any evidence she could present that he was wrong. And she believed that, if she stuck with the relationship, she could convince him he was wrong about her. She recalled to me that after she saw his manuscript where he wrote about her as an autogynephile, "he said this is a first draft, we can use any information to support your theory if you have support for your theory. If you can change my mind, that's all part of our relationship[....] What I saw was a misunderstanding or a misinterpretation, [and] I wanted the opportunity to change his mind" (Kieltyka, 2006b). Kieltyka tells me she eventually came to believe that the opportunity to change Bailey's mind came in the form of a sexual arousability study Bailey's lab was conducting, and so she helped recruit transwomen subjects for that study. The study sought to explore whether sexual arousal is category-specific in females as it is in males. Bailey and his colleagues specifically wanted to know whether homosexual and heterosexual natal men, homosexual and heterosexual natal women, and MTF transsexuals demonstrated genital arousal to male sexual stimuli (i.e., erotic images of men), to female sexual stimuli, or to both.

Kieltyka told me she was convinced that the study would show Bailey what she believed to be true: that transsexual women such as herself (i.e., those primarily attracted to women) would show genital arousal to *other* women. In other words, she believed the study would show Bailey that women like her are gynephilic, and not autogynephilic (Kieltyka, 2006a, 2006b). And indeed she believes the results did demonstrate just that, because the women like her showed clear category-specific genital arousal patterns to the female stimuli (Chivers, Rieger, Latty, & Bailey, 2004).

I asked Bailey about Kieltyka's interpretation of this study, and he explained that the study was never designed to be a critical test of Blanchard's theory of autogynephilia, because the study included no clear assessment of whether "nonhomosexual" transsexual women are or are not erotically aroused by the idea of being or becoming women; to his mind, the study simply showed *that* nonhomosexual transsexual women are aroused by erotic pictures of women—not *why* they are, nor whether other women are the primary source of their arousal, nor what is the motivation for their transitions. More importantly, Bailey said Kieltyka never gave him any sense that her recruitment of transwomen to the study was motivated by her desire to disprove Blanchard. His understanding was that she was simply interested (as he was) in having his lab study the arousability of transwomen like her (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., January 17, 2007).

All in all, given the substantial historical record of their collegial associations, it makes sense that Kieltyka got a lot out of her relationship with Bailey and that consequently she wanted to try to make it work in spite of their continuing disagreement over her identity. It also makes sense that she would try to talk him out of labeling her an autogynephile, and that she would choose to believe that, as she says he claimed, he remained open to contrary evidence—although it is also clear he would have required truly extraordinary evidence to seriously doubt Blanchard's theory and the peer-reviewed scientific evidence for it, especially when virtually everything Kieltyka and her friends told him about themselves seemed to him only to back up Blanchard's theory.

One has to suspect that, had the intervention of Conway and her fellow "investigators" never happened, Kieltyka and Bailey might well have continued to have a relatively congenial relationship even while Bailey continued to label Kieltyka an autogynephile, against her sense of self. I say this because of the friendly emails that continued after Kieltyka had seen a copy of Bailey's book. For example, recall that on May 16, 2003, several weeks *after* she received the book and just after the backlash had started, Kieltyka jokingly offered to lend Bailey her old athletic support for his next book signing or lecture, and signed the email "Your friend, in spite of spite" (Kieltyka to Bailey, p.e.c., May 16, 2003). But the intervention of Conway and company did indeed happen, and once it did, Kieltyka painfully came to see how, via Bailey's portrayal of her as an autogynephile and the ensuing backlash against *TMWWBQ*, her personal identity was fast being reconstructed by people like Conway and James. She was being actively transformed from a well-liked local trans advocate to a national pariah in the realm of trans rights. And so she came to believe she had been used and abused by Bailey; and she came to believe he had been pulling a con job on her and her friends all along. For his part, he was stunned and then angry at how, after years of a friendly relationship in which he often helped her and her friends, she turned so viciously on him (Bailey, 2006a).

So, to return to the question posed at the outset of this discussion: *Did Bailey abuse the trust he established with the transsexual women about whom he ultimately wrote in TMWWBQ, essentially tricking them into revealing otherwise private information about themselves, so that he could use them as "poster children" for Blanchard's taxonomy in his book?* A total of two women—Kieltyka and Juanita—have complained personally of this sort of treatment. I think it is clear that, in fact, *both opted to reveal intimate details about themselves publicly again and again, and both of them knew, or surely should have known, that Bailey was very likely if not certain to write about them as examples of Blanchard's taxonomic types.* It is also clear Kieltyka repeatedly objected to the characterization of her as an autogynephile, and *it seems likely that, through his words and actions, Bailey let Kieltyka wishfully believe she might change his mind about that when, in fact, there was little chance of her doing so.* If Bailey falsely put forth an image of being likely to be swayed by Kieltyka's critiques as a way of drawing more intimate information from Kieltyka and her friends about their sexualities and their lives, that would be wrong. But I can't find any evidence that this is how he came to know the intimate details of Kieltyka's life or the lives of her friends; rather, he seems to have obtained those because Kieltyka, Juanita, and indeed several other transwomen in their circle were generally forthright and unashamed about themselves in their presentations and their conversations with Bailey.

A subsidiary question to consider in the context of this discussion is this: *Did Bailey write about Juanita and Kieltyka without their permission, as they claimed in their complaints, and if so, was that wrong?* As noted above, it appears that, at least early on, both Juanita and Kieltyka gave Bailey permission to write about them—gave permission explicitly (according to what Kieltyka said about their testimonies to Northwestern and what Juanita said in her "sealed" letter to Northwestern) and implicitly (judging by the fact they helped Bailey by answering questions when he told them he was writing about them in the manuscript). Notably, although he did obtain their permission, according to commonly accepted ethical standards, Bailey was not required to obtain or even seek Juanita's and Kieltyka's permission to write about them; it is not uncommon for scholars to relay stories without asking permission of subjects, particularly when their identities are protected. Now, was it *obnoxious* of Bailey to write of Juanita and "Cher" as examples of Blanchard's two types without obtaining their permission to do that specifically? One can see why the subjects themselves might feel that way. But I think one must also appreciate that scholarship (like journalism) would come to a screeching halt if scholars were only ever able to write about people exactly according to how they wish to be portrayed.

I said above that it is not uncommon for scholars and journalists to relay stories without ever asking permission of subjects, *particularly when their identities are protected.* But

one of Kieltyka's complaints is just that—that Bailey failed to adequately protect her identity, leaving her personally open to criticism and profound misunderstanding. What about this? *Did Bailey fail to adequately protect his subjects' true identities?*

No person aside from Kieltyka has alleged that his or her identity was inadequately protected in *TMWWBQ*, so I focus here on Kieltyka. In his self-defense piece “Academic McCarthyism,” Bailey claims “It was [Kieltyka] who compromised her own anonymity, in her [May 4, 2003] email to Conway,” an email Conway quickly put up on her Website (Bailey, 2005). But after I listened to Kieltyka's version of the story, I told Bailey that Kieltyka said that by the time she contacted Conway in early May 2003, Conway already knew she was Cher. Kieltyka told me, “They were about to hang me. I was told this by people that had frequented the Internet, and that's why they gave me the link to contact Andrea James and Lynn Conway, because I was going to be hanged by them” (Kieltyka, 2006f).

How did James and Conway figure out who Cher was? In the preface to *TMWWBQ*, Bailey thanks Anjelica Kieltyka for “introduc[ing him] to the Chicago transsexual community” (Bailey, 2003, p. xii), and then much later says that “most of the homosexual transsexuals I have met, I met through Cher” (Bailey, 2003, p. 177). Even given this mirroring of acknowledgements, I think it is safe to say the average reader, unfamiliar with the trans scene, would have been unlikely to figure out from Bailey's book that “Cher” was Kieltyka, especially given that in the preface he separately thanks Kieltyka and Cher as if they were two different people (pp. xii–xiii). But Conway and her co-“investigators” were not average readers. Kieltyka notes that Bailey revealed that Cher plays the hammered dulcimer in an Irish folk group (Kieltyka, 2006c; see Bailey 2003, p. 155). A number of people in Kieltyka's local communities, including presumably neighbors and various associates in Chicago transwomen circles, knew about Kieltyka's transsexuality as well as her musical life. Given the hammered dulcimer reference as well as the extent to which Bailey's description of Cher matches Kieltyka's personality and personal life—about which she had been very public—it would not have been too hard for Conway to ask around and find out who this “Cher” was (Kieltyka, 2006c). It is also possible—even likely—that Conway or a member of her cohort was Web-savvy enough to find archives of the portion of Bailey's Northwestern site where in 1998 he had put up the part of the manuscript where he described Kieltyka, identifying her at that time by her real name. (Bailey states he had put this material up for his human sexuality students to read. It never occurred to him that it could or would later be found by others [Bailey, 2006a].)

When I asked Bailey about whether he thought he had failed to protect Kieltyka's identity, and whether he regretted that, he explained,

I had originally asked her to help me pick a pseudonym for her, and she asked me to use her real name. I still remember her saying: “I am not ashamed of anything I've ever done.” I admired that. It was only after she read the initial draft, and especially my interpretation of her behavior as autogynephilic, that she changed her mind on this. (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., January 17, 2007)

He continued, “Because Anjelica Kieltyka had so publicly given her story to so many people (including not only my class but to transgender groups in Chicago), I felt no legal or ethical obligation to mask her. I changed her name because I liked her at that time and because she requested it.” According to Bailey, “She only requested that I change her name, and not that I mask her” by changing other details that might identify her (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., January 17, 2007).

It is entirely possible, given her personality and especially her persistent interest in being public about herself, that Kieltyka might have decided to out herself as the woman who was Cher sometime after the book came out if Conway's “investigation” had never begun. But Kieltyka never had the option of deciding that, since Conway and James quickly flushed her out. *I do not believe Bailey intentionally outed Kieltyka as Cher, so I don't think we can call his behavior in this case unethical in any simple fashion, though he might have thought more carefully about changing more of her personal identifying information, especially given that he knew she didn't want to be called an autogynephile.* I understand why Kieltyka is so angry that she came to be seen, based on Bailey's portrayal of her and the backlash-reading of that portrayal, to be a cause of harm to the very women for whom she saw herself as an advocate. It must have been—and still must be—truly painful to feel that her core identity has been misrepresented over and over again.

Four final charges made against Bailey must be considered before we close this inquiry into the merit of the claims that Bailey behaved unethically, illegally, or immorally in the production of his book. I believe all four can be dispensed with rather quickly.

First, *did Bailey fabricate the ending to the “Danny” story to show that Danny (and most boys like him) would end up gay instead of transsexual* (Bailey, 2003, pp. 213–214)? Conway claims this on her site and bases the claim solely on a report from Kieltyka that Bailey admitted this to Kieltyka (Conway, 2003). When I asked Bailey about the matter, he responded: “I changed things [in the ending story about Danny] to prevent identification. In fact I'm not sure that, if Danny read the book, that he would say ‘oh, that's me.’ But the essential story at the end of the book is true. To tell you more about what that means would compromise the anonymity that I'm trying to maintain” (Bailey, 2006a). He added, “Lynn Conway says that, by the way, [solely] on the basis of what Anjelica told her, and I'd like to know if Lynn Conway thinks everything Anjelica says

is true” (Bailey, 2006a). In fact, I can find no evidence that Bailey fabricated anything meaningful in Danny’s story or in the story of anyone else in the book. It is worth noting again that even Kieltyka has never disputed any of the facts Bailey related about her and her life; she disputes only his interpretations.

Second, *was Bailey illegally practicing clinical psychology without a license when he provided letters in support of a few local transwomen’s requests for SRS?* This may not really be a point germane to an inquiry into the production of *TMWWBQ* since Bailey says he did not use the SRS interviews as the basis for the stories in his book, but let’s assume for the moment that he *did*, and answer the question anyway. After all, Conway, James, and McCloskey each filed formal complaints with the Illinois Department of Professional Regulation and Northwestern University accusing Bailey of illegally practicing psychology without a license by providing the SRS-support letters (Conway, 2004d).

A quick check of the laws of the state of Illinois reveals that, in fact, Bailey was not practicing illegally, because he never asked for or received money (or anything else) in exchange for producing the SRS-support letters, and the relevant Illinois state regulations indicate that if a person does not seek or obtain “remuneration” for services offered or rendered, that person is not required to have a license, even if the person otherwise appears to be offering what counts as “clinical psychological services” (225 ILCS 15/1 [from Chap. 111, para 5351]). Bailey also never offered or represented a therapeutic relationship with any of the women in question. Presumably this is why the Illinois Department of Professional Regulation never seems to have bothered pursuing the charges made against Bailey.

As a side point, let me just note the irony in Conway’s, James’s, and McCloskey’s trying to use Bailey’s SRS-support letters against him. It certainly appears from this vantage that, in answering Kieltyka’s call for help for her marginalized transwomen friends by providing letters in support of their requests for SRS—free of charge and without any requirement of a lengthy and costly “therapeutic” relationship—Bailey was helping to reduce the barriers to transition for a small number of transwomen, the very barriers about which people such as Conway, James, and McCloskey have complained (see, e.g., Conway, 2006b; James, n.d.-g; McCloskey 1999, pp. 71–72). One can imagine, in a different situation—say, one in which the psychology professor in question didn’t believe in Blanchard’s taxonomy—the likes of Conway, McCloskey, and James holding up Bailey as a model for his support of these women’s pursuit of SRS.

Third, *was Bailey undermining the rights of sexual minorities, including transsexual women, by producing the book he did?* As I’ve noted, this claim has been made again and again by Conway, McCloskey, Kieltyka, and others, including to the press, on the Web, and in letters and emails to

Bailey’s colleagues in the Northwestern Psychology Department. But it isn’t clear that Bailey’s book does undermine the rights of sexual minorities, any more than it is clear that it supports them. Yes, he points to the relative femininity of many gay men, and that reiterates a classic stereotype, but he also makes clear he believes there’s nothing *wrong* with being a relatively feminine man or a gay man. Yes, he labels some transwomen as having a paraphilia—namely autogynephilia—but he also clearly says it is not harmful and that the only real consideration with regard to SRS decision-making is the happiness of individual transwomen. If it makes them happier (and he says it does), then they should be able to get it. As I think I showed clearly in Part 3 of this essay, Bailey’s book is complicated and often atypical in its claims, and this is probably why different readers have read *TMWWBQ* quite differently. Public critiques as well as correspondence Bailey has received (like correspondence I myself have received) suggest that some queer people find his book part of the problem of social oppression of queer people, while others see in it personal liberation through his finally giving voice to politically incorrect truths about their queer identities.

Notably, because it is often scientifically and politically atypical in its claims, Bailey’s work seems particularly inclined to create critics and allies on all sides; so, for example, we’ve seen how he was criticized and praised in both the left-wing and right-wing media. And we find the anti-gay National Association for Research & Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH) trying, largely through highly selective quotation, to use Bailey’s words on homosexuality to defend their homophobic policies (see, e.g., Byrd, 2006) even while Bailey has been reasonably positioned to debate *against* NARTH representatives on a Catholic radio program and in academic conferences on homosexuality. So I think it is a serious intellectual challenge to make the claim that Bailey is simply anti-queer or even anti-trans in his book. I see no evidence the book is, as Kieltyka has suggested, part of a widespread, undercover agenda to eliminate queer people through eugenics and other biotechnological means. And, after my exegesis of *TMWWBQ* as presented in Part 3, I find it impossible to analogize the book to *Mein Kampf*, as McCloskey has done (McCloskey to Marks, p.e.c., February 3, 2004, available at Conway, 2005a).

Finally, *did Bailey ignore critical data against Blanchard’s theory, so that he was essentially engaged in the suppression of legitimate data in his book?* Bailey’s response to this is a resounding no—that he did not, during the production of his book, see legitimate evidence of transwomen whose lives and histories flew in the face of Blanchard’s taxonomy and what he saw as the substantial scientific evidence for it (Bailey, 2006a). Of course, McCloskey, Conway, and others have claimed otherwise. I think this one ends up as a problem that has stumped philosophers of science for ages, namely the problem of how scientists (or scholars more generally) are to discern what data count as legitimate and relevant. Given the

evidence for Blanchard's theory and the lack of peer-reviewed evidence or argumentation refuting it, Bailey is about as convinced of the theory as he is of the theory of evolution by natural selection—though, when I jokingly asked him, he did say he thinks Blanchard's theory is more likely to eventually fall than Darwin's (p.e.c., January 3, 2007). Bailey considers claims made against Blanchard's theory extraordinary, and extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof. Thus, what seems to some trans critics obvious proof against Blanchard strikes Bailey as very weak indeed (Bailey, 2006a). No matter how many transwomen bombard Bailey with claims of being a "third type" unexplained by Blanchard's theory, I don't think Bailey can be called unethical for sticking stubbornly to a theory he believes to be, all in all, well-evidenced not only in his own experience but in the scientific literature (e.g., Blanchard 1989, 1993; Smith, van Goozen, Kuiper, & Cohen-Kettenis, 2005).

So in conclusion, what did Bailey do wrong legally, ethically, and morally? *It seems J. Michael Bailey should have been more proactive in protecting the identity of Anjelica Kieltyka. It also seems he should perhaps have worked harder to be as clear as humanly possible with Kieltyka just how unlikely she was to ever convince him that Blanchard's theory was wrong, so that she was not at risk of continuing to relate with him under an umbrella of wishful thinking.*

That's it? After months of investigation evinced by the foregoing, I must conclude: that's it.

How could there possibly have been so much smoke and so little fire? One answer is that, if you look as closely as I have done here, there were in fact far fewer accusers of Bailey than all the noise in the press and on the Internet would have you believe. And of the accusations made, almost none appear to have been legitimate. But all of the noise of the accusations did what I suspect Conway, James, and McCloskey hoped: It distracted attention from the book's message—that Blanchard's theory of MTF transsexualism was right—by apparently killing the messenger. Indeed, much as Bailey would prefer not to admit it, in their leadership of the backlash against *TMWWBQ*, Lynn Conway, Andrea James, and Deirdre McCloskey came remarkably close to effectively destroying J. Michael Bailey's reputation and life.

## Part 6: Epilogue

So what happened to the text at the center of all this? I asked Stephen Mautner, a representative of the publisher, Joseph Henry Press, how many copies of *TMWWBQ* were ultimately sold. Mautner first sought Bailey's permission to answer my question—sales figures are ordinarily privileged information—and then, given the go-ahead, Mautner revealed that as of August 2006, the book had sold about 4200 copies. That would be considered a moderate number for an academic book

and a low number for a trade book, which *TMWWBQ* was intended to be. But, Mautner continued, "The big story is the activity online," where Joseph Henry's books were until recently available to anyone to read for free. "Since publication, there have been about 900,000 visits to the electronic version of [*TMWWBQ*]. We are not able to tell you how many of those were repeat visits, but by any measure, that's a LOT of online reading" (Stephen Mautner to Michael Bailey, copy to Alice Dreger, p.e.c., August 11, 2006; capitalization in original).

Given that the book probably turned out to have at least a quarter-million readers (and possibly many more), did *TMWWBQ* ultimately have the negative effect on transwomen that so many of Bailey's trans critics feared at the outset? I think that is hard to demonstrate. In their January, 2004 letter to the faculty of Northwestern University's Department of Psychology, denouncing Bailey "as a central figure in an elite reactionary group [... in] pursuit of institutionalized bigotry and defamation of transsexual women," Anjelica Kieltyka, Lynn Conway, Andrea James, and Calpernia Addams claimed of knowing "how Bailey's junk science is hurting young trans women." They said they were aware "of cases where it is destroying [young transwomen's] relationships with families and friends, limiting or even ruining their chances for employment, and causing deep emotional angst." They named one specific instance: "One woman wrote to us describing how her mother came running into her bedroom after reading Bailey's book, and threw the book at her shouting, 'Now I know what you are!'" (letter from Kieltyka, Conway, James, and Addams, to the faculty members of the Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, January 7, 2004).

Nevertheless, I have found it impossible to locate any independent confirmation that *TMWWBQ* has been responsible for these kinds of negative effects—employment discrimination, ruining of relationships, and "deep emotional angst"—although it seems reasonable to presume that those who read it may have come away believing Blanchard's taxonomy more than the feminine essence narrative, and that that will have caused certain transwomen real angst. Bailey has certainly received copious correspondence from transwomen claiming to be a "third type" not addressed in Blanchard's theorizing or Bailey's book—just as Bailey has received substantial correspondence from transwomen who thank him for explaining Blanchard's theory and thus helping them to make sense of their lives as "homosexual transsexuals" and "autogynephilic transsexuals" (J. Michael Bailey, personal files; compare <http://www.transkids.us>). When I wondered to Anne Lawrence whether it might be true that *TMWWBQ* has led to transwomen suffering things such as employment discrimination, ostracism, deep angst, or even—as Kieltyka, Conway, James, and Addams implied in their January, 2004 letter to Bailey's closest colleagues—violent hate crimes, Lawrence responded: "At the risk of stating the obvious, the



reason that Conway, James, McCloskey, [Becky] Allison, [Christine] Burns, et al. are so angry is not because they are so sure that Bailey is *wrong*. It is because they worry that he might be at least partly *right* and this realization is potentially fatal for their hard-earned sense-of-self” (p.e.c., December 11, 2006; italics added). In that vein, Lawrence agrees with the claim about angst, but thinks it is not an unjust angst thrust upon particularly vulnerable young transwomen. Bailey is more blunt in his assessment: he says that if there has been an injury from his book—a book he sees as positive in its honesty and in its acceptance of transwomen’s realities—it has been a narcissistic injury suffered by a small number of autogynephilic transsexuals who wish we would all deny the truth (Bailey to Dreger, p.e.c., February 27, 2007).

Several people have claimed *TMWWBQ* and the ensuing controversy have had substantial negative effects on sex researchers’ relationships with transwomen, because supposedly they have made the two groups deeply suspicious of each other. In his review of the book, University of Minnesota sex researcher Walter Bockting argued that the controversy constituted “yet another blow to the delicate relationship between clinicians, scholars, and the transgender community,” a real problem for the professionals (like him) in question, since clinicians and researchers “cannot do this work without the cooperation and support of the transgender community” (Bockting, 2005). Recall that, similarly, Bockting’s University of Minnesota colleague Eli Coleman has publicly argued that *TMWWBQ* equated to “an unfortunate setback in feelings of trust between the transgender community and sex researchers” (Eli Coleman, p.e.c., August 4, 2006). Meanwhile, trans advocate Jamison Green reported to me that “A few sex researchers that I know have expressed dismay over the controversy, [but] mostly to say that they were sorry that Bailey treated both his subjects and the topic in such a cavalier manner” (Jamison Green, p.e.c., August 20, 2006).

Nevertheless, a number of sex researchers with whom I talked made the argument that, while Bailey’s book perhaps rubbed some people the wrong way—and perhaps rubbed them the wrong way more than it needed to do to make its points—it was the over-the-top response from Conway and her colleagues that really put a chill on sex researchers’ interest in trans issues. Steven Pinker of Harvard University opined to me, “The intimidation directed at Bailey will ensure that graduate students, post-docs, and other young researchers will not touch this topic with a ten-foot pole, starving the field of new talent. Only tenured professors who have decided to change fields—a tiny number—would take it on” (p.e.c., June 27, 2006). Blanchard had a similar take:

The population of people who were actively doing research on transgender was already pretty small[...] If anything, [the attack on Bailey] has had a discouraging

effect about getting into the area of study. It’s not hard for a student to see, if they have a choice of topics, “Why should I pick one where the subjects are likely to get litigious or make a fuss, or suspect everything I do?” (Blanchard, 2006)

Blanchard was striking a common chord here; many sex researchers told me—without wishing to be named—that trans activists such as James have behaved so crazily, the entire population they “represent” has been marked by researchers as being too unstable and dangerous to bother with.

Beyond the research realm, what about the effect *TMWWBQ* has had on clinicians and their trans clients? Again, most people I talked with seem to think its effects have been small or negligible. Although, as we have seen, Bockting (2005) thought the book would harm clinician–client relationships, Jamison Green has speculated that it has had little effect: “I’ve not seen [the book] cited in any important articles or books, other than to comment on the controversy it generated[...] Most of the clinicians that I’ve spoken to don’t seem to be aware of the book or the controversy” (p.e.c., August 20, 2006). It certainly does seem to be the case that Bailey’s book and Blanchard’s theory continue to be largely ignored in the popularized gender psychology literature, literature that generally accepts and promotes the feminine essence narrative as the one and only true story of MTF transsexualism.

What about the book’s and controversy’s effects on trans advocacy? Several people have argued for a generally positive outcome there. So Simon LeVay suggested to me,

It may be that [the criticisms and attacks] have raised the visibility of transgendered people to some extent. For example, I like the fact that Ben Barres of Stanford has become quite vocal in the area of sexuality and gender, even though I don’t agree with everything he says. I think Mike’s book sparked that to some extent. (p.e.c., August 2, 2006)

Jamison Green similarly argues that “I think the Conway-led response had a positive effect on the community at large. I believe people felt empowered by it, because it modeled a powerful self-regard and courage to stand up for what one believes in, which is something that trans people need to see and internalize” (p.e.c., August 20, 2006). But others believe that the nastiness that ensued from the controversy shut down productive discussion of the etiology and meaning of MTF transsexualism among transwomen and indeed among sex researchers to some extent. When I asked Anne Lawrence about the effects of the book and the controversy, she told me that

extreme reactions led to a hardening of positions. It became difficult for anyone to stake out a middle ground

concerning the book [and its claims]. It became hard to say, “Well, some things could have been expressed more sensitively or with more qualification, but there is still great value in the book.” And because the attacks on Bailey have been so unfair, those of us who find value in the book and who like and respect Bailey are not inclined to talk about what we might wish he had done differently. It’s almost impossible now to stand in the middle. (Lawrence, 2006a)

As Lawrence was hinting here, a few people have suggested that Bailey might have avoided at least some of the fray if he had only been more politic in some of his wording. LeVay told me that, when he saw the manuscript of the book, he encouraged Bailey to be careful that his terminology not cause him to “be read as blurring or denying the real differences that exist between gay and transgendered people, especially in the area of self-identification.” He went on, “I don’t think that Mike made any significant changes as a result of that comment of mine, which was perhaps unfortunate because [it] did in fact spark some (unnecessary) hostile reactions” (p.e.c., August 2, 2006). But I suspect Bailey was right when he told me that he was going to encounter resistance to his support of Blanchard’s taxonomy regardless of how he phrased it. Blanchard is sure: “If Mike’s book had been written by someone who [had] self-censored every paragraph, Conway et al. would not have liked the message any better. They would not have liked the bottom line message” (Blanchard, 2006).

For his part, Bailey says he doesn’t care primarily about whether the book had a negative or positive effect; he cares that he told what he saw as the truth, and that he continued to speak what he saw as the truth in the face of vitriolic personal assaults. He clearly puts the value of truth-seeking and truth-telling over the value of the complicated relationships among sex researchers, gender clinicians, and trans people—complicated (even tangled) relationships he sees as having perpetuated the universalizing of the feminine essence narrative at the exclusion of reality. He argues that speaking the truth will help trans people more in the long run, even if it hurts in the short run:

It is almost always better (in terms of having a positive effect) to know and speak the truth than it is to believe and speak something that is untrue, even if the former upsets people more than the latter. Furthermore, I have profound skepticism regarding claims that X should not be studied or said because it is dangerous, harmful, or hurtful to do so. (p.e.c., January 29, 2007)

So was Bailey speaking the truth—not just the truth as he knew it, but the truth? It is beyond the scope of this history to examine the evidence for and against Blanchard’s typology of MTF transsexualism. I will say here that the literature around Blanchard’s theory looks ripe for a thorough queer theory-

based, science studies critique that would consider the possible inconsistencies, blind spots, and culture-heavy assumptions in that literature. A number of reasonable questions could (and should) be raised: What do we make of the varied ways that autogynephilia has been conceived, including by Blanchard himself (Blanchard, 2005)? What of the choice of terms used, and how might those terms constrict conceptions of the phenomena and harm (or help) the individuals in question? Could “autogynephilia” exist in at least some natal women, and if so, might autogynephilia in MTFs not be understood as a sign of a core female gender identity? Patterns of demographic differences between “homosexual transsexuals” and “autogynephilic transsexuals” are taken as evidence for Blanchard’s theory (see, e.g., Smith et al., 2005), but to what extent might those apparent demographic differences be a product not of inherent differences in those people but in the way androphilic MTFs versus non-androphilic MTFs are treated in our culture?

Pending a thorough critical analysis of Blanchard’s theory, let me say for this historical record, reports of its death have been premature. Blanchard’s explanatory typology certainly has not been roundly rejected by virtually all sexologists, as the sites of people such as Conway and James suggest. Although fewer sexologists are as familiar with it as Blanchard and Bailey would like, there are indeed researchers considering its explanatory power and evidentiary basis—and some have found evidence to support it. For example, a group in the Netherlands found that

Homosexual transsexuals were [...] younger when applying for sex reassignment, reported a stronger cross-gender identity in childhood, had a more convincing cross-gender appearance [...]. Moreover, a lower percentage of the homosexual transsexuals reported being (or having been) married and sexually aroused while cross-dressing.

These researchers concluded, “A distinction between subtypes of transsexuals on the basis of sexual orientation seems theoretically and clinically meaningful” (Smith et al., 2005; see also Chivers & Bailey, 2000). And while Blanchard’s work on MTF transsexualism has been portrayed by his critics as if it was merely theoretical with no real empirical basis, the truth is that Blanchard himself has also sought and published empirical data for his typology and his theory of autogynephilia (see, e.g., Blanchard, 1992). For instance, he has demonstrated a high prevalence of sexual arousal to cross-gender fantasy among non-homosexual MTF transsexuals (Blanchard, 1989) as well as showing that “nonhomosexual men most aroused sexually by the thought of having a woman’s body are also those most interested in acquiring a woman’s body through some permanent, physical transformation” (Blanchard, 1993).

What of the supposed evidence against Blanchard's theory? Many transwomen have complained that, in their work, Blanchard and Bailey have ignored their life narratives, narratives that these women say fly in the face of the simple two-type model of MTF transsexualism that sees eroticism as a fundamental motivation for MTF sex reassignment. But what many of these critics have failed to realize is that Bailey and Blanchard aren't interested in whether people's *narratives* fit Blanchard's theory; they are interested in whether *people* do. And Bailey and Blanchard see plenty of evidence that, self-representation to the contrary, transwomen's histories—including their gendered and erotic histories—and the data drawn from them in lab-based and clinical studies support rather than weaken Blanchard's typology.

There have been multiple attempts to shut down meaningful public discussion of Blanchard's theory, even beyond the controversy that surrounded *TMWWBQ*. So the Wikipedia entries on "homosexual transsexual," "autogynephilia," and "Blanchard, Bailey, and Lawrence theory" seem to be permanent sites of dispute, with editors constantly replacing, spinning, deleting, and augmenting each other's contributions. But there remain resilient pockets not only of sexologists who subscribe to Blanchard's theoretical work, but also of transwomen who subscribe to it and identify themselves as "homosexual transsexuals" and "autogynephilic transsexuals" (though not always without questioning Blanchard's choice of terminology). For example, as noted in Part 4, the "Transkids" Website records the autobiographies and critiques of transwomen who see themselves as fitting the "homosexual transsexual" model (<http://www.transkids.us>). For a time, during the height of the Bailey controversy, there was also an active listserv of self-identified autogynephilic transwomen, and even today, after the *TMWWBQ* blow-up, a small number of transwomen such as Willow Arune and Anne Lawrence continue to be open about their self-identification as autogynephilic transwomen (Arune, 2004; Lawrence, 2007; see also the "narratives about autogynephilia" at Lawrence, 1999a, 1999b).

Indeed, even people highly critical of Bailey sometimes acknowledge the existence of autogynephilia, though they discount its importance in trans identity and deny Blanchard's two-type taxonomy. Thus, Bockting told me, "Autogynephilia is not an uncommon phenomenon among my clients, and a phenomenon that is relevant and part of their identity development. However, I do not see it as an identity in and of itself" (p.e.c., August 30, 2006). Others acknowledge the phenomenon of erotic crossdressing but refuse to categorize it as "autogynephilia"; so transwoman Becky Allison, M.D., asks rhetorically in her critique of Bailey's book, "am I suggesting that eroticism while crossdressing played no part in my history, or in the histories of my many non-autogynephilic friends? I am not. It did play a part. A small part. Call it a phase if you will" (Allison, 2003). So I think it is fair to say that the

role of eroticism—including erotic crossdressing—in transsexualism remains a lively point of discussion, as does Blanchard's two-part typology.

The controversy over Bailey's book has allowed his critics to lump together the work of Bailey, Blanchard, and Anne Lawrence as a monolithic, containable, anti-trans-rights theoretic entity known as "the Blanchard, Bailey, Lawrence theory" (see, e.g., James, n.d.-h). But this strikes me as a blatant mischaracterization at several levels. First, in a move I think could only be labeled pro-trans-rights, Blanchard, Bailey, and Lawrence have each actively argued that the chief determinant of whether transwomen should have access to SRS is whether or not individual transwomen are better off (Bailey, 2003; Blanchard, 2000; Lawrence, 2003). Blanchard and Lawrence *have done the work to show* that they generally are better off (Blanchard, 1985, 2000; Blanchard, Clemmensen, & Steiner, 1983; Blanchard, Legault, & Lindsay, 1987; Blanchard & Sheridan, 1990; Blanchard & Steiner, 1983; Blanchard, Steiner, & Clemmensen, 1985; Blanchard, Steiner, Clemmensen, & Dickey, 1989; Lawrence, 2003). This is the work that Bailey alludes to in his book when he writes about why Paul McHugh is wrong to deny transwomen access to reassignment (Bailey, 2003, p. 207). Second, referring to the theory as the "Blanchard–Bailey–Lawrence" theory conveniently denies that there are plenty of other professional sexologists who take seriously Blanchard's typology of homosexual and nonhomosexual MTF transsexuals (see, e.g., Cohen-Kettenis & Gooren, 1999; Green, 2000; Kelly, 2005; LeVay & Valente, 2006; Schroder & Carroll, 1999; Smith et al., 2005; van Goozen, Slabbekoorn, Gooren, Sanders, & Cohen-Kettenis, 2002). Third, the "Blanchard–Bailey–Lawrence" construction fails to give Blanchard the substantial priority he is due.

Finally, it seems to me that there are actually subtle but key differences in the way that Blanchard and Bailey have conceived of and Lawrence is now conceiving of autogynephilia. Lawrence is developing a conceptualization of autogynephilia as a real sexual orientation, akin to the way being homosexual or heterosexual is a sexual orientation. Like Blanchard and Bailey, she sees autogynephilia as a paraphilia, but she seems to be more interested than Blanchard and Bailey in elaborating what it means to take seriously autogynephilia as a sexual orientation. So she has been theorizing the roles of the erotic-based, attraction-based, and attachment-based elements of autogynephilia, and considering how the balance of these elements might change as an autogynephilic transsexual develops her identity as woman. When she speaks of autogynephilia, Lawrence speaks much more of "becoming what we *love*" than "becoming what we *lust after*". All this, she suggests, helps to explain why some transwomen who admit to erotic crossdressing pre-transition say that they essentially give up or lose what looks like autogynephilia after transition, especially after the reduction of libido that happens with

the intentional shift from male-typical to female-typical hormones. Thus, what some transwomen label as “an autogynephilic stage” in personal development is understood by Lawrence as representing a period when the erotic component of autogynephilia is more prominent (and undeniable) than it becomes later in the lives of most autogynephilic transsexuals. Consequently, in spite of being lumped into what gets labeled by its critics the “Blanchard–Bailey–Lawrence” theoretical construct, Lawrence seems to be developing a vision of autogynephilia that is more complex and potentially more explanatorily powerful (and possibly even more palatable) than what has thus far been put forward (Lawrence, 2004, 2006b, 2007).

But will Blanchard’s theory ever make it into the mainstream of trans politics and discourse? To do so, it would have to overcome the widespread political rejection of a model that sees transsexuality as a pathology. After all, Blanchard, Bailey, and Lawrence have all argued that autogynephilia is a paraphilia—a psychosexual disorder. Granted, they argue autogynephilia is a non-harmful paraphilia, and one which absolutely should not eliminate a transwoman from consideration for sex reassignment. But as long as they talk of any kind of transsexuality as a paraphilia, I think it is unlikely Blanchard’s theory will find anything like general acceptance among politically conscious trans people who, understandably, are sick and tired of being treated as if they suffer from a pathology.

Putting aside for a moment the whole problem of the scientific truth about MTF transsexuality, I’m not sure that the simplistic feminine essence narrative is necessarily any better for transwomen than Blanchard’s typology. In doing research for this project, I have been disturbed to see the extent to which transwomen, in order to speak and be heard, seem to feel obliged to completely deny the role of eroticism in their decisions to undergo sex reassignment—and not just by trans activists like Conway and James, but also by gender therapists like Randi Ettner and Mildred Brown, and by the press. Historically, this de-eroticization of transsexuals’ life narratives has been promoted not only by certain transwomen like Christine Jorgensen but also, importantly, by the medical professionals who have acted as gatekeepers to sex reassignment (Meyerowitz, 2002). After all, in the past, some influential clinicians claimed that confession of a *single instance* of sexual arousal associated with crossdressing should eliminate a patient from consideration of a diagnosis of transsexualism and thus also from consideration of sex reassignment (see, e.g., Baker, 1969). Although the de-eroticized feminine essence narrative may function socially and clinically like a sort of get-out-of-male-free card, this pushing of sex into the closet where transsexuality is concerned at some level robs transwomen of their erotic possibilities and realities, and in that sense Ettner and Brown are surely doing their clients and readers no favors. I personally hope that as trans activists seek

to work for greater acceptance of trans people, they also do not insist upon a complete and universal de-eroticization of trans people’s life histories.

Importantly, as Lawrence has pointed out, there exists an almost invisible group of people for whom the universalizing of the feminine essence narrative may (ironically) act as a barrier to beneficial sex changes. These are male-bodied people who experience severe, sometimes incapacitating distress about or alienation from their male bodies but who do not feel in themselves a “feminine essence” others seem to be describing. If a “feminine essence” feeling is said to be the necessary motivation for a sex change, these people may not seek and get sex changes from which they would truly benefit (Lawrence to Dreger, p.e.c., March 23, 2007). This constitutes another reason why the feminine essence narrative—especially at the exclusion of all other possibilities—may harm some trans people even as it seems to help others.

Ironically, as some science studies scholars have suggested, it is gender clinicians and sexologists themselves who have set the scene for trans women denying anything other than feminine essence autobiographies by demanding singular sorts of Western heteronormative stories out of MTFs seeking SRS (Stone, 1991; see also Meyerowitz, 2002). Clinicians like Robert Stoller maintained a dichotomy of “true transsexuals” (i.e., androphilic would-be MTFs who came with what looked like feminine essence narratives) versus “transvestites” (including non-androphilic would-be MTFs who confessed to erotic cross-dressing), insisting only the former sort be allowed SRS (Stoller, 1971). Although Blanchard and most of his followers have abandoned this language of “true” versus untrue transsexuals, and have insisted (and even shown) that SRS can benefit “autogynephilic” transsexuals as much as “homosexual” transsexuals, the legacy of their more prohibitive predecessors hangs over the clinical and political representations of MTF transsexuality.

Finally, what of the individuals who played major parts in the history of the controversy over *TMWWBQ*? As I write, Deirdre McCloskey maintains an active and prominent academic career, enjoying an international reputation as an interdisciplinary scholar. Lynn Conway, now retired from the University of Michigan, continues to use her university Website to broadcast her ongoing “investigation” of Bailey and to provide inspiring stories of successful transwomen like herself. Andrea James keeps up her own Website as a source of consumer advice to transwomen, as a marketing platform for herself, and as a font of intimidation to those who would dare to openly disagree with her. James was featured on the front cover of *The Advocate*’s June 2006 Pride Special; inside she was quoted as saying, “I consider myself agnostic but guided by a set of unwavering moral principles” (James, 2006). I do not know what has happened to the woman known as Juanita.

As for Anjelica Kieltyka, my sense is that she feels chewed up and spat out several times over. It is clear she now feels she

was being used by Bailey all along, and I take from what she told me that she also feels abused by Conway and her “co-investigators.” During our interviews, she remembered several times that the last thing Michael Bailey ever said to her was to warn her of Conway and James, “Don’t let them use you” (Kieltyka, 2006c, 2006d). Of all the people in this story, Kieltyka is the one I worry about. She struck me—both in her biography and in our conversations—as a genuinely kind-hearted person who truly tried to help her fellow transwomen along the way, only to find herself ejected from that community. She told me, “The problem is that Conway [came] in and befriended all of my friends and turned a number of them into discrediting me” (Kieltyka, 2006f). She can’t even seem to attend the regular trans gatherings she used to without risking being misunderstood and rejected. Just as I told her of Conway’s bizarre threat to tell people I was stalking her, Kieltyka recalled to me, with some anger,

the recent incident at the Be-All [a trans gathering] where [Conway] accused me of stalking her. I was at the bar over there and she was among my friends and I [...] heard that she was going around saying that I was stalking her. [...] Anyway, it was a nonevent that Professor Conway tried to turn into a “staged event”—an opportunity to discredit me. (Kieltyka, 2006a)

A woman who once enjoyed an active life among the transwomen circles of Chicago, a woman who once valued her regular association with academics (including Bailey and his colleagues) at Northwestern University, Kieltyka has now become largely isolated through what she feels has been one misrepresentation of her after another.

Meanwhile, on the sex research side, Blanchard says he hasn’t been much affected personally by the controversy, because “there were no opportunities for those people to attack me the way they had attacked Mike.” Blanchard had already lost interest in doing work in transsexuality before *TMWWBQ*, and, not surprisingly, the controversy has not rekindled his interest. He did tell me he found the backlash

discouraging. I guess to some extent I’m used to academic controversies, and however vicious those get, people have a common understanding of where you draw the line about disputing a theory or an idea. In this particular battle, people were not playing by the familiar academic rules. James put up pictures of Mike’s children, people moved to have books removed from consideration for awards. This was totally out of the rules of discourse. (Blanchard, 2006)

When I asked Lawrence about how she had been affected by the backlash personally—a backlash that ended up repainting her as a sworn enemy of trans rights—Lawrence said:

It feels like a great loss to be so alienated from my own community. I have worked very hard on behalf of my community. For over 10 years now, I have tried to provide accurate information for MTF transsexuals on my website. And I worked so hard to try to liberalize the [HBIGDA] Standards of Care! [Sex researcher and FTM] Aaron Devor and I must have put in close to a hundred hours, trying to make Version Six [of the Standards of Care] better for transpeople and reduce barriers to care. I conducted the research that demonstrated, among other things, that nonhomosexual transsexuals can have outcomes from sex reassignment surgery that are every bit as good as those of homosexual transsexuals. I used to be respected, even admired, within my community. Now many people see me as the anti-Christ. I rarely attend transgender conventions anymore. (Lawrence, 2006a)

And Bailey? Undaunted, he plugs ahead, working on more sexual-orientation studies—studies likely to keep angering people on both the right and the left who wish his work fell simply into one of the politicized scientific boxes on which they insist. He is relieved that, with the dust of the backlash settling and the full history emerging, his colleagues seem increasingly inclined to rally to his side and to the sides of similarly beleaguered sex researchers (see, e.g., De Vries et al., 2007).

As I was nearing the end of my research into this history, I asked Bailey whether he regrets publishing his book. Not a bit, he replied. Regrets the backlash? At this, he surprised me by answering, “I have decided that I’m glad for everything, even Lynn Conway’s behavior.” The backlash, he explained to me, made him realize what fine family, friends, and colleagues he has, to stand by him for all the right reasons. On top of that, he notes, the backlash also did exactly what I had warned Conway back in 2003 it would: it gave his book far more publicity than it otherwise would have had. And finally, Bailey explained, the whole experience “has taught me, albeit the hard way, the value of truth.” He went on, “I think that before, sometimes, I used to hesitate to say true things out of concern that the truth would cause someone pain. But Conway et al. took away any remaining inhibitions I had against telling the truth” (p.e.c., January 30, 2007).

**Acknowledgments** My thanks go to the more than 100 people who answered inquiries on this project, Yorgos Strangas for excellent research assistance, the Editor for patient editorial assistance, and the following people for comments on drafts of this article: Marcus Arana (Holy Old Man Bull), William B. Kelley, Lisa Lees, Kathryn Montgomery, James L. Nelson, Maxine Petersen, Julie F. Simpson, Aron Sousa, John Sylla, Kiira Triea, Paul Vasey, 13 readers who asked that I not name them, and three anonymous reviewers. Thanks to Claire Hoipkemie and Kepler Domurat-Sousa for assistance with proofing.

## References

- Allison, B. (2003, April 13). *NONs (or the National Academy meets the National Enquirer)*. Retrieved October 16, 2006, from <http://www.drbecky.com/blog05.html#apr13>
- Allyn & Bacon. (2004). *Human sexuality videoworkshop* [14 modules on CD-Rom]. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- American Association of University Professors. (2006). *Research on human subjects: Academic freedom and the Institutional Review Board*. Retrieved January 1, 2007, from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/About/committees/committee+repts/CommA/ResearchonHumanSubjects.htm>
- Arune, W. (2004). I \*am\* Arune. *Transgender Tapestry*, 106, 44–51.
- Bad Science. (2006, August 9). *Chicago Free Press*. Retrieved February 29, 2008, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/Bailey/Chicago%20Free%20Press/Chicago%20Free%20Press%20EDITORIAL%208-09-06.htm>
- Bailey, Deb (2006, August 9). Interview with Alice Dreger; no revisions to transcript.
- Bailey, Drew (2006, June 20). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript received August 1, 2006.
- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- Bailey, J. M. (2005, October 9). Academic McCarthyism. *Northwestern Chronicle*. Retrieved February 19, 2007, from <http://www.chron.org/tools/viewart.php?artid=1248>
- Bailey, J. M. (2006a, July 6). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript received July 18, 2006.
- Bailey, J. M. (2006b, August 8). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript received August 8, 2006.
- Bailey, J. M. (2006c, August 25). Interview with Alice Dreger; no revisions to transcript.
- Bailey, J. M., & Pillard, R. C. (1991). A genetic study of male sexual orientation. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 48, 1089–1096.
- Bailey J. M., Pillard, R. C., Neale, M. C., & Agyei, Y. (1993). Heritable factors influence sexual orientation in women. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 50, 217–223.
- Baker, H. J. (1969). Transsexualism: Problems in treatment. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 125, 1412–1418.
- Barlow, E. (1996). Masculine and feminine traits in homosexual transsexuals, homosexual cross-dressers and gay men. Unpublished Honor's thesis, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.
- Barlow, G. (2003, December 17). NU professor faces sexual allegations. *Chicago Free Press*.
- Beatty, C. (2003, Fall). [Review of the book *The man who would be queen*]. *Transgender Tapestry*, 103, 27–28, 56.
- Becker, R. (2003, July 29). Author is ripped for transsexual research. *Chicago Tribune*. This appears on p. 1 of the Metro section.
- Beirich, H., & Moser, B. (2003, Winter). Queer science: An 'elite' cadre of scientists and journalists tries to turn back the clock on sex, gender and race. *Southern Poverty Law Center Intelligence Report*. Retrieved December 10, 2006, from <http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?sid=96>
- Blanchard, R. (1985). Gender dysphoria and gender reorientation. In B. W. Steiner (Ed.), *Gender dysphoria: Development, research, management* (pp. 365–392). New York: Plenum Press.
- Blanchard, R. (1989). The concept of autogynephilia and the typology of male gender dysphoria. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 177, 616–623.
- Blanchard, R. (1992). Nonmonotonic relation of autogynephilia and heterosexual attraction. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 101, 271–276.
- Blanchard, R. (1993). Varieties of autogynephilia and their relationship to gender dysphoria. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 22, 241–251.
- Blanchard, R. (2000, April). Part II: The case for publicly funded transsexual surgery. *Psychiatry Rounds*, 4(2), 4–6.
- Blanchard, R. (2005). Early history of the concept of autogynephilia. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 34, 439–446.
- Blanchard, R. (2006, August 2). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript received August 3, 2006.
- Blanchard, R., Clemmensen, L. H., & Steiner, B. W. (1983). Gender reorientation and psychosocial adjustment in male-to-female transsexuals. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 12, 503–509.
- Blanchard, R., Legault, S., & Lindsay, W. R. (1987). Vaginoplasty outcome in male-to-female transsexuals. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 13, 265–275.
- Blanchard, R., & Sheridan, P. M. (1990). Gender reorientation and psychosocial adjustment. In R. Blanchard & B. W. Steiner (Eds.), *Clinical management of gender identity disorders in children and adults* (pp. 159–189). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Blanchard, R., & Steiner, B. W. (1983). Gender reorientation, psychological adjustment, and involvement with female partners in female-to-male transsexuals. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 12, 149–157.
- Blanchard, R., Steiner, B. W., & Clemmensen, L. H. (1985). Gender dysphoria, gender reorientation, and the clinical management of transsexualism. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 295–304.
- Blanchard, R., Steiner B. W., Clemmensen L. H., & Dickey R. (1989). Prediction of regrets in postoperative transsexuals. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 34, 43–45.
- Boatner, E. (2003). [Review of the book *The man who would be queen*]. *Lavender Magazine*. Excerpt retrieved March 28, 2007, from <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10530.html>
- Bockting, W. O. (2005). Biological reductionism meets gender diversity in human sexuality [Review of the book *The man who would be queen*]. *Journal of Sex Research*, 42, 267–270.
- Bornstein, K. (1994). *Gender outlaw: On men, women, and the rest of us*. New York: Vintage.
- Brown, M. L., & Rounsley, C. A. (1996). *True selves: Understanding transsexualism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Byrd, A. D. (2006). [Review of the book *Sexual orientation and psychoanalysis: Sexual science and clinical practice*]. Retrieved March 22, 2007, from <http://www.narth.com/docs/sexualscience.html>
- Cantor, J. M. (2003). [Review of the book *The man who would be queen*]. *Newsletter of Division 44 of the American Psychological Association*, 19(2), 6.
- Center for Advanced Study. (2005). *Improving the system for protecting human subjects: Counteracting IRB "mission creep"* (also known as *The Illinois White Paper*). Retrieved February 27, 2007, from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Website: <http://www.law.uiuc.edu/conferences/whitepaper>
- Chivers, M. L., & Bailey J. M. (2000). Sexual orientation of female-to-male transsexuals: A comparison of homosexual and nonhomosexual types. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 29, 259–278.
- Chivers, M. L., Rieger, G., Latty, E., & Bailey, J. M. (2004). A sex difference in the specificity of sexual arousal. *Psychological Science*, 15, 736–744.
- Cohen-Kettenis, P. T., & Gooren, L. J. (1999). Transsexualism: A review of etiology, diagnosis and treatment. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 46, 315–333.
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2003a). *Early reviews and comments on Bailey's book by transwomen and transmen*. Retrieved February 21, 2007, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/BaileyA1.html>
- Conway, L. (2003b). *An investigative report into the publication of J. Michael Bailey's book on transsexualism by the National Academies*. Retrieved January 22, 2007, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/LynnsReviewOfBaileysBook2.html>

- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2003c). *A second woman files research misconduct complaints against Bailey*. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Bailey/SecondComplaint.html>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2003d). *A third woman files research misconduct complaints against Bailey*. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Bailey/ThirdComplaint.html>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2003e). *Documentation of a formal complaint about J. Michael Bailey's sexual exploitation of a research subject, and of Northwestern University's apparent decision to not investigate such egregious misconduct*. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Bailey/KeyDocuments/Misconduct-12-11-03.html>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2003f). *A fourth trans woman files a formal complaint with the Vice President of [sic] Research of Northwestern University regarding the research conduct of J. Michael Bailey*. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Bailey/FourthWomansComplaint.html>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2003g). *The sinking of "the queen": The saga of the maiden voyage of "the queen" and her collision with a great iceberg off the shores of DSM-land. Reflections and historical illustrations by Charlotte Anjelica Kieltyka*. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Sinking/Sinking.html>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2003h). *At the IASR conference at the Kinsey Institute, 19 July 2003*. Retrieved December 11, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/IASRmessage.html>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2003i). [No unifying title; various documents and comments on HBIQDA's role in the controversy.] Retrieved December 11, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/HBIGDA-ALERT-RE-BAILEY.html>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2003j). *HBIQDA officers and board of directors begin to respond to Bailey's book*. Retrieved December 11, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/HBIGDA-Response-10-20-03.html>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2003k). *Tuesday, November 4, 2003: Blanchard resigns in a huff from HBIQDA!* Retrieved December 11, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/BaileyAssociates/BlanchardResigns.html>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2003l). *It's fiction! Bailey admits to Anjelica Kieltyka that he fabricated the key final scene in his book*. Retrieved June 16, 2007, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/DannyFabrication.html>
- Conway, L. (2004a). *The Bailey investigation: How it all began with a series of e-mail alerts*. Retrieved January 22, 2007, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Bailey/Investigation%20start-up/Investigation%20start-up.htm>
- Conway, L. (2004b). *Interim investigation report on J. Michael Bailey's 06-02-03 public lecture at UCLA*. Retrieved December 10, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Anjelica/Bailey-UCLA-Lecture.html>
- Conway, L. (2004c). *May 10, 2004: The "May 10th complaint"; a new, confidential formal complaint of research misconduct is filed against J. Michael Bailey at Northwestern University*. Retrieved December 11, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Bailey/May%2010/The%20May%2010,%202004%20Complaint.htm>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2004d). *April 6, 2004: Evidence and complaints filed against J. Michael Bailey for practicing as a clinical psychologist without a license, and then subsequently publishing confidential clinical case-history information without permissions*. Retrieved December 11, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Bailey/Clinical/ClinicalComplaint.html>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2005a). *The gay and lesbian "Lambda Literary Foundation" disses all transsexual women by nominating Bailey's book for a GLB'T literary award!* Retrieved December 5, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Bailey/Lambda%20Literary%20Foundation.html>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2005b). *April 30, 2005: Dr. Eli Coleman rebukes J. Michael Bailey's book at IFGE 2005*. Retrieved December 18, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Trans%20Health/IFGE%202005/Eli%20Coleman%20Rebukes%20Bailey's%20Book%20at%20IFGE%202005.htm>
- Conway, L. (2006a). *Timeline of the unfolding events in the Bailey investigation (update of 12-31-06)*. Retrieved January 22, 2007, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Bailey/TimeLine/Timeline%20spreadsheet.htm>
- Conway, L. (Ed.). (2006b). *How colleges and universities can improve their environments for TG/TS students (cont.)*. Retrieved January 22, 2007, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/College-Appendix.html>
- Copaken, D. (Producer). (1993). *Sugar and spice. Dateline NBC* [Television broadcast]. New York: National Broadcasting Company.
- De Vries, G. J., Arnold, A. P., Ball, G. F., Balthazart, J., Baum, M. J., Forger, N. G., et al. (2007, January 30). The gay sheep and sound science [Letter to the editor]. *New York Times*.
- Derbyshire, J. (2003, June 30). Lost in the male [Review of the book *The man who would be queen*]. *National Review*, 51–52.
- Dreger, A. D. (1998). "Ambiguous sex"—or ambivalent medicine? Ethical problems in the treatment of intersexuality. *The Hastings Center Report*, 28(3), 24–35.
- Dreger, A. D. (2004). Cultural history and social activism: Scholarship, identities, and the intersex rights movement. In F. Huisman & J. H. Warner (Eds.), *Locating medical history: The stories and their meanings* (pp. 390–409). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dreger, A. D. (2006, May 13). *The blog I write in fear*. Retrieved May 1, 2007, from [http://www.alicedreger.com/in\\_fear.html](http://www.alicedreger.com/in_fear.html)
- Dreger, A. D., & Herndon, A. (in press). Progress and politics in the intersex rights movement: Feminist theory in action. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*.
- Ettner, R. (1996). *Confessions of a gender defender: A psychologist's reflections on life among the transgendered*. Chicago: Chicago Spectrum Press.
- Ettner, R. (1999). *Gender loving care: A guide to counseling gender-variant clients*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- France, D. (2000, May 28). An inconvenient woman. *The New York Times Magazine*, 24–30.
- Freund, K., & Blanchard, R. (1993). Erotic target location errors in male gender dysphorics, paedophiles, and fetishists. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 162, 558–563.
- Gibson, M. (1999, February 24). True selves. *The Daily Northwestern* ("Focus" section), p. 1, 5.
- Green, J. (2003). Bailey's wick. Retrieved July 18, 2006, from Planet Out Website: <http://www.planetout.com/people/columns/green/archive/20031014.html>
- Green, R. (2000). Birth order and ratio of brothers to sisters in transsexuals. *Psychological Medicine*, 30, 789–795.
- Greenberg, A. S., & Bailey, J. M. (2001). Parental selection of children's sexual orientation. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 3, 423–437.
- Hiltzik, M. A. (2000, November 19). Through the gender labyrinth: How a bright boy with a penchant for tinkering grew up to be one of the top women in her high-tech field. *Los Angeles Times Sunday Magazine*.
- Hinkle, C. (Ed.). (2006). *Alice Dreger: Disorders of sex development*. Retrieved October 5, 2006, from <http://www.oii-usa.blogspot.com/2006/09/alice-dreger-disorders-of-sex.html>
- James, A. (n.d.-a). *J. Michael Bailey Connections*. Retrieved November 12, 2006, from <http://www.tsroadmap.com/info/bailey-chart.html>
- James, A. (n.d.-b). *Simon LeVay on transsexualism*. Retrieved June 15, 2007, from <http://www.tsroadmap.com/info/simon-levay.html>

- James, A. (n.d.-c). *Steven Pinker on transsexualism*. Retrieved December 11, 2006, from <http://www.tsroadmap.com/info/steven-pinker.html>
- James, A. (n.d.-d). *Internet fakes: "transkids.us."* Retrieved February 28, 2007, from <http://www.tsroadmap.com/info/transkids/index.html>
- James, A. (n.d.-e). *Jim Marks and J. Michael Bailey*. Retrieved December 5, 2006, from <http://www.tsroadmap.com/info/jim-marks.html>
- James, A. (n.d.-f). *A note regarding Bailey's children*. Retrieved December 7, 2006, from <http://www.tsroadmap.com/info/bailey-children.html>
- James, A. (n.d.-g). *Standards of care for women in transition*. Retrieved January 22, 2007, from <http://www.tsroadmap.com/reality/hbgda-standards.html>
- James, A. (n.d.-h). *Categorically wrong? A Bailey–Blanchard–Lawrence clearinghouse*. Retrieved January 30, 2007, from <http://www.tsroadmap.com/info/bailey-blanchard-lawrence.html>
- James, A. (2003a). *Invective against J. Michael Bailey's "The Man Who Would Be Queen."* Originally published as a page of <http://www.tsroadmap.com> in May 2003 and subsequently removed. Complete copy obtained from the files of J. Michael Bailey. Slightly edited version available at <http://web.archive.org/web/20030605112712/www.tsroadmap.com/info/j-michael-bailey.html>
- James, A. (2003b). *Joseph Henry Press cites Duncan Osborne*. Retrieved February 27, 2007, from <http://www.tsroadmap.com/info/duncan-osborne.html>
- James, A. (2003c). *Joan Linssenmeier on transsexualism*. Retrieved December 18, 2006, from <http://www.tsroadmap.com/info/joan-linsenmeier.html>
- James, A. (2006, June 20). Andrea James. *The Advocate*, 965, 88.
- Kelly, G. F. (2005). *Sexuality today* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kieltyka, C. A. (Producer/Director). (1999). *Becoming real: Chuck to Anjelica* [Videotape]. Provided to the author from the personal files of Charlotte Anjelica Kieltyka.
- Kieltyka, C. A. (2003a). *Images of "Juanita."* Originally published at <http://www.ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Juanita.html>. Retrieved January 22, 2007, from <http://web.archive.org/web/20030627161412/http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Juanita.html>
- Kieltyka, C. A. (2003b). *Anjelica Kieltyka files*. [Texts of three formal complaints to Northwestern University]. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Anjelica/Complaint.html>
- Kieltyka, C. A. (2006a, August 16). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript received September 22, 2006.
- Kieltyka, C. A. (2006b, August 17). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript received September 22, 2006.
- Kieltyka, C. A. (2006c, August 21). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript received September 27, 2006.
- Kieltyka, C. A. (2006d, August 22). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript received September 27, 2006.
- Kieltyka, C. A. (2006e, August 31). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript received September 27, 2006.
- Kieltyka, C. A. (2006f, September 19). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript received September 22, 2006.
- Kirkus Reviews. (2003). [Review of the book *The man who would be queen*]. *Kirkus Reviews*, 71(2).
- Lawrence, A. A. (1998). Men trapped in men's bodies: An introduction to the concept of autogynephilia. *Transgender Tapestry*, 1(85), 65–68.
- Lawrence, A. (1999a). *28 narratives about autogynephilia*. Retrieved March 25, 2007, from <http://www.annelawrence.com/agnarratives.html>
- Lawrence, A. (1999b). *31 new narratives about autogynephilia, plus five revealing fantasy narratives*. Retrieved March 25, 2007, from <http://www.annelawrence.com/31narratives.html>
- Lawrence, A. A. (2003). Factors associated with satisfaction or regret following male-to-female sex reassignment surgery. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 32, 299–315.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2004). Autogynephilia: A paraphilic model of gender identity disorder. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Psychotherapy*, 8(1/2), 69–87.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2006a, August 8). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript received August 17, 2006.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2006b). Clinical and theoretical parallels between desire for limb amputation and gender identity disorder. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 35, 263–278.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2007). Becoming what we love: Autogynephilic transsexualism conceptualized as an expression of romantic love. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 50, 506–520.
- LeVay, S., & Valente, S. M. (2006). *Human sexuality* (2nd ed.). Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, Inc.
- Levine, S. B., Brown, G., Coleman, E., Cohen-Kettenis, P., Hage, J. J., Van Maasdam, J., et al. (1998). *The standards of care for gender identity disorders* (5th version). Düsseldorf: Symposium.
- Maria (pseudonym). (2004). *Maria's Story*. Retrieved August 5, 2006, from Transsexual Women's Successes: Links and Photos of Lynn Conway's Website: <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/successes/Maria.html>
- McCain, R. S. (2003, Nov. 25). University investigates ethics of sex researcher. *The Washington Times*.
- McCloskey, D. N. (1999). *Crossing: A memoir*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCloskey, D. (2003a, November). Queer science. *Reason Online*. Retrieved September 29, 2006, from <http://www.reason.com/0311/cr.dm.queer.shtml>
- McCloskey, D. (2003b, December 19). Transsexual travesty [Letter to the editor]. *Chicago Reader*. Retrieved February 29, 2008, from <https://secure.site.chireader.com/cgi-bin/Archive/abridged2.bat?path=2003/031219/LETTERS/MCCLOSK&search=mccloskey>
- McCloskey, D., & Conway, L. (2003, July 29). *Deirdre McCloskey and Lynn Conway file a formal complaint with the Vice-President of Research of Northwestern University regarding the research conduct of J. Michael Bailey*. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/Ts/Bailey/McCloskey-Conway-complaint.html>
- Meyerowitz, J. (2002). *How sex changed: A history of transsexuality in the United States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mundy, L. (2003, March 23). Codes of behavior. *The Washington Post*, p. BW09.
- Office for the Protection of Research Subjects. (n.d.). *Institutional Review Board*. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from Northwestern University Website: <http://www.research.northwestern.edu/research/oprs/irb/>
- Osborne, D. (2003). [Review of the book *The man who would be queen*]. *Out Magazine*.
- Raymond, J. G. (1979). *The transsexual empire: The making of the she-male*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Rendon, J. (1999, December 16–22). Doctor strange love. *Metro, Silicon Valley's Weekly Newspaper*. Retrieved March 22, 2007, from <http://www.metroactive.com/papers/metro/12.16.99/sexology-9950.html>
- Ritchie, D. A., & Shopes, L. (2003). *Oral history excluded from IRB review* [writing for the Oral History Association and the American Historical Association]. Retrieved January 1, 2007, from [http://alpha.dickinson.edu/oha/org\\_irb.html](http://alpha.dickinson.edu/oha/org_irb.html)
- Rodkin, D. (2003, December 12). Sex and transsexuals. *Chicago Reader*, 33(11), 1, 30–33.
- Roughgarden, J. (2003, April 25). Psychology lecture lacks sensitivity to sexual orientation. *The Stanford Daily*. Retrieved December 10, 2006, from <http://daily.stanford.edu/article/2003/4/25/psychologyLectureLacksSensitivityToSexualOrientation>
- Sauer, N. (2003, October). Junk science and Michael Bailey. *Transgender Community News*, pp. 25–27.



- Schroder, M., & Carroll, R. (1999). New women: Sexological outcomes of male-to-female gender reassignment surgery. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 24*, 137–146.
- Smith, Y. L., van Goozen, S. H., Kuiper, A. J., & Cohen-Kettenis P. T. (2005). Transsexual subtypes: Clinical and theoretical significance. *Psychiatry Research, 137*, 151–160.
- Stoller, R. J. (1971). The term “transvestism.” *Archives of General Psychiatry, 24*, 230–237.
- Stone, S. (1991). The empire strikes back: A posttranssexual manifesto. In J. Epstein, & K. Straub (Eds.), *Body guards: The cultural politics of gender ambiguity* (pp. 280–304). New York: Routledge.
- Triea, K. (1999). Power, orgasm, and the Psychohormonal Research Unit. In A. D. Dreger (Ed.), *Intersex in the age of ethics* (pp. 141–144). Hagerstown, MD: University Publishing Group.
- Triea, K. (2006, September 28). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript returned October, 5, 2006.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services. (2005). Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Part 46, “Protection of Human Subjects.” Retrieved March 25, 2007, from United States Department of Health & Human Services Website: <http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.htm>
- van Goozen, S. H., Slabbekoorn, D., Gooren, L. J., Sanders, G., & Cohen-Kettenis, P. T. (2002). Organizing and activating effects of sex hormones in homosexual transsexuals. *Behavioral Neuroscience, 116*, 982–988.
- Velasquez, S. A. (2004). Book review: *The man who would be queen*. Retrieved March 25, 2007, from <http://transkids.us/review.html>
- Walker, P. A., Berger, J. C., Green, R., Laub, D. R., Reynolds, C. L., & Wollman, L. (1990). *The Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association's standards of care* [version 4]. Sonoma, CA: Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association.
- Wallen, K. (2006, July 26). Interview with Alice Dreger; revised transcript returned July 27, 2006.
- Wilson, R. (2003a, June 20). “Dr. sex”: A human-sexuality expert creates controversy with a new book on gay men and transsexuals. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 8.
- Wilson, R. (2003b, July 25). Transsexual ‘subjects’ complain about professors’ research methods. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 10.
- Wilson, R. (2003c, Dec. 19). Northwestern U. psychologist accused of having sex with research subject. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 17.
- Wilson, R. (2004, Dec. 10). Northwestern U. will not reveal results of investigation into sex researcher. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 10.

## Two Modes of Thought: The Narrative/Paradigmatic Disconnect in the Bailey Book Controversy

Jonathan M. Adler

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Alice Dreger's compelling history of the controversy surrounding J. Michael Bailey's book, *The Man Who Would Be Queen*, presents two opposing camps, each entrenched in a seemingly intractable and incompatible position. On one side are proponents of Blanchard's theory and the scientific research supporting it that served as the basis for Bailey's book. The theory suggests that a certain segment of natal men who undergo sex reassignment surgery to become women do so out of an autogynephilic sexual orientation—an erotic attraction to the idea of themselves as women. On the other side are the transwomen who strongly object to the theory, dispute the scientific basis for it, and maintain that their desire to change genders was not motivated by erotic desires, but instead was founded in an identity-based position that their bodies do not match their true selves, what Dreger termed the "feminine essence narrative." In this commentary, I hope to offer one interpretation that attempts to get at the core of this conflict. In doing so, I do not intend to take either position in the controversy or to suggest that one side's argument rests on firmer ground. I have chosen to write this commentary because I believe that the controversy provides an elegant example for illustrating the nature of how we come to understand our lives.

Before I begin, let me take a cue from Dreger and briefly explain my background. I am currently an advanced graduate student in the psychology department at Northwestern University, the same department as Bailey. I have taken two courses taught by Bailey that are required components of my academic program (one about statistics and the other about psychopathology, both in 2003). I also served as a teaching

assistant for Bailey's course on human sexuality in 2003, a position I was randomly assigned to, wherein I served in an entirely administrative role, photocopying and scoring the multiple-choice exams (other TA's handled content-related issues). While I have had contact with Bailey in program-wide meetings and on two administrative committees, at no point in my graduate career has Bailey directly supervised any of my research or clinical work, nor has he served on any of my research committees. I observed the controversy surrounding his book from the sidelines as it unfolded, but have never talked with Bailey about his experiences. As a courtesy, I asked Bailey if he would mind my writing this commentary, which he was supportive of, but we did not discuss the content of the commentary, nor did he see a pre-publication version of it. In sum, while I observed the controversy from within Bailey's department, I have never been involved in the events in any way, and I would prefer to keep it that way. As I said, I chose to write a commentary not because I wish to weigh in on the merits of either side's position, which I do not, but because I believe the controversy raised an important question that I felt I could illuminate.

As I alluded to earlier, that important question is about the nature of how we understand our lives. I believe the core of the controversy surrounding Bailey's book is that the opposing sides were operating from fundamentally different epistemological positions. Bruner (1986) wrote about two modes of thought humans use in interpreting and understanding the world and their experiences. He wrote:

...one mode, the *paradigmatic* or logico-scientific one, attempts to fulfill the ideal of a formal, mathematical system of description and explanation. It employs categorization or conceptualization and the operations by which categories are established, instantiated, idealized,

---

J. M. Adler (✉)  
Department of Psychology, Northwestern University, Swift Hall,  
2029 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208, USA  
e-mail: jadler@northwestern.edu

and related to one another to form a system. (p. 12, emphasis added)

The paradigmatic mode is the mode of science and is concerned with logically categorizing the world. The other mode, which Bruner called the *narrative* mode, is concerned with the meaning that is ascribed to experiences through stories. Bruner (1986) explains that these stories are about “human or human-like intention and action and the vicissitudes and consequences that mark their course” (p. 13). They capture people’s own explanations about what they want and how they go about achieving it.

In other words, thought grounded in the paradigmatic mode seeks to explain the underlying relationships between sets of observable variables while thought grounded in the narrative mode seeks to explain the storied meaning people make of these relationships. Each mode of thought has significant strengths. The paradigmatic mode offers the power of prediction in that it sets up and tests hypotheses about the nature of reality. In contrast, the narrative mode organizes the complex and often ambiguous world of human intention and action into a meaningful structure.

The two modes of thought, though complementary, are not reducible to one another—one is not simply an emergent property of the other. Bruner (1986) adds, “Each of the ways of knowing, moreover, has operating principles of its own and its own criteria of well-formedness. They differ radically in their procedures for verification” (p. 11). As a result, the merits of paradigmatic arguments and narrative stories cannot be judged by the same criteria. Good paradigmatic explanations should accurately predict observable phenomena. Good narratives should meaningfully capture the shifting contours of lived experience. In his excellent work on philosophy of mind, Brendel (2000) has referred to this distinction as one between causal explanations (the paradigmatic) and meaningful explanations (the narrative). Brendel argued that an equal appreciation and incorporation of both serves as the indispensable foundation for an ethical practice of psychiatry.

I believe that the fundamental conflict between the two sides in the controversy over Bailey’s book is their relative commitment to different modes of thought. Dreger writes:

Many transwomen have complained that, in their work, Blanchard and Bailey have ignored their life narratives, narratives that these women say fly in the face of the simple two-type model of MTF transsexualism that sees eroticism as a fundamental motivation for MTF sex reassignment. But what many of these critics have failed to realize is that Bailey and Blanchard aren’t interested in whether people’s *narratives* fit Blanchard’s theory; they are interested in whether *people* do. And Bailey and Blanchard see plenty of evidence that, self-representation to the contrary, transwomen’s histories—including their gendered and erotic histories—and the data drawn

from them in lab-based and clinical studies support rather than weaken Blanchard’s typology.

Dreger begins to suggest that Blanchard and Bailey are operating in the paradigmatic mode while the transwomen are operating in the narrative mode. What Dreger doesn’t address, however, are the relative contributions of each mode and their fundamental irreducibility.

I will devote less attention to the merits of the paradigmatic mode, as readers of this journal are well-versed in the power of scientific explanation and no doubt firm believers in scientific epistemologies. Without a doubt, the paradigmatic arguments of scientific practice provide an essential system for explaining the world. Paradigmatic explanations aspire to generalizable truths, those which accurately categorize and predict the observable world. As in Dreger’s article, it is well beyond the scope of this commentary to weigh in on the paradigmatic merits of Blanchard’s theory, except to note, as Dreger did, that it has accumulated some supporting evidence of the type mandated in evaluating paradigmatic arguments (though I am aware that some in the opposing camp dispute its validity). There can be little doubt that the work of Blanchard and Bailey strives to embody the ideals of the paradigmatic mode and to produce the kind of truth that this mode reveres; their success in doing so is beyond the scope of this commentary.

But what of the narratives of the opposing side? From its paradigmatic position, Bailey’s book suggests that Blanchard’s theory refutes their truth value. Yet shifting to the narrative mode, these self-stories assume a new power. Over the course of the past several decades, a group of academics from diverse disciplines has emerged to form a new field, loosely termed the *narrative study of lives*. At the foundation of this field lies the assertion that an individual’s identity is comprised of the stories he or she constructs about his or her life. This theory of narrative identity was developed by my research advisor, Dan P. McAdams, a personality psychologist (e.g., McAdams, 2001, 2006). McAdams (2001, 2006) has suggested that the internalized and evolving stories we tell about ourselves weave together the reconstructed past, the perceived present, and the anticipated future in an attempt to provide one’s life with unity and purpose. Stories of high points, low points, and turning points provide the key components of narrative identity. While Bruner (1986) suggested that humans are predisposed to crafting stories out of their experiences, the development of a coherent narrative identity is no simple task. Indeed, difficult, unanticipated, and highly emotional events can pose significant challenges to the maintenance of one’s narrative identity, and constructing good stories about these experiences is especially important for mental health and maturity (e.g., Adler, Wagner, & McAdams, 2007). There can be little doubt that feeling one’s body inappropriately reflects one’s sense of self is a uniquely

troubling experience, and the ability to craft a viable narrative about it is certainly vital to one's psychological well-being. Indeed, this story is at the very core of many transsexuals' narrative identities.

Where do people's stories about themselves come from? McAdams suggests that they are drawn from a menu of script templates made available to each of us by our broader cultural context (McAdams & Pals, 2006). In our modern, Western culture, the narratives that are produced by scientific inquiry are accorded special power. For example, a recent scientific study showing differences in intelligence among first-born and later-born children was published, receiving significant media attention and entering the realm of popular discourse. As a result, the narratives people construct about their own intelligence relative to their siblings began to shift to accommodate this finding (see Carey, 2007). Though narratives derived from scientific findings deserve privileged status as a result of the rigorous and replicable steps of the scientific method that produced them, they may or may not capture any given individual's unique experience. Adrienne Rich (1986) wrote, "When someone with the authority of a teacher, say, [or scientist, I would add] describes the world and you are not in it, there is a moment of psychic disequilibrium, as if you looked into a mirror and saw nothing" (p. 199). In the case of the controversy over Bailey's book, the scientific (paradigmatic) narrative of autogynephilia was pit against the "feminine essence narrative." Which cultural script is the best to adapt for one's own narrative identity is an incredibly important question; it determines who you believe you are. But it is a question firmly grounded in the narrative mode, not in the paradigmatic mode. The merits of a given self-narrative cannot be judged on their ability to generalize and categorize. The primary psychological way to assess the value of one's narrative identity is from within a narrative framework: Does the narrative effectively capture your perspective on your shifting intentions and actions?

One conflict inherent in approaching the same issue simultaneously from paradigmatic and narrative modes is that the goal of paradigmatic arguments is to generalize, to speak to trends in populations, while the goal of narratives is to explain how one's life is unique. Bruner (1990) writes that "the function of the story is to find an intentional state that mitigates or at least makes comprehensible a deviation from a canonical cultural pattern" (pp. 49–50). So, narratives are not supposed to offer the type of probabilistic, generalizable explanations that paradigmatic inquiry seeks; and paradigmatic arguments are not meant to apply to every individual in a given population, but merely to capture trends. No matter how robust a scientific finding about a given group, there will be people in that group whose personal narratives do not embrace the trend. In fact, for individuals who feel their own personal stories diverge from dominant cultural narratives, it

is especially important for them to develop a coherent narrative about that difference in order to maintain their psychological equilibrium. Such discrepancies do not render the scientific findings less valid, nor do they diminish the value of the narratives.

It is worth noting that narratives can be studied from within a paradigmatic framework. Much of McAdams' work, and mine as well, treats individuals' narratives as the raw data for a scientific exploration. For example, my own research focuses on people's stories about their experiences in psychotherapy (e.g., Adler & McAdams, 2007; Adler, Wagner, & McAdams, 2007). Therapy is an unusual experience in life, one explicitly focused on transforming the self in a positive way. People enter psychotherapy in a negative state with the intention of working towards healing. I have studied the stories people construct about this experience in an effort to explain how people understand their own process of self-transformation and how that understanding relates to their psychological functioning. I have found that particular narrative styles relate more strongly to mental health than others (Adler & McAdams, 2007). Instead of objectively assessing people's behaviors in psychotherapy, I use the meaning they make of the experience via storytelling as the data that drive my scientific attempts to generalize and categorize it and to uncover its relationships with mental health. My research, therefore, operates in the paradigmatic mode, but with narrative data.

So, which of the two narratives that frame the controversy around Bailey's book is right—the narrative of autogynephilia or the feminine essence narrative? The answer, of course, is both and neither. To date, there is a body of scientific evidence to support the paradigmatic argument for autogynephilia. There is also a group of individuals whose identity is firmly rooted in the narrative that they were women trapped in men's bodies. When these assertions are understood as operating in different modes of thought, they need not contradict each other; both can be accepted and validated.

Certainly both make important contributions and have significant drawbacks. The paradigmatic argument for autogynephilia has received some scientific support for its ability to accurately predict certain theoretically and clinically meaningful observable behaviors, though, like all worthwhile scientific findings, it is not undisputed. Yet, it has also generated a particular narrative of transsexualism that is accorded special power as a result of its grounding in the methods of science. As a result, those individuals who do not see themselves reflected in this narrative have endured the destabilizing experience of looking into a mirror and seeing nothing, as Rich put it.

On the other hand, the feminine essence narrative that some transwomen espouse affords them the coherence of identity that the most effective self-stories provide. This narrative

organizes this important component of their personal histories and imbues it with meaning. It has also proven to be a very effective tool in navigating the perilous medical terrain of obtaining sex reassignment surgery, where denying any erotic component of transgendered behavior may serve as a “get out of male free card,” as Dreger humorously puts it. At the same time, as Dreger adroitly pointed out, adopting a strictly de-eroticized narrative might have the potential to encourage these women to compartmentalize their genuine sexual experiences in a manner that restricts the full, integrated expression of their identity.

Dreger’s article offers her own historical narrative of the controversy surrounding Bailey’s book. She is careful to note that “the interview work [she] conducted for this historical project [has] been neither scientifically systematic nor generalizable.” It is not science; although its publication in a scientific journal may inadvertently accord it some of the power of scientific narratives. As with all successful narratives, Dreger’s account no doubt “mean[s] more than [it] can say” (Bruner, 1990, p. 59). It has likely been therapeutic and healing for the Bailey side of the controversy, providing a coherent through-line to the messy past few years. And it has likely been inflammatory to some of the transwomen who may continue to fail to have their personal experiences narrated in a way that is consonant with their own stories. This is exactly why narratives are important: people’s identities (professional and personal) are comprised of them. In writing this commentary, I have now offered a paradigmatic argument that suggests a new narrative for the bitter controversy surrounding Bailey’s book. I have no doubt that each side will

find some slippage in my ability to capture their perspective. My hope is that I have identified a novel perspective and that I have provided a compelling assertion for the fundamentally different, though equally important, contributions of paradigmatic arguments and narratives.

## References

- Adler, J. M., & McAdams, D. P. (2007). The narrative reconstruction of psychotherapy. *Narrative Inquiry*, 17, 179–202.
- Adler, J. M., Wagner, J. W., & McAdams, D. P. (2007). Personality and the coherence of psychotherapy narratives. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 1179–1198.
- Brendel, D. H. (2000). Philosophy of mind in the clinic: The relation between causal and meaningful explanation in psychiatry. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, 8, 184–191.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carey, B. (2007, June 25). Study on I.Q. prompts debate on family dynamics. *New York Times*. Retrieved September 10, 2007, from: <http://www.nytimes.com>.
- McAdams, D. P. (2001). The psychology of life stories. *Review of General Psychology*, 5, 100–122.
- McAdams, D. P. (2006). *The redemptive self: Stories Americans live by*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McAdams, D. P., & Pals, J. L. (2006). A new Big Five: Fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *American Psychologist*, 61, 204–217.
- Rich, A. (1986). *Blood, bread, and poetry: Selected prose 1979–1985*. New York: W. W. Norton.

## Lust or Identity?

John Bancroft

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Dreger has written a detailed and exhaustive account of the reactions to Bailey's book. She also debates closely the arguments for and against Bailey's position and the criticisms leveled against him. The resulting campaign against Bailey, as she describes it, is disturbing. One lesson we should all have learned from this is that we live in an Internet world where such reactions are a distinct possibility. I was naïve to think that I could make a remark about this book at an International Academy of Sex Research meeting which would stay within the academic community; a lesson for all of us. But contrary to what Dreger was quoted as saying in the *New York Times* (Carey, 2007), I do not feel that this needs to have a major negative impact on scientific discourse; it might even improve it.

Looking back at my own writing on various aspects of sexuality, I have become aware that, in the past, I have used words or concepts that I would not use today because they are insensitive or potentially hurtful. I now consciously strive to avoid such insensitivity, and so far have not found this a barrier to communicating scientific ideas.

I was, therefore, particularly disturbed by the final paragraph of Dreger's essay in which Bailey explains what he has learned from this controversy: "It has taught me, albeit the hard way, the value of truth. I think that before, sometimes, I used to hesitate to say true things out of concern that the truth would cause someone pain. But Conway et al. took away any remaining inhibitions I had against telling the truth." What does he mean by truth? Does he mean scientific evidence or religious belief? Dreger commented on Bailey's book as follows: "Using stories in this way is not science—it

doesn't even rise to the level of *bad* science..." I agree with her on that point. And why is he apparently no longer concerned about causing someone pain?

I read Bailey's book soon after it was published and before knowing of the reactions of the transgender community, and it troubled me—in particular, the extraordinary certainty, and the disparaging way it was expressed. I felt almost as certain that this book would disturb and offend many transgendered individuals who read it, and contribute to the stigmatization of the transgender community, compounded by its presentation as science (the book's sub-title is "The science of gender-bending and transsexualism") and the picture on its cover. The "certainty" conveyed was that there were only two types of transgendered individuals: they were either effeminate homosexual men who changed gender to make themselves sexually attractive to heterosexual men, or heterosexual men who changed gender so they could lust after their now female bodies. The idea that any of them were changing to seek an identity that would enable them to feel better about themselves was simply not an option.

I have not researched transgender like Blanchard has, but I have seen many transgender individuals during 44 years as a clinician, and I have written about my clinical impressions and opinions (see below). Some of these individuals reported clear gender non-conformity during childhood that merged into their wish to adopt a female identity in adolescence or early adulthood. In most such cases, they were principally seeking my clinical support for surgical reassignment. In several respects, their transition was made easier by the fact that they were able to pass effectively as women when cross-dressed. Not surprisingly, most of them also developed sexual attraction to men, although a proportion of them saw sexual intercourse following surgical reassignment more as a validation of their femaleness than a source of sexual pleasure. There were others who had gone through a phase of sexualized cross-

---

J. Bancroft (✉)  
Barnhurst, 4 Blenheim Road, Horspath,  
Oxfordshire OX33 1RY, UK  
e-mail: jbankrof@indiana.edu

dressing; what we used to call transvestic fetishism. Over 35 years ago, I wrote the following:

...(women's) clothing may be used during masturbation as a form of fetish object. In the absence of a real female, this behaviour is understandable. The transvestite, however, wears the clothing. Usually this will enhance the excitement further. This may be partly due to the texture of the material, which for some unknown reason can be very erotically arousing. But more relevant is the fact that whilst wearing it the fetishist experiments with fantasy in which his own body becomes that of a woman. In these fetishists there is usually no doubt that their orientation is heterosexual and in some way the masquerading of the body image produces an effect as though a woman was there. (Bancroft, 1972, p. 60)

I have remained intrigued by this “doppelgänger” effect, the ability to create an illusion that alongside one's self is the body of a woman. However, by the time I saw these individuals in my clinic they had reached the point where they were seriously thinking about surgical gender reassignment, and most of them described this “doppelgänger” effect as a transitional phase, often the earliest recognizable phase, in their progression to a transgender identity. A typical story was that, in those early stages, the fetishistic behavior was clearly sexually arousing, they would masturbate, and as soon as they had ejaculated they would feel regret that they had done it again, and would want to remove the female clothes as quickly as possible. Over time, in many of them, this pattern changed; post-ejaculation would be a phase of calm when they had no wish to remove the clothing but enjoyed the non-sexual feeling of looking like a woman. This would eventually end up with clear transgender feelings and the wish for change, a process that might take many years. Whereas the feminine transgender individual would typically seek reassignment when young, the individual who had gone through what I called the “transvestite-transsexual shift” would usually be much older, in their 30s, 40s, or 50s. The last transgender patient I saw before I retired was aged 70. He gave a history of lifelong intermittent cross-dressing and a longstanding confusion about his gender identity. His wife had recently died, and this was a last, somewhat desperate attempt to find some peace in his troubled mind.

I am prepared to accept, and have written to this effect (e.g., Bancroft, 1972, 1989), that such patients are likely to play down the fetishistic or sexually arousing element in their history, and the evidence that many clinicians would see such a pattern as a contraindication to reassignment surgery is an understandable reason why. But I have difficulty in accepting that many, if any, of these patients, by that stage, were motivated by a lust for the female body that would result from the surgery. Compared with the feminine transgender group, these men reporting a transvestite-transsexual shift usually

had a formidable challenge in making the transition. Quite apart from the challenge of surgery, their appearance and mannerisms were often unfeminine, making it much more difficult to “pass” effectively as a woman. Their motivation, while never easy to understand, was more understandable as an attempt to resolve a relatively longstanding conflict about their gender identity.

I have remained of the opinion that the one thing that transgendered individuals have in common is their wish for gender reassignment, which in historical context became a more realistic option once surgical reassignment was shown to be possible in the 1950s (Meyerowitz, 2002). Otherwise, I have been impressed by the heterogeneity of their developmental histories and have documented my reasons for this elsewhere (Bancroft, 1989, pp. 341–357). I have recently revised and updated this section for the third edition (not yet published) with no change in this fundamental conclusion. The interaction between gender identity and sexual orientation remains seemingly complex and ill understood.

It is noteworthy that, since the controversy over Bailey's book started, Blanchard (2005) has published a paper on the “Early history of autogynephilia.” He concludes by distinguishing between the concept of “autogynephilia” as a description of a behavioral pattern and the theoretical use of the concept. He lists a series of theoretical positions based on the “autogynephilic pattern” that he has adopted at different times (e.g., all gender-dysphoric biological males who are not homosexual [erotically aroused by other males] are instead autogynephilic) and goes on to say “All or none of the foregoing propositions may be true, false or somewhere in between” (p. 445). That sounds reasonable. Lawrence (2005) has reported evidence that the large majority of “autogynephilic” transsexuals who go through gender reassignment show a marked reduction in the “autogynephilic” sexuality following surgery. In Dreger's article, Lawrence is reported as now emphasizing “autogynephilia” as a developmental stage.

I would encourage all of us who work in sex research, including Bailey, to make very clear what is scientific reporting and what is personal belief that goes well beyond the data. When describing the ill understood lives of those in the transgender community in particular, who are challenged in so many ways, a level of sensitivity is needed to allow our messages to be heard and rationally appraised.

## References

- Bancroft, J. (1972). The relationship between gender identity and sexual behaviour: Some clinical aspects. In C. Ounsted & D. C. Taylor (Eds.), *Gender differences: Their ontogeny and significance* (pp. 57–72). Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone.
- Bancroft, J. (1989). *Human sexuality and its problems* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone.

- Blanchard, R. (2005). Early history of the concept of autogynophilia. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 34, 439–446.
- Carey, B. (2007, August 21). Criticism of a gender theory, and a scientist under siege. *New York Times*, pp. S1, S6.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2005). Sexuality before and after male-to-female sex reassignment surgery. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 34, 147–166.
- Meyerowitz, J. (2002). *How sex changed: A history of transsexuality in the United States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.



## Pretenders to the Throne

Talia Mae Bettcher

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Dreger writes:

As I believe I have shown here, this book [*TMWWBQ*] isn't simply pro- or anti-gay or pro- or anti-trans....It's significantly more complicated than it at first appears, and much more complicated than its cover and its title would lead one to believe. Most importantly for this discussion *TMWWBQ* is not the book many people assumed it to be—particularly after the phenomenal backlash it received...

Dreger draws this conclusion at the end of Part 3 of her article; it is the conclusion I dispute here. In particular, I show why *TMWWBQ* is significantly anti-trans. I prefer the term “transphobic” to the terms “anti-trans,” however, because while the latter reduces the issue to mere pro/con positions, the former suggests deep misrepresentation. Dreger points out ways Bailey appears pro-trans. For example, Bailey (2003) is supportive of transsexual surgery as a strategy for promoting happiness among transwomen (p. 209). However, this does not establish the book is not transphobic. The fact a man endorses a woman's right to vote does not show he is not sexist. Indeed, such a man may hold deeply sexist views about women—views so misogynist his recognition of women's right to vote simply pales in comparison. As I shall show, Bailey's book is deeply transphobic.

Dreger admits several respects in which *TMWWBQ* is likely to disturb. Since she underplays these points, I discuss some in greater detail. Consider Bailey's contention that gay men tend to be feminine and promiscuous (Bailey, 2003,

Chaps. 4–5). In his own admission, Bailey is undertaking to show prevailing stereotypes about gay men are literally true (p. 76). As Dreger notes, Bailey answers charges of homophobia with counter accusations of “femiphobia” (Bailey, 2003, pp. xi, 59). Yet, Dreger does not observe why one might feel this is an inadequate response. Consider the stereotype that Asian men are especially feminine. Imagine a scientist aiming to show the stereotype is true. Does it make it any less racist if the scientist should then speak against femiphobia? Certainly outrage at such a project is to be expected.

Such considerations are relevant to Bailey's contention that “homosexual transsexuals” may be especially suited for sex-work (Bailey, 2003, p. 185). Dreger fails to mention that transwoman as sex-worker (or as sexually promiscuous) is a common stereotype. In alleging this stereotype is true (and probably grounded in biology), Bailey is engaged in an enterprise similar to his project of attempting to establish the veracity of stereotypes about gay men. Consider the analogous stereotype of the Black whore which has plagued Black women (Collins, 2000, pp. 81–84). Imagine a scientist attempting to show Black women are naturally constituted for sex-work (on the grounds they are naturally sexually aggressive). Surely, sex-positivity on the part of the scientist would not erase the racism of the enterprise. Nor would his opposition to segregation or Japanese internment undermine the racism in the following comment (insert name and race):

Although \_\_\_\_\_ is so feminine in some respects, even in some behavioral respects, [his/]her ability to enjoy emotionally meaningless sex appears \_\_\_\_\_-typical. In this sense, \_\_\_\_\_ might be especially well suited to prostitution. (Bailey, 2003, p. 185, certain words omitted)

To be sure, Bailey happily flies in the face of “political correctness” (Bailey, 2003, pp. x–xi). Yet, while the view

---

T. M. Bettcher (✉)  
Department of Philosophy, College of Arts and Letters,  
California State University, Los Angeles, 5151 State University  
Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90032-8114, USA  
e-mail: tbettch@exchange.calstatela.edu

that “scientific” searches for truth (especially within the arena of sexuality and gender) are exempt from political agendas is extremely problematic, my aim is not to dispute it here. Instead, I propose the following: It is reasonable to believe the preceding remarks about Asian men and Black women would be (rightfully) viewed by many people as very racist and highly inflammatory. So, it is reasonable to expect a similar outcry in this particular case as well.

The remarks cited above are not even central to the outrage. The outrage principally involves the concern that Bailey’s book aims to invalidate the identities of transwomen. Dreger, however, erases the main way Bailey’s work is invalidating to transwomen by representing the central issue as nothing but a theoretical dispute.

According to Dreger, much of the dispute concerns Bailey’s rejection of a particular theoretical model of transsexuality (“the feminine essence narrative”). In this model (characterized by the notion of “the woman trapped in the body of a man”), a MTF has always self-identified as female (for as long as she can remember), has a core internal gender identity at odds with her male body, and needs SRS to bring things into proper alignment (Bailey, 2003, p. 143). Dreger writes, “Bailey would happily play Galileo to Blanchard’s Copernicus, spreading, supporting, and fiercely defending a truth too often denied and suppressed...”, thereby suggesting what is at issue is the rejection of a particular theoretical model (analogous to the Ptolemaic theory of the universe).

What is erased in this representation? It is difficult to state without already begging the question against Bailey. Since Bailey is critical of the very notion of gender identity (Bailey, 2003, pp. 22, 50), I will try to avoid appealing to it. Instead, I will speak only of the personal import gender has for many people. By this, I mean, for example, living as a woman and being recognized and respected as a woman, are personally important for many transwomen in a non-erotic way. I mean, in part, when a stranger says of a transwoman, “Hey, that’s really a man!” this can be experienced as personally hurtful. It can lead to severe emotional pain because it is personally important to a transwoman to be regarded as a woman (and not as a man). When I say this personal import is non-erotic, I mean the emotional pain caused through invalidation does not involve the mere frustration of an erotic obsession or the derailment of a sexual agenda to be with straight men. Rather, it is experienced as deeply emotionally wounding in a highly personal way.

Unless the personal import of gender is recognized as a pre-theoretical phenomenon, no subsequent discussion about these issues is possible. Indeed, if it isn’t recognized, it is hard to see why invalidating a person’s gender identifications should be regarded as wounding. At best, the effect of such invalidation would be formulated in terms of the frustration of an erotic obsession or the derailment of an agenda to attract straight men. Why should one care about

undermining somebody’s sexual fantasy—a sexual fantasy enacted in public? Certainly, while calling a “homosexual transsexual” “really a man” might make her doubt her capacity to attract straight men, this isn’t quite so bad.

So, this phenomenon must be recognized as independent of any theory which seeks to explain it. I have tried to acknowledge it in a way that makes as few theoretical commitments as possible. Of course, one theory in which this phenomenon finds a home is the feminine essence narrative. Yet, other theories recognizing this phenomenon, at least among “autogynephiles” include that even of Blanchard (1993). To be sure, it is explained as a secondary phenomenon—a mere effect or extension of “autogynephilia” (to the extent the theory attempts to undermine the significance of personal import, it will inevitably be regarded as invalidating). But it is recognized nonetheless. In Bailey’s account, however, there is an almost exclusive focus on sexuality. He writes:

Autogynephiles are men who have created their image of attractive women in their own bodies, an image that coexists with their original male selves. The female self is a man-made creation. They visit the female image when they want to have sex, and some become so attached to the female image that they want it to become their own, true self. (Bailey, 2003, p. 168)

In recognizing there are some who “become so attached to the female image that they want it to become their own, true self,” Bailey may be to some extent owning this phenomenon of personal import. In this account, the personal import of being recognized as a woman would be explained by appeal to the attachment of the “autogynephile” to the image of the female self.

Yet, this phenomenon is so downplayed in Bailey’s account it does no theoretical work whatsoever. Instead, all major decisions of both “homosexual” and “autogynephilic” transsexuals are explained in terms of erotic motivation. According to Bailey (2003), the motivation to transition is largely non-rational among “autogynephiles” (p. 183); it principally concerns an erotic obsession with the image of themselves as women (p. 146). By contrast, the motivation to transition among “homosexual transsexuals” has more rational components: “Can I make it? Will I be happier as a female? Will I be more successful getting straight men as a woman than I am at getting gay men as a man” (p. 182). Yet, even here, the motivation ultimately concerns sexual object desire. Notably, in this list of reasons there is no mention of the personal importance of being taken as a woman, i.e., there is no acknowledgement that a “homosexual transsexual” can feel personally invalidated through being represented as “really a man.”

By pitting Bailey’s version of Blanchard’s theory against the “feminine essence narrative,” Dreger obscures the way Bailey’s account involves more than a mere theoretical

disagreement. Once we recognize the existence of personal import of gender, we can see why Bailey's account might wound or invalidate that sense of personal import in a way that is quite independent of any theoretical disagreement about the nature and etiology of the phenomenon of personal import.

Dreger observes that Bailey uses the feminine pronoun to refer to post-SRS transsexual women and at least in this way does not invalidate transwomen. She neglects to mention the obvious point, however, that the two major categories into which he inserts transwomen characterize them as men (Bailey, 2003, p. 146). In fairness to Bailey, these terms are not his invention and this general approach to categorizing transpeople in ways that run contrary to their own self-identifications has a long history in the field of sexology. Yet, Bailey (2003) also explicitly endorses them, signaling his approval of their aptness (p. 146). Moreover, Bailey (2003) expects this terminology to apply to transwomen even after SRS. Thus, he speaks of "autogynephiles" as men who have made their bodies conform to their images of women (p. 168). The idea is surely that the men trapped in male bodies have now become men in female bodies.

While Dreger does recognize Bailey as a skeptic about gender identity, she does not take the time to point out why this attitude might be experienced by transwomen as invalidating. It literally means, as far as I can tell, their own sense of who they are doesn't count for anything. Indeed, this outright rejection of gender identity by Bailey drags all personal import with it. Transwomen are represented as motivated almost exclusively by sexual considerations. Because he only understands the notion of a gendered self in terms of dispositions to behave in stereotypical feminine and masculine ways, he can say "homosexual transsexuals" are somewhat mixed gender selves in female bodies, and "autogynephilic transsexuals" are simply male gender selves in female bodies. Thus, while post-surgical transwomen are acknowledged by Bailey as women by appeal to their surgically altered bodies, they are denied validation in terms of the personal importance to them of gender. Ironically, in such a theory, it becomes impossible to even formulate this invalidation, since it isn't acknowledged in the first place.

In fairness to Dreger, she draws sharp attention to Bailey's representation of transwomen (in particular, "non-homosexuals") as liars, who use the feminine essence narrative to cover up the sexual fetish. Dreger rightfully observes, "One gets the clear sense from the book that all transsexual narratives are deeply suspect—or just plain false—unless they fit Blanchard's theory and Bailey's reading." Unfortunately, because Dreger mischaracterizes the invalidation of the personal import of gender as a mere theoretical dispute, she cannot capture the close link between the representation of transwomen as liars and the invalidation she herself erases.

In Bailey's view, post-operative "non-homosexual transsexuals" are really erotically obsessed men in female bodies while post-operative "homosexual transsexuals" are really highly feminine men attracted to straight men in female bodies. Because Bailey believes transsexual women tend to lie or misrepresent, nothing a transwoman can say contests this theory. Alas, the main way to determine personal import is to rely on first person narratives. Since Bailey casts doubt upon the reliability of such avowals of gender import, there is no way it could ever be taken seriously in his theory. This is to say: Personal import is first theoretically erased and then any evidence for its existence is banished by discounting first person narrative and avowals. In this way, invalidation and silencing go hand in hand.

These accusations of deception can be placed in a larger context. Dreger does not note this deceiver-representation is a stereotype that has long plagued transpeople (MTFs and FTMs alike) (Bettcher, 2007). While this accusation has certainly been repeated in therapeutic contexts (Prosser, 1998, pp. 110–111), there is also a more basic way in which it is carried out. Indeed, one of the most obvious ways transpeople are invalidated is through being represented as in reality at odds with their appearance. One is "really a man disguised as a woman"; one is "really a woman disguised as a man." Given this representation, transpeople can be viewed as either openly pretending to be something they are not or as deliberately misleading people about who they are.

Bailey's picture plays precisely into this theme: Transsexual women are really sexually motivated men. The appearance that is stripped away is the lie of the feminine essence narrative and the politically correct cover-ups. (The lie may also be the female body of the post-operative which does not accord with the sexual reality of who this person really is.) Bailey (2003) writes:

But will popular features on "the transgendered" begin to mention the teenage masturbatory cross-dressing? Will "The Cher Mondavi Story" become a made-for-television movie co-starring "Robot Man?" Probably not, and it is a pity. True acceptance of the transgendered requires that we truly understand who they are. (p. 176)

Notice this passage uses "Robot Man" as a symbol for the truth about "who the transgendered are." It is worth recognizing how words can be used to publicly convey "information" about a person's private sexual life in order to inflict disgrace or shame. Notably this potential (exemplified in the passage above) to sexually shame can be used as a strategy to invalidate the personal import of gender.

I conclude by observing that the title and cover of Bailey's book do capture one very important thesis. Surely, the

title is about men who are pretenders to womanhood, fully captured in the cover picture of someone who may easily be construed as “a man in a dress” (or “a man in pumps”). Bailey’s thesis is that underneath all that false talk of “identity” is a disturbing and yet titillating reality. And forget what transwomen have to say about the personal importance of gender to them: They are liars anyway. I hope I do not need to belabor why this was rightfully perceived as highly transphobic; certainly the fact Bailey countenances SRS goes no distance toward undermining that fact. I don’t think Dreger has shown otherwise.

## References

- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- Bettcher, T. M. (2007). Evil deceivers and make-believers: Transphobic violence and the politics of illusion. *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*, 22(3), 43–65.
- Blanchard, R. (1993). Partial versus complete autogynephilia and gender disphoria. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 19, 301–307.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Prosser, J. (1998). *Second skins: The body narratives of transsexuality*. New York: Columbia University Press.

# Deconstructing the Feminine Essence Narrative

Ray Blanchard

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

In Dreger's history of the controversy surrounding Bailey's (2003) work on femininity in biological males, she refers to the popular view of male-to-female transsexualism as the *feminine essence narrative*. Because my commentary considers the feminine essence view as a set of propositions rather than as a story, I will refer to it as the *feminine essence theory*.

Dreger presents the main ideas of the theory quite clearly enough for the purposes of her history. She writes, for example, that according to the feminine essence theory, "trans people suffer from a sort of trick of nature, whereby they have the brain of one gender in the body typical of the other. Thus the trans person has a sort of neurological intersex condition, typically understood to be inborn." She does not, however, formally enumerate the distinguishable elements and implications of the theory, an exercise that would have taken her beyond the scope of her article. Such an analysis is the subject of this commentary. My purpose in writing it is to present the feminine essence theory in a form that facilitates its comparison with other theories of male-to-female transsexualism, including my own view.

The remainder of this commentary has three main parts. First, I will list what I consider to be the central tenets of the feminine essence theory. There is no "official version" of this theory, and another author might come up with a shorter or longer list of tenets, or state some of them in different

language. Second, I will explain each of the tenets as I conceive them, and third, I will compare the various elements of the feminine essence theory with my own conjectures.

## Tenets of the Feminine Essence Theory

1. Male-to-female transsexuals are, in some literal sense and not just in a figurative sense, women inside men's bodies.
2. There is only one type of woman, therefore there can be only one type of (true) transsexual.
3. Apparent differences among male-to-female transsexuals are relatively superficial and irrelevant to the basic unity of the transsexual syndrome.
4. Male-to-female transsexuals have no unique, behavioral or psychological characteristics that are absent in typical men and women.

## Elaboration of the Tenets

### Women Trapped in Men's Bodies

The popular description of male-to-female transsexuals as women trapped in men's bodies has sometimes been interpreted to mean that they feel like women or that they wish to be women. The feminine essence theory proposes that they *are* women. This proposition is usually paired with the notion that there exist one or more sex-dimorphic structures of the human brain that can be regarded as the seat of gender identity, and that key parameters of these structures (e.g., neuron number or density) are similar in male-to-female transsexuals and natal females (see Bailey & Triea, 2007). Contemporary proponents of this view also generally hold

---

R. Blanchard (✉)  
Law and Mental Health Program, Centre for Addiction  
and Mental Health, 250 College Street, Toronto, ON,  
Canada M5T 1R8  
e-mail: Ray\_Blanchard@camh.net

R. Blanchard  
Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto, Toronto,  
ON, Canada

that the female-typical structure of the gender identity center(s) is congenital, so that male-to-female transsexuals are and always have been female where it counts—in the brain.

### Singularity of the Feminine Essence

Human females do not occur in alternative morphs; that is, human females do not consist of two or more discrete subpopulations with different phenotypes, as in the damselfly or the black bean aphid. Since there is only one type of human female, there can be only one type of female trapped in a male body. It follows that the notion of a taxonomy of transsexuals with discrete diagnostic categories is almost oxymoronic. There may be a miscellany of males who, for whatever reason, desire sex reassignment and might even profit from it, but without the singular feminine essence—or its characteristic neuroanatomic substrate—they cannot be considered to be real transsexuals.

The notion of a single, true transsexual syndrome exists within the transsexual subculture as well as parts of the scientific community. One can find, on the Internet, hostile postings in which one postoperative transsexual derides another as a pseudotranssexual who transitioned for the “wrong” reasons.

### Irrelevance of Apparent Differences

Contemporary proponents of the feminine essence theory freely acknowledge that some male-to-female transsexuals are erotically attracted to men, both before and after sex reassignment surgery, whereas others are erotically attracted to women, before and after surgery. In my terminology, which follows the individual’s chromosomal sex, these groups are *homosexual* and *heterosexual* transsexuals, respectively. In their own terms, which follow their subjective gender identity rather than their chromosomal sex, they are heterosexual (“straight”) and homosexual (“lesbian”) trans women, respectively.

Research has shown that homosexual and heterosexual male-to-female transsexuals (my terminology) differ in the onset, course, and associated features of their disorders. Compared with homosexual transsexuals, heterosexual transsexuals are less conspicuously feminine in boyhood (Blanchard, 1988; Smith, van Goozen, Kuiper, & Cohen-Kettenis, 2005), they approach clinicians with the request for sex reassignment at a later age (Blanchard, 1988; Smith et al., 2005), they have a less convincing appearance when dressed as women (Smith et al., 2005), they have more extensive histories of penile erection with or without masturbation during cross-dressing (Blanchard, 1985; Lawrence, 2008; Smith et al., 2005), and they are more likely to report histories of erotic arousal in association with the thought or image of themselves as women

(Blanchard, 1989a). I labeled the propensity to be sexually aroused by cross-gender ideation *autogynephilia* (Blanchard, 1989b), after many decades in which clinical writers had described the phenomenon without giving a name to it (see Blanchard, 2005).

According to the feminine essence theory, the differences between homosexual and heterosexual transsexuals have no bearing on the origins of transsexualism per se. There is no more need to ask whether homosexual and heterosexual male-to-female transsexuals have the same reasons for believing themselves to be women than there is to ask whether homosexual and heterosexual natal females have the same reasons for believing themselves to be women.

### Absence of Unique Features

The feminine essence theory is not incompatible with the possibility that transsexuals’ behavior includes some male-typical and some female-typical traits. Male-to-female transsexuals have, after all, been subject to societal pressures to act like males throughout most of their development. The theory is, however, incompatible with a high prevalence of distinctive traits that are typical of neither males nor females.

For the foregoing reason, the high prevalence of autogynephilia among male-to-female transsexuals might seem to represent a challenge to the feminine essence theory. The simple rebuttal offered by the theory’s proponents is that natal females commonly experience sexual arousal at the thought of themselves as attractive women. On this view, autogynephilia is not a generally rare trait with a strikingly high prevalence among male-to-female transsexuals; it is a common behavior in all women, whether they happen to be born with male or female bodies.

### Comparison With My Version of the Traditional Clinical View

Over a period of 20 years (Blanchard, 1985, 2005), I published a series of papers that attempted to integrate and systematize the clinical observations and research findings on male-to-female transsexuals published during the last century. My conclusions were adopted, in part or in whole, by Bailey (2003) and Lawrence (2004). The substantive parts of Bailey’s book that contributed to his attackers’ motivation were largely parts that were based on my writings and that contradicted the feminine essence theory. It is therefore relevant to consider precisely how the tenets of that theory conflict with my synthesis of the traditional clinical literature. I will begin my comparisons with the last of the four tenets and work my way up the list.

## Occurrence of Autogynephilia in Natal Females

The notion that typical natal females are erotically aroused by—and sometimes even masturbate to—the thought or image of themselves as women might seem feasible if one considers only conventional, generic fantasies of being a beautiful, alluring woman in the act of attracting a handsome, desirable man. It seems a lot less feasible when one considers the various other ways in which some autogynephilic men symbolize themselves as women in their masturbation fantasies. I recall more than one patient who had sexual fantasies of menstruation and masturbatory rituals that simulated menstruation. I recently read about an individual who fantasized, while giving himself enemas, that his anus was a vagina and that he was giving himself a vaginal douche. I have listed other examples in previous articles: an autogynephile who was sexually aroused by the thought of helping the maid clean the house or sitting in a girls' class at school, an autogynephile whose favorite masturbation fantasy was knitting in the company of other women, an autogynephile who was sexually aroused by the idea of riding a girls' bicycle, and an autogynephile who got an erection when he went out cross-dressed and someone called him “ma'am.” These examples argue that autogynephilia has a fetishistic flavor that makes it qualitatively different from any superficially similar ideation in natal females.

There is also the very telling phenomenon of autogynephiles who are *involuntarily* aroused by cross-dressing or cross-gender ideation. I gave an example of that in Blanchard (2005), and other authors had reported such observations before I started working in the field. Buhrich (1978) reproduced quotes from men who regarded genital arousal as an unwanted and bothersome by-product of changing into women's apparel: “When I ejaculate it is an accident and undesirable,” “I can manage to ‘dress’ now and not have an erection,” “I masturbate to get rid of the erection so I can get on with dressing” (p. 147). It seems likely that few natal women would give the analogous reports that they wish that they could put on their clothes without triggering vaginal lubrication or orgasm.

Proponents of the feminine essence theory could argue that it is an empirical question whether heterosexual male-to-female transsexuals manifest a higher prevalence of autogynephilia than do natal females. My view, in contrast, is that the correct control group for such (necessarily survey) research is not natal females but rather homosexual male-to-female transsexuals, and that the results of such research have already shown that autogynephilia is characteristic of heterosexual transsexuals (Blanchard, 1989a). Thus, it is unlikely that heterosexual male-to-female transsexuals manifest autogynephilia simply because they resemble natal females. If heterosexual male-to-female transsexuals report sexual arousal

from thoughts of being feminine because they are like natal women, then why don't homosexual male-to-female transsexuals report sexual arousal from thoughts of being feminine? Homosexual male-to-female transsexuals are just as much like natal women, perhaps more so. In summary, my view is that male-to-female transsexuals—more specifically, one class of them—do have at least one important characteristic that is absent in both typical men and women.

## Significance of Differences Among Male-to-Female Transsexuals

In my view, the differences between homosexual and heterosexual male-to-female transsexuals regarding the onset, course, and associated features of their disorders are not superficial, insignificant distinctions. I view them as evidence that homosexual and heterosexual transsexualism probably have different etiologies. I have stated this conclusion in several places. In Blanchard (2005), I expressed it as follows:

There are two distinct types of cross-gender identity. The feminine gender identity that develops in homosexual males is different from the feminine gender identity that develops in heterosexual males. In other words, homosexual and heterosexual men cannot “catch” the same gender identity disorder in the way that homosexual and heterosexual men can both “catch” the identical strain of influenza virus. Each class of men is susceptible to its own type of gender identity disorder and only its own type of gender identity disorder. (p. 443)

## Typology of Male-to-Female Transsexualism

It will be clear, from the preceding paragraph, that I believe there is more than one type of male-to-female transsexualism. In this regard, I agree with the majority of previous clinical writers. Where I depart from my predecessors is that many of them identified one type of transsexual as *true* or *primary* and labeled the remaining type or types as *secondary*. That is not to say that all previous researchers agreed on the diagnostic criteria for primary and secondary transsexualism. They routinely contradicted each other, in fact, about the defining characteristics of the true (primary) transsexual.

I eschewed the primary–secondary terminology for a variety of reasons, one being that it implies a hierarchy of genuineness. My main reason, however, was that I believed that transsexuals' sexual orientations are the best basis for classification. After a series of studies designed to identify the number of fundamentally different types, I hypothesized that there are only two: “All gender-dysphoric biological males who are not homosexual (erotically aroused by other

males) are instead autogynephilic (erotically aroused by the thought or image of themselves as females)” (Blanchard, 2005, p. 445).

Bailey adopted my hypothesis of two discrete types, and this became a recurring point of contention in the attacks on his book. Bailey was criticized for his (our) stance by many transsexuals who recalled no subjective awareness of sexual response to men or to cross-gender ideation and who insisted, on that basis, that they must belong to a third type.

I have not seen any new research studies that present compelling evidence for a third, distinct type of male-to-female transsexualism. It is quite difficult, however, to achieve complete certainty in taxonomic work. I made this point in a lecture on the parallels between gender identity disorder (GID) and body integrity identity disorder (BIID), a condition characterized by the feeling that one’s proper phenotype is that of an amputee, together with the desire for surgery to achieve this. Most, but not all, persons with BIID report some history of erotic arousal in association with thoughts of being an amputee (apotemnophilia). In discussing the taxonomic problems common to the study of GID and BIID, I noted the following:

There are some nonhomosexual male-to-female transsexuals who state that they were *never* erotically aroused by cross-dressing or cross-gender fantasy. Similarly, there are some persons with BIID who claim that they were *never* erotically aroused by the idea of being amputees. I’ve published two studies that suggest at least some transsexuals who deny autogynephilic arousal are consciously or unconsciously distorting their histories. That doesn’t completely solve the taxonomic problem, however. There could still be some nonhomosexual transsexuals whose denial of any autogynephilic arousal is accurate. The taxonomic study of GID and BIID raises the same problem: How does one decide when the discrepant self-reports of a minority of patients indicate psychological denial and when they indicate a bona fide separate syndrome? (Blanchard, 2003)

The question of whether there are two or three distinct types of male-to-female transsexualism is an interesting and important one in its own right. There is a sense, however, in which the difference between two, three, or even more discriminably different syndromes of gender dysphoria is tangential to the feminine essence theory *per se*. The feminine essence theory implies that there can be only one kind of true transsexualism; it is silent about the number of other syndromes that might imitate its symptoms.

#### Transsexuals as Intersexes

In principle, one could hypothesize that there are two, three, or more sex-dimorphic structures in the brain that influence

gender identity, and that the differentiation of any one of them in the female-typical direction could cause a natal male to develop as a male-to-female transsexual. This strategy would preserve the concept of transsexualism as a kind of intersexuality, and it would allow for the possibility of multiple, separate but equal types of transsexualism. Such a strategy presents certain philosophical problems for the feminine essence theory, however. Presumably, all gender-identity-related structures are differentiated in the female-typical direction in the overwhelming majority of natal females. If there are multiple types of male-to-female transsexuals with different subsets of female-differentiated structures, then all of them would be incomplete females. That notion is quite inharmonious with the spirit of contemporary feminine essence theory, which emphasizes the psychology of male-to-female transsexuals as that of “normal” women. For this reason, the ideal neuroanatomic finding, from the standpoint of the feminine essence theory, would be a single gender identity center that is differentiated in the female-typical direction in heterosexual, homosexual, and any other type of male-to-female transsexual.

My personal view—which I present here only because it has so often been incorrectly surmised by participants in the Bailey controversy—is that the brains of both homosexual and heterosexual male-to-female transsexuals probably differ from the brains of typical heterosexual men, but in different ways. In homosexual male-to-female transsexuals, the difference does involve sex-dimorphic structures, and the nature of the difference is a shift in the female-typical direction. If there is any neuroanatomic intersexuality, it is in the homosexual group. In heterosexual male-to-female transsexuals, the difference may not involve sex-dimorphic structures at all, and the nature of the structural difference is not necessarily along the male–female dimension. None of this speaks to the relative usefulness of reassignment surgery for the two groups, which is an empirical matter that must be decided on grounds other than etiology (Blanchard, 2000).

#### Conclusion

As I have previously noted, there undoubtedly exist variant forms of both the folk and academic versions of the feminine essence theory. Some of these variations can be understood with regard to the four tenets that I listed. I can illustrate this with a clinical example. I have interviewed more than one preoperative male-to-female transsexual whose entire sexual history had been with women, but who told me that they expected (or hoped) that after surgery they would start to feel attracted to men. When I asked them why they would not want to be lesbians after surgery—which seemed like the more probable outcome to me—they answered that (in their view) lesbians are masculine and thus are not “real” women. For that



reason, they felt that ending up as a lesbian after surgery would represent a failure to achieve full womanhood. These individuals apparently subscribed to the notion of a singular feminine essence, but they denied its presence in lesbians. By implication, therefore, they denied the third tenet, which asserts that “straight” and “lesbian” trans women can lay equal claim to the designation of true transsexuals.

There may be versions of the feminine essence theory that vary in ways not covered by the tenets I identified. One might hope that this will stimulate other writers to compile different and perhaps better lists of the theory’s propositions and implications. Such a conversation may eventually help to clarify the substantive component of controversies regarding transsexualism.

## References

- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- Bailey, J. M., & Triea, K. (2007). What many transgender activists don’t want you to know—and why you should know it anyway. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, *50*, 521–534.
- Blanchard, R. (1985). Typology of male-to-female transsexualism. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *14*, 247–261.
- Blanchard, R. (1988). Nonhomosexual gender dysphoria. *Journal of Sex Research*, *24*, 188–193.
- Blanchard, R. (1989a). The concept of autogynephilia and the typology of male gender dysphoria. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, *177*, 616–623.
- Blanchard, R. (1989b). The classification and labeling of nonhomosexual gender dysphorias. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *18*, 315–334.
- Blanchard, R. (2000). Part II: The case for publicly funded transsexual surgery. *Psychiatry Rounds*, *4*(2), 4–6.
- Blanchard, R. (2003). *Theoretical and clinical parallels between body integrity identity disorder and gender identity disorder*. Paper presented at the Third Annual International BIID Meeting, Columbia University, New York.
- Blanchard, R. (2005). Early history of the concept of autogynephilia. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *34*, 439–446.
- Buhrich, N. (1978). Motivation for cross-dressing in heterosexual transvestism. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *57*, 145–152.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2004). Autogynephilia: A paraphilic model of gender identity disorder. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy*, *8*, 69–87.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2008). Male-to-female transsexual subtypes: Sexual arousal with cross-dressing and physical measurements [Letter to the Editor]. *Psychiatry Research*, *159*, 319–320.
- Smith, Y. L. S., van Goozen, S. H. M., Kuiper, A. J., & Cohen-Kettenis, P. T. (2005). Transsexual subtypes: Clinical and theoretical significance. *Psychiatry Research*, *137*, 151–160.

## Dreger's Adventures

Antonia Caretto

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Dreger's essay is a thorough review of one current manifestation of what has been the quintessential question within the field of sexology for nearly 150 years: What is the nature of the relationship among sex, gender identity, gender role, and sexual orientation? I agree wholeheartedly with Dreger's premise that "a scholarly history of this controversy is critically necessary to advancing both transgender rights and sexology." However, though Dreger shows the historical significance of the speed and far reach of the internet and how it contributed heavily to the controversy, she neglects to examine the controversy within a larger historical context of the evolution of our discourse on the quintessential question and our present day conceptualizations of transsexualism. An overview of this larger historical context may show both ways in which we have seemingly come full circle, rediscovering the germ of truth in theories put forth by both Bailey and Conway, and ways in which we are going in circles as if chasing rabbits; repeating the same flaws in logic and returning to the same faulty premises.

Not only does Dreger not reflect on the history of the controversy within the larger history of our thinking about transsexual identity, she also fails to attempt or even suggest the possibility of a theoretical integration or synthesis in which both gender and sexuality are considered relevant to the development of transsexuality. She does identify what may result from a broader perspective when she states "the literature around Blanchard's theory looks ripe for a thorough queer theory-based, science studies critique" and, when she adds, "I'm not sure that the simplistic feminin-essence narrative is necessarily better."

Not only did Dreger neglect the opportunity to address the inherent problems with the content of each argument, she also neglected the opportunity to address the inherent problems with the logic of both arguments on which each theory stands: that there is one transsexual identity; that there is one pathway to transsexual identity development; and that a relationship between constructs implies causation. It is as if Dreger gets caught up in the controversy and loses her footing in science, as if falling into a very deep rabbit hole.

Both Bailey and Conway a priori accept and promote the idea of a single transsexual identity. Dreger fails to note that both arguments are based on this premise which was first elucidated 40 years ago and has long since been dismissed: the myth of the "true transsexual." Paradoxically, though Bailey and Conway each regress to Benjamin's (1966) problematic concept of the "true transsexual," they both reject Benjamin's assertion that there are many types of transsexuals. Even Benjamin, who categorized the six types of transgendered individuals into three distinct groups, clearly believed in the idea of gender identity as a continuum, stating that the six types that he identified could never truly be considered separate categories.

Bailey (2003) states, "Gender identity is probably not binary" (p. 50) and Conway would probably agree. However, though Bailey and Conway would both endorse the idea that gender exists on a continuum, each rejects the concept of a continuum of gender variance. Dreger fails to note that the controversy which she reviews may be moot if, in fact, Bailey and Conway are each referring to a different type of transsexual.

Dreger makes a significant error in judgment by adhering to a reporting of the controversy which is free of criticism and, therefore, does not speak of the damage done to transgender rights by both Bailey and Conway. Just as any and all theories based on the premise of some theoretically ideal

---

A. Caretto (✉)  
P.O. Box 2265, Dearborn, MI 48123, USA  
e-mail: drcaretto@aol.com

gender identity and resulting in the conclusion that any variation from the ideal is a perversion contribute to the stigmatization of transgenderism, so do theories based on the premise of some theoretically ideal transgender identity and resulting in the conclusion that any variation from the ideal is an aberration. Dreger failed in her obligation to duly note this collateral damage beyond her mention of the problem with “a model that sees transsexuality as pathology.”

Just as both Bailey and Conway engage in the same faulty premise of a single transsexual identity, they both assert the faulty premise that there is simply one theory of transsexualism that applies to all transsexuals. Dreger fails to note that, regardless of the content, the evolution of our understanding of gender is such that a valid theory must address both the similarities and the variations in transsexual identity development. Bailey makes explicit and Conway accepts implicitly that theory must either “lump” or “split” groups. Dreger does not hold Bailey and Conway to an expectation that their respective theories must each at least emulate Benjamin’s theory, which both identified distinctions and retained relationships, and thereby allowed for the possibility that a transsexual identity can be the result of various developmental pathways.

Dreger ignores that fact that neither Bailey nor Conway adequately discuss the relationship among childhood gender non-conformity, transvestism, and transsexuality: neither Bailey nor Conway adequately address the fact that, though childhood gender role non-conformity may be a significant aspect of the personal history of some transsexuals, absence of a history of childhood gender role non-conformity does not preclude a transsexual identity. Furthermore, neither theory adequately addresses that fact that though cross-dressing exists in practically all transsexuals and transsexual desires are not evident in most transvestites, often transsexualism may first appear to be merely transvestism.

Instead, Bailey and Conway both make a significant error in judgment by adhering to their respective reductionistic theories which each resort to denial of phenomena which cannot be explained by their particular paradigm. Dreger seems to be complacent about this denial and ignores the possibility that just because we are as of yet unable to understand the distinctions in types of childhood gender identity disorder (GID), and the relationships among childhood GID, cross-dressing, and transsexualism doesn’t mean they don’t exist.

In tandem with the same faulty premises, Bailey and Conway both engage in the same flaw in logic: the classic case of failing to distinguish between a relationship or association and a causal link. Each views their respective variable of

interest as causative in a rather linear way, thereby each excluding the possibility of other variables, other relationships, or other valid theories. Dreger is not critical of the assumption of causation though it is the crux of the controversy she reviews.

By asserting that transgender identity is the result of sexuality or the result of feminine essence, Bailey and Conway each deny the complexity of the relationship that exists between gender and sexuality and deny the possibility of moderator variables, such as some underlying biological cause or a complex array of environmental factors. Prince (1957) warned us 50 years ago: “...identification is not in fact an explanation at all. Like so many other things in life, it is often felt that once one has given a descriptive name to a thing, that everything is taken care of and is clear. The concept of ‘feminine identification’ is useful but is only the germ of an idea.”

Though Dreger’s review was thorough and unbiased, the failure of such a well-informed scholar to criticize both Bailey and Conway for such glaring problems in argumentation speaks volumes about the impact of the controversy. Dreger’s essay highlights how politics and the internet can result in the evolution of a germ of an idea into a controversy, acting as accelerants and resulting in a loss of focus on the content of the various theories and the opportunity to advance understanding. In addition, the power of the controversy resulted in failure to attend to distortions in logical argumentation and statistical interpretations.

Hopefully, Dreger’s essay and the resultant peer commentaries will finally put to rest the controversy and will usher in the return to a focus on theories based on scientific exploration of the nature of the relationship among sex, gender identity, gender role, and sexual orientation. It is time: “When logic and proportion have fallen sloppy dead and the White Knight is talking backwards and the Red Queen’s ‘Off with her head!’ Remember what the dormouse said: ‘Feed your head!’” (Slick, 1965).

## References

- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- Benjamin, H. (1966). *The transsexual phenomenon*. New York: Julian Press.
- Prince, C. V. (1957). Homosexuality, transvestism and transsexuality: Reflections on their etiology and differentiation. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 11, 80–85.
- Slick, G. (1965). White rabbit. Retrieved November 14, 2007, from <http://seeklyrics.com/lyrics/Grace-Slick/White-Rabbit.html>

## Is This a Work of Science?

John H. Gagnon

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

I have thought long, but perhaps not long enough, about whether to contribute to this discussion about the conflict between Bailey and his opponents in the transgendered movement. Unlike Dreger, I do not have even the most minimal belief that whatever is written about this conflict will not be spun by one side or the other.<sup>1</sup> Social conflicts about meaning, such as this one, often play themselves out without much resolution. The sets of combatants are all usually left standing, some more wounded than others, the on-lookers grow bored, and nearly everyone (including most of the combatants) go on to other matters. It is unfortunately true that some few combatants make their participation in such conflicts central to their post-conflict identities, obsessing over the details of the conflict in the same fashion as those with post traumatic stress disorders.

Two phrases struck me when I read Dreger's contemporary history of these events because they accorded with my own first reactions when reading *The Man Who Would Be Queen* (hereafter, *TMWWBQ*). The first was the phrase, "it seemed to me that Bailey had stuck his hand into a buzzing hornet's nest and he should have expected to be stung..." and "I did read the book sometime around late 2003 or early 2004, and—judging by my marginalia—I found it generally lively and well written, unnecessarily snide or even contemptuous in places, lacking in evidentiary support (the book has "further reading" suggestions but no

citations), and full of claims and ideas that I knew very little about. I marked it up copiously and put it down."

This pretty much sums up my first reaction to Bailey's venture and his book, though my judgment of the literary style was more severe and I made no notes because I was reading a library copy. However, I was puzzled that a book with this limited a scientific apparatus and with such a jacket had been published by an imprint of the National Academy of Sciences. I have been a member of scientific committees of the Academy and contributed to official publications of those committees and recalled the rigorous peer review process that the scientific assertions in each of those publications underwent. The imprint series in which *TMWWBQ* published (The Joseph Henry Press) is described on the website of the National Academies Press as "created with the goal of publishing well-crafted, authoritative books on science, technology, and health for the science-interested general public" (<http://www.nap.edu/about.html>). I wondered if books in this series were vetted in their pre-publication form by members of the Academy or other appropriate reviewers, but thought no more about it.

As Dreger's history recounts, matters deteriorated rapidly after the publication of *TMWWBQ* as the blowback against Bailey and his book was mobilized. In her judgment, these attacks went beyond the limits of civilized debate in academic circles. That this blowback has come to include her was apparently one of the stimuli that motivated her to write her version of the events involved. That her "objectivity" might have been influenced by becoming collateral damage in the conflict over Bailey and *TMWWBQ* is not addressed in any detailed way. I believe that she could have expanded on this question of motivation. In any case, the normative rules of academic discourse are often the first victims of serious conflicts, both those internal to the scientific enterprise and those between scientists and their non-scientist adversaries.

---

J. H. Gagnon (✉)  
Eden Beach, Batiment C-2, 122 Blvd. Carnot, 06300 Nice,  
France  
e-mail: [jhgagnon@gmail.com](mailto:jhgagnon@gmail.com)

<sup>1</sup> This is in contrast to her stated hope that "I believe that this history has the potential to calm and even quell some of the tensions that persist."

As someone who has been at the center of such conflicts (Laumann, Michael, & Gagnon, 1994), I was not startled when the conflict began to take on what she describes as its more ugly aspects.

It is important to note here that “the normative rules of scientific conflict” are often breached, even in conflicts that are internal to any specific scientific community. While there is a belief, dare one call it myth, that if scientist A disagrees with some aspect of a paper by scientist B, he or she will, in a spirit of scientific comity, offer a helpful critique of the explanations, observations or methods of B’s work, and perhaps even conduct research which replicates or disconfirms B’s work. It is agreed that it is non-normative for scientist A to attack scientist B’s character or intelligence in private conversations with fellow scientists, graduate students or persons making research grants, and that he or she will not prevent scientist B or his or her students from gaining promotion, tenure, post doctoral fellowships or research grants. I suspect that if the dirty linen of academic in-fighting were fully disclosed there is little that has happened to Bailey that has not happened in fights about priority, tenure, grants, and the rest of the cognitive and worldly goods that are at stake in any scientific controversy. It seems that all conflicts have the potential to spin beyond the limits of propriety.

While both Dreger and I responded to our first reading of *TMWWBQ* in somewhat similar ways, my views of its tone are more critical. I felt that in the book Bailey presents himself as a scientific tough guy, sort of a Sergeant Friday of sexology, whose message is “these are the scientific facts and I come bearing the mantel and the political privilege of science to tell the ‘data’ what the real explanation of their condition might be.” Bailey’s overriding concern is with the “truth” and he views his obligation to his role as a scientific “truth bearer” to let the chips fall where they may.

The belief that one knows something called the truth in capital letters is both comforting and sometimes dangerous to the person who possesses it (and often to others about whom the truth is being told). It is perhaps not possible in science as it is now lived and practiced to recognize that most of what was thought to be scientifically proven in the social and behavioral sciences just a few years ago has been discarded. I use the word discarded because in many cases the old ideas and observations were not formally dis-proven, but rather became unfashionable for reasons both internal and external to the activities of social and behavioral scientists. The low incidence of replication of experimental and other research suggests that Popper’s project of disconfirmation has not taken hold in the daily life of social science.

Indeed, truth in science is often unstable, particularly when the work is close to the cutting edge. In no field is this more apparent than in fields such as the study of sexuality or gender that attract researchers from various disciplines with different and often incommensurate research paradigms. The fable of

the elephant and the blind man comes easily to mind. In addition, there are many interactions, some very conflicted, between scientists and non-scientists about what is known about many aspects of sexuality and gender and what policies should be implemented to deal with these aspects. Finally, the media in all of its forms finds sexuality and gender, including preliminary scientific reports about them, an inexhaustible source of news to fill columns separating the advertising messages that pay for their existence. None of this bodes well for Bailey’s version of “science” and “truth.”

Dreger carefully points out the marginalized status of most transgendered persons, their often tortured journeys to transition, and their appropriate fears of further marginalization and oppression as a result of Bailey’s judgment that their desire to change their gender from man to woman is rooted in a sexual paraphilia. They are concerned that if their desire is interpreted as rooted in sexual perversity that this interpretation will be used to prevent them from having access to all of the necessary steps to a safe and comfortable transition and a decent life thereafter. Bailey argues that he supports their goals, but the truth as he sees it overrides these concerns. It is an accident of history a number of those persons who have opposed Bailey are persons who have distinguished careers in the “hard” sciences and, perhaps ironically, two are members of the National Academy of Sciences. Like Bailey, they too are believers in the influence of scientific ideas (both true and false) and, as a consequence, they mobilized to get the messenger.

If his opponents had asked me for advice on how to proceed, I would have suggested that Bailey’s work would probably disappear in the river of unread works, it would have a few moments of notice, and then disappear into the dustbins of the second hand book store. Apparently, Dreger actually did give Conway a version of this advice. However it *could* have been the wrong advice. There are some dangers that really are dangers (here one thinks of Munich) and, if not dealt with immediately and remorselessly, it will come to overwhelm one and one’s friends. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to determine when the sky is falling and when it is only Chicken Little crying havoc in the streets.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> I would have given this same advice to ignore Bailey’s book based on an earlier experience. In the early years of my tenure at the Institute for Sex Research (as it was called then) at Indiana University, a prepublication campaign was launched in the press about a new novel being written by Irving Wallace (a successful popular novelist of the period) to be titled *The Chapman Report*. Its promise to reveal the secrets behind the doors of an unnamed sex research organization was more than hinted at in the gossip columns. A substantial contract had been signed which included hard cover, soft cover, and film rights. Alarmed by these innuendos, Paul Gebhard and I went to New York to confer with the Institute’s lawyers who told us that we had no legal remedies until after the work was published. Hoping that at least we might see the pre-publication manuscript, we met with the senior lawyers for the two publishing houses; they defended their clients’ rights, and they held out the possibility that we could always sue. Later that day, we dined with Glenway Wescott, who was a great friend of

Unlike generations of scientific explainers who got away unscathed when they told women that they were by nature submissive, or gay men that they were perverts, the “data” in this case decided to fight back. And, according to Dreger’s account, they did not fight back in very fair ways. They did not get grants from foundations, they did not publish in peer reviewed journals, they did not endure years in the waiting rooms of graduate schools, or climb the academic ladder or accumulate papers in unread journals to be listed on their vitas—and then engage in polite scientific criticisms about theory, observations, and methods. They thought politically and they acted politically, they tried to get Bailey fired by fair means or foul. Dreger, who has been an activist, is offended, but she surely cannot be surprised.

It is a fact that in the contemporary world you cannot say anything you want about Native Americans, African Americans, Africans (see the recent case of Nobelist James Watson), Jews, women, gay men and lesbians, Christians, Islamists, Hindus, children, seniors (to name only a few) without a political reaction. Once upon the time, before decolonization, anthropologists could say what they pleased about the natives. Once upon a time, before gay liberation, psychoanalysts and psychiatrists could say anything they wanted about “homosexuals.” Once upon a time, before postmodernisms, one could say practically anything about anybody under the privilege of science. It does not mean that people, including scientists, cannot say what they please about nearly anything, except the troops in Iraq; it is that speakers and writers, including scientists, should expect that the “data” (or spokespersons for the “data,” often self appointed) are going to talk back and, in some cases, fight back.

Many of the particular details of the blowback seem to me to have been predictable. The university which conducted the investigation is keeping its mouth shut. That is what institutions do when they have a multiplicity of interests to keep under control; the “truth,” which is what Dreger seeks, is not in the interest of the university. The lawyers for Bailey tell him to keep his mouth shut. Bailey mostly follows their advice. That portion of the scientific community which shares Bailey’s views either about the autogynephilia matter or the role of science as “truth seeking” support his position in the controversy. Most (though not all) of those in the transgendered community who led the charge against Bailey have moved on. The publication of Dreger’s article and these commentaries

will provoke another spike in the notice given to the controversy. Little new will be said.

There are two points with which I differ with Professor Dreger’s interpretations. The first is whether Bailey’s book was one of science and his field work subject to institutional review board approval, two issues which are mutually implicated, and the second is whether her own work is a work of history that should have been exempted by her own Institutional Review Board at Northwestern University’s medical school.<sup>3,4</sup>

In the blowback from his publication of *TMWWBQ*, Bailey has made the argument that this book was not meant to be a work of science nor did his various contacts with transgendered persons in his office or in other public locations rise to the scientific level which required formal consent forms or IRB approval. My reading of Dreger suggests to me that she agrees with Bailey. My sense is quite different. To argue that *TMWWBQ* was not meant to be a book of science appears to be more a result of the conflict about the book than a description of the author’s intentions. The book is a work of popular science authored by a scientist with all of the institutional and personal marking of the qualified scientist (he was, at the time, the chairman of a department of psychology at a well known research university, he has a Ph.D., he has a collection of peer reviewed papers—none of this was concealed and, indeed, why should it have been?) and published by a press that is an agency of one of the most prestigious scientific bodies in the U.S. It is a book that was written, as the author says, in the spirit of scientific truth telling, a truth telling that was meant to persuade its readers and those about whom it was written that its contents were based on science. Many of the first hand anecdotes in the book are likely to be assumed by the non-scientist reader as products of a working scientist. It was not a journal article in a peer reviewed journal nor was it a monographic work in a scientific series, but, in my view, it was intended to be a work of science and it was fully clothed in the trappings of science. It is possible that this text might have published if it had been authored anonymously, but I think that would have been unlikely.

It can be argued, and with some force, that Bailey’s usual scientific work has been with subjects in experiments or in surveys and in these studies he has (here I am supposing, I have not asked) submitted his research plans to his IRB on the main

Footnote 2 continued

Kinsey’s and of the Institute after Kinsey’s death. He told us that they wanted us to sue. The attendant publicity would enhance the sales of the book in all of its editions and create an audience for the film. Wescott gave us an early variant of the Warhol dictum: no one will remember this book or this film more than a few hours after they read or see it. Go back to Bloomington in peace and without paying any further legal fees he counseled us. We did and in this case Wescott turned out to be right.

<sup>3</sup> It should be clear that I differ from Bancroft when he asserted that *TMWWBQ* is not science.

<sup>4</sup> In the interests of full disclosure, I wrote an e-mail to Dreger asking whether the decision that the research work involved in her article was exempted by the IRB at the medical school where she has her appointment or by the IRB on the main campus of Northwestern University. In her kind reply, she said that there were two IRB’s at Northwestern and because her appointment was at the medical school it was that IRB which exempted her work.

campus at Northwestern and provided consent forms to his (and his colleagues') subjects. His contacts with transgendered persons were (if I may infer), to his mind, more casual and less scientific than his other work. However, for anyone coming from disciplines in which field studies (often called participant observation) are more common and in which IRB approval is usually necessary, an alternative view of Bailey's activities is surely possible. Many of his observations arose from his encounters and conversations with transgendered persons both in his office and in the field; such encounters contributed to his understanding of the phenomena in which he was interested and to his reporting of them. From the point of view of most IRBs with which I am familiar, Bailey was doing field work and his respondents were research subjects, even though he did not think so at the time.

I believe that a similar issue arises from Dreger's report that her own work on which this is a commentary was exempted from human subjects review by the IRB at Northwestern University's medical school despite the fact that she was interviewing people whom I would treat as "human subjects." I am not sure how the IRB on the main campus of Northwestern, which is far more familiar with social science research, would have dealt with Dreger's submission. I know as a matter of personal experience that studies such as hers (including oral histories) have required IRB approval at other universities and have required consent forms. She makes the case that what she has done does not rise to the level of "scientific research." Here, I believe that she is being disingenuous: hers is a paper published in scientific journal, from an author who has an academic appointment in a medical school, who is a professional historian, who says that her goals are setting the historical record straight. What is this but careful scientific research? To suggest that it is not generalizable is to go against her stated purposes to instruct her readers how to deal with serious conflicts between scientists and the people whose behavior they study and whose conduct they explain.

I think that Dreger has conflated the two cases, Bailey's and her own, in one of the few places in which I think her story has seriously leaned in his direction. This choice has consequences for how she interprets other matters in her history, such as whether the person with whom Bailey is alleged to have sex was a "research subject" (on other grounds, Dreger thinks he did not). In my view, both *TMWWBQ* and Dreger's comment are works which fall into recognizable genres of scientific writing and both are dressed in scientific costume. Both employ methods that bring them under the rules and regulations of the appropriate Institutional Review Boards about informing human subjects that they have become "data." Neither Bailey or Dreger are actors who are free of these constraints on the academic researcher.

Despite what I have written, I am not an unqualified supporter of IRBs and their workings. They are often (perhaps

more often than not) excessively intrusive, legalistic, and ignorant of the methods and traditions of the disciplines which they review. However, they are part of the apparatus of managing ethical dilemmas in human science in the current political and economic atmosphere that surrounds the production of knowledge by academic researchers. The decision to define either Bailey's or Dreger's works as non-science may be tactically useful in this case, but in my view, neither choice is the correct one.

As to the belief in autogynephilia versus the belief that one is a woman mistakenly occupying a man's body, there will be many discussions of the extant science of these beliefs in the other comments on this article. I do not have a view on this question since I view both beliefs as social constructions that have emerged from the positions that believers in one or the other view have acquired from their roles in the historical conversation about what is now called transgender and gender transitions. Neither explanation is true in some universal sense. No human conversation is free of the time and place in history and culture in which it occurs; this includes whatever activity that is called science in any time and place. What distinguishes contemporary scientific conversations from other conversations is the requirement of transparency about explanations, observations, and methods (what Kuhn described as the elements of a paradigm.) The method of science is the attempt to make clear (1) what it is one believed before one conducts an inquiry, (2) how one went about doing it, and (3) how one made a record of the inquiry so that others can accurately judge how one might have gone wrong. These meta constraints, which are internal to a study in a particular discipline, do not exhaust the appropriate questions that might be asked about extra-scientific influences that shape the findings of even the best conducted and influential scientific research.

One hundred years from now, there may be more or fewer people who feel that they would like to be another gender depending on the cultural conditions under which gender performances are acquired and evaluated (it is possible to think that congruency between genitals and minds [or brains] may even be passé as a marker of gender). Those with desires that are decided to be gender anomalous will contest with whomever is given the power to make the rules about how their desires are to be treated. What we may be sure of is that few will remember the explanations which are currently in contention.

## Reference

- Laumann, E. O., Michael, R. T., & Gagnon, J. H. (1994). A political history of the Adult Sex Survey. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 26, 34–38.

## Gender Identity Politics, Human Subjects Issues, and the “Law of Unintended Consequences”

Brian A. Gladue

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Among the many fascinating aspects of her excellent historical study of the Conway-Bailey affair, Dreger provides a succinct and accurate overview of how human research protection programs are operated at universities and research institutes. The key element in all such programs is the research ethics committee for that institution, generically known as the Institutional Review Board (IRB). It is the IRB and its accompanying administrative office and staff that are responsible for approval and oversight of research involving human subjects.

One of the main charges against Bailey was that his book (*TMWWBQ*) was a research project involving unconsented subjects and research data gathered without a priori IRB review and approval. As Dreger accurately analyzed and concluded, this is an empty accusation without foundation or merit. First, Dreger outlines the various practical and regulatory considerations demonstrating that the Bailey book was *not* research (that is, not a systematic investigation intended to contribute to generalizable knowledge), a position previously noted by the then Director of the Kinsey Institute, John Bancroft (“Michael, I have read your book and I do not think it is science”). And even if the background for the book were a scientific research undertaking, federal regulations allow for such research to be conducted without IRB review under the so-called Exempt categories in which formal IRB review is not required. This is that set of research activities Dreger noted as ethnographic research, oral history, historical research, and so forth. Recent clarifications by the U.S. Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) confirm that the kind of inter-

viewing and journalistic background research done by Bailey was not human subject research that requires IRB review.

There is a triple irony at play in the Conway-Bailey affair that will probably have unintended consequences and repercussions for years to come. First, it is hugely ironic that social activists and social scientists/life historians would even argue that Bailey should have obtained IRB review for his book. For years, these groups of scholars and academics have chafed under the regulatory burden of IRB reviews. Oral historians, ethnographers, anthropologists, and social historians lobbied long and hard to have OHRP issue a special ruling to clarify that ethnographic and one-on-one personal history interviewing was excluded from IRB oversight (which OHRP finally did in 2003, but the lobbying predated that by over a decade). Numerous scholars have argued in a variety of forums (Internet blogs, letters to the editor, appeals to federal agency officials) to stem what they see as “mission creep” by IRBs requiring extensive oversight and review of such personal history/interviews (see, e.g., Gunsalus et al., 2006). For Conway et al. to raise this issue using Bailey’s book as an example was not only against their own discipline’s immediate position and interests, but, as will be noted later, probably counter-productive.

Clearly, as Dreger points out, the Northwestern IRB would have determined that Bailey’s book project did not need IRB review, and Bailey was correct, both ethically and by regulations, in not seeking or obtaining IRB review. Simply stated, he did not need it—any more than journalism students need IRB review for class projects, or history faculty need IRB review to ask people questions about growing up in their hometowns, or interviewing war veterans about their experiences, etc. Frankly, IRBs generally are busy enough and do not need the extra business and burden of evaluating minimal risk human interactions that are not in and of themselves scientific research. So, where was the outcry from genderists and journalists and bloggers about opening this regulatory door and

---

B. A. Gladue (✉)  
Office for the Protection of Human Subjects, University of North  
Texas Health Science Center, 3500 Camp Bowie Blvd, Fort  
Worth, TX 76107, USA  
e-mail: bgladue@hsc.unt.edu



begging for more unneeded IRB oversight and “mission creep” into their discipline’s scholarly areas?

One of the curious aspects of the IRB system is that, as a regulatory concept and system, it is extraordinarily de-centralized. Although all IRBs must operate in accordance with specific federal regulations and guidelines, directed by the OHRP, the federal agency in charge of monitoring and oversight of IRBs, each IRB is essentially a franchise of OHRP. As such, all IRBs are “locally owned and operated” and are expected to develop their own policies and procedures, and interpret and execute human subject research review in accordance with federal regulations (the laws and rules) and guidance (the strong suggestion that is not yet a regulation). The key here is that each IRB operates within a community and is expected to address ethical research issues within that specific local community of scholars, scientists, citizens, and research subjects. Thus, a research project that is approvable “as is” in one university might raise an ethical eyebrow at another. Although this raises no shortage of frustrations among scientists dealing with multiple IRBs in inter-institutional research projects, there is a strange strength in this concept. By encouraging each IRB to become educated and aware of what works and does not work within their specific operational area, each IRB is actually more in tune and in touch with the spirit as well as the printed regulations of ethical research than would happen with a top-down compendium of dictums from the central government. Just as “all politics is local,” all ethical reviews are local. Thus, the Northwestern IRB, the locally owned and operated arm of the federal HRP system, did not need to review and approve Bailey’s book project. If the Northwestern IRB *had* required Bailey to seek such approval for this particular project, they would have had to be fair and balanced for the entire campus and faculty and apply the same principle and procedure to all similar activities. One can imagine the howling from numerous English, history, sociology, literature, and assorted “studies” faculty about being required to have similar personal history and life story narratives and writing projects reviewed and approved by the IRB.

A second irony is that such highly public character assassinations and scandalous accusations (sexual relations with research subjects, not consenting subjects, not getting IRB approval, etc.) tend to make things worse, not better, for sexology. Good for tabloid copy, but rarely do such campaigns enhance the public image of science disciplines. By relentlessly attacking Bailey’s book and methods by any means necessary, his critics may have over-played a hand. Every time a sexologist gets attacked in such a manner, especially by university-based liberals, it draws a lot of negative attention and provides long-term fuel for opponents of sex research. Dreger notes that Blanchard and others are concerned that ever fewer students and faculty will consider research in transsexuality, perhaps even sex research in general. Add to that the flat-to-shrinking amount of funding support for sex research. Serious scholarly critiques about testable ideas are one thing; high visibility

global smear campaigns are quite another. Finding long-term funding support for sex research is hard enough without having to fend off innuendo and accusations about research ethics and integrity. Instead of focusing on the theoretical arguments in the book, there was an attack on the messenger (and anyone supporting him). Probably, this sort of scorched-earth behavior might provide someone a transient satisfying moment but is eventually counter-productive: “Destroying the village in order to save it” makes good theatre, but bad science policy.

Finally, there is the irony that false but frenzied accusations often call attention to problems that do not need addressing. Flogging the Internet and professional conferences with the notion that sexologists conduct research without consenting subjects raises specters of renegade mad scientists engaged in ethical misconduct. Eventually, such exaggerated propaganda can filter up to regulatory agencies and legislatures. Behind every regulation or guidance regarding, in this case, human subject research is an act or perception of someone’s misconduct. As some say in IRB Land, “behind every reg is a screw-up (or the fear of one).” Dreger noted, even when there has been no malfeasance or inappropriate conduct, if you make enough racket long enough, people begin to wonder if there is something to it all. Hence, we can probably expect a tightening, not relaxing, of human subjects regulations regarding ethnographic studies and oral history research, and not just in sexology.

Recently, OHRP issued a federal agency Notice for Public Comment on revisions to regulations associated with human subject research. Typically, such notices are a prelude to a change in regulations, with such change likely to occur within the following year. In this latest Notice, OHRP has indicated it will expand regulatory oversight for research that needs to be reviewed by an IRB as follows (changes noted in italics):

Research (a) on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, *affective states*, *interpersonal relationships*, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior); or (b) employing *methods commonly used in social, behavioral, epidemiologic, health services and educational research (including, but not limited to*, survey, interview, oral history, *participant observation*, *ethnographic*, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methods). (Note: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) and (b)(3). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.) *Federal Register*: October 26, 2007 (Volume 72, Number 207), pages 60848–60851.

This change is likely to result in one of those “glass half full/glass half empty” situations. The inclusion of studies on affective states and interpersonal relationships along with methods employed by social, behavioral, health services,

participant observation, and ethnographic methods is a positive step, since it helps to reinforce and refine such methods as legitimate scientific enterprises and allows for this research to be reviewed on an “expedited” basis (i.e., can be reviewed by as few as one or two IRB members) rather than wait for a convened full IRB meeting which usually takes more time and resources.

The expansion of this category, however, also effectively limits the type and amount of research that was previously managed by institutions and research committees as “exempt” from IRB review. Thus, the often dreaded “mission creep” of ethics review committees may be further re-energized with an expansion of regulatory oversight and the usual accompanying documentation and time burden associated with such expansion. At the very least, this revision to the Code of Federal Regulations will add to potential confusion about what is, and is not, required to be reviewed by an IRB and to what extent, especially in the realm of social and behavioral science research. These regulatory changes and consequences will all be clearer after a time, maybe a long time. In the mean-

time, all those locally owned and operated IRBs are going to be a whole lot busier.

Perhaps this latest clarification on human subjects regulations has nothing to do with the negative publicity campaign against Bailey not so long ago. Maybe this “regulatory creep” to include more facets of social and behavioral science research has been building for some time, driven by too much variability among IRB approvals, or by too many complaints about too many restrictions on social and behavioral science research. But as Lawrence (Yogi) Berra famously observed, “It’s too coincidental to be a coincidence.”

## Reference

- Gunsalus, C. K., Bruner, E., Burbules, N., Dash, L. D., Finkin, M. W., Goldberg, J., et al. (2006). *The Illinois white paper—improving the system for protecting human subjects: Counteracting IRB mission creep*. University of Illinois Law & Economics Research Paper No. LE06-016. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=902995>

## Lighten Up, Ladies

Richard Green

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Dreger's meticulously detailed and documented essay is on remarkably even terrain, considering the steep slope on which the events are perched. My concern here is not with the strengths or weaknesses of the Blanchard studies or the Bailey book. Rather, it is with the vortex of vitriol, the unrelenting campaign of character assassination. It could have been different.

Perhaps, as some critics contend, the dichotomization of gender dysphoric persons into two groups is overly reductionistic. But a rational critique could have invoked Kinsey: "The world is not to be divided into sheep and goats...It is a fundamental of taxonomy that nature rarely deals with discrete categories. Only the human mind invents categories and tries to force facts into separate pigeon-holes" (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948, p. 639). Thus, there are not only heterosexuals and homosexuals. There are seven categories of sexual orientation on the Kinsey scale.

And, why the furor over whether the need to change sex includes, for some, an eroticized component? Except for the odd asexual, human beings are erotically aroused by a vast array of stimuli, including cannibalizing a sex partner met on the Internet. By comparison, the eroticized image by a male of a female body (not all that uncommon, albeit not usually of oneself) is pretty tame stuff.

Further, how many professionals remain convinced that to qualify for sex-change a person must fit the Cinderella history of Christine Jorgensen? And who knows whether her life story was entirely factual? In 1952, how else was an "Ex-GI" to become a "Blond Beauty" (New York Daily News, 1952). Homosexuality was both a mental disorder

and a crime. Transsexualism was neither. Was Christine's autobiography a "fairy tale"?

Some people didn't like Bailey's book title or cover. "The Man Who Would Be Queen" is not what I would have chosen. But this is coming from the author of "The 'Sissy Boy Syndrome' and the Development of Homosexuality" (Green, 1987). That bothered a few, although acknowledged by an International Academy of Sex Research anthropologist as professionally precise. Both book covers are adorned with a male in a woman's shoes. But, as the cosmetic surgeons never say, "Don't judge a book by its cover."

Tempered, scholarly-based critiques, without more, would have sufficed. It would have freed three folks from eons of computer time. It would have allowed them to get out more.

Ironically, the vendetta against Bailey, a supporter of sex reassignment surgery, was not a consequence for two earlier harsh critics of the surgery. Raymond (1979), whose "Transsexual Empire" argued vigorously against it, could have been savaged for her lesbian-feminist diatribe. And Paul McHugh, who, as Johns Hopkins psychiatry chair, pushed to close the pioneering surgical program (McHugh, 1992), could have been paraded as another example of Catholic intolerance. Both got off lightly.

The Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association behaved badly in this tempest. When ablated sex parts hit the fan and the Association saw fit to meddle with its gratuitous pronouncement, copied to Northwestern, I, as a Past-President of the Association, e-mailed the current President. This was sent to Walter Meyer on 28 October 2003:

Without knowing more of the process whereby the HBIGDA letter regarding Michael Bailey was written to Northwestern University, I am deeply disturbed by it. As an attorney, I am very aware of the two sides to a

---

R. Green (✉)  
Department of Psychological Medicine, Imperial College  
at Charing Cross Hospital, London W6 8LN, UK  
e-mail: richard.green@ic.ac.uk

controversy. After reading the brief of counsel for one party, one is enraged at the conduct of the opposing party in what is clearly an open and shut case. Then, after reading the brief of counsel for the opposing party, one is convinced that there was no wrongdoing. What materials were inspected by the Board? Who provided them? Were materials from both sides of the controversy examined?

Is the Board aware that there are medical and psychiatric professionals, including a transsexual, who side with Bailey in this situation? Finally, calling the Bailey book poorly referenced may be an instance of the pot calling the kettle black. How many references are included in the current version of the Standards of Care?

I await a reply.

On a more general issue, I take exception to the Dreger article characterization of research as the systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to contribute to generalizable knowledge, and only then subject to protection of human subjects. A scholarly study may differ from a scientific one welded to that definition but still impact its subjects. Stoller's (1973) epic "Splitting: A Case of Female Masculinity" was a 395 page case study of a woman convinced that she had a penis. It was seven years of interview transcripts. It was not generalizable. There was no hypothesis testing. But his subject required (and received) protection.

Was there benefit to Bailey in his nightmare? When I was a kid, the sure fire means for a film becoming a "must see" was its condemnation by the Catholic Church. "Banned in Boston" was a helluva lot better means to buckets of bucks than two thumbs up by a couple of naf critics. Conway, James, and McCloskey generated a fortune in publicity for Bailey's book, attracting a moderate sized city of readers who otherwise would have never heard of it.

Bailey did not bring actions in defamation for the generally broadcast Internet attacks against him or the communications to his employer. Had he done so, he might be substantially wealthier. Shortly after I graduated from Yale Law School 20 years ago, with nothing else to do in the legal world, I represented my friend, the German actress, Elke Sommer, in a defamation suit against Zsa Zsa Gabor. Gabor had been quoted in a German language publication saying that Elke was a "has been," sold hand knit sweaters to earn a living, and hung around seedy bars. Many would prefer these to the comments

about Bailey. Nevertheless, a California jury awarded Elke 3 million dollars.

In an otherwise painful reading of the Bailey ordeal, one point brought a smile. Dreger may have stumbled onto a means of generating considerable income. She has the seed for a new Monopoly game for gender dysphorics, beginning with the "Get Out of Male Free" card.

The lowest point in the Dead Sea level onslaught against Bailey was the Internet posting of photographic figures of his two children with their eyes obscured in the tradition of medical publishing. In what was argued to be satire, his daughter could be a "cock-starved exhibitionist" and "the two types of children in the Bailey household" are those "who have been sodomized by their father [and those] who have not." Most viewers considered this to be at least as funny as Mein Kampf.

Bailey's long-awaited Internet response to the campaign of denigration, posted after Northwestern concluded its investigation, analogized the campaign to the tactics of U.S. Senator Joe McCarthy. McCarthy's crusade of smear and intimidation in the 1950s was resurrected for this generation in the film "Good Night and Good Luck."

As a teen, I watched the Army-McCarthy hearings on TV. The turning point leading to McCarthy's downfall and dissolution in alcohol was June 9, 1954, when he attempted to blight the career of a young attorney by saying that he had ties to a Communist organization. Counsel Joseph Welsh's retort was the beginning of the end. It is quoted here, with its gender ironic admonition: "Until this moment, Senator, I think that I never really gauged your cruelty or your recklessness. Let us not assassinate this lad further, Senator. You have done enough. Have you no sense of decency? Have you no sense of decency, sir...?"

## References

- Green, R. (1987). *The "sissy boy syndrome" and the development of homosexuality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.
- McHugh, P. (1992). Psychiatric misadventures. *American Scholar*, 61, 497–510.
- New York Daily News. (1952, December 1). *Ex-GI becomes blond beauty*. p. 1.
- Raymond, J. (1979). *The transsexual empire*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Stoller, R. J. (1973). *Splitting: A case of female masculinity*. New York: Quadrangle/New York Times Books.

# Truth, Lies, and Trans Science

Riki Lane

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Bailey (2003) wrote that the treatment of transsexuals on talk shows was “designed to provoke rather than to illuminate” (p. 146), a comment which also seems apt for his *The Man Who Would Be Queen (TMWWBQ)*. Dreger’s account of the ensuing controversy may also provoke, despite her stated intentions and careful acknowledgement of her position as a participant in the controversy. Dreger’s article has some positives—her detailed account of events before and after *TMWWBQ*’s publication allows some insight into the unfolding battles. She gives a reasonable “analytic synopsis” of *TMWWBQ*, which brings out the causes for offence to trans people in their negative portrayals and the nature of the book’s cover and title. Dreger pointedly challenges common assumptions made by Bailey’s critics about his statements and highlights the stifling of discussion about erotic aspects of trans people’s experience and the tensions among the different factions.

As I am researching the political and social implications of research into a biological etiology for transsexuality, this response is informed by interviews with researchers, clinicians, and trans people. Ethics approval for interviews was received at La Trobe University and all interviewees have had the opportunity to correct transcripts and to choose anonymity. I will first provide a critique of Dreger’s article; second, I will sketch some points towards an alternative approach. The central weakness I see in Dreger’s approach is that it mostly ignores the social circumstances of science, politics, and identity that enable understanding of the deep anger that *TMWWBQ* provoked and the political battle over what counts as knowledge that ensued.

---

R. Lane (✉)  
School of Social Science, La Trobe University, Bundoora 3086,  
Australia  
e-mail: rilane@students.latrobe.edu.au

## Critique

Dreger aims to help end the “us and them” atmosphere and to make the historical record clear. However, it is difficult to find the broad questions that Dreger seeks to answer. Are they: “Why was the backlash so fierce?” or “How do we assess the competing truth claims about knowledge?” If so, discussion of important contexts is largely absent: scientific debates; processes of construction of knowledge; social and political. This seems very odd, given Dreger’s (1998) approach in *Hermaphrodites and the Medical Invention of Sex*, which explicitly rejects a retreat into “Damn it, I’m a historian, not a doctor or an ethicist or a sociologist!” (p. 14). That work is a rounded social history of the development of medical classification and treatment of intersex people: a very relevant, but not employed, methodology for this controversy.

Instead of this integration of medical, social, and historical disciplines, Dreger employs an individualist approach, explaining events almost solely through intensively examining the words of the participants. With so much attention to detail and little to the big picture, we cannot see the war for the skirmishes. This approach lends itself to addressing narrow questions: “Who is to blame?” and “Is Bailey guilty of anything much?” Ironically, Dreger’s most convincing argument in defending Bailey against charges of academic misconduct is that *TMWWBQ* is not a work of science, despite some protestations, but one of science journalism:

The total lack of citation and documentation makes it very difficult to determine to what extent Bailey’s claims are based on peer-reviewed scientific evidence...One would be hard-pressed to call what Bailey did...“science”—or even “research” in *any* scholarly sense...Using stories in this way is not science...it doesn’t even rise to the level of *bad* science.

As it wasn't research, he didn't need IRB oversight. Dreger ends up with an individualist, legalist defence of Bailey from various charges, which obscures the larger ethical questions: Why was a scientist writing so unscientifically about science in a way that portrayed a very marginalized group so negatively? Is it reasonable to slip through regulatory cracks to avoid the need for IRB oversight? Is it reasonable for a scientist to present his or her hunches and biases as if they are supported by rigorous science?

Dreger explicitly excludes scientific debate about Blanchard's typology from her scope. How is it then possible to assess the opposed truth claims? How does a social constructionist end up writing an individualist history? Perhaps Dreger became trapped by her personal involvement and concern for "the truth" about Bailey's ethical practices. For example, she reaches the astonishing conclusion that Bailey (2003) is not anti social constructionist, despite his open hostility (p. 124) and apparent ignorance: "a contemporary social science textbook...would say 'femininity' and 'masculinity' are hopelessly muddled concepts." Any such textbook I have read uses them as core analytic concepts. Dreger's (1998) earlier understanding of the recent invention of homosexual *identity* not *orientation* (p. 127) is in stark contrast to Bailey's approach.

Dreger sets worthy goals of defending free debate and reducing tensions, but can this article achieve them? Dreger's personal involvement directly contributes to the one-sided nature of her story. No "objective" unbiased position is possible, but her acting to stop James speaking at Northwestern University made it inevitable that many of Bailey's opponents would not participate. James' action in posting sexualized pictures of Bailey's children was disgraceful, but does it follow that she had no right to speak on campus 3 years later? Dreger shows no reflexivity here: no self-awareness that her actions to "no-platform" James are similar to the tactics she ascribes to Bailey's opponents in their attempts to shut down discussion of Blanchard's theories.

Dreger's inability to "fathom" the depth of the transwomen's anger derives from the central weaknesses of her article: the absence of sociopolitical and scientific context. After succinctly citing the comments that were found most offensive, Dreger softens the story with some kind remarks Bailey makes about Kieltyka and his support for sex reassignment surgery (SRS) and concludes that he has a "mixed tone" about trans people. This crucial link from "exegesis" to "backlash" is fundamentally flawed as the negative overwhelms the positive in this mixed tone. I cannot see how anyone reading these passages would form a positive image of transwomen: Dreger's summary of Bailey's (2003) Part III has 10 paragraphs of offensive quotes and four that are more sympathetic. What she fails to do is to sum up Bailey's (2003) overall picture of transwomen as either: low IQ, low class, shoplifting, gay *men* who are "especially suited to

prostitution" (p. 185) and prefer casual encounters with attractive men to committed relationships; or neurotic, bizarre, obsessed, lying, straight *men* sexually excited by the idea of themselves as women.

Painting that picture is left to the angry transwomen and is very sketchy. Despite many pages describing their actions, only a few paragraphs describe their reasons for being so angry. James' and Conway's views are available on their websites, including a tightly argued article by Roughgarden. Dreger could easily have cited explanations such as:

This protest will not disappear. At stake is the possibility of transgendered women being able to live dignified, productive and loving lives in today's Western society. Few would support equality of opportunity for people of varied gender expression if science concluded that transgendered people were but prostitutes and fetishists. (Roughgarden, 2004)

And here is the nub of the problem—in 52,000 words, Dreger's entire discussion of the social and political context comprises one solitary paragraph about the oppression of trans people and a few comments such as that Bailey's portrayal of transwomen "seems unlikely to cause an outpouring of admiration or acceptance." She has little or nothing to say about: the difficult struggle for trans people's rights; complex interactions with struggles for gay, women's, and intersex people's rights; the intense transphobia of the U.S. religious right; battles for health insurance coverage and the associated interrelation with race and social class; or unequal power relations between trans people and psychiatrists as "gate keepers" for access to SRS. In this context, the threat to trans people posed by Bailey's book starts to look very real and very urgent.

Dreger identifies the concept of autogynephilia as what "transwomen leaders detested and rejected most," but diverges into the erotic aspects of their personal histories and how they built an "us and them" atmosphere that derailed any productive dialogue. I see two fundamental misinterpretations here: what is at issue is the dichotomous division of transwomen into two *essential types*, homosexual and autogynephilic, not the presence of erotic aspects to trans experience; the attribution of all blame for the atmosphere to the transwomen and none to Bailey's sensationalist, sexualized, and deeply pathologizing portrayal of trans people.

Dreger doesn't seem to appreciate the significance of her quote from Bancroft:

Michael's book...promoted a very derogatory explanation of transgender identity which most TG people would find extremely hurtful and humiliating—hence the reaction of the TG community was not surprising. Whether based on science or not we have a responsibility to present scientific ideas, particularly in the public arena,

in ways which are not blatantly hurtful...the Lynn Conways of the transgender world are the exception. They fight back, often in a self-defeating fashion. In this case, they went over the top and lost credibility in the process. But the majority in that world are less resilient and more vulnerable, and they get hurt.

In Bancroft's approach, Bailey bears primary responsibility for the damage to trans people due to his hurtful and humiliating portrayal, while Conway et al. bear a secondary responsibility for going over the top in their response.

### An Alternative Approach

Another approach may have been more effective in reducing tensions and casting light on the competing truth claims. First, establish a social rather than personal frame to examine the political battle over what counts as knowledge by discussing: scientific debates; how that knowledge is constructed; the social and political climate. Second, outline the controversy in that framework, with less "he said, she said" detail. Third, use the understanding gained of the competing truth claims to propose ways to restart communication.

So what do researchers and clinicians think about Blanchard's typology? Almost all see two broad groups (or poles in the distribution) of transwomen: (1) transition early, attracted to men exclusively, high childhood femininity, few have been aroused by cross dressing, "pass" well; (2) transition late, variable sexual attraction, low childhood femininity, many aroused by cross dressing, don't pass well. Only Bailey sees a neat dichotomy, maintained by fitting transwomen into categories that do not agree with their self description by saying that they lie. Some transwomen have lied about arousal to cross dressing, as that has been used to deny access to SRS. But, any typology can be made to work by describing people who don't fit as liars.

Even a researcher who strongly supports the Blanchard typology said: "This particular categorization, works. Whether it is exhaustive...maybe not. But it works in most of the transsexuals we work with" ("Roger," personal communication, July 13, 2007). Most clinicians and researchers are more sceptical about dichotomy: "I am not sure there are two types—you might find 15 types" (F. Pfäfflin, personal communication, September 20, 2007) and about a sexual motivation for transition: "There is validity to the two that have been described, but I don't think it is complete...I don't know whether the people they describe are primarily motivated [for SRS] by an erotic fixation on themselves as females" (R. Green, personal communication, September 7, 2007). "My feeling...is that there are many routes into... transsexual identity...Blanchard's theory or Anne Lawrence's theory...those patterns do exist to some degree, but I believe they have

overstated their case" (A. H. Devor, personal communication, September 9, 2007). Sam Winter (personal communication, September 9, 2007) reports arousal to cross-dressing among transwomen in Thailand (10%), the Philippines (40%), and Laos (35%), although "the vast majority of these transwomen were erotically attracted solely to men...transwomen who Blanchard, Bailey and Lawrence would of course call 'homosexual' who also seem to be 'autogynephilic'. It all seems to undercut the 'homosexual versus autogynephilic' argument, doesn't it?"

Dreger touches on the etiological counter position between the "brain sex" theory and the Blanchard one, which underlies much of the hostility. The brain sex theory has a unitary cause in a neurological sex reversed gender identity center or network, but a potentially pluralist outcome as it manifests differently in the two groups and in those who don't fit either group. For Bailey, there is a strict dichotomy: biologically based homosexuality combines with biologically based femininity causing homosexual transsexuality; biologically based heterosexuality and probably biologically based autogynephilia causing autogynephilic transsexuality; and no exceptions.

There are always factions and disputes in science, but usually there is a large research base and some agreement on relevant data. This is not so here: there are large (but also disputed) research bases on differences between men and women and on sexual orientation which are applied to transsexuality, but actual research on transsexuality is very limited. For the brain sex theory, there is the famous paper of Zhou, Hofman, Gooren and Swaab (1995) and later papers from that lab, in which six transwomen's brains show a sex reversed size and neuron numbers in the BSTc in the hypothalamus. For Blanchard's theory, there are his papers from 1985 to 1993 (e.g., Blanchard, 1985, 1993), and a partial replication by Smith, van Goozen, Kuiper and Cohen-Kettenis (2005), which finds sexual orientation to be clinically meaningful, but with significant overlaps between the groups and rarely mentions autogynephilia. Importantly, "nobody has really systematically independently replicated the Blanchard [or Zhou] data...we have to have three replications before you start thinking that there is something to it" (H. F. L. Meyer-Bahlburg, personal communication, September 10, 2007). Research into the etiology of transsexuality has a rich history of failed psychological and biological theories. So the research base really does not exist to support unequivocal protestations of truth, which may contribute to hardening factions, as disputes are unlikely to be settled by convincing new evidence.

Although Dreger mentions the oppression that trans people face, much greater attention is needed to the social and political context. Describing salient features of U.S. society could help explain why the controversy raged there alone. The U.S. has strongly divided attitudes to sex and sexuality: on the one hand, "with its general sex-phobia...people have...all kinds of

emotional reactions...in other countries, that is probably less loaded” (H. F. L. Meyer-Bahlburg, personal communication, September 10, 2007); on the other hand, there is a huge pornography industry and very “out” lesbian, gay, bi, trans, and intersex communities in some places. The political struggle for trans people’s rights is very difficult (e.g., the religious right oppose trans people’s rights even more than gay rights). The history of classificatory schemes and of clinicians as gate keepers and diagnosers of pathology creates wariness among their clients. Relations between some gender clinicians and clients are shifting away from gate keeping towards collaborative exploration of the best alternatives. There are ongoing debates about *DSM-V*: will autogynephilia be included, as Bailey hopes (2003, p. 176); will gender identity disorder be retained or replaced with a less pathologizing alternative; what will be the diagnostic criteria? The U.S. has relatively large numbers of trans people, some with successful careers and high social status, networks, and resources.

It would be useful to employ the queer theory Dreger mentions to examine the subject positions of the participants. Bailey appears in his writing to assume the naturalness and superiority of his heteronormativity, individualism, and scientific objectivity: there is little sense of reflexive examination of his role as researcher. He uses his personal sexual response to transwomen to support general statements. Several of my interviewees (anonymously) described Bailey as a “locker room guy,” while others saw this sexualizing of research (or journalism) subjects as *TMWWBQ*’s worst feature. Perhaps he is so secure and unquestioning in his identity as a “normal,” white, middle class, heterosexual man (presumably with associated “male-typical” attitudes to sexualization) that he has few qualms in describing other people’s gender identity as bizarre and sexually driven. His transwomen opponents have a necessarily marginalized sense of identity, having established their identity against great social pressures. Where Bailey may see sexualization as a “natural” part of masculinity, transwomen have negotiated a difficult path around sexuality, desire, and gender identity.

These social circumstances of science, politics, and identity create the situation in which a group of transwomen took a stance of fighting back against “pseudoscience” as actors, not just research (or journalism) subjects. This spirited contestation of Bailey’s truth claims about research created a particularly lively, even vicious, battle over what counts as knowledge. Bailey’s supporters see themselves as defending unpopular scientific “truth” against people who won’t face a reality that is politically unpalatable and destructive to their self image. Bailey’s opponents see themselves as defending their community from sensationalist pseudoscience that sexualizes them as sex starved gay men or neurotic straight men with a sexual obsession.

So can we move forward: is it possible to restart communication? A few points can be made. First, nobody has

privileged access to “the truth.” All knowledge in this area is provisional and speculative, due to the inadequate research base, the disciplinary biases on all sides, and the extreme personal emotional sensitivity of discussion of trans people’s identity. Second, ideally, Bailey would apologize for his insensitive portrayal of trans people and accept the importance to the process of scientific inquiry of trans people’s self perceptions. His opponents could agree that some of their tactics were over the top. Third, and less in the realm of fantasy, supporters of the Blanchard typology could: stop insisting that every trans person who doesn’t fit their schema is a liar; provide better evidence; stop using terminology that people find offensive (e.g., “homosexual transsexual,” which is also very confusing). As Devor (personal communication, September 9, 2007) said, “if what we really mean to say is attracted to males, then say ‘attracted to males’ or androphilic...I see absolutely no reason to continue with language that people find offensive when there is perfectly serviceable, in fact *better*, language that is not offensive.”

Moving the discussion to a different framework could help. The erotic aspects of transgender experience and the utility of the concept of autogynephilia have been considered in some detail by Ekins and King (2006, pp. 83–96), who argue that their sociological perspective is far more productive than the “taxonomic, typological and diagnosing approach of Blanchard” (p. 96) In this mode, “autogynephiles” are not an essential type of person, but the concept that autogynephilia names, “attraction to the idea of oneself as a woman,” may be usefully employed in a framework that respects trans people’s narratives and lived experience.

## References

- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- Blanchard, R. (1985). Typology of male-to-female transsexualism. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 14, 247–261.
- Blanchard, R. (1993). Varieties of autogynephilia and their relationship to gender dysphoria. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 22, 241–251.
- Dreger, A. D. (1998). *Hermaphrodites and the medical invention of sex*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ekins, R., & King, D. (2006). *The transgender phenomenon*. London: Sage Publications.
- Roughgarden, J. (2004). Psychology perverted. <http://www.ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/Reviews/Psychology%20Perverted%20-%20by%20Joan%20Roughgarden.htm>. Retrieved 7 November 2007.
- Smith, Y. L. S., van Goozen, S. H. M., Kuiper, A. J., & Cohen-Kettenis, P. T. (2005). Transsexual subtypes: Clinical and theoretical significance. *Psychiatry Research*, 137, 151–160.
- Zhou, J. N., Hofman, M. A., Gooren, L. J., & Swaab, D. F. (1995). A sex difference in the human brain and its relation to transsexuals. *Nature*, 378, 68–70.



## Shame and Narcissistic Rage in Autogynephilic Transsexualism

Anne A. Lawrence

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

One of the most important contributions made by Dreger's article is her description of the extraordinary lengths to which some of Bailey's male-to-female (MtF) transsexual opponents went in their attempts to discredit him, his book, and his ideas. By Dreger's account, their campaign against Bailey continued for at least two years after the publication of *The Man Who Would Be Queen* (TMWWBQ; Bailey, 2003). Examination of the Internet sites maintained by some of Bailey's principal transsexual opponents suggests that the campaign against him remains ongoing. The attacks, as described by Dreger, went far beyond writing scathing reviews of TMWWBQ. They included orchestration of charges of professional misconduct against Bailey, filed with Northwestern University and the Illinois Department of Professional Regulation; attempts to turn Bailey's colleagues against him; attacks directed against Bailey's children; and efforts to discredit or silence nearly anyone who openly supported him. Dreger's article suggests that many of Bailey's opponents intended not only to discredit Bailey's book, but also to destroy its author. The duration, intensity, and sheer savagery of the campaign waged by many of Bailey's MtF transsexual opponents is astonishing, especially given that Bailey's book sold only about 4200 copies and probably would have received little attention, in either its print or Internet versions, were it not for the publicity that his opponents themselves created.

One could imagine that Kohut (1972) was describing the campaign conducted by some of Bailey's MtF transsexual opponents when he wrote the following:

[There is a] need for revenge, for righting a wrong, for undoing a hurt by whatever means, and a deeply

anchored, unrelenting compulsion in pursuit of all these aims.... There is utter disregard for reasonable limitations and a boundless wish to redress an injury and to obtain revenge.... The fanaticism of the need for revenge and the unending compulsion of having to square the account after an offense are...not the attributes of an aggressivity which is integrated with the mature purposes of the ego.... Aggressions employed in the pursuit of maturely experienced causes are not limitless.... The narcissistically injured [person], on the other hand, cannot rest until he has blotted out [the]...offender who dared to oppose him, [or] to disagree with him. (pp. 380, 382, 385)

These excerpts are taken from Kohut's description of *narcissistic rage*, a concept that I believe is central to understanding many of the attacks against Bailey and their implications.

In this essay, I argue that much of the MtF transsexual campaign against Bailey can be understood as a manifestation of narcissistic rage. It is no coincidence, I believe, that most of Bailey's principal opponents fit the demographic pattern associated with nonhomosexual MtF transsexualism (see Lawrence, 2007). I propose that nonhomosexual (i.e., presumably autogynephilic) MtF transsexuals are probably at increased risk for the development of *narcissistic disorders*—significant disorders in the sense of self—as a consequence of the inevitable difficulties they face in having their cross-gender feelings and identities affirmed by others, both before and after gender transition. As a result, many autogynephilic transsexuals are likely to be particularly vulnerable to feelings of shame and may be predisposed to exhibit narcissistic rage in response to perceived insult or injury. It is not hard to understand why Bailey's book was experienced by at least some nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals as inflicting narcissistic

---

A. A. Lawrence (✉)  
6801 28th Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98115, USA  
e-mail: alawrence@mindspring.com

injury and why this led some of them to express apparent narcissistic rage. I propose that narcissistic disorders in autogynephilic transsexuals are important and probably common phenomena, which deserve more extensive study than they have thus far received. I also suggest that clinicians and scholars should be aware of the susceptibility of autogynephilic transsexuals to narcissistic injury and should try to avoid inflicting such injury.

It is widely accepted that transsexualism represents a fundamental disorder in a person's sense of self (Beitel, 1985; Hartmann, Becker, & Rueffer-Hesse, 1997), and this may be particularly true of nonhomosexual MtF transsexualism. Indeed, it is hard to imagine a more dramatic example of a disturbed sense of self than for a person who has lived an outwardly successful life as a man to believe that he genuinely is, ought to be, or would be happier living as a woman. It is not surprising, then, that the field of self-psychology, which is concerned with the diagnosis and treatment of disorders of the sense of self, offers a theoretical and clinical perspective that is relevant to understanding the dynamics of nonhomosexual MtF transsexualism.

Kohut (1971, 1972), one of the most influential theorists in the field of self-psychology, wrote extensively about how individuals develop a stable, cohesive, and positive sense of self. He also discussed the genesis of narcissistic disorders, which can arise when something interferes with the development of a healthy sense of self. Kohut observed that two fundamental processes, *mirroring* and *idealizing*, supported the development of a healthy sense of self during childhood and contributed to maintaining a healthy sense of self in adulthood. Mirroring occurs when children or adults experience themselves as being witnessed empathetically (i.e., both accurately and approvingly) by other people. Idealizing occurs when children or adults are able to experience a sense of unity or identity with a person (often a parent) or an entity (e.g., a cause or an ideal) that they perceive as powerful and admirable.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that many nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals do not receive satisfactory mirroring and idealizing experiences, either before or after gender transition, although I am aware of only one article (Lothstein, 1988), limited to three case reports involving preschool boys, that has formally addressed mirroring and idealizing experiences in gender-dysphoric males. Unlike their homosexual counterparts, nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals do not display pervasive femininity during childhood and adolescence, but many exhibit at least some feminine interests and behaviors (for a review, see Lawrence, 2004). The nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals I have interviewed usually report, however, that any feminine characteristics they displayed during childhood and adolescence were not witnessed approvingly. On the contrary, they report that they were criticized, ridiculed, or shamed for displaying feminine interests and behaviors and

quickly learned to conceal them (see also Seil, 2004). Concealed characteristics cannot, of course, be empathetically mirrored and can become an ongoing source of shame. Erotic cross-dressing, which is probably nearly universal in nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals (Lawrence, 2007), is especially unlikely to be empathetically mirrored and is likely to feel especially shameful. Usually it is conducted in secret, which precludes any mirroring. If erotic cross-dressing is witnessed, as in the case of accidental discovery, it is usually met with severe disapproval. The need to conceal elements of the self in order to experience approval from significant others is both a cause and an effect of feelings of shame, and these feelings may be especially intense if the concealed elements are related to one's sexuality (Tangney & Dearing, 2002), as is true in autogynephilic transsexualism.

Nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals may also find it difficult to idealize and identify with parents or caregivers of either sex during childhood and adolescence. The nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals I have interviewed commonly report that they felt distant or estranged from their fathers and male caregivers during childhood. Typically, they say that they felt closer to their mothers, other female relatives, and female caregivers, whom they often idealized. They often report or imply, however, that they were unable to identify fully with these female figures, perhaps due to the many masculine traits and interests they also observed within themselves. Because of an inability to fully identify with women, these autogynephilic transsexuals may be prone to experience their feminine characteristics, including their desire to cross-dress, as ego-dystonic and shameful (Seil, 2004).

After gender transition, the situation often becomes no better and may become worse. Nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals who transition to live as women want to be regarded as women and treated as women. The male-typical aspects of their appearance and behavior, however, often make it difficult for them to be seen as other than transsexual women. Sometimes they may be seen simply as men pretending to be women. This makes it likely that they will experience frequent unempathetic reactions, including overt disrespect or derision, harassment, denial of basic civil rights, or violence, as Dreger observed. Because their feelings of being or wanting to be women are so central to their sense of self, they may experience the negative reactions of others as implying that they are inadequate in a deep and fundamental way, leading to further feelings of shame (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Autogynephilic transsexuals may also find it harder to fully identify with women after transition than before, because the differences they inevitably observe between themselves and natal women become harder to rationalize after transition. Before transition, these differences can be attributed to the necessity of temporarily maintaining a socially acceptable masculine persona; after transition, when this excuse evaporates, autogynephilic transsexuals may be

forced to confront reality. Nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals often seem to expect that, with enough effort, they will be able to pass undetected as natal women after transition; but because their appearance and behavior are rarely naturally feminine, this expectation usually proves to be unrealistic. Tangney and Dearing (2002) observed that persons prone to narcissistic disorders “typically develop many unrealistic expectations for themselves... that, in effect, set the stage for shame. With each failure to achieve ambitions—ambitions that are often grandiose—the narcissistic individual is apt to feel shame” (p. 72).

If the preceding analysis is accurate, one might expect that narcissistic disorders would be common among nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals. Surprisingly, there is little solid empirical evidence on this point. The few studies that have examined personality disorders among transsexuals usually have found that these disorders in general—and disorders in Cluster B, which includes Narcissistic Personality Disorder (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2000), in particular—are more common in transsexuals than in nontranssexuals. Most studies, however, either have not reported data on Narcissistic Personality Disorder specifically or have not reported results for MtF and female-to-male transsexuals separately; almost none have reported results for homosexual and nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals separately. The notable exception is a study by Hartmann et al. (1997), conducted with 20 MtF transsexuals, half of whom were androphilic (homosexual) and half of whom were gynephilic (nonhomosexual). Hartmann et al. found “significant psychopathological aspects and narcissistic dysregulation in most of our [MtF] gender dysphoric patients.” Both homosexual and nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals displayed levels of narcissistic pathology that were similar to, or slightly higher than, a clinical sample of patients with nonpsychotic psychiatric problems, including some patients with narcissistic disorders. Hartmann et al. used cluster analysis to assign their transsexual participants to one of four categories, representing different patterns of narcissistic pathology. Their category of greatest interest is “the classic narcissistic self,” which encompasses most of the traits associated with Narcissistic Personality Disorder. Hartmann et al. observed that “gynephilic patients are higher (but not statistically significant) in... the ‘classic narcissistic self,’ which is largely due to high scores in the scale ‘narcissistic rage’.” This finding confirms that high levels of narcissistic rage are present in at least some nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals.

It is certainly not difficult to find evidence of narcissistic personality traits, including a sense of entitlement, grandiosity, and lack of empathy (APA, 2000), in some of Bailey’s principal MtF transsexual opponents. Perhaps the most obvious of these is a sense of entitlement, the belief that one is deserving of special treatment. This is evident, for example, in their outrage that Bailey described them in a way they

felt was inconsistent with their identities and in their belief that Bailey had an obligation to address what they believed to be evidence for a “third type” of MtF transsexual. A sense of entitlement is also evident in the demand some of them made that the Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association conduct an investigation of Bailey. The grandiosity of some of Bailey’s opponents comes across most clearly in the Internet sites that some of them maintain, which contain, for example, claims of their supposed ability to pass undetected (in “deep stealth”) as natal woman, despite the presence of many unmistakably masculine features, and reports of their discovery of supposed facts about transsexualism that have escaped the notice of other researchers for decades. Their lack of empathy is most apparent in their utter disregard for the feelings of the persons they attacked, with the attack on Bailey’s children providing perhaps the most egregious example.

The grandiose, unrealistic sense of self that is characteristic of many persons with narcissistic disorders can be understood as a defense against what would otherwise be overwhelming feelings of inadequacy or shame (Kohut, 1971). In the case of nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals, this unrealistic sense of self might include the belief that one passes undetectably as a woman, despite having unmistakably masculine physical characteristics; that one has a “female brain” in one’s male body, despite having male-typical interests and attitudes; that eroticism had nothing to do with one’s gender transition, despite an extensive history of cross-gender fetishism; and that one is exclusively sexually attracted to men, despite a past history of attraction to, and sexual activity with, women. Although there may be a temptation to disparage this unrealistic sense of self, it is arguably preferable to some alternatives, which might include a life of “empty” depression, overwhelming feelings of shame leading to suicide, or returning to an unsatisfying and unfulfilling life as a man.

An action that threatens to disrupt the grandiose, unrealistic sense of self that many narcissistic persons maintain is experienced as a *narcissistic injury*. Kohut (1972) noted that narcissistic rage—the disproportionate, compulsive pursuit of revenge that seeks to obliterate both the offense and the offender—is one of two possible responses to narcissistic injury: “It is easily observed that the narcissistically vulnerable individual responds to actual (or anticipated) narcissistic injury either with shamefaced withdrawal (flight) or with narcissistic rage (fight)” (p. 379). Tangney and Dearing (2002) pointed out, however, that rage is by far the more effective response for reconstituting a damaged sense of self:

Feelings of self-righteous anger can help the shamed person regain some sense of agency and control. Anger is an emotion of potency and authority. In contrast, shame is an emotion of the worthless, the paralyzed, the ineffective. Thus,...by turning their anger outward, shamed

individuals become angry instead, reactivating and bolstering the self (p. 93).

So, narcissistic rage, although very unpleasant to experience, is nevertheless an understandable response to perceived narcissistic injury.

Why did so many of Bailey's MtF transsexual opponents appear to experience *TMWWBQ* as inflicting narcissistic injury? Bailey's presentation of Blanchard's concept of autogynephilia, and the transsexual typology and theory of transsexual motivation associated with it, seems to have been the real focus of most of the anger directed against the book. In oversimplified form, Blanchard's theory might seem to imply that nonhomosexual MtF transsexualism is little more than sexual fetishism. Because most of Bailey's principal opponents fit the demographic pattern associated with nonhomosexual MtF transsexualism, Blanchard's ideas probably seemed utterly inconsistent with their sense of self. But Blanchard's ideas were hardly new; they had first been presented some 15 years earlier. So, why was the reaction against *TMWWBQ* so intense? I believe there were several reasons.

First, Bailey's summary of Blanchard's ideas was, as far as I am aware, the first to appear in a book intended for general readers and was, therefore, harder to ignore; previous presentations of Blanchard's ideas had been limited to scientific journals, textbooks, and a few Internet essays. Moreover, Bailey presented Blanchard's ideas in uncompromising terms: not just as a theory with strong empirical support and powerful explanatory value, but as the defining truth about MtF transsexualism. Anyone who rejected Blanchard's theory, Bailey seemed to imply, was either ignorant or a fool. Finally, Bailey made little effort to describe MtF transsexuals in an empathetic, affirming way. Admittedly, he had some complimentary things to say about his two main informants, Terese and Cher, and he was a strong advocate for the availability of sex reassignment surgery to both types of MtF transsexuals. But his characterization of autogynephilic transsexuals as unwomanly ("there is no sense in which they have women's souls"; Bailey, 2003, p. xii), as not "primarily" (p. 167) having a disorder of gender identity, and as untruthful (pp. 172–175) undoubtedly struck many of his MtF transsexual opponents as insensitive at best and gratuitously insulting at worst. His statements implying that many or most homosexual MtF transsexuals are prostitutes (p. 184) or shoplifters (p. 185) certainly made the situation no better, if only by suggesting a pattern of disrespect. In short, it is not hard to see why many of Bailey's MtF transsexual opponents experienced his book as inflicting narcissistic injury and why they reacted with narcissistic rage.

What conclusions can be drawn from the foregoing analysis? First, I propose that there are good theoretical and clinical reasons for believing that narcissistic disorders are prevalent among nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals. At present, however,

there is little solid empirical evidence to support this belief. I suggest that this would be a promising area for additional research, especially because the results could have important clinical implications. Meanwhile, clinicians and scholars should perhaps be more aware that angry reactions they elicit from nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals might represent narcissistic rage, rather than mature, instrumental anger. This awareness might aid in interpretation and also facilitate empathy.

Second, I suggest that clinicians and scholars should be aware of the susceptibility of autogynephilic transsexuals to narcissistic injury and should try to avoid inflicting such injury through insensitivity or carelessness. Virtually all transsexuals are likely to have been shamed and criticized for their gender variance before transition, and virtually all transsexuals—but perhaps especially autogynephilic transsexuals—are likely to encounter subtle or blatant disrespect, harassment, discrimination, or violence after transition. Autogynephilic transsexuals undertake painful and expensive treatments and often suffer severe losses in their efforts to live in a way that feels authentic and vital. They deserve sensitive, respectful treatment that reflects an awareness of the narcissistically wounding experiences they are likely to have suffered in the past. In particular, we should use care, and perhaps even forbearance, in our choice of descriptive language. I have suggested, for example, that it might be helpful to begin to describe autogynephilic transsexuals as persons who want to "become what they love" (Lawrence, 2007), as an alternative to more stigmatizing descriptions.

Finally, attention to sensitivity and respect in descriptive language might eventually make it easier to conduct the research that will lead to a better understanding of autogynephilic transsexualism. Largely due to the polarized climate created by the controversy over *TMWWBQ*, such research would be difficult, if not impossible, to conduct at present. But, if clinicians and scholars make a concerted effort to think about, speak about, and write about autogynephilic transsexualism with sensitivity and empathy, the climate for such research might eventually improve.

## References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text revision). Washington, DC: Author.
- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- Beitel, A. (1985). The spectrum of gender identity disturbances: An intrapsychic model. In B. W. Steiner (Ed.), *Gender dysphoria: Development, research, management* (pp. 189–206). New York: Plenum.
- Hartmann, U., Becker, H., & Rueffer-Hesse, C. (1997). Self and gender: Narcissistic pathology and personality factors in gender dysphoric patients. Preliminary results of a prospective study. *International*

- Journal of Transgenderism*, 1(1). Retrieved September 21, 2007, from <http://www.symposion.com/ijt/ijtc0103.htm>.
- Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self: A systematic approach to the psychoanalytic treatment of narcissistic personality disorders*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kohut, H. (1972). Thoughts on narcissism and narcissistic rage. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 27, 360–400.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2004). Autogynephilia: A paraphilic model of gender identity disorder. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy*, 8 (1/2), 69–87.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2007). Becoming what we love: Autogynephilic transsexualism conceptualized as an expression of romantic love. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 50, 506–520.
- Lothstein, L. M. (1988). Selfobject failure and gender identity. In A. Goldberg (Ed.), *Frontiers in self psychology* (pp. 213–235). Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
- Seil, D. (2004). The diagnosis and treatment of transgendered patients. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy*, 8(1/2), 99–116.
- Tagney, J. P., & Dearing, R. L. (2002). *Shame and guilt*. New York: Guilford Press.

## Cowboys, Shepherders, and *The Man Who Would Be Queen*: “I Know” vs. First-Order Lived Experience

Robin M. Mathy

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

The firestorm about Bailey's *The Man Who Would Be Queen: The Science of Gender-Bending and Transsexualism (TMW WBQ)* can be understood from both theoretical and methodological perspectives. The title of Dreger's article leads one to believe that the author would present such perspectives, and it was disappointing that these were not addressed. From a theoretical perspective, Bailey's book promulgated the kind of Kantian categorical imperative in which essentialist thinking becomes elevated to the level of absolute and universal. Beginning with the premise that all transsexuals are of one of two types necessarily leads to an absolute and universal system of binary typologies. However, when such absolutism is applied to human discourse, individuals who feel they do not fit the universal typology are likely to insist upon alternative explanations, and the aggregate impact of all the exceptions inevitably leads to scientific controversy. The essentialists work harder to insist that everyone fits their binary typologies, and constructivists strive still more to highlight the exceptions.

From a methodological perspective, Bailey's book was a total failure. It utilized neither positivist nor hermeneutic methods, and hence could not satisfactorily describe, explain, or predict the phenomena about which he wrote. Nor did it enhance our ability to understand the phenomena. Without an established corpus of theoretical or methodological discourse upon which to moor itself, *TMW WBQ* was set adrift amidst a tide of popular opinion. Not surprisingly, it crashed among the rocky shores inhabited by the transwomen about whom Bailey wrote, most of whom resoundingly rejected it.

Fundamentally, I would argue, Bailey erred in his choice of methodology for the book. As a clinical psychologist, Bailey likely never has had any substantive training in ethnographic

research methods or supervised field research. If he had, he certainly would have kept detailed field notes and checked his impressions and interpretations with the transwomen who were the subjects of his study. He would have continued the research until, for example, he was able to reconcile his second-order interpretations that Kieltyka was an example of Blanchard's typology of autogynephilia with Kieltyka's first-order, lived experience that she was nothing of the sort. However, as Dreger noted, Bailey's goal was to provide examples of his preconceived notions, not to learn anything new, reverberating with seemingly narcissistic assertions, “*I know...*” A good reading of Friere's (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* also was in order, and Bailey would have done well to present himself to this group of transwomen as a learner.

Dreger seems to take great pains to vilify a few prominent transwomen in an effort to vindicate Bailey. That some prominent transwomen behaved uncivilly is indisputable, though one might be reminded of the old, tired adage that two wrongs do not make a right. Nonetheless, Dreger fails to provide evidence that the behaviors of these few transwomen were the primary antecedents or contributions to the furor, which extended (as Dreger noted) far beyond the Northwestern University campuses and, indeed, overseas. Although Dreger does substantiate that these few transwomen were involved in the fray, no credible, reliable evidence is presented to indicate that they were the chief architects of the opposition to *TMW WBQ*. In fact, there were scores of us who signed petitions and organized outspoken opposition to *TMW WBQ* and to Bailey's methods (if one wishes to call them that). The reasons for doing so had nothing to do with Conway, James, or any other high-profile transwomen. They had everything to do with *TMW WBQ* and Bailey. For the record, I was one of the people who suggested filing a complaint with the Illinois Board of Examiners of Psychologists, and I called Bailey (once) to express to him directly my concerns about my perceptions of his unethical

---

R. M. Mathy (✉)  
1841 Madora Avenue, Douglas, WY 82633, USA  
e-mail: R.M.Mathy.01@cantab.net

behaviors and to tell him directly my impressions that *TMWWBQ* was neither scientific nor an accurate appraisal of gender-bending and transsexualism.

Dreger appears to take great pains to vindicate Bailey for charges of ethics violations, and this is the least convincing part of the lengthy article. Virtually all practicing psychologists adhere to the American Psychological Association code of ethics, and my reading of *TMWWBQ* and Dreger's article leads me to believe that Bailey violated a number of ethical standards regarding human relations. Section 3.04 (Avoiding Harm) reads, "Psychologists take reasonable steps to avoid harming their clients/patients, students, supervisees, *research participants*, organizational clients, and *others with whom they work*, and to minimize harm where it is foreseeable and unavoidable" (emphasis added). There is no doubt that Kieltyka, at least, was harmed by Bailey's research, and that harm was reasonably foreseeable and avoidable. That Bailey repeatedly permitted Kieltyka to undress in his classroom and promulgated her exhibitionism in pornographic videos suggests to me that he had prurient interests that transcended any educational benefit to his students. How any dean of a well-respected research institution could permit such decadent behavior in the guise of pedagogy is simply astonishing.

It is also clear that Bailey had multiple relationships with his research participants. Section 3.05 (Multiple Relationships) reads, "(a) A multiple relationship occurs when a psychologist is in a professional role with a person and (1) at the same time is in another role with the same person, (2) at the same time is in a relationship with a person closely associated with or related to the person with whom the psychologist has the professional relationship, or (3) promises to enter into another relationship in the future with the person or a person closely associated with or related to the person." Dreger dismisses concerns about Bailey's ethics by noting that he did not charge a fee for writing letters for the subjects of his study (i.e., research participants). However, Bailey was writing the book as a professional psychologist with the expectation to earn money for doing so, which created an ethical obligation to his research participants. Clearly, because Bailey was profiting financially from the inclusion of material about a research participant, writing a letter of support for that individual's surgical sex reassignment created a dual relationship, whether or not he charged the research participant a fee for writing that letter. Section 3.05 continues, "A psychologist refrains from entering into a multiple relationship if the multiple relationship could reasonably be expected to impair the psychologist's objectivity, competence, or effectiveness in performing his or her functions as a psychologist, or otherwise risks exploitation or harm to the person with whom the professional relationship exists." With more than two decades of published research experience in human sexuality, I have absolutely no doubt that writing letters in support of a research participant's surgical sex reassignment compromised the integrity of the research

and risked exploitation and harm to the research participant. Candidates for surgical sex reassignment frequently are desperate for a letter in support of surgery, and some are so desperate that they would say virtually anything a psychologist wanted to hear.

Section 3.08 (Exploitative Relationships) reads, "Psychologists do not exploit persons over whom they have supervisory, *evaluative*, or other authority such as clients, patients, students, supervisees, *research participants*, and employees" (emphasis added). Clearly, Bailey had formulated an evaluative impression of Kieltyka as an autogynophile transsexual, despite Kieltyka's rejections of that impression. His relationship with her was exploitative in many ways, not the least of which was twisting her personal narrative to fit his preconceived notions and rejecting her own sense of self in the process. Moreover, he did so for financial gain—and I call upon Bailey to compensate Kieltyka for the damages his work did to her.

It is not clear from Dreger's article that Bailey ever informed Kieltyka or others that they could "opt out" of his research. Observational studies are excluded from the APA Code of Ethics (see Section 8) only if "disclosure of responses would not place participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or damage their financial standing, employability, or reputation, and confidentiality is protected..." Bailey's book provides sufficient details to place participants at risk of criminal liability for, among other things, sex work. "Research" locations are readily identifiable, and sufficient identifying information is given to enable a reasonably trained detective to identify and apprehend transwomen engaged in sex work.

One of the most alarming parts of Dreger's assessment of the controversy surrounding *TMWWBQ* is her assertion that Bailey was not really engaged in research after all. She writes that the United States Department of Health and Human Services defines research as "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge." The foreword to *TMWWBQ* makes it extremely clear that Bailey was engaged in a process of research development designed to challenge common assumptions in social science textbooks, in a way that would contribute to generalizable knowledge. The most alarming part of *TMWWBQ* is Bailey's thought process, as evidenced in the foreword of his book. To understand the outrage about *TMWWBQ*, one must understand the insidious thought processes of the man that created the book with the subtitle, *The Science of Gender-Bending and Transsexualism*. In the foreword, Bailey described an encounter with a man working at the local upscale department store: "Knowing his occupation and observing him *briefly and superficially* were sufficient, together, for me to guess confidently about aspects of Edwin's life that *he never mentioned*. I know what he was like as a boy. I know what kind of person he is sexually attracted to. I know what kinds of activities interest him and what kinds do not" (emphasis added). Bailey added, "I do not ask Edwin about his

childhood because I do not need to. *I already know* that Edwin played with dolls and loathed football, that his best friends were girls. *I know* that he was often teased by other boys, who called him ‘sissy’” (emphasis added). That the editors and publishers of Joseph Henry Press, an imprint of the National Academies Press, would allow such intellectual rubbish to be published at all is a mystery to me. That they would endorse it with a subtitle that includes the word “science” is unfathomable. I fully support the First Amendment and believe that Bailey ought to have the right to publish anything he wishes. However, to call it “science” does considerable harm to serious scientific research and scholarship (some of which he himself has done), and its misrepresentation as science caused considerable harm to transgender individuals and the clinicians who work with them, including me.

Deconstruction is the method of choice for postmodernists (Gross & Levitt, 1998). Dreger’s article is simultaneously a deconstruction of the controversy and an apparent effort to vindicate the book’s author. In postmodernist scholarship, legitimate claims to epistemic authority and a right to be heard are based primarily upon the first-person narratives of the oppressed, in this case transgender women. Neither Dreger nor Bailey are members of this oppressed group, and neither have first-person narratives that can make a legitimate claim to an epistemic authority that would help one understand the intense furor over *TMWWBQ* and Bailey’s unethical behavior in this case.

“It is important to provide a context for one’s work in the often-denied politics of the personal; because, in a post-modern era, we simply cannot take refuge in our previous certainties of objective vision” (Sylvester, 1994, p. 17). Unlike Bailey and Dreger, my legitimate claim to epistemic authority and a right to be heard about the controversy surrounding *TMWWBQ* is based upon being a member of the oppressed group as well as a fairly well published sex researcher, a member of the International Academy of Sex Research, and a staff therapist at a community mental health center on the Wyoming frontier. Most MTF postoperative transsexuals disappear “into the woodwork,” and it is only very rarely, if ever, that some of us emerge to set the record straight. The controversy surrounding *TMWWBQ* and Dreger’s article presented one such occasion. There are times when the thought process of an influential researcher, however prominent, must be challenged with a call to accountability for theorizing, methods, and ethics. This is one such instance.

As a clinical social worker by vocation, I decided to move to Wyoming shortly after Matthew Shepherd’s death, not long after graduating from the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. With graduate degrees from Oxford, Cambridge, Minnesota, and Indiana University-Bloomington, most of my mentors, colleagues, and friends zealously questioned and opposed my move to the Wyoming frontier. Dozens of times, I replied, “That’s where the services are needed.” I moved to Riverton,

Wyoming, home of the fictional character Ennis Del Mar (played by Heath Ledger) in Ang Lee’s Oscar-winning adaptation of E. Annie Proulx’s short story, *Brokeback Mountain*, where I accepted a position as a therapist at a local community mental health center. It may suffice to note that *Brokeback Mountain* was never shown in Riverton, where real cowboys are both abundant and real, and where it will be some time yet before there is a Pride celebration. The primary industries in Wyoming are cattle, coal, and oil, which attract rugged individualists who prefer common sense and frank conversation to scientific, peer-reviewed research and political schmoozing.

After living on the frontier a year, working quietly behind the scenes to advance rights for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals as well as other oppressed groups, I was elected President of the Wyoming Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers. It was in the context of this work that I had the opportunity to interact with the son of a leading cattle rancher. When I asked the handsome, well-built, never-married, 30-something cowboy if ever he had seen *Brokeback Mountain*, he replied, “Yes,” sadly shook his head, and added, “Those weren’t real cowboys, you know. They were shepherders.” The cowboy certainly never had read *TMWWBQ* and did not know (and had no need to know) that the woman with whom he was speaking had lived as a man until a decade and a half earlier. However, the furor over *TMWWBQ* might best be understood by his reaction to “those” “shepherders” (actually, a rodeo cowboy and a ranch hand) from whom he cognitively and vocationally distanced himself. Had one pressed the point with this cowboy and insisted that he was vocationally, at least, very much like Ennis Del Mar in *Brokeback Mountain*, one would reasonably expect a certain amount of hostility and antipathy to emerge. Simply put, much of the furor over *TMWWBQ* had to do with a white, heterosexual, upper-middle class male exerting the power and privilege of his class to invalidate the lived experiences and identities of an entire group of oppressed people about whom he has no first-order knowledge. Perhaps worse, Bailey rejected the first-order epistemic authority that Kieltyka proffered repeatedly, hoping to “educate” him. Instead, like many white, heterosexual, upper middle-class men of privilege and power, Bailey humored Kieltyka and wrote his book as the authority about a subject with which he has had no first-order, lived experience. In doing so, he maligned and humiliated an entire group of oppressed people, notwithstanding the few self-identified autogynephiles who agreed with his views (and even here the operative word of importance is *self-identified*).

Let us be clear that Bailey—and only Bailey—is responsible for igniting and instigating the firestorm, and any attempt to blame transwomen (as Dreger seems to) is simply an instance of “blaming the victim” and “trans-bashing.” Dreger’s attempt to dismiss all transwomen because of the controversy surrounding *TMWWBQ* is quite telling, and it makes as little sense as suggesting that the rowdy behavior of a few female boxers is



somehow responsible for the lack of interest in research regarding all female boxers. It is another example of intellectual sloppiness that has tainted this whole sordid affair. Bailey fired the first shot heard around academia with the subtitle of his book (which is conspicuously absent from the title of Dreger's article): *The Science of Gender-Bending and Transsexualism*. Had he published his book with the subtitle, *The Armchair Musings of a White, Heterosexual, Upper Middle-Class Male of Privilege*, the book likely would not have created the subsequent firestorm. Now that homosexuality has been out of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* for 35 years, perhaps many people have forgotten how hurtful and damaging it is to have one's identity and lived experiences pathologized and eroticized by "experts" who know nothing about our lived experiences. This is at least as hurtful and damaging as suggesting that being lesbian or gay is about unresolved, displaced, pathological sexual drives. Despite the fact that transwomen continue to tell white, heterosexual, upper middle-class males (and some females) of privilege that they have it all wrong (notwithstanding a few genuine self-identified autogynephiles), they continue to presume to tell us what makes us who we are.

Dreger also failed to contextualize the maelstrom regarding Bailey and *TMWWBQ* to the ongoing attack against gender diversity. It would have been well to note that Gender Identity Disorder was added to the *DSM* in 1980, in the third edition, many years after homosexuality was removed from the second edition. It would have been better still to point out that childhood gender atypical behavior is *de facto* labeled as pathological and an early childhood predictor of adult homosexuality. Thus, transgender individuals have had to contend with intellectually sloppy, undocumented, and grossly negligent "research" being passed off as, "*The Science of Gender-Bending and Transsexualism*" (emphasis added) at the same time that books such as *A Parent's Guide to Preventing Homosexuality* (Nicolosi & Nicolosi, 2002) have been advertised in *Psychology Today*. Nicolosi, the President of National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH), and his followers contend that gender atypical behaviors result from a child's failure to bond with the parent of the same sex, ultimately leading to adult homosexuality.

As I expressed via email to Dreger, I find it a bit too convenient that another prominent sexologist at Northwestern University has risen to Bailey's defense, publishing her work in a prominent peer-reviewed journal edited by a close colleague of Blanchard (i.e., Kenneth Zucker), whose typology Bailey used in *TMWWBQ*. In fact, despite numerous requests Dreger has not denied that she served Northwestern University as an investigator in the ethics charges against Bailey, and her article appears to me to be nothing less than an institutionalized

attempt to vilify J. Michael Bailey and Northwestern University by blaming a vulnerable, oppressed, and stigmatized sexual minority group. Dreger's attempt to vindicate Bailey, particularly by vilifying several prominent transwomen, was unconvincing, at best, and superficial and institution-serving at worst. The thought process, "If I did it, it wasn't wrong" and, "Oh, by the way, I didn't do it because it doesn't meet the definition" is the same kind of antisocial thinking I see in the inmates of the local county jail, with whom I do group therapy twice a week. Suggesting that it is all right to have intimate sexual relationships with a research participant is simply reprehensible as well as unethical—even if that research participant is one's spouse. I have yet to read one methods section of any peer-reviewed published paper in which the author stated that her or his spouse was one of the subjects, and as a peer-reviewer I would never recommend such a paper for publication.

Dreger suggests that because of the controversy surrounding *TMWWBQ*, many researchers will be reluctant to pursue studies concerning transgender issues, to which my response is a loud and resounding, "Great!" We certainly do not need any more "science" or "research" in this area like that published by Bailey in *TMWWBQ*. We welcome serious researchers and writers who want to learn from us and come to appreciate the multifaceted nature of gender diversity, individuals who are willing to leave their preconceived notions and stereotypes at the proverbial door to our worlds. We welcome researchers and writers who will not pathologize or stigmatize us. Those of you who think you "know" something about us because of how feminine or masculine we appear to you need to check your watches. They are at least a decade too slow. Since the early 1990s, we have evolved into an international community, and as such we are prepared to confront anyone who would try to harm us by using voodoo science and haphazard research to substantiate their hurtful, preconceived stereotypes. It is time to recognize that gender diversity is not pathology. We have only begun to fight for the right to recognize our own lived experiences, to define and identify ourselves without the hegemonic (mis)labeling and erroneous pathologizing of white heterosexual men of privilege and power.

## References

- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.
- Gross, P., & Levitt, N. (1998). *Higher superstition: The academic left and its quarrels with science*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Nicolosi, J., & Nicolosi, L. (2002). *A parent's guide to preventing homosexuality*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press.
- Sylvester, C. (1994). *Feminist theory and international relations in a postmodern era*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

## Politics in Scholarly Drag: Dreger's Assault on the Critics of Bailey

Deirdre McCloskey

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Dreger defends Bailey at length and assaults those like me who disagreed with his book and his behavior.

Why is the Clarke Institute theory of gender crossing so bad? For one thing, it has trivial scientific support. Dreger claims throughout her long essay that, on the contrary, it has a lot. But look at her citations, which again and again are to the same handful of papers. For another, most students of the matter don't believe the Clarke Institute. Look at the immense literature, which neither Bailey nor Dreger have much studied, saying that gender crossing is a matter of free choice of identity, not sex, sex, sex. And the worst feature of the theory is the treatment it inspires at the Institute and elsewhere. As Bailey (2003) himself notes, "some psychiatrists refuse to recommend for sex reassignment any man who has had even one incident of erotic crossdressing" (p. 174). That is the problem. That, and the murders and lesser mistreatments which can be laid at the door of those who have wanted so very much and for so very long to define a free human choice as a sexual pathology.

Dreger is correct that Bailey doesn't really get going in his distaste for late-transitioning gender crossers until late in the book, where he describes them as liars (p. 146) who are best classified with "masochism, sadism, exhibitionism,...necrophilia, bestiality, and pedophilia" (p. 171), needing "curing" (p. 207). Admittedly, Bailey's view of early transitioning gender crossers is little better, since they apparently are inclined to "shoplifting or prostitution or both" (p. 185) and to taking jobs as strippers (p. 142). How he would know any of this scientifically, considering that most MtF gender crossers

early or late disappear without comment into the female population, is never made clear.

Indeed, Bailey and his little group of followers claim that nothing can be learned about gender crossing from actually talking to the tens of thousands of people worldwide who have been through it. You see, unless gender crossers agree with the Clarke Institute theory based on a few sexual-stimulation studies (which never have female controls, by the way), they are liars or self-deluded. So much for the bulk of the evidence available to serious students of the matter. It's like doing astronomy without looking at the sky. That's why Bailey feels no responsibility as a scientist to read anything or listen to anyone beyond a sample of convenience sized 7 gathered in the gay bars of Chicago. He claims for example to have read my own book, *Crossing: A Memoir* (McCloskey, 1999). But you can tell immediately from his brief description of it in his own book that he's fibbing. He writes that McCloskey "focuses on the standard transsexual story ('I was always a female')." No I don't. He said in an interview with the *Chicago Reader* in 2003: "Deirdre says he [get it? 'he'] was really a woman inside. What does that mean really? What does it mean to say you were a man but you 'felt like a woman'?" But I said nothing of the kind. To be sure, the ten-second journalistic take on gender crossers is that they are "women trapped in a man's body." But that's not how I felt, nor is it how anything like all gender crossers have felt. When I was a man, I felt like one.

Why do Bailey and Dreger have such difficulty understanding human choice and change? I suppose it's because they are enamored of a behaviorist meta-theory that says that people just are this or that, from birth, despite all the anthropological and psychological and literary evidence to the contrary. Born a man, always a man, even if a queer man who gets off on gender change. "Bailey and Blanchard aren't interested in whether people's *narratives* fit Blanchard's theory," Dreger writes

---

D. McCloskey (✉)  
Department of Economics, University of Illinois at Chicago, UH  
2100, Harrison and Morgan, Chicago, IL 60605, USA  
e-mail: deirdre2@uic.edu

triumphantly, “They are interested in whether *people* do.” Under this theory, people just are, presumably measured independently of human speech. Who cares about speech as evidence of other minds? Who cares about

The mind, that ocean where each kind  
Does straight its own resemblance find;  
Yet it creates, transcending these,  
Far other worlds, and other seas;  
Annihilating all that’s made  
To a green thought in a green shade.

Get in your category at birth and stay there. The theory of science in Blanchard, Bailey, and now Dreger is undefended 1930s behaviorism in aid of gender policing.

What it “means” to want to be something you are not yet is, of course, among the commonest human experiences, not “really” that difficult to understand. You were once a child, did not know “really” what it was like to be an adult, but wanted to be one. Not so difficult after all. Someone born in Mexico doesn’t “really” know what it’s like to live in the United States, but immigrates. Someone who wants a better job doesn’t “really” know what it’s like to have an MBA, but goes to get one. It’s is not rocket science. But unlike the exiguous “evidence” assembled for the Clarke Institute theory, at least it’s science.

Bailey’s book keeps emphasizing its highly scientific character. Bailey writes, for example, of “recruiting [in gay bars] research subjects for our study of drag queens and transsexuals” and about his own “recent research”; and so on throughout. Those who glory in doing scientific research had better have something to back it up. Bailey doesn’t and Dreger has not shown that he does. At a July 2003 meeting in Bloomington, Indiana, of the International Academy of Sex Research, John Bancroft, once director of the Kinsey Institute, stood up after Bailey’s abbreviated talk and said sternly, “Michael, I would caution you against calling this book ‘science’ because I have read it, and I can tell you it is not science.” Then he sat down, to stunned silence. Bailey resigned that afternoon as Secretary-Treasurer from the Academy. The sexologists had finally gotten up the courage to resist Bailey, Blanchard, and the Clarke Institute.

Dreger enthusiastically joins in advertising Bailey’s scientific standing. Practically none of her lengthy “analytic synopsis” of the book, for example, is critical of anything Bailey says. Astonishing claims such as that “transgender homosexuality is probably the most common form of homosexuality found across cultures” (p. 134, quoted by Dreger) pass smoothly without comment. (Neither Bailey nor Dreger appear to have heard of how the British Navy was governed in its prime, with “rum, buggery, and the lash.”) When Dreger simply has to admit that Bailey’s ideas are dubious, she immediately shifts the discussion to matters of how they “rubbed a lot of people the wrong way” or “offended” gender crossers. Never mind how wrong the ideas were scientifically.

Dreger accuses me of now denying what I wrote in my book, that I was sexually aroused by the thought of being a woman—“an admission it is hard to imagine her offering post-[Bailey].” This is just silly. Yes, I was aroused. So? According to the Clarke Institute theory that makes me an “autogynophile” to be classified in the *DSM-IV* with pedophiles and animal lovers. But my point has always been that it’s a mistaken theory, with no scientific basis, which has been put forward over and over, as it is in Bailey’s book and in Dreger’s account, without taking chances with contrary pieces of evidence, pieces of evidence like me. As soon as I seriously contemplated changing gender, the notion stopped being sexually arousing. Some theory. I could tell you more. Ask, doctor.

Dreger defends Bailey’s failure to request permission to use the women’s lives as he does in his book by agreeing with Bancroft that the book isn’t science. This is how Bailey defended himself on his website after the book came out, despite the heavy we-are-scientists rhetoric in the book itself. Yet, Dreger treats with the utmost respect Bailey’s generalizations on the basis of a half-dozen gender crossing prostitutes. She can’t have it both ways. Either he was doing rigorous science and therefore violated the norms of science or, he was doing casual journalism, and his views do not deserve the attention she uncritically gives. I’m not against casual journalism as an institution. On the contrary, I will take to the hills to defend it. Don’t mess with my First Amendment. But journalism differs from science as an institution, quite properly on both sides. When Dreger wants to defend Bailey, it’s “oh, he was just doing a journalistic book.” When she wants to admire his science, it’s “gosh, what persuasive scientific generalizations that gay men lisp and gender crossers are in it for sex, sex, sex.”

But set aside Bailey’s theory. Dreger’s essay is mainly not about the science. It is an exercise in political advocacy. She fashions it as a sober inquiry into the ethics of the reaction to Bailey’s book (though by the way she appears not to know anything about ethical theories and cites none of them). It’s not. It’s a very long brief for Bailey, right down to touching stories about Bailey’s children (e.g., “Bailey’s family and friends privately rallied around him”). I am appalled by James’s vulgar satire using his children. But now that we’re talking about people’s children, what about mine, who haven’t spoken to me since 1995, or allowed me to see my two grandchildren, precisely because of the sort of transphobic theories that it’s-all-about-sex which Bailey and Dreger advocate?

So the issues between us are political. I am described by Dreger as a “transgender activist.” James, who can certainly be described that way, plays a big part early on, complete with unsubstantiated suggestions that she is somehow physically dangerous. Dreger then describes at great length Kieleyka’s “remarkable sex life.” The idea is to lead with a heavy dose of the strange—consistent with the characterization early in the essay of everyone involved against Bailey as weird and dangerous and “activists”—and to leave for much later the sober

gender-crossing scientists who have taken exception to Bailey's theories. Only very late in the paper do we discover that eminent scientists like Roughgarden are part of the nutty "transgendered activists" she is going after. I am introduced as "enjoying an international reputation" literally on the next to last page. It reminds one of Bailey: make it easy; don't face the best your critics have to say.

At various points, Dreger complains that Blanchard, Bailey, and Lawrence (described sympathetically as a "physician-researcher": no "activists" work on the Bailey side of the street) are "lumped together...as a single, uniformly dangerous beast." If it's a bad idea to lump together three people who are old friends and collaborators in forwarding Blanchard's unsubstantiated theories, what's this about calling us all on the other side "transgender activists"?

I deny in particular that I worked "to ruin Bailey professionally and personally" or "to make Bailey as personally miserable as possible." I disagree with Bailey's theories and have explained repeatedly why I disagree, in print, and here again. I think his theories will result in more dead queers and I've said so (there's some "actual damage done to people"). I think his behavior from beginning to end has been disgraceful and unscholarly, and I've said that, too. What's the beef? Isn't it appropriate to criticize such work and such a person?

Not according to Dreger's ethics. I am supposed to have done something wicked by complaining through channels about Bailey's mistreatment of his victims. Dreger wrote to the appropriate parties through channels to try to persuade Northwestern's Rainbow Alliance not to invite James to speak. I did similarly. Ask again: What exactly is wrong with requesting that a book attacking gender crossers be removed from a nomination for a book prize by an organization that defends gender crossers? It's not "tantamount to censorship." Censorship is governmental interference in a free press. Bailey is portrayed as a lone hero against the government of gender crossers. I do wish, especially on April 15, that the real government were so feeble.

Dreger seems to think that it was somehow scandalous for me and others to have persuaded "Juanita" and "Cher" to complain to Northwestern University. Repeatedly, she argues that the integrity or indeed the truth of the complaint is somehow undermined because we intervened. I wonder how she views lawyers or mothers or friends who similarly intervene as persuaders in the decisions people make. Are they guilty of impropriety? And does their intervention make the decisions inauthentic? You can see that this distinguished member of the Medical Humanities and Bioethics Program at Northwestern's School of Medicine hasn't cracked a book on the humanities or on ethics. I would guess that a romantic theory of sincerity is at work in her mind, under which people never make decisions as social beings, never change their opinions, never consult, never come to see their pasts in a different light.

Dreger has a gift for self-dramatization. She portrays herself as a courageous defender, who is legitimately concerned she will suffer "personal harassment for researching and publicizing this history." She portrays herself repeatedly as writing "scholarly history" (the phrase is used four times, as though by saying that you are doing historical scholarship you can make it so). She needs to write, she says, because misunderstanding of the Bailey controversy "are adversely affecting many people's lives and actions."

I am a historian. I asked Dreger to send the paper to me. She never did, even when it was finished, though she is proud that she "solicited responses to drafts from 12 transgender activists." She would not—and she admits she would not—show me her work and allow me to criticize it, one historian to another. So she is able to characterize my views free of critique by the person most involved.

I, of course, had no wish to give her ammunition for her false case. It was apparent from the outset that Dreger was determined to tell the story as though Bailey were Galileo (she in fact uses the image, though jocularly; Blanchard is Copernicus; she, I guess, is Newton) and as though I were among the papal inquisition confining him to house arrest. The power positions of the people involved make the Bailey-as-victim story bizarre. Bailey is a tenured professor at a major university, defended stoutly by its bureaucracy; the two "activists" on which Dreger spends by far the most time (James and Kieltyka) have only the feeble power of words.

Dreger is irritated that I therefore gave her factual answers to the questions she posed ("She declined to elaborate"). Dreger evidently wished to have ample material on me like the 11 hours of interviews with Kieltyka, from which she could carefully select evidence. She asserts, for example, on the basis of a claim by Kieltyka, that Conway and I understood the alleged "sex" Bailey had with his scientific object of study to be an (unsuccessful) attempt at sex. This is mistaken, as she could have discovered had she troubled to send me the draft of her paper.

Dreger has written a political brief. One more typical example. By her own evidence—she asked Bailey (and he wouldn't answer) if Bailey *had* slept with an object of his scientific study. Much later she enthusiastically reviews the "proof" Bailey offers against the direct and precise testimony of Juanita that he had sex with her. The proof is shallow.

That is how one might characterize Dreger's tedious and tendentious "scholarly history." Lengthy but shallow.

## References

- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- McCloskey, D. N. (1999). *Crossing: A memoir*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

## The Drama of Sex, Identity, and the “Queen”

Marta Meana

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

After years of following the developments surrounding the publication of *TMWWBQ* in real time, it was interesting to step back and read Dreger’s comprehensive reconstruction of events. The story that emerges is reminiscent of classical drama. It comes complete with a protagonist (Bailey), antagonists (Conway, James, McCloskey), characters caught in the crossfire (Kyeltika), and a balanced and half-detached chorus (Dreger) explaining to the audience (the rest of us) the lessons to be learned from the melee. Mercifully, this drama did not end up a tragedy, but it shares significant qualities with the latter. It features a well-meaning, though necessarily flawed, protagonist with the requisite amount of hubris and a group of antagonists whose sordid means nullify any possible empathy the audience may have had with their perceived injury. The chorus seems open-minded and fair, although perhaps a little naïve in her belief in the healing power of her narrative.

Our protagonist did not actually say anything new in *TMWWBQ*, but he said it differently. Bailey clearly intended to take the research on homosexuality and transgender to the people and to “people” that research with real, full, and palpable lives (Danny’s and Cher’s and Juanita’s). Unfettered by the restrictive conventions of scholarly writing, the disembodied voice of research became the very much personalized voice of J. Michael Bailey. An unintended consequence of the device was a loss of sensitivity—a loss by no means requisite to the colloquial presentation of the science and his interpretation of it. As Dreger quickly points out, the cover is a perfect case in point. If an image ever communicated against the feminine essence hypothesis of transsexuality, this would be

it. But did it overreach? Did it have to communicate complete and total failure? An important part of the male-to-female transsexual’s goal is to cosmetically approximate womanhood, whether she is autogynephilic or homosexual. Some may never succeed because they are not sufficiently feminine to begin with, but a book cover that says they fail so miserably in that enterprise may have been excessive. My suspicion is that Bailey was so convinced of his own unquestionably progressive, positive, non-homophobic, and non-transphobic self that he made the political/interpersonal mistake of over-familiarity. In the words of a T-shirt I once saw declaiming an old Virginia Slims cigarette slogan aimed at women, “We haven’t come that far, and don’t call me baby.”

In my estimation, Bailey’s other possible failing was a certain degree of dismissiveness regarding the dilemma of identity for sexual minority groups and for science. I think he is right when he eschews the idea that individuals generally experience a gender identity. The construct seems weak unless it is moored in a set of behaviors and preferences. However, I wonder if that is a dominant culture perspective. It reminds me of the concept of worldview (*Weltanschauung*), a defining feature of which is its invisibility. People rarely recognize their experience of reality as a worldview but rather as “just the way things are.” You don’t think about it. You don’t question it. You don’t examine it. It just is. Maybe it is only when that worldview does not include us that we recognize it as a worldview. Maybe something similar happens in terms of gender identity. Could it be that gender identity is only evident for those who feel incongruence? This is not just a political question but an empirical one. It is useful to remember that “heterosexuality” was coined at least 14 years after “homosexuality” (Katz, 1995)—an articulation of dominant perspectives often requires the codification of a minority alternative. Furthermore, even if the driving impulse in autogynephilic transsexuality is sexual

---

M. Meana (✉)  
Department of Psychology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas,  
4505 Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89154-5030, USA  
e-mail: marta.meana@unlv.edu

and paraphilic in nature, this does not necessarily negate the development of identity around that originating drive. As Lawrence (2006) states, it is likely that “paraphilic erotic–romantic orientations involving erotic target location errors would make especially potent contributors to identity.” The originating drive of sexual arousal to oneself as a woman may even dissipate over time and the perpetuating drive may be a sense of *acquired* identity. Sexual drive and identity do not have to be mutually exclusive.

And this brings me to my final point regarding the protagonist’s blind spots—his absolutist stance regarding the Blanchard typology. The typology is convincing and the data compelling; however, typologies are necessarily imperfect and never free of a significant number of exceptions resistant to their strict organizational imperatives. Blanchard himself distinguishes between the empirically validated phenomenon of autogynephilia and, as yet untested, theoretical statements involving autogynephilia (Blanchard, 2005). Bailey could have more seriously entertained the theory’s limitations or the need for more empirical validation without denying the description of the folks he wrote about as autogynephilic. For example, autogynephilia, like any of the paraphilias involving target locations errors, are quite distinct from paraphilias that involve sexual arousal to a specific, usually time-limited and discrete activity (e.g., frotteurism, exhibitionism, voyeurism). Before SRS, the autogynephilic transsexual may engage in the types of “enactments of womanhood” described in *TMWWBQ* to achieve arousal and orgasm. But what happens after SRS? Surely no one believes that the autogynephilic transsexual walks around in a constant state of rapture as a consequence of her newfound “womanhood.” Why not acknowledge this difference? It takes nothing away from the well-appointed distinction Blanchard makes between two different types of transsexuals. This acknowledgment probably would not have made our protagonist less of a target for his zealous antagonists, but that is not the point. The point is that it would have been a more nuanced presentation of what we know and what we don’t yet know. In either case, it is clear to this commentator that Bailey was, to quote Shakespeare in *King Lear*, “a man more sinned against than sinning” by a very long shot.

Enter Conway, James, and McCloskey. The distrust of sexual minorities to the psychological/psychiatric enterprise is understandable as they have historically all too often found themselves pathologized and marginalized. Considering this history, it is not difficult to understand why some transsexuals would be more attached to the feminine identity explanation for their predilection than to the paraphilic one. The paraphilic label risks trivializing and sully their struggle for legitimacy and interfering with their eligibility for SRS (although clearly Bailey openly supports SRS for both types of transsexuals). But that is not Bailey’s problem. That is the problem of a psychiatric nosology that has chosen to classify sexual arousal patterns that fall outside the norm as mental disorders.

Clearly, Bailey did not help his normalizing discourse by using words such as “risk” and “cure” but, as the nosology currently stands, autogynephilia is indeed a paraphilia.

Given the history of oppression of sexual minorities, one might have had some empathy for a reasoned counterpoint to *TMWWBQ* from either rigorous phenomenological or theoretical standpoints, even in the absence of systematic data. I cannot deign to speak for Bailey, but I certainly would have been open to a thoughtful, divergent point of view. But none was to be had. The antagonists in this drama dressed for battle while an unsuspecting Bailey slept. Their attack was not only devoid of intellectual weaponry—it was anti-intellectual. It consisted of primitive tactics that bespoke a massive narcissistic injury with shockingly little emotional regulation and not a stitch of constructive discourse.

The onslaught was characterized by identity politics in the worst sense of that term and I do not subscribe to the belief that identity politics is always a necessarily malignant force. I do, however, feel that one brand of it is—the “if I feel it, then it must be true” brand. This discourse claims legitimacy by the simple act of articulating subjective experience. The problem with this approach is that it necessarily closes off the possibility of critique or disagreement by individuals who have not shared the experience. This, in turn, silences one or both parties and there is little opportunity for a productive exchange of ideas (Kruks, 2000). Everyone loses. Personal narratives are compelling and they have causal force, regardless of their accuracy. We need to care about them, but we also need to be aware of the significant ego needs shaping their plot line. We need to attend to the ways in which individuals weave their sexual pasts into their life narratives to help solidify their current identity (Plummer, 1995). Schrock and Reid (2006) provide a vivid example of this type of identity work in a small sample of male-to-female transsexuals. Despite the profound concerns about identity that James, Conway, and McCloskey apparently had, none of them exhibited any insight into the complicated work that goes into actually constructing an identity, any identity.

Another element in the drama that was curious to me was the level of “conservatism” characterizing the attacks. By conservatism, I mean rigidity but also, more interestingly, a high level of prudishness regarding sexuality. Why is being a “woman trapped inside a man’s body” any more respectable than being a man who loves womanhood so much he yearns to become the object of his own desire? Why is an erotic motivation any less worthy than an identity performative one? Bailey does not seem to privilege one over the other. That discrimination belongs entirely to the antagonists in this story. It is not uncommon for the outsider seeking acceptance into the dominant group to adopt its most conservative and least ambiguous conventions. Adopting the ubiquitous societal discomfort with sexuality may have been part of what the antagonists did to legitimize their struggle, internally and externally.

Teasing apart identity from sexuality may have been central to the development of a consolidation of self for this group of transsexuals. Judging, however, from their extreme reaction to the intimation of sexual motivation, that consolidation has apparently yet to firm up.

Perhaps the least defensible attack on Bailey (barring the attacks on his children) was on the question of his ethical conduct. It is crystal clear that had Bailey promoted the feminine essence theory of transsexualism, none of the antagonists would have cared one bit about ethics. Their allegations were completely off-topic and simply an attempt to inflict as much damage as possible. What is truly reprehensible about their questioning of his ethics, however, is that the antagonists looked to be taking the high moral ground in defense of their “daughters.” If Bailey had, in fact, acted unethically, who could have blamed them for defending their supposedly helpless “research” participants? It reminds me of another quote from a play, this time T. S. Eliot in *Murder in the Cathedral*: “The last temptation is the greatest treason, to do the right thing for the wrong reason.”

And now for the chorus. Dreger is a conscientious choric figure, guiding us through the story with a voice at once reasonable and compassionate. She is really trying as hard as she can to understand all parties—she really does give everyone the opportunity to construct their part. She is after a plurality of visions. After all, a story in which the antagonists have no reasoned impetus for their attack on the protagonist is not much of a drama—it is more like a horror film. Unfortunately, not much plurality emanates from her heroic attempt. We are left to infer it when we can scrape enough empathy to try to get into the minds of people who behaved as single-mindedly as did these antagonists. It is not easy.

By the time that Dreger gets to the last section of the article in which she investigates the merits of the charges against Bailey, this commentator wished she had not written that last part. Why? Because, by then, it has become clear that the charges against Bailey are beside the point. Because investigating them legitimizes them. Because the miscon-

duct charges are not what this story was about, in the slightest. I admit to having read it with a certain prurient interest and I imagine some will find relief in her publicly clearing him of any misdeeds. Ultimately, I think Dreger takes an unnecessary detour from the real point of the story, which is about intellectual freedom and open dialogue.

In the introduction, Dreger expresses the hope that her reconstruction of events will “calm and even quell some of the tensions that persist.” This seems strangely naïve. It belies a belief that makes you wonder if Dreger fully comprehends the profundity of what really happened. This was not a story of misunderstanding or star-crossed characters. This was not a story in which a messenger arrived a minute too late with a missive that would have forestalled a tragedy. This is a darker, less hopeful story. Flaws on either side notwithstanding, the two forces clashing in this drama have radically opposing ideas about the path to truth, whatever that truth may be. That is why Dreger’s careful telling of the “facts” is unlikely to be successful in quelling anything at all. Actually, it is more likely to reveal her ultimate allegiance to one side—Bailey’s. This commentary does much the same, with a little trepidation but nary a doubt.

## References

- Blanchard, R. (2005). Early history of the concept of autogynephilia. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 34*, 439–446.
- Katz, J. N. (1995). *The invention of heterosexuality*. New York: Dutton Books.
- Kruks, S. (2000). *Retrieving experience: Subjectivity and recognition in feminist politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2006). Clinical and theoretical parallels between desire for limb amputation and gender identity disorder. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 35*, 263–278.
- Plummer, K. (1995). *Telling sexual stories: Power, change and social worlds*. London: Routledge.
- Schrock, D. P., & Reid, L. L. (2006). Transsexuals’ sexual stories. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 35*, 75–86.

## A Different Perspective

Charles Moser

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Dreger has written an unusually long article detailing the events of this “controversy,” but she does not comment on how to resolve conflicts between researchers and subjects (or the community being studied) or place the “controversy” in the larger history of dissent against the Autogynephilia theory. Unfortunately, due to space limitations, those issues cannot be discussed here. Dreger also implies that the concerns of transsexual activists are not supported by a careful review of *The Man Who Would Be Queen (TMWWBQ)*; a very different perspective will be presented.

As Dreger did, I believe it is important to detail my background. I also have been on the receiving end of a withering and unfounded personal attack for my professional writing (see Kleinplatz & Moser, 2005; Moser & Kleinplatz, 2005). I am a physician who cares for a large number of transsexual patients, and a psychotherapist who regularly evaluated and counseled transsexual patients prior to my medical career. I am a sex researcher who has been quite critical of the “Autogynephilia Theory,” but critical of the “Feminine Essence Theory” as well.

I do not believe I have ever met Dreger. I know Bailey, Blanchard, and Lawrence both professionally and personally; we have often disagreed, but always in a professional manner. I believe they are good and honest people, trying to find answers to basic sex and gender questions and how to help people with these concerns; I have the same quest. I do believe they are profoundly wrong in the case of Autogynephilia. From my interactions with Bailey, I do not believe he is homophobic, heterosexist, sexist, or transphobic. Nevertheless, from his

writings and statements, I understand how someone could come to the opposite conclusion.

I do not believe that Bailey, Dreger, or any researcher should be the recipient of the treatment outlined in the article for presenting his or her beliefs, research, opinion, ideas, etc. Although I disagree strongly with Bailey’s conclusions about transsexuality and many of his other professional beliefs, he has the absolute right to present them and *not* suffer the attacks he has. I do not know Conway, James, or McCloskey, except by reputation. None of my following remarks should be construed as supportive of them, their accusations against Bailey, or their tactics.

### A Different Perspective on the Controversy

Bailey wrote a very provocative book for the lay public. Dreger admits *TMWWBQ* is “unnecessarily snide or even contemptuous in places, lacking evidentiary support” and that “*TMWWBQ* was never envisioned as a work of science.” Dreger noted that some people suggested that the tone or cover be changed prior to publication to minimize the expected negative reaction to the book; Bailey apparently ignored these suggestions. Possibly as intended, publication of *TMWWBQ* created considerable controversy.

The publication of *TMWWBQ* signified the transition of the theory of Autogynephilia from academic journals to the popular press. As Dreger reports, mothers were telling their “daughters” that they finally understood them; that meant for some being told “you are a sexual pervert,” not “I understand your struggle to be accepted as a woman.” In the transsexual community, this was a call to arms.

Some transsexual activists reacted to the book by making a number of accusations against Bailey. These activists asked for support from a variety of organizations and individuals.

---

C. Moser (✉)  
Department of Sexual Medicine, Institute for Advanced Study of  
Human Sexuality, 45 Castro Street, #125, San Francisco, CA  
94114, USA  
e-mail: Docx2@ix.netcom.com



All these entities referred the accusers to the appropriate organization to conduct the investigation, Northwestern University. That investigation took place. It basically concluded that Bailey had not violated any professional, ethical, legal, or moral standards; no penalties were levied against Bailey. It seems the system worked.

In our society, individuals make accusations with some frequency; these usually prompt some sort of an investigation. The investigating body eventually decides if any violation of rules, ethics, law, or standards of practice occurred and the appropriate sanctions for those violations. Some of these allegations have merit and some do not. It is hoped that the system sorts them out correctly. This is the system and this is what happened. It is not clear how else individuals, who believe that they have grievances, could have proceeded. Threats towards Bailey or Dreger and accusations involving their family members are clearly inappropriate and there is no excuse for that behavior.

Dreger implies that ad hominem attacks are a *new* tactic in the attempt to discredit sex research with which one disagrees. This is patently false; Kinsey, Money, Rind, and Bullough, among many others, have suffered such attacks. By the mere mention of their names, some readers will undoubtedly think that those attacks were different because they were either well-founded or baseless. The motivation in all cases was an attempt to prevent the researchers' ideas from being taken seriously and ruin them personally. Dreger's article fails to place the attack on Bailey in its historical perspective.

Factual material can be presented in different ways; some of these are likely to cause strong negative reactions. For example, although it is true that, on average, men have more upper body physical strength than women, it would be inflammatory and inappropriate to call women the *weaker* sex. I doubt that criticizing a researcher for using this politically charged language would be interpreted as infringing on free speech, discouraging research, or political correctness run amok.

To call a transsexual who denies Autogynephilia vigorously autogynephilic or an autogynephile-in-denial is also inflammatory and inappropriate. One can convey the same point with more cautious language. In general, researchers should avoid inciting hostility from their subjects. Stating that a subject is in denial or misleading the researcher usually leads to an angry reaction. Ridiculing someone for their beliefs, religious, political, or gender identification is never a good strategy. Ignoring these common courtesies will probably lead to an ugly confrontation, such as this "controversy." Being a researcher does not confer immunity from the consequences of incivility.

### A Different Perspective on the Allegations

There have been many allegations in this case. Dreger discussed three in detail; conducting research without IRB

approval (which would have included obtaining informed consent from one's subjects), practicing psychology without a license, and engaging in sex with a research subject. It is important to realize that Bailey did field research for *TMWWBQ* without IRB approval, did not obtain informed consent from his "subjects," and he did engage in activities that could be construed as practicing psychology without a license. All these acts were judged *not* to be a violation of law, ethics, or university rules. The complaints were not spurious; they also were not actual violations.

Although there is disagreement as to whether Bailey engaged in sex with a subject, even if he had, that would not be a violation of law, ethics, or university rules either. I have no way of judging the validity of this allegation and frankly do not care.

### A Different Perspective on the Autogynephilia Theory

Imagine that you are a male-to-female transsexual (MTF), whom Bailey would classify as an "autogynephile" (because you reported sexual arousal by dressing in female clothing a few times in early adolescence; it was a minor interest that you just outgrew). Also imagine you feel, really feel, that you are a woman trapped in a man's body. It really does not matter if it is true; it does matter that you believe it to your core.

Now imagine some "doctors" tell you that your real problem is that you are an autogynephile, all your feminine feelings are sexually based and false, and you are *just* a generic man with a really unusual sexual interest. This sounds absolutely bizarre to you; you know you are not aroused by thoughts of yourself as a woman, but these doctors say you are lying or deluding yourself. These doctors go further; this unusual sexual interest makes you more likely to have other unusual sexual interests, which include pedophilia. You are disgusted by pedophiles and insulted that someone would categorize you in that way. If, after your surgery, you choose to marry a wonderful man, the theory suggests he is actually nothing more than a prop you use to propagate the erotic fantasy of being a woman. According to the theory, you really love your female self, not your husband. These same doctors tell you that you are in denial about your true sexual proclivities. They say other "autogynephilic" transsexuals find acceptance and understanding from this theory, if only you would recognize it in yourself. You think this is crazy, you do not fantasize about being a woman; you *are* a woman in your fantasies.

You are seething with rage about the way you have been categorized and your own feelings discounted. Your reaction is to fight back with whatever weapons you have at your disposal. Oh, by the way, you often need these doctors to get your hormones and surgery.

The theory is equally distressing for MTFs who are primarily sexually oriented towards genetic males (classic or homosexual transsexuals). The theory suggests that they are not women either, just very effeminate homosexual men with a desire to amputate their penises. They cannot have autogynephilic desires, even if they say they do.

To be classified as an individual with a paraphilia is to be classified as mentally ill, potentially suffer employment discrimination, and denied child custody. Add to that the specific problems transsexuals face, the difficulty obtaining a marriage license, passport, and other government services. Some clinicians will not even approve autogynephiles for sex reassignment surgery. Bailey and other Autogynephilia proponents have condemned strongly the actions of those clinicians, but the discrimination continues.

In *TMWWBQ*, Bailey called for the formal inclusion of Autogynephilia into the Gender Identity Disorder diagnostic criteria in the *DSM*. I believe this would be a mistake on numerous grounds. Placing it in the *DSM* would imply that Autogynephilia is a form of psychopathology. I do not deny that Autogynephilia exists (though it appears to be very different from the other paraphilias listed in the *DSM*), but it does not follow the compulsory association with sexual orientation that *TMWWBQ* suggests. I am also not convinced that Autogynephilia is the cause of gender dysphoria or the motivation to undergo sex reassignment surgery in this “type” of MTF.

Not so long ago, homosexuals were conceived of in a similar manner, incapable of loving someone else, only interested in sex, and likely to sexually molest children. Also not so long ago, when the police were hassling a group of effeminate gay men (a common occurrence at the time), these gay men committed the clearly inappropriate and illegal act of fighting back and violently resisting arrest. It was called the Stonewall Riots and is considered the birth of the contemporary Gay Rights Movement. A few years after Stonewall, homosexuality was removed from the *DSM* and the negative stereotypes of homosexuals described above were being debunked. Sometimes extreme acts lead to political change.

The controversy surrounding *TMWWBQ* is not solely about the content of the book, but the oppression transsexuals experience and their belief that it stems from the Autogynephilia theory. Bailey’s book with its unnecessarily derisive comments and contemptuous tone is just the flash point. Even if Bailey had added all the appropriate qualifiers to his book, he did not address the transsexual community’s concerns that this theory is oppressive to them.

Dreger identifies three main protagonists, but the chatter on numerous transsexual websites has been how the book symbolizes their oppression. Bailey surely did not deserve the treatment outlined in the article, but his attitude, actions, and responses are partially responsible for the escalation of the controversy (see below).

## A Different Perspective on Dreger

With all due respect to Dreger, was she the correct person to tell this story? She admits she was not unbiased. She has been attacked by the same detractors as Bailey and she has her own political agenda.

Dreger is a prominent figure in the Intersex movement; I was surprised there was no discussion about the friction (to put it mildly) between the Intersex and Transsexual Movements. The diagnostic criteria for Gender Identity Disorder (Transsexuality) in the *DSM-IV-TR* (American Psychiatric Association, 2000) specifically omit individuals with a physical intersex condition. Nevertheless, as Dreger notes, some people (both transsexual and professional) believe that transsexuality is a type of neurological intersex condition. Some intersex activists are quite dismissive of this possibility and point to the Autogynephilia theory as a way of distinguishing and distancing themselves from transsexuals.

Dreger (1998) has stated: “...the experiences and advice of adult intersexuals must be solicited and taken into consideration. It is incorrect to claim, as I have heard several clinicians do, that the complaints of adult intersexuals are irrelevant...” If one were to replace the term “intersexuals” with “transsexuals” in the above quote, it would suggest that Dreger would be critical of Bailey for ignoring the transsexual activists’ perspective and complaints. Dreger seems to be inconsistent in her admonitions about the right to self-definition.

This is an article about a scientist who was maligned. It is surprising that Dreger chose to malign others in her article. I am not talking about Conway, James, or McCloskey, but I see no reason why Dreger needed to report that Dr. Millie Brown settled a lawsuit brought against her by a former patient. The implication that Brown was guilty of professional misconduct appears to have been added just to undercut her credibility as a proponent of the Feminine Essence Perspective.

Dreger neglected to add that Brown was advised to accept the settlement by her insurance company, which is quite common with this type of lawsuit. Brown chose to follow her insurance company’s advice and move on with her life. The terms of the settlement are confidential, but did not require any admission of wrongdoing (M. Brown, personal communication, September 14, 2007). In this case, Dreger acted like Bailey’s accusers, stating facts out of context to impugn someone’s reputation.

## A Different Perspective on How to Manage “Controversies” in the Future

As I am writing this commentary, Bailey is taking part in radio interviews (August 22, 2007; <http://www.kqed.org/>

[epArchive/R708221000](#)), giving interviews to the press (New York Times, August 21, 2007), and calling one critic “...a big fat ugly liar, and I am thinking of suing her” (Bailey to Sexnet, p.e.c., August 22, 2007). This only reinvigorates the opposition. In my opinion, Bailey is not clearing his name, but fomenting further controversy.

From my experience as a researcher who has been the subject of an ad hominem attack, I have some advice on how to handle these controversies. If you do not like controversy, do not want people making accusations or saying nasty things about you, I suggest that you make your point with respect and kindness. I believe it is often best to refuse all interviews, respond only in scientific forums, avoid speaking to the press, and refrain from name-calling. If you need to respond, do so with formal statements, posted to a website or faxed to reputable magazines or newspapers. Although it is very tempting to confront your accusers, you cannot control the media. Lies always make for more sensationalistic press than the truth. Which do you think they will print?

### Epilogue: A Different Perspective

Dreger asked, “How could there be so much smoke and so little fire”? The same could be asked of Dreger. Did she uncover a pattern of lies and false allegations? No, the allegations were basically true; they just did not constitute

any formal misconduct. I agree that the many voices in this debate “...have been repeatedly silenced, misrepresented, or misheard...”, but this has occurred on both sides of the debate, not just by the Autogynephilia critics as Dreger implies. Did she find anything but a small group of women who felt that this popular book was a threat and let their displeasure be known quite loudly?

My last bits of insight are to remember the Golden Rule. Remember also that you reap what you sow. The death of free speech and academic freedom has been highly exaggerated. Science is not free of politics, never has been, and never will be. The origins of transsexuality are still not known and the concept of Autogynephilia is still controversial.

Can we all get back to science now?

### References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text revision). Washington, DC: Author.
- Dreger, A. D. (1998). Ambiguous sex—or ambivalent medicine? *The Hastings Center Report*, 28(3), 24–35.
- Kleinplatz, P. J., & Moser, C. (2005). Politics versus science: An addendum and response to Drs. Spitzer and Fink. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 17(3/4), 135–139.
- Moser, C., & Kleinplatz, P. J. (2005). *DSM-IV-TR* and the paraphilias: An argument for removal. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 17(3/4), 91–109.

## Dreger on the Bailey Controversy: Lost in the Drama, Missing the Big Picture

Margaret Nichols

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Dreger describes herself as an historian, a bioethicist, and a “queer activist.” In this essay, she fails at all three. She has described the Bailey controversy myopically, without placing it in its larger sociocultural context. She ignores the history of queer activism and its relationship to psychiatry. She is particularly oblivious to changes in the emerging transgender movement. The transgender community, and the professionals who work within it, are in the midst of a revolution, but Dreger hasn’t noticed. Under a veneer of neutrality, Dreger has aligned herself with the conservative rearguard of professionals, not realizing that changes in the field are already rendering much of that rearguard obsolete. Shocked by some of the tactics, she has missed the symbolic significance of the uproar over *TMWWBQ*. As transwoman Herman (2007) put in her critique of Dreger’s paper: “To focus on the overzealous response of some trans activists is to miss the bigger picture—that transsexuals are fed up with non-transsexual ‘experts’ claiming to know us better than we do” (p. 1).

As a queer psychologist and sex therapist, a queer activist since 1976, and founder and director of a queer psychotherapy agency with strong transgender services since 1983, let me provide a bit of context that, I believe, leads to an entirely different analysis of the Bailey controversy. As I write this, ENDA (the U.S. Federal Employment Non-Discrimination Act) has just been passed in the House of Representatives. ENDA protects gays, lesbians, and bisexuals, but transgendered people were removed from the bill to ensure passage. Trans people are the “new homosexuals,” regarded by society largely as freaks and perverts less deserving of rights than

others. Bailey’s book has reinforced cultural stereotypes of male-to-female transsexuals, beginning with the demeaning cover. He maintains that transsexuals are motivated by lust, not gender identity issues, that transsexuals lie, and that they are drawn to shoplifting. He asserts that one “type” of transsexualism is in fact a “paraphilia,” linking some MTF transsexuals with “necrophilia, bestiality, and pedophilia” (p. 171) and that the members of the other “type,” homosexual transsexuals, “might be especially well-suited to prostitution” (p. 141). By not acknowledging that Bailey’s book panders to popular prejudice, Dreger shows an appalling lack of understanding of the power of psychiatry to enforce and justify societal oppression.

Psychiatry has a long, shameful history of participating in the stigmatization and abuse of disenfranchised people. Beginning with the 19th century diagnosis of “drapetomania” (the desire of a slave to run away from his/her master), for well over a century psychiatric diagnosis has tended to reinforce the prejudices of society against women and racial and sexual minorities. And the abuse carried out in the name of psychiatric healing—forced incarceration, invasive and often painful treatments, forced sterilization, and clitorodectomies, not to mention loss of employment, housing, children, etc.—has been terrible.

Ironically, psychiatric diagnosis has also served a humanistic purpose, sometimes for the same groups that it oppresses. Psychiatric classification can initially increase public empathy for people who are seen as suffering from a “disease” and can even enable oppressed groups to be treated more humanely, but classification comes at the cost of reinforcing the belief that certain behaviors are deviant, subnormal, or pathological, and therefore less deserving of genuinely equal rights. Thus, the removal of homosexuality from the *DSM* was a watershed event in gay rights history and it foreshadowed the direction of the transgender rights movement today.

---

M. Nichols (✉)  
Institute for Personal Growth, 8 South Third Avenue, Highland  
Park, NJ 08904, USA  
e-mail: shrnklady@aol.com

As Bayer (1987) described in his definitive history, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis*, in the first half of the 20th century homosexuals welcomed a psychiatric diagnosis: “better sick than criminal, better the focus of therapeutic concern than the target of the brutal law” (p. 9). It was not until the 1960s that the gay activist movement came to see the disease model of homosexuality as one of the largest obstacles standing in the way of equal status in the eyes of society. The story of how homosexuality came to be removed from the *DSM* is less a story of “scientific truth” than one of rowdy, militant activism, as Bayer makes quite clear. Research by Hooker and others may have been the public rationale for the removal, but it was the total disruption of the American Psychiatric Association’s annual convention for 2 years running by gay activists, and a threat of a third disruption, that was the necessary impetus for removal. In other words, behavior that Dreger might call harassing, rude, and uncivilized, even threatening, was required to topple the power hierarchy of so-called impartial science and medicine. Viewed from the perspective of those toppled, the *DSM* nomenclature change was accomplished because a small group of crazy homosexuals intimidated a lot of psychiatrists. So, while Dreger portrays the Bailey controversy as a “freedom of speech” issue, she forgets that the point of activism is sometimes “silencing,” if by that one means destroying the credibility of professionals that activists deem dangerous. As a result of the 1973 nomenclature change, professionals and researchers alike who espoused pathology models of homosexuality were officially discredited. No doubt Charles Socarides felt “silenced.”

Although drag queens were an integral part of the 1969 Stonewall Rebellion, the tipping point for modern gay activism, the transgender activist movement did not really coalesce until much more recently. Twenty-five years ago there was no trans community; indeed, “transgender” is a word invented by activists. FTM transsexuals were considered rare and the post-operative MTF transsexual’s sole goal was to fit into society and “pass” as a genetic female. Transsexuals stayed away from transvestites, most were deeply closeted, and few (except the drag queens) wanted to affiliate with gays.

Since the early 1990s, there has been a profound paradigm shift among trans people themselves. Whereas before, trans identities were limited, discrete, and categorical, i.e., one was a transvestite, a transsexual, or a drag queen, now there is truly a “transgender continuum” that encompasses a multitude of identities and lifestyles: FTM’s and MTF’s, part and full-time crossdressers, drag kings and queens, transmen and transwomen, bi-gendered, Two Spirit, gender benders, femmes, butches, bois, and many more. With this has come a wide variation in the kind of body modifications people desire, permutations and combinations of various surgeries and hormone treatments, and the emergence of some trans people who do not want to be credible as either male or female, or who want to be

seen as both. Although Dreger doesn’t seem to recognize this, there has been an enormous expansion in the transgendered narrative as well. If one reads the stories of prominent trans activists like J. Green, Feinberg, Califia, and Bornstein, or simply listens to trans people, one hears not only the “feminine essence” and the “autogynephilic” narrative, but a dizzying array of histories Bailey can’t even begin to imagine. The emergence of such an array of gender variance renders a simplistic taxonomy like Blanchard’s not so much “wrong” as irrelevant.

The development of the transgender continuum mirrors the increasing solidarity between transgendered people, regardless of sexual orientation or degree of transition desired. Trans people became affiliated with the already-established gay community—the “T” was added to the “G,” “L,” and “B.” And with all this came a sense of pride. Whereas in the past post-operative MTF transsexuals dreamed only of “fitting in” as a genetic female, many now identify as “transwomen.” And, significantly, trans people have largely stopped thinking of themselves as “disordered” or suffering from a “psychiatric disease.” They are not as likely to have an uncritical gratitude towards the benevolent and sometimes not so benevolent healers who are the gatekeepers of medical services. Mental health professionals are especially problematic for those who want body modification, because they control access to surgeons and doctors who can prescribe hormones.

Trans activism now finds itself at a point similar to that of gay activism in the early 1970s. There is a huge and important dialogue within the trans community about de-classifying Gender Identity Disorder. (This is separate from the criticism of the diagnosis of Gender Identity Disorder for children.) Space does not permit the discussion of this issue, which is complicated by the perception that a *DSM* diagnosis is necessary to assure medical services for transpeople, but the movement to reform includes professionals as well as trans people themselves. GIDreform.org (“Because our identities are not disordered”) lists as advocates psychiatrist Dan Karasic, WPATH Board member Jamison Green, and GRS surgeon Marci Bowers. Almost all of the essays in the recently published edited book about re-evaluating the sex and gender diagnoses of the *DSM* concern the GID diagnosis (Karasic & Drescher, 2005). Transactivists are recognizing that pathologizing transgenderism is, in the end, more harmful than helpful.

Although there is still debate on the *DSM* issue, there is an increasing perception that the diagnosis is a formality needed to ensure medical treatment: “There is a modern medical and mental health understanding that the way we are described in the *DSM* is just wrong,” says Mara Keisling, executive director of the National Center for Transgender Equality (Rochman, 2007, p. 35). Contrast this with Bailey’s stated desire to place some MTF transsexuals in the Paraphilia section of the *DSM*, a

move that could only serve to increase the pathologizing of trans people and the social stigma against them. Bailey and others like him run directly counter to progress for transgendered people.

The de facto de-pathologizing of trans people to which Keisling refers is, however, already occurring in the community of health care professionals who work with transgendered people (Lev, 2004). In the United States, trans people increasingly get services at G/L/B/T health centers, precisely to avoid the pathologizing that occurs at clinics like Blanchard's. These centers are taking over the gatekeeping roles formerly assumed by predominantly white, heterosexual psychiatrists. Rather than focusing on excluding those who do not fit the official diagnosis of GID (transsexualism), they are attempting to put the decision-making in the hands of the clients. The protocols of several centers include automatically prescribing hormones for anyone who is already obtaining them illegally. The WPATH (formerly the Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association) guidelines have become more flexible and many G/L/B/T Gender Identity centers are interpreting them more loosely still. Some endocrinologists and surgeons now treat trans people without requiring mental health "clearance." While not quite yet at the "hormones or surgery on demand" stage, the trend in the community is in the direction of self-determination by transpeople themselves, a direct repudiation of the disease model.

There are, of course, some transgendered people who still see themselves as "disordered," just as there were gay activists who opposed the removal of homosexuality from the *DSM*. Lawrence, the self-identified autogynephilic transsexual who works with Blanchard, may be the equivalent of Donald Webster Cory, the gay activist who passionately defended the disease model of homosexuality in his 1965 forward to Albert Ellis's *Homosexuality: Its Causes and Cure* (cited in Bayer, 1987). It is especially tempting to believe this after reading her recent paper (Lawrence, 2006), in which she compares transsexuals to amputee fetishists. Dreger is oblivious to the implications of Lawrence's views.

And there are still gays, lesbians, and bisexuals who have difficulty with transgendered people. Sadly, the recent ENDA experience demonstrates this: the gender identity exclusion was a deal negotiated by openly gay Congressman Barney Frank and the gay and lesbian Human Rights Campaign. Dreger does not understand the unfortunate ignorance about trans issues within the L/G/B/T community. She cites positive reviews of Bailey by scientists Cantor and LeVay, not realizing that many would consider their pathology-paradigm perspectives unenlightened. She implies that *TMWWBQ*'s removal from the nomination for the Lambda Literary Award was achieved by the harassing tactics of the trans-activists, when it might more appropriately be seen as a belated acknowledgment that the original nomination reflected a slur against trans people.

Seen within the larger context of the transgender community and the trends among professionals, Bailey's views are archaic and paternalistic. Dreger commends him for supporting the right of autogynephilic transsexuals to receive GRS despite his belief that they are paraphiliacs. But she misses the point: trans people don't want benevolent doctors to decide their fates anymore. They don't want to be controlled by gender identity professionals who believe they have the right, even duty, to "protect" society by keeping a tight hold on the gateway to trans services for adults and by preventing gender nonconforming boys from growing up to be trans adults.

The shift away from the psychiatric disorder model of transgender issues towards self-determination has created differences among professionals who work with or study transgenderism. Male psychologists like Blanchard and Zucker, whom Bailey asserts are the "world experts," are at the ever-decreasing conservative end of this issue. Coleman, Diamond, and Bockting, for example, all contemporary leaders in the field of transgender research and services, hold much different views, but Dreger seems not to be familiar with their work. Indeed, she hardly acknowledges that this field exists. For example, she appears to have little regard for the foremost professional organization in this specialty, WPATH; it appears in her account as just another organization that has been intimidated by the Conway/James/McCloskey cabal. In fact, many WPATH members panned the book. Coleman called it "an unfortunate setback," Bockting titled his review "Biological Reductionism meets Gender Diversity in Human Sexuality," and J. Green compared Bailey's style of portraying transsexuals to *The Silence of the Lambs*.

As a bioethicist, Dreger ducks the big issues by hiding behind legalistic arguments. She skirts the question of whether Bailey slept with any of his subjects by giving Clinton-esque arguments about what constitutes "sex," concluding that, even if sex occurred, it's technically not a violation of ethics. She used similar arguments to explain Bailey's conflicts with Northwestern University, the allegations about informed consent, and the complaint to the Board of Psychological Examiners. She does not address the power differential between Bailey and the trans people he trotted out to shock and titillate his human sexuality classes, or the ethics of "befriending" such people, who are unsophisticated about academia and research, only to turn around and write about them in ways that make them look like psychologically crippled freaks. This behavior may be technically ethical but it is morally repugnant. Most significantly, Dreger fails to see the larger impact that books like this one have on society's treatment of transgendered people. She disingenuously wonders if the book, which has been read by over a quarter million people, really has harmed anyone, meaning, I suppose, how many people actually fired a trans person after reading this book, while avoiding the larger issue of how *TMWWBQ* contributes to the over-all cultural view of transgendered people.

Dreger is blind to Bailey's homophobia and transphobia, claiming that *TMWWBQ* is "complex," neither pro nor anti gay, neither pro nor anti trans. Bailey's views are not complex; he could be compared to Spitzer. Because Spitzer regarded homosexuality as a "suboptimal condition" (Bayer, 1987), it was not inconsistent for him to defend the reparative therapy movement 30 years after playing a positive role in eliminating homosexuality from the *DSM*. Similarly, Bailey upholds decent and fair treatment for gay and transgendered people. He magnanimously allows that it's possible to be both gay and happy, and he regards adult transsexuals as fascinating and exotic. But he is quite clear in *TMWWBQ* that transsexualism is a condition to be prevented, if possible. And Bailey has proposed what amounts to a "birth defect" model of homosexuality. In *TMWWBQ* he called homosexuality "evolutionarily maladaptive" (p. 115) and "the most striking unresolved paradox of human evolution" (p. 116). And although he claims to be sympathetic to gay people, he sees nothing wrong with eliminating homosexuality if it comes about as the result of "parental right to choose": Bailey has defended the rights of parents to abort gay fetuses (Greenberg & Bailey, 2001). Bailey further exposes his underlying biases in an article attempting to explain data showing that gays have higher rates of certain psychopathologies than non-gays:

...a second possibility [to account for the findings] is that homosexuality represents a deviation from normal development and is associated with other such deviations that may lead to mental illness. One need not believe that homosexuality is a psychopathologic trait...to believe that evolution has worked to ensure heterosexuality in most cases and that homosexuality may represent a developmental error. (Bailey, 1999, p. 884)

Dreger excuses these views and doesn't recognize the audacity of Bailey's implicit assumption that he has the right to decide whether or not homosexuality and transsexualism are socially desirable.<sup>1</sup> She barely mentions the controversy over Bailey's research on bisexuality and his obsession with documenting the "effeminate" characteristics of gay men, the latter of which is at the very least a waste of research money that could be better spent on more important questions. And Dreger is unconcerned with Bailey's membership in the Human Biodiversity Institute (HBI), a paleoconservative, neo-eugenicist "think tank" with a limited, invitation-only listserv of "prominent scientists," as described by director Sailor, the conservative journalist best known for his anti-immigration views. Other members include Pinker and Buss, who both "blurbed" *TMWWBQ*, Murray, co-author of *The Bell Curve*, Cochrane, who has proposed that homosexuality is caused by a germ, and Rushton, president of the eugenicist Pioneer Fund

and believer in the genetic inferiority of blacks. Dreger practically ridicules the Southern Poverty Law Center report on Bailey and HBI. But Bailey's connection to HBI belies his politics and has important bearing on his research in the areas of sex and gender diversity. In my opinion, the HBI connection alone makes Bailey an enemy of queer people.

The deficits in Dreger's historical, ethical, and political analyses of the Bailey controversy lead her to fundamentally flawed conclusions. Dreger portrays Bailey as an impartial "truth-seeking" scientist who courageously espoused "politically incorrect" views and was unfairly maligned by a tiny group of crazed transwomen. She implies that Bailey's freedom of speech has been abridged, forgetting that the right to free speech, which can legally be infringed only by the government, entitles one to a voice, not to a forum, and not to grant funding, public speaking appearances, or book awards. Not that Bailey has lost these forums. Thanks to Dreger, even the *New York Times* has painted him as a beleaguered hero (Carey, 2007).

Dreger bemoans the "chilling" effect this controversy will have on research on transgenderism, implying that the trans activists have scared away legitimate scientists. To the extent that those subscribing to a pathology-paradigm of transgenderism have been discouraged from research, the activism against Bailey will have been successful. Gay professionals led the outcry against reparative therapy for gays and Spitzer's research and the result was widespread professional disapproval of the ex-gay movement. Just as queer theory and science is coming to be dominated by gays, trans research will not progress beyond a narrow focus on "disorder" without strong input from the trans community. And it will not progress until people like Bailey are de-throned from their positions of power within the academic and scientific world.

## References

- Bailey, J. M. (1999). Homosexuality and mental illness [Comment]. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 36, 883–884.
- Bayer, R. (1987). *Homosexuality and American psychiatry: The politics of diagnosis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Carey, B. (2007, August 21). Criticism of a gender theory, and a scientist under siege. *New York Times*, pp. S1, S6.
- Dreger, A. D. (2007, June 20). Liberty and solidarity: May we choose children for sexual orientation? *Bioethics Forum*. Retrieved September 24, 2007 from <http://www.Bioethicsforum.org/science-gaydar-homosexuality-prenatal-selection.asp>.
- Greenberg, A. S., & Bailey, J. M. (2001). Parental selection of children's sexual orientation. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 30, 423–437.
- Herman, J. (2007, September 4). *Why the Bailey controversy won't die soon*. Advocate.com. Retrieved September 12, 2007 from [http://www.advocate.com/exclusive\\_detail\\_ektid48612.asp](http://www.advocate.com/exclusive_detail_ektid48612.asp).
- Karasic, D., & Drescher, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Sexual and gender diagnoses of the diagnostic and statistical manual (DSM)*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2006). Clinical and theoretical parallels between desire for limb amputation and gender identity disorder. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 35, 263–278.

<sup>1</sup> Interestingly, Dreger (2007) has criticized Bailey's "parental selection" views in another venue.

Lev, A. I. (2004). *Transgender emergence: Therapeutic guidelines for working with gender-variant people and their families*. New York: Haworth Press.

Rochman, S. (2007, November 20). What's up, doc? Would removing transgender from the list of mental disorders do more harm than good? *The Advocate*, pp. 32–35.



## The Bailey Affair: Political Correctness and Attacks on Sex Research

Bruce Rind

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

In Dreger's history of the Bailey affair, readers are informed about yet another attack on a sex researcher and his work, which came into conflict with others' political views or agendas. Bailey, a Northwestern University psychologist and sexologist, published a book arguing that male-to-female (MTF) transsexuals are motivated to become females for erotic, not gender identity, reasons. Some, he argued, are sexually aroused by the thought of being a woman (autogynephiles) and others have felt female since birth and want to be transwomen for easier access to sexual relationships with men (homosexual transsexuals). He specifically rejected the explanation favored by many therapists and trans persons of "feminine essence," that MTF transsexuals are women trapped in men's bodies, and their motivation for becoming women is based on gender identity, having nothing to do with sex, sexual behavior, or sexual orientation. Bailey did not merely reject this explanation as incorrect, but as politically correct rubbish, motivated by self-serving identity politics, and injurious to reality by distorting and suppressing the truth. He saw this as a problem in need of redress—thus his research and book. A firestorm of protests came from transsexual activists, who variously compared his work to Ku Klux Klan racial slurs and Nazi propaganda or attacked Bailey's family members on the Internet. These same activists successfully organized charges of scientific misconduct against Bailey, which his university then investigated. He was attacked in the press and was put at a distance by colleagues. Ultimately, as Dreger painstakingly demonstrated, the allegations against Bailey were either unfounded or irrelevant to the integrity of his work.

---

B. Rind (✉)  
Department of Psychology, Temple University, Philadelphia,  
PA 19122, USA  
e-mail: rind3@temple.edu

Dreger's account shows how vulnerable sex researchers and their work are to assaults accompanied by belligerence, intimidation, ad hominem attacks, hyperbole, and misrepresentation when their research is "politically incorrect," arguing for explanations that clash with hegemonic or privileged views. Her account also illustrates the problem that attackers within the hegemony, or currently privileged by it, who employ such tactics are generally immune to sanctions after the smoke clears, even when the original research is found to have been proper within the protocols of scientific methodology, analysis, and presentation. In Dreger's account, we learn that nearly all of Bailey's attackers were doing quite well in their careers afterwards. Some were distinguished university professors, but still were not above aggressive, underhanded confrontation, as opposed to civil academic exchange. As some of Dreger's interviewees asked, what researcher would want to examine MTF transsexualism scientifically after the maltreatment that Bailey was subjected to? That is, how can we expect to attain an objectively better understanding of MTF transsexualism when the study of it is bounded by political correctness?

Dreger briefly goes into some of the background behind the transsexual activists' assault on Bailey. Trans people have faced numerous difficulties and traumas trying to adjust to a society that has oppressed them. The oppression has involved criminalization, medicalization, pathologization, involuntary commitment, denial of basic rights, discrimination in housing and jobs, relentless harassment and mockery, and not infrequent physical assaults. The effects have been an ubiquitous feeling in this population of threat to personal safety, work, love life, and family. Blanchard, the developer of the theory that Bailey followed in trying to understand MTF transsexuals, characterized some MTF transsexuals' orientation as an "erotic target location error," a characterization that can easily be supposed to add fuel to

the fire already set by the long history of oppression. From this backdrop, it is not difficult to understand the impulse in trans activists to have supporters of this theory “infiltrated and taken out” and then “vectored and destroyed,” as Dreger documented.

But does their history of oppression warrant the tactics they employed? As Dreger noted, the transsexual activists’ fear was that Bailey’s book would popularize a theory they opposed, given that the book had the imprimatur of the National Academies and was written by a well-established sexologist and psychologist for mass consumption. If one reads Foucault (1990), who summarized well the meddling nature of psychiatrists and other helping professionals as they “entomologized” sex “perverts” at the end of the 19th century, while subordinating their science to the imperatives of morality and the powers of order in exchange for the power immanent in their discourse, then one can empathize with the trans activists’ anger at any further instances of perceived entomologizing. One can understand that trans people want to live life in dignity, without society thinking that they are committing an “erotic target location error.” Thus, we can understand their impulse to attack and to substitute their discourse for the psychiatrists’ or psychologists’. As Foucault (1990) observed, the 18th through 20th centuries brought us an unprecedented explosion in discourses about sexuality, all more or less centered on reconstituting power relations to the advantage of the authors of these discourses. The discourse of the psychiatrist has been an especially powerful one, especially with regards to persons on the sexual periphery, and so we might expect sexually peripheralized persons or groups to strike back discursively, and stridently so, if they have the opportunity. That is simply the politics of discourse and power that Foucault described well.

On the other hand, keeping in mind that explaining is not excusing, in sexological science it will not do to stand by as its knowledge is corrupted by political argumentation and ideology. The same can be said for academia more generally and for professional publications tied to academia, where objective truth and its pursuit should take priority over politics. When activists conspire to “infiltrate and take out” or to “vector and destroy” a social scientist solely or principally for political reasons, then that strikes against academic freedom. In Dreger’s account of the attacks, there was no indication that the trans activists were disputing Bailey’s ideas for anything other than political reasons. There was no discussion from them involving, for example, empirical, cross-cultural, historical, cross-species, or evolutionary data or perspectives, all of which have some bearing on this issue. Only subjective realities and fears of damaged images were put forth. The practical objection to their behavior, aside from its injuriousness to Bailey the researcher, is that it acts against the pursuit of objective truth, which needs room

within a dialectical exchange to emerge. Such room is especially needed when understanding of a phenomenon is far from complete, as is the case with MTF transsexualism. Over a wide range of sexual and gender phenomena, we have repeatedly seen that therapeutically- and politically-based theories have been far less than adequate in validly accounting for these phenomena in scientific terms. What is needed for scientific understanding is the freedom to develop alternative, even iconoclastic, approaches and explanations.

Contrary to Bailey’s critics, as Dreger documented, Bailey was not reckless in his presentation, ideologically bent on subjugating or denigrating the people in his investigation; instead, he defied politically left–right leanings and presented wide-ranging ideas in trying to grapple with this complex phenomenon. Whether his ideas are factually correct is still to be decided; what matters is that they can be seen as science-advancing, challenging the boundaries of conventional thinking on transsexualism dialectically. What we know about the advance of knowledge and science, from philosophers such as Mill and Kuhn, freedom of inquiry and expression and the serious questioning of conventional thinking are central to this advance, not inimical to it.

A larger problem above and beyond the activists’ politicking was the easy acceptance they found among others in academia and the media, who took up the activists’ political cause and disseminated it, to the detriment of Bailey, science, and the pursuit of objective truth. After a long history of oppression, transsexuals have at long last achieved at least one set of allies—diversity-embracing progressives in academia and their counterparts in the liberal media—who are “politically correct” on racial, sexual, and gender issues. This political correctness traces back to the liberation and victimization movements of the 1960s and early 1970s (Best, 1997). To be sure, all these movements were based on deep-seated foundations of oppression and injustice over decades, centuries, or millennia. The problem is, as Best (1997) documented, once these movements began coming into power, vocal advocates within them frequently hyperbolized matters as a strategy for greater political gains. This hyperbole involved expanding definitions for what constituted victims to increase the aggrieved class, injustice-collecting of atrocity stories for emotional impact, and vilification of opponents and actual or perceived offenders to weaken their points of view and stifle debate. As embracing victimological causes became fashionable in academia and the liberal media, such hyperbole easily filtered into the social sciences and across the general population as well. Problematically, the politically correct “truths” thus generated became injurious to scientific activity and academic freedom.

Illustrative of these victimization movements is radical feminism, which emerged as a vocal, confrontational subgroup

within feminism in the 1970s. This movement was quite influential in not only altering power relations between the genders but in manufacturing and promoting politically useful “realities” to this end (Angelides, 2004; Sommers, 1995). Radical feminism and MTF transsexual advocacy are related to one another in their shared striving for feminine empowerment against traditionally hegemonic masculinity. Examining radical feminism can be of some use, because it provided a model for political action, which set the tone for aggressive gender-related protest and which can be presumed to have influenced others in their struggles on gender issues (e.g., MTF transsexuals).

Sommers (1995) provided a poignant critique of radical feminism (“gender feminism” in her usage), detailing its hyperboles made in service of gender politics, hyperboles that were facilely assimilated into the mainstream. One was the claim that 150,000 women and girls in the U.S. died each year from anorexia nervosa caused by the “androcentric system,” when the Center for Disease Control’s more objective estimate was 100 (and not necessarily from the “androcentric system”). Another was the claim, based on a March of Dimes study, that battery of pregnant women was the main cause of birth defects, when no such study had ever been done. Yet another was that females were battered 40% more on Superbowl Sundays, a claim without merit. What is most significant about the charges that Sommers detailed is how facilely they were accepted in academia in gender studies and other programs and by the liberal media, which uncritically disseminated them. The moral of this victimization movement’s approach was that “truth” is something that is not necessarily true but that is politically useful, and that efforts to manufacture such “truth” have significant payoffs in a post-1960s society that has been primed to be receptive to the “victim” message (cf. Best, 1997).

Sommers (1995) documented hyperbole in sexual areas as well. One key example was “one in four,” which became the “official” figure for rapes of women by men. Sommers showed that the figure had been inflated four-fold by the radical feminist researchers who conducted the study yielding this figure. More recently, Angelides (2004) documented radical feminist hyperbole in sexual and gender relations, arguing that this movement used issues such as sexual harassment, adult pornography, rape, incest, and child sexual abuse (CSA) to attack masculinity, male sexuality, and the “patriarchy” in attempts to reconstitute power relations between the sexes. Focusing on CSA, he documented how radical feminists overturned more nuanced opinion among professionals before the mid-1970s to reframe CSA as all about power, in which the older person invariably possesses all of it while the younger partner possesses none of it, irrespective of circumstances. Their reframing subsequently worked itself into all influential professional theorizing on CSA, holding it to be an act of violence that devastates all its

victims. The hyperbole became so intense and extreme that it led to a moral panic in the 1980s involving widespread manufactured claims of satanic ritual day care abuse and recovered memories of childhood incest, which wreaked havoc on numerous hapless victims (Angelides, 2004; Jenkins, 1998).

In short, radical feminist tactics have been influential in reconstituting sexual and gender relations over the last four decades. Their tactics helped erode or “queer” the sharp distinctions or binaries between masculinity and femininity, which had been regnant, decidedly privileging the former (Angelides, 2004). These tactics, however, as the foregoing examples illustrate, have been far from benign in their effects on objective truth, which has been repeatedly reconstructed and compromised in service of political ends. Moreover, resource to these tactics has been reinforced by progressives’ facile acceptance of hyperbole from the victim class aimed at the oppressor class. Transsexual activism, which itself has centered its arguments on gender issues, can be understood better through the perspective of its ideological cousin, radical feminism. Its strident response to Bailey is consistent with the tone set by radical feminism.

Dreger, who identifies herself as a longstanding advocate of transsexual causes, analyzes whether Bailey’s book was derogatory towards transsexuals. If she judged that it was, she presumably would have pounced on him as other transsexual advocates had. Given that she found that Bailey had not been derogatory or guilty of any other serious complaint, it seems that it would have been appropriate to offer suggestions on sanctions against the aggressors in the Bailey affair as a matter of fairness and balance, because they were derogatory towards Bailey. But no such suggestions appeared. Surely, if such underhanded attacking can be done with impunity, which it was here, and which it frequently has been done in regards to other sex researchers championing iconoclastic ideas or conclusions, then the advance of sound sexological science on controversial issues is and will continue to be held hostage to politics.

To illuminate further the Bailey affair and the attacks that “politically incorrect” sex research invites, consider some of the studies conducted by me (Rind, 2005; Rind, Tromovitch, & Bauserman, 1998). In the Rind et al. (1998) *Psychological Bulletin* meta-analysis, my co-authors and I examined the degree of relationship between CSA and psychological problems, concluding that the field had vastly exaggerated the association. While it has become politically incorrect to speak negatively of transsexualism, it has become politically incorrect *not* to speak negatively of CSA. The study was fiercely attacked by both progressives and conservatives until it was finally condemned by the U.S. Congress. An American Association for the Advancement of Science committee examined the controversy, and rather than finding any fault with our study, the committee attacked

our critics. Other researchers and authors, who have similarly tried to restore some complexity to this oversimplified topic, have been hounded as well, always with impunity, which can only discourage future critical examination. The attacks on politically incorrect CSA research and views find parallels in the Bailey affair. Gender politics have been at the base of constructions of both CSA and MTF transsexualism, and they have encouraged strident response to deconstructions or reconstructions of either.

More recently, I have examined pederasty, i.e., sexual relations between men and male adolescents (Rind, 2005). The article was requested by the *Journal of Homosexuality* to close out a special issue with a focus on pederasty in ancient Greece and Rome. The assignment was to tie together the historical record with modern empirical data. The article briefly examined historical, cross-cultural, cross-species, and empirical data, and then speculated that pederasty may have a natural basis. This speculation, even as tentative as it was, constituted a clear violation of the political correctness discussed previously, where only conclusions pointing to disease or disturbance in this area are permissible. When the article was about to be published, both conservatives and progressives protested, whereupon the publisher, Haworth Press, withdrew it almost immediately. This hurried response, which derived in part from the attacks on the Rind et al. (1998) study, provides evidence for the chilling effect that hyperbolized attacks can have.

The tales of the attacks on Bailey's (2003) book on MTF transsexualism and this author's article on pederasty have deeper layers. Virtually every cross-cultural review of male homosexuality concludes that male homosexuality has usually appeared in two main forms: transgenerational (pederasty) and transgenderal (transsexualism) (e.g., Greenberg, 1988). The fortunes of the two in terms of practice and acceptance have varied widely across cultures and time as a function of differing social structures and belief systems (Greenberg, 1988; Williams, 1999). Williams (1999), in his authoritative review of Roman homosexualities, extensively documented that, in ancient Rome, pederasty was held as normative, normal, and natural, while effeminacy (e.g., transgenderism) was held as disgraceful. Men who castrated themselves (for religious reasons) were the most disgraceful and served as the "scare-figures" of the day. Rome was a culture that highly esteemed masculinity and created sharp binaries between the genders. This pattern, as Williams noted, has been common across time and place. Anomalous by comparison, in the modern post-1960s West, masculinity has been considerably eroded, gender has been queered, and effeminacy is no longer disgraceful. Unlike Rome and many other societies, ours has constructed rigid binaries around age, such that those who have sex with minors are the current

"scare-figures." To talk of pederasty in a cool manner would have drawn no notice in Rome, where the poets celebrated it and prominent emperors practiced it. To do so today, however, is scandalous. In the case of transsexualism, the reverse now obtains.

Historical or cross-cultural perspectives strikingly point to the role that social structures, cultural values, and ideologies play in constructions of sexualities, constructions that need more serious attention among scientists in their evaluations of peripheral sexualities, which are especially vulnerable to being embraced and normalized or condemned and pathologized based on these social forces. Research that steps outside the boundaries imposed by hegemonic cultural values and ideologies to question privileged constructions of sexuality may be accused of championing bigotry or abuse, while practicing pseudo-science. But such research is arguably essential to the advancement of sexological science, which has too often been slanted and biased by these values and ideologies. Rather than giving lip-service to academic freedom while characterizing such research efforts as beyond the pale, as critics have tended to do, what is needed for the advancement of sexology is room for enhanced dialectic. Given the long history of sexosophies misrepresenting themselves as sexology, scientists and modern academia can do better than catering to the powers of order, which in the present day are, to a significant degree, a regnant political correctness.

## References

- Angelides, S. (2004). Feminism, child sexual abuse, and the erasure of child sexuality. *GLQ*, 10, 141–177.
- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- Best, J. (1997). Victimization and the victim industry. *Society*, May/June, 9–17.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *History of sexuality. An introduction: Vol. I*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Greenberg, D. (1988). *The construction of homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jenkins, P. (1998). *Moral panic: Changing concepts of the child-molester in modern America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rind, B. (2005). *Pederasty: An integration of cross-cultural, cross-species, and empirical data*. Temple University, Unpublished manuscript.
- Rind, B., Tromovitch, P., & Bauserman, R. (1998). A meta-analytic examination of assumed properties of child sexual abuse using college samples. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 22–53.
- Sommers, C. H. (1995). *Who stole feminism? How women have betrayed women*. New York: Touchtone.
- Williams, C. A. (1999). *Roman homosexuality: Ideologies of masculinity in classical antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

## McCloskey and Me: A Back-and-Forth

Seth Roberts

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

McCloskey and Conway should have gotten their story straight. In a review of Bailey's (2003) book, McCloskey (2003) wrote: "Almost everyone in the scientific study of sex and gender has checked and balanced and resisted the Clarke Institute's theory. It has proven to be wrong and has been laid aside by the mainstream of gender researchers." The review never made clear who "almost everyone" is. Meanwhile, Conway's (2003) website on the subject had little to say about Blanchard's typology other than this: "It is unfalsifiable (note: any trans woman who reports that she doesn't fit the classifications is explained by the "theory" as being a "liar"). Furthermore, the scheme has no predictive capabilities. Thus it is thus untestable."

Well, which is it? "Proven wrong" by "almost everyone" (McCloskey) or "unfalsifiable" and "untestable" (Conway)? In the course of their attack on Bailey, surely McCloskey and Conway talked many times. This discrepancy in how they attacked Blanchard's theory suggests how little they cared about its truth—or that they knew it was true.

After Dreger's article became available, I posted this and other comments critical of McCloskey and Conway on my blog ([blog.sethroberts.net](http://blog.sethroberts.net)). Soon after that (August 24, 2007), McCloskey e-mailed me. In part, she wrote:

In case you are more careful and thoughtful than your blog suggests, I attach a couple of attempts to persuade you that you've got the story wrong. Dreger is wrong, and what's more important in the long run a theory based on ignoring most of the scientific evidence, and appealing instead to the sort of prejudices about queers you praise in your piece, is wrong.

Attached to her e-mail were her *Reason* review of Bailey's book (from which I had quoted), a comment by her on Dreger's article, and her vita. In my reply (August 24, 2007), I asked her to point out any factual mistakes in what I'd written; she never did. I continued:

In your article about Dreger's paper, you "deny that [you] worked 'to ruin Bailey professional and personally'" but this denial is incomplete and unconvincing. It's incomplete because you don't defend the letter you wrote to the State of Illinois complaining that Bailey had practiced medicine without a license. That is exactly trying to ruin someone. And you don't convince me that causing to be filed an absurd human-subjects complaint against Bailey constitutes some sort of virtuous act. "Complaining through channels about mistreatment of his victims"! Please. It is another example of trying to ruin someone.

In your e-mail to me, you write: "What's more important in the long run is a theory based on ignoring most of the scientific evidence, and appealing instead to the sort of prejudices about queers you praise in your piece, is wrong." This may be the big issue to you; it isn't the big issue to me. The big issue for me is free speech. Two professors (you and Conway) with great power tried to silence someone who said something they didn't like. I titled my blog posts on the topic "Can Professors Say the Truth?" The "truth" was not Blanchard's theory; it was that Blanchard had proposed a theory, a theory that Bailey accurately described. Blanchard said something; Bailey accurately reported what he said. The accurate reporting was the "truth." Somehow it was not enough for you and Conway that Blanchard's theory, if false, would eventually be discarded. Somehow it was not enough to attack the theory; you had to attack Bailey too,

---

S. Roberts (✉)  
Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley,  
Berkeley, CA 94708, USA  
e-mail: [twoutopias@gmail.com](mailto:twoutopias@gmail.com)

and in an awful way—by filing absurd complaints with credulous and powerful bureaucracies.

To this, McCloskey wrote a long reply. Her main points seemed to be these:

“The big issue” for you is free speech. In what way have I or anyone else in this debate abridged anyone’s free speech? We aren’t the government. It’s just confused to identify published complaints by private citizens about someone—justified in this case, but let’s for the moment set the issue of the merits aside—with censorship or some other governmental act in violation of “free speech.” People complain about other people all the time. For example, I complain about Paris Hilton.

Your confusion fits smoothly with your strange assertion, swallowed from Dr. Dreger’s self-dramatizing piece ... that we have “great power.” ... Hmm. In what does our great power lie? Professor Bailey, like us, is a senior, tenured professor. We objected to his work and to his behavior, through our writings and through channels. What exactly is the exercise of “great power” there? Isn’t this power called “the power of the pen,” and isn’t that exactly the “free speech” you believe you are so courageously defending? The National Academy of Science, which published Bailey’s unscientific book, ... is powerful. That’s the hand of a governmental advisory body, great power indeed, right? We are a couple of professors not in sexology who objected to the mistreatment of some of our poor and ignorant friends, and objected to Bailey’s theories and especially to his lack of interest in investigating the bulk of the actual scientific evidence on the matter, namely, any serious sample of the lives of gender crossers. Where’s the power?

And how about *our* right of free speech? We complained to the licensing board about Bailey practicing psychology without a license and you regard that action as requiring defense. (One reason the board did not act, by the way, is that the physician-created statute of limitation on malpractice had run out. It has a notably short fuse.) We complained about his abuse of scientific subjects (it’s his claim, not ours, that they were scientific subjects), to the proper authorities. The proper authorities took what you call an “absurd” complaint most seriously, and Bailey resigned from the chairmanship of his department. You regard our actions not as the “free speech” you believe you are defending but as attempts to destroy Bailey....

Let me ask you what you would do in a similar case. I don’t know what your scientific work has been, but let’s be symmetrical. Suppose an economist had written a book with a exiguous selection of evidence saying that psychologists were liars and sexual perverts, and refused to risk his theory in a serious scientific test by

interviewing a wide range of psychologists. Suppose he found, by searching in places where prostitutes gather, some psychologists working as prostitutes, and concluded that psychologists tended to be prostitutes. Suppose the psychologists he interviewed were very eager to get The Letter that would, they believed in their innocence, give them, say, very valuable rights to trade on the New York Stock Exchange, and suppose the economist said he would write the letter if they would talk to him. Suppose he then in addition slept with one of the psychologists, and then used the “evidence” thus acquired to support his unscientific theories in a long book published with the government’s imprimatur filled with anti-psychologist lore. First, kill all the psychologists.... When someone mugs you or a friend on the street, do you report it to the police? And would your just complaints against such a character be an attempt to ruin him? Or would it be fair comment in a free society and the exercise of the rights and duties of a citizen?

I replied (August 26, 2007):

“In what way have I or anyone else in this debate abridged anyone’s free speech?” By attacking someone—Bailey—who said something you didn’t like. Fearful of future attacks from you or Conway or Andrea James, others will keep their mouths shut. The term is *chilling effect*. Here is Wikipedia’s definition: “A chilling effect is a situation where speech or conduct is suppressed or limited by fear of penalization at the hands of an individual or group.” Wikipedia’s example is fear of a lawsuit—which you have threatened (“I’m going to sue Bailey for defamation if ...”). Minutes after I posted my second blog entry about the attacks on Bailey, the first post that mentioned you, I got an email from a wise friend. “There has been a big McCloskey/Bailey feud, I believe involving also lawsuits or the threat thereof,” he wrote. It was a warning. He was worried.

“In what does our great power lie?” In four things: (1) Job security. Not only tenure—you and Conway are near the top of your professions. (2) Money. (3) Respect. Your upcoming honorary degree, for example. A recent memoir by an esteemed economist praised you for your “courage.” Conway’s membership in the National Academy of Engineering. (4) Knowing how the system works—in particular how to get powerful bureaucracies (such as Northwestern’s) to do what you want. “We are a couple of professors not in sexology.” Please. You and Conway are not average professors. What fraction of professors get honorary degrees? What fraction of engineering professors are in the National Academy of Engineering?

“What about our right to free speech?” You think calling your absurd complaints to credulous and powerful

authorities “free speech” somehow defends them? I don’t...

How would I react if your scenario about psychologists came to pass? I would do nothing. I’m supposed to get upset that Person X asked Person Y for a letter and before Person Y wrote that letter he asked Person X to speak to him—perhaps about the contents of the letter? On what planet is that wrong? I should react because someone “had sex with a psychologist”? I should be upset that the person “used the ‘evidence’ thus acquired to support his unscientific theories in a long book”? We are at a curious place in intellectual history when a Distinguished Professor of this and that, soon to receive an honorary degree from a major university, thinks that a sane person might be upset that someone had sex with a psychologist.

Your complaints to powerful and credulous authorities, you say, were not absurd because they were taken seriously. (“They took what you call an ‘absurd’ complaint most seriously.”) Okay, here is why your complaints were absurd. 1. You and Conway complained to the State of Illinois that Bailey was practicing psychology without a license because he wrote letters on behalf of several persons who had come to him for help. He helped them! They came to him for help! To complain about this is absurd. To say your complaint “protects” anyone is absurd. To say what Bailey did resembles “mugging” is absurd. No one seeks out a mugger and asks to be mugged. 2. You and Conway orchestrated the filing of human-subjects complaints against Bailey. These complaints assumed that persons mentioned in stories in Bailey’s book were “research subjects”—simply because they were in the book. Never before in the history of science had the subject of a story told to illustrate a point been thereby considered a research subject. Bailey’s book is not a scientific monograph. It is not a piece of science. It is a trade book *about* science. When I or anyone else gives a lecture about a scientific subject, and tell a story from everyday life to make the conclusions come alive, do we need informed consent from everyone mentioned in the story? Of course not. No one has ever been required to do this. No one has ever done this. No one has ever even conceived of such a thing. The whole idea is absurd. Northwestern administrators may be credulous; I’m not.

To which McCloskey wrote another long reply (August 27, 2007). About “chilling effect,” she said:

Criticizing someone is “abridging free speech”? Good Lord, how do you think the Constitutional Convention went? Have you listened to a political campaign? Have you participated in any scientific dispute? I guess not.

If Bailey is chilled, perhaps he should get out of the cold room. If one doesn’t like the heat of real scientific disagreement, get out of the kitchen. Free speech is how science advances. It ain’t beanbag.

About her and Conway’s power, McCloskey said:

The “great power” is on the other foot. Relative to the Hispanic women he abused, Bailey had the power.... Relative to Sex Scientists like Bailey and Zucker, and the reactionary and queer-hating people that Bailey, and now you, have inspired (look at the blogs, dear), Lynn and I, as notable queers, do not have the power. Relative to the authority of *The New York Times* ... the “power” of our articles is merely, as I said, a feeble one. The feeble power of truth against prejudice and ignorance and cowardice.

A few less relevant emails followed. McCloskey suggested that the correspondence get shorter and shorter. Her arguments became clearer (August 28, 2007):

Your only—*only*—argument against our complaints about Bailey’s behavior is to assert repeatedly, unadorned by evidence, that they were “absurd.” Northwestern University did not think them absurd. They fired Bailey from the chairmanship; they investigated him for a year. The lawyer we consulted did not think them absurd; nor did the state licensing bureau. Alas, the statute of limitation had run out.

We did nothing to “silence” anyone. Get this: *we are not the government*. We argued with Bailey. We complained about his behavior. None of that constitutes “silencing,” unless indeed poor, dear Bailey is too feeble for this world.

I replied (August 28, 2007):

Please see my earlier letter for a detailed explanation, including evidence, of why your complaints were absurd. No one has ever gone to a mugger and asked to be mugged. That’s my evidence for your State of Illinois complaint. And no one has ever been considered a research subject because they were in a story in a trade book. That’s my evidence for your Northwestern complaint. When you say that Bailey left the chairmanship because of your complaints, you are wrong.

“We did nothing to ‘silence’ anyone.” If you don’t understand the term *chilling effect*, we are again at a curious point in intellectual history.

She replied (August 28, 2007):

Anyone who is chilled by being challenged intellectually, I suppose you agree, doesn’t belong in intellectual life.

Anyone who is chilled by being investigated for wrongdoing when he's done wrong is just a moral coward, as I reckon Bailey to be. You don't understand The Letter if you don't think the women were mugged. You've not walked in those shoes, or bothered to find out. You haven't read Bailey's book if you think the women were not "research subjects." He called them that, and bragged about it. After the book came out he said, oh, it was "only a trade book. Not science."

I replied (August 28, 2007):

If you believe that Bailey should be punished for helping those who came to him for help, you have a most unusual and unfortunate view of how people should treat each other.

If you can't tell the difference between a trade book and a research monograph, we are again at a curious place in intellectual history.

McCloskey's brief reply ("OK, OK .... The next time you hear of a queer being murdered, think what you've done", August 29, 2007) added no substance.

When McCloskey posted our correspondence on her website ([www.deidremcloskey.org](http://www.deidremcloskey.org)), she omitted my last email ("If you believe ..."). On August 31, 2007, I emailed her pointing out the omission but my assiduous correspondent did not reply.

## References

- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- Conway, L. (2003). An investigative report into the publication of J. Michael Bailey's book on transsexualism by the National Academies. <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/LynnsReviewOfBaileysBook2.html>. Retrieved 2 February 2008.
- McCloskey, D. (2003). Queer science. *Reason*, 35(6), 46–52.



## Sex, Sexuality, and Gender Dichotomized: Transgender Homosexuality in Israel

Amir Rosenmann · Marilyn P. Safir

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

Dreger's illuminative narrative of the *TMWWBQ* controversy is highly informative in explicating the emergence of the constricted discourse surrounding Bailey's book. Unfortunately, the discourse became disproportionately focused on the topics of autogynephilia and homosexual transsexuality and its clashes with transsexual self-narratives. This discourse has shifted attention from many other significant issues Bailey popularized in his book. We believe that his discussion of models of homosexuality and their apparent relations with gender non-conformity warrants more complete scrutiny. This, then, is the focus of our comment.

Before Bailey (2003) turns to his highly controversial discussion of transsexuality, he distinguishes between "egalitarian homosexuality" and "transgender homosexuality." Egalitarian homosexuality, considered most prevalent in Western societies, is defined as the relationship between "two individuals of similar age and social class" (p. 137), a relationship in which both individuals are expected to clearly define themselves as members of their genetic sex and gender. Conversely, the transgender homosexual model requires one man of the same-sex dyad to "[take] on a feminine role, often dressing as a woman and taking a woman's name, and has sex with masculine men" (p. 134). This model is more frequent in non-Western societies, and in many cases is integrated into the cultural gender typology. Bailey, recapping theories such as that offered by Ross (1983), claims that men who are predisposed to feminine role-identification construct their identities according to the model of homosexual relations most accepted in their respective societies. Thus, femininely predisposed men most often assume a gay identity and engage in egalitarian

homosexuality in the West, while similarly predisposed genetic males in Thailand, for instance, may opt to embody the transgender model of homosexuality, self identifying as *kathoey*, and lead a transgendered or possibly transsexual life.

Israeli society is an amalgam of Western and Middle-Eastern influences. While Western identity typologies are widely employed (gay or ge'e, literally "proud" and phonemically similar to gay, are commonly used identifications), the endogenous Middle-Eastern cultural sub-stratum is easily observable. It is fairly uncommon for men to self-identify as gay (or equivalent) outside the metropolitan area of Tel-Aviv, where social acceptance of such labels can be very low. Conversely, the prevalence of effeminate men seems higher in Israel than in more typical Western societies. Much as Ross (1983) hypothesized, it appears that Israel's conservative gender-role differentiation directs some same-sex inclined men towards adaptation of more or less feminized gender/sex identities. Perhaps the most compelling example of this is Dana International, a transsexual woman who started out as an effeminate gay youth, and went on to win the 1998 Eurovision contest for Israel.

We propose that in gender conservative societies, transsexuality may be more acceptable than non-transgendered homosexuality, as it does not pose a similar threat to the gender divide. Indeed, Dana is quoted in an interview from 1996 saying that "where a homosexual will have a bottle smashed over his head, a trans woman will receive indecent propositions" (Kampinski, 1996), presumably because the trans women does not equally violate sexual roles. Accordingly, in his seminal ethnography of men who have sex with men (MSM) in Israel and elsewhere in the Middle-East, Sofer (1992) describes the unequal treatment of men engaging in sexual relations. Much like in Latino cultures (e.g., Manalansan, 1996), the penetrator's heterosexual identity may not suffer from sexual relations with another men, because of his

---

A. Rosenmann (✉) · M. P. Safir  
Department of Psychology, University of Haifa, Haifa 31905,  
Israel  
e-mail: arosenmann@gmail.com

conformity to the male sexual role. The penetrated partner, however, is treated with extreme prejudice. In this universe of cultural meanings, the assumption of the penetrated role in sex among men is intrinsically linked with devalued femininity. This “sexual femininity” is expected to manifest in the gender presentation of the individual, and possibly in his or her surgically altered body. Anecdotally, the Arabic word used to denote a man who has been penetrated by another man—“maniak”—is one of the harsher curses commonly used in Israeli vernacular.

These observations may also be linked with cross-cultural research differentiating between collectivistic and individualistic cultures (e.g., Oyserman, Coon, & Kimmelmeier, 2002). Collectivism places a high premium on group harmony, conservation of traditions and social status quo. It may be postulated that, in such societies, individuals are expected to strictly adhere to socially proscribed roles, and thus embody different organic and social components of femininity along side with “feminized sexuality.” Individualistic cultures, by comparison, emphasize the individual’s pursuit to fully express his/her inner attributes. Social roles are not as binding and thus it is the attraction to men (conceptualized as a stable, innate individual trait) that is pivotal in defining an individual as a member of the gay sexual minority, and not the specific sexual role he plays in such encounters (Rosenmann & Safir, 2007).

We believe the study of these issues may benefit greatly from interdisciplinary cross-cultural scientific attention. We hope that the broad appeal of *TMWWBQ* will facilitate such

exchange of ideas, and allow for further explication of the relations among sex, sexuality, and gender from a cross-cultural perspective.

## References

- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- Kampinski, T. (Winter, 1996). Bemakom shehomosexual mekabel bakbuk barosh, koksinelet mekabelet hatsa’a meguna: Ra’ayon im dana international [Where a homosexual will have a bottle smashed over his head, a trans woman will receive indecent propositions: An interview with Dana International]. *Tat-Tarbut: rivon le-tarbut homoit ve-lesbit.*, pp. 2–6.
- Manalansan, M. (1996). Double minorities: Latino, Black, and Asian men who have sex with men. In R. C. Savin-Williams & K. M. Cohen (Eds.), *The lives of lesbians, gays, and bisexuals: Children to adults* (pp. 393–415). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kimmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 3–72.
- Rosenmann, A., & Safir, M. P. (2007). Gay identity nonendorsement and the role of dissociative characteristics in a culturally diverse online sample of men who have sex with men. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy: Journal of NSRC*, 4(2), 18–26.
- Ross, M. W. (1983). *Homosexuality and social sex roles*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Sofer, J. (1992). Testimonies from the holy land: Israeli and Palestinian men. In A. Schmitt & J. Sofer (Eds.), *Sexuality and eroticism among males in Moslem societies* (pp. 105–120). Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.

## A Matter of Perspective: A Transsexual Woman-Centric Critique of Dreger's "Scholarly History" of the Bailey Controversy

Julia Serano

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

As someone who is both an academic scientist and a transsexual woman and activist, I would very much welcome a proper historical analysis of the controversy over Bailey's book *The Man Who Would Be Queen*: one that fully explores the many ethical issues raised by both the book and the backlash that ensued, one that thoughtfully articulates the perspectives of both researchers/gatekeepers and their transsexual subjects/clients while taking into consideration the institutionalized power that the former group holds over the latter. On paper, Dreger seems well suited for the task given her experience as a science historian, ethicist, and an advocate for sexual minorities in her past work with the Intersex Society of North America. Unfortunately, while Dreger describes her article as a "scholarly history," it fails in this regard for numerous reasons, several of which I will address here.

The first rule of thumb when conducting a historical analysis—particularly one involving any backlash or tipping point event—is to provide the necessary background and the socio-political context in which the involved parties are situated within in order to understand the underlying forces that helped to shape the ways in which people reacted and events unfolded. In her lengthy article, Dreger devotes approximately 14 pages to Bailey's conceiving and writing the book and the subject matter contained therein, 17 pages to describing the backlash against the book (with an overwhelming emphasis on purported attempts by a handful of trans activists to "ruin" Bailey), and 13 pages to clearing Bailey of most of the charges of misconduct that were made against him. In other words, it is primarily a Bailey-centric reading of the controversy. What is

conspicuously absent from Dreger's account is an adequate examination of transsexual women's realities and perspectives on the issue. Indeed, in her discussion of the backlash, she offers one mere paragraph to address the role that "the long history of oppression against trans people" may have played in fueling trans activists' responses to the book. And in that paragraph, she offers one brief and vague acknowledgement of the fact that "trans people...have had their identities unnecessarily medicalized and pathologized" without even mentioning that it is Bailey himself (and other psychologists/sexologists) who pathologize us. From a trans perspective, the Bailey controversy is part of a much larger story, one that has unfolded over the last half century, during which time there has been growing resentment and resistance within the trans community to having our identities and realities defined by nontrans researchers/gatekeepers. Because Dreger overlooks this background and power dynamic, her article is largely an ahistorical "scholarly history."

Dreger glosses over or completely ignores three realities of trans women's lives that are crucial to appreciate if one wants to truly understand why the backlash against Bailey's book occurred. First, transsexuals' gender identities and lived experiences as members of our identified sex are deemed to be less socially and legally valid than those of nontranssexuals (Currah, Juang, & Minter, 2006). Most of the discrimination, demonization, harassment, etc., that trans people face in our daily lives is predicated on this double standard. For this reason, transsexuals are constantly placed into positions where we have to account for, and/or fiercely defend, our gender identities in order to obtain the same rights and respect that nontranssexuals take for granted. Second, transsexual women are routinely sexualized in our culture (Serano, 2007). This can be seen in the media, which sexualizes our motives for transitioning by portraying us as either sexual deceivers who "prey" on unsuspecting heterosexual men, or as men who

---

J. Serano (✉)  
Department of Molecular and Cell Biology, University  
of California at Berkeley, LSA Building #3200, Berkeley,  
CA 94720, USA  
e-mail: serano@berkeley.edu

simply “get off” on the idea of being a woman (suspiciously resembling the “homosexual” and “autogynephilic” transsexual stereotypes Bailey forwards). In my own experience, I have found that as soon as people discover that I am a transsexual woman, they often feel entitled to openly objectify my body, make sexually graphic comments, and/or ask lurid questions that are far more debasing and hardcore than anything I experience when I am presumed to be a nontranssexual woman. As with all forms of nonconsensual sexualization, this has the very real negative effect of disempowering trans women in our day-to-day lives. Third, the delegitimization and sexualization of trans women’s gender identities occurs not only in mainstream society, but within medical/psychological/sexological settings. To this day, transsexuals have to submit to psychological pathologization and live up to psychologists’ often sexist and heterosexist standards of womanhood or manhood in order to physically and legally transition. The gatekeeper role positions psychologists and sexologists as “experts” on transsexuality—their opinions and perspectives on our experiences are typically deemed more valid than those of trans people themselves. Further, the gatekeeper system has regularly sexualized trans people on the MTF spectrum (while largely ignoring those on the FTM spectrum) with regards to taxonomy, theories of etiology, descriptions of case histories, and diagnoses, and it is well documented that many gatekeepers have based their recommendations for sex reassignment on whether they considered the trans woman in question to be physically attractive and/or willing to dress and act in a hyperfeminine manner (Bolin, 1988; Namaste, 2000; Serano, 2007).

Because Dreger is either ignorant of, or unconcerned by, the ways in which trans women have been historically and institutionally marginalized in society and within psychology, her accounts of the trans community’s reaction to Bailey’s book are superficial and patronizing. For example, she dismisses trans people’s accusations that Bailey’s views and his book are “transphobic” by claiming that he advocates sex reassignment for transsexuals and he genuinely likes trans people. This belittles trans people’s legitimate concerns that Bailey’s book (1) is highly pathologizing, reducing trans womanhood to the status of a paraphilia, (2) encourages readers to think of trans women as either “homosexual” or “autogynephilic” *men*, thus fostering the idea that our female gender identities are not to be taken seriously, (3) routinely and extensively sexualizes trans women and encourages a largely trans-ignorant lay audience to do the same, and (4) he positions himself as an authority on transsexuality and repeatedly claims that trans women whose experiences and perspectives contradict his “expert opinion” must be purposely trying to deceive or mislead others. Dreger also chides Roughgarden, Allison, and others for panning Bailey’s book upon first seeing the cover art without any recognition that, being trans women, they would be highly cognizant of how such

imagery both taps into and reinforces the historical delegitimization and sexualization of trans female identities. And Dreger plays down the numerous sexualizing comments Bailey makes about trans women’s physical attractiveness (or lack thereof) by describing these remarks as “germane to his discussion.” Dreger’s repeated attempts to overlook, underplay, or purposely discount trans women’s concerns about Bailey’s book are reminiscent of the way men often dismiss women’s concerns about sexism, or the way heterosexuals are often oblivious to homophobic remarks. Marginalized groups tend to be more fully aware of, and sensitive to, the obstacles, stereotypes, and discriminatory practices they face than those who do not share their experience. The fact that Dreger (who is nontranssexual) so thoroughly dismisses trans people’s concerns about Bailey’s book strikes me as insensitive at best and condescending at worst.

Nowhere is Dreger’s trivializing of trans women’s perspectives more pronounced than in the way she frames the “autogynephilia” debate. Specifically, she creates a false dichotomy between trans women who buy into an overly simplistic “woman trapped inside a man’s body” model and psychologists like Bailey who simply reject that “feminine essence” narrative. Framing the issue this way dumbs down transsexual perspectives of gender. In my experience, most trans people recognize that gender identity, sexual orientation, and gender expression all vary from one another and interact in different and sometimes confounding ways from person to person. Those of us who reject causal theories of autogynephilia typically do so, not because we believe that we are “women trapped in men’s bodies,” or that sexuality plays no role in our explorations of gender, but because such theories naively conflate sexual orientation with gender expression, gender identity, and sex embodiment in a way that contradicts our personal life experiences and that is inconsistent with the vast diversity of trans women that exist. In fact, most trans critiques of autogynephilia center on the fact that this scientifically unsubstantiated theory forces all trans women into one of two rigid categories, nonconsensually defines us in ways that contradict our own personal sense of selves, mistakes correlation for causation, handwaves away nonpathological alternative models that better explain the data, unnecessarily sexualizes and delegitimizes our identities, and has the potential to jeopardize our access to sex reassignment and our social and legal status as women (e.g., Barnes, 2001; Johnson, 2001; Roughgarden, 2004; Serano, 2007; Wyndzen, 2004). Dreger’s false dichotomy invisibilizes this body of work, thus enabling her to overstate the validity of Bailey’s claims without ever seriously considering the real negative impact they might have on trans women’s lives.

While autogynephilia has long been controversial, the backlash against Bailey’s book was admittedly far more intense than anything that had come before it. Dreger seems to attribute this to a calculated attempt by three trans activists,

Conway, James, and McCloskey (CJM), to personally “ruin” Bailey. In Dreger’s article, CJM are portrayed as single-handedly initiating and orchestrating the entire backlash against the book via personal attacks on Bailey. I would argue that this is a rather myopic view, as it both overstates these activists’ influence within the community and underplays the broad consensus of trans activists, allies, and advocates who found the book to be unapologetically arrogant, crass, stigmatizing, sensationalizing, and a distortion of both trans people’s lives and the scientific literature on the subject. If CJM did not become involved, and if no personal attacks were carried out against Bailey, the backlash still would have occurred and it would likely have been just as contentious. The reason is that Bailey’s book—which encourages readers to sexualize trans women and to view us as “men”—was being marketed to a mainstream audience as “science.” This constituted a very real potential political threat to trans women, despite all of Dreger’s dismissive claims to the contrary. Further, the backlash was not merely a response to Bailey’s book, but to decades of having our gender identities and perspectives undermined or reinterpreted by psychologists who claim to know more about us than we know about ourselves.

The backlash against Bailey’s book was a tipping point event, one that was enabled by a decade of trans activism during which trans people finally began to gain a collective voice and to redefine themselves in non-pathological ways (e.g., as transgender or gender variant). There was a broad consensus within the community that Bailey’s book demeaned and misrepresented trans women’s lives and countless trans people and allies expressed their opinions on this manner in legitimate ways (e.g., by writing critiques of the book, signing petitions, writing letters to editors, and so on). Dreger belittles this legitimate community effort by exaggerating the number of trans people who support Bailey’s claims (in my experience, such people represent a very small yet vocal minority within the community) and by focusing almost entirely on the actions of three individuals (CJM). By centering the discussion around the most extreme and unsavory aspects of the backlash, Dreger creates the impression that the entire breadth of the trans community’s response to Bailey’s book was wholly unjustified, unprovoked, and irrational. This, in combination with her failure to provide sufficient historical background and context regarding trans people’s marginalization in society and within psychology, and her continual dismissiveness toward trans people’s concerns about the book, practically strong-arms the reader into viewing the entire backlash as a mass hysterical overreaction on the part of trans people.

To state for the record, I do not condone personal attacks on people. And I believe that Dreger is rightly concerned about the way in which such attacks and threats can create a censoring environment in which people are afraid to say what they believe. The problem is that she seems to have approached the Bailey controversy, not to truly understand why it happened or

why trans activists almost universally decried the book, but rather to solely focus on allegations that CJM tried to “ruin” Bailey. In fact, she seems to have settled on her thesis (i.e., that trans activists took things too far and are a threat to academic freedom of expression) back in June 2006, before she began her investigation into the Bailey controversy (Dreger, 2006). The reason why many trans activists feel that Dreger’s article is problematic is not because they believe that personal attacks are a legitimate tactic in activism, but because their own concerns (i.e., the psychological pathologization, delegitimization, and sexualization of trans identities) have been virtually written out of the story. In this sense, one cannot help but draw parallels between Dreger’s article and Bailey’s book: both are one-sided renditions of issues that critically impact trans people’s lives, both fail to take trans people’s concerns, objections, and differing perspectives seriously, and both are touted as authoritative accounts (Bailey’s as “science” and Dreger’s as “scholarly history”), creating the impression that they are necessarily objective, well reasoned, and academically valid, in opposition to the accounts of trans people, which are (by implication) irredeemably subjective, unreasonable, and academically invalid.

Perhaps the most striking oversight in Dreger’s article (given her position as a bioethicist) is that she eagerly defends academic/scientific freedom of expression without ever engaging in the equally important issue of academic/scientific responsibility. In our society, people tend to view opinions as being inherently valid when they are spoken in the name of science and when the person voicing them has an advanced degree in a germane field. Perhaps nowhere is this more obvious than in public discourses on transsexuality, where the opinions of nontrans “experts” (whether they be psychologists, sexologists, historians, sociologists or gender theorists) regularly trump, or completely stand in for, the perspectives of actual transsexuals. The fact is that when a self-appointed “expert” like Bailey claims that transsexual women transition for purely sexual reasons, and that they are lying if they state otherwise, people will believe him because of his academic/scientist status. For this reason, it is disturbing that Dreger would exonerate Bailey of most of the scientific misconduct charges made against him primarily on the basis that his book was not “science,” without ever taking him to task for misrepresenting his book as “The Science of Gender-Bending and Transsexualism” in the first place. In her article, Dreger claims that Bailey wrote the book “more like a science journalist than a scientist,” but this ignores the fact that he consistently positions himself as a scientist and an expert on transsexualism throughout the book: he claims to know feminine men’s childhood histories and sexual orientations without having to ask them, claims he can tell “homosexual” and “autogynephilic” transsexuals apart just by looking at them, and claims to know which transsexuals are being “honest and open,” and which ones are “lying” and “misleading” (depending on

whether their personal stories support or contradict his worldview).

As a scientist myself, I feel that it is important that we defend scientific freedom of expression. But we must also recognize that with that freedom comes the responsibility not to abuse our positions as scientists. Unfortunately, there has been a long history of dubious research that has lent scientific credence to prejudiced beliefs that already exist in the culture: studies that have claimed to show that people of color are inherently less intelligent than white people, that homosexuals are more criminally-inclined than heterosexuals, or that women are biologically ill-suited for leadership positions. Often, such studies are embraced by the public despite their methodological flaws because they reaffirm and reinforce presumptions and biases that already dominate in the culture. Bailey's book claims to provide a scientific basis for three of the most commonly repeated sexualizing stereotypes of trans women: that we are either perverted men who "get off" on the idea of being women, gay men who transition to female in order to pick up straight men, and/or that we are "especially well suited to prostitution" (Bailey, 2003, p. 185). Like most research that merely confirms popular stereotypes, the data supporting Bailey's claims are weak: He relies primarily on Blanchard's correlations and his own impressions, speculations, and anecdotes. The cavalier way in which Bailey forwards these sexualizing stereotypes with no concern for the profound negative impact they have on trans women's lives is scientifically irresponsible and a misuse of the institutionalized power that he holds over trans people as a psychologist.

The fact that Dreger does not consider this institutionalized erasure of trans women's identities, perspectives, and concerns to be ethically important is troubling its own right.

## References

- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.
- Barnes, K. (2001, Spring). Some observations on autogynephilia. *Transgender Tapestry*, 1(93), 24–25, 62.
- Bolin, A. (1988). *In search of Eve: Transsexual rites of passage*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Harvey.
- Currah, P., Juang, R. M., & Minter, S. P. (Eds.). (2006). *Transgender rights*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dreger, A. D. (2006, June 7). *The blog I write in fear*. Retrieved November 3, 2007, from [http://www.alicedreger.com/in\\_fear.html](http://www.alicedreger.com/in_fear.html).
- Johnson, D. A. (2001, Summer). Is sex necessary? *Transgender Tapestry*, 1(94), 33–36.
- Namaste, V. K. (2000). *Invisible lives: The erasure of transsexual and transgendered people*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Roughgarden, J. (2004, February 11). *The Bailey affair: Psychology perverted*. Retrieved November 3, 2007, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/Reviews/Psychology%20Perverted%20-%20by%20Joan%20Roughgarden.htm>.
- Serano, J. (2007). *Whipping girl: A transsexual woman on sexism and the scapegoating of femininity*. Emeryville, CA: Seal Press.
- Wyndzen, M. H. (2004). *Everything you never wanted to know about autogynephilia (but were afraid you had to ask)*. Retrieved November 3, 2007, from <http://www.genderpsychology.org/autogynephilia>.

## A Social Psychology of a History of a Snippet in the Psychology of Transgenderism

Madeline H. Wyndzen

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

This is not a simple story. It is so complex that it is hard to know what *is* the story. For Dreger, the story is the plight of Bailey after he wrote *The Man Who Would Be Queen*. I would not define the situation this way, but the intersection of our perspectives is very personal to me. I am a psychologist with passionate convictions about the value of our field as a scientific endeavor. I am also transgendered and have, at times, identified myself as everything from “oh no, not me” to cross-dresser, to transsexual, to bi-gendered (someone who embraces different gender roles in different situations).<sup>1</sup> I was a member of Bailey’s “sexnet” discussion list for years before his book and I corresponded with many “pro-” and “anti-” autogynephilia advocates. I was among the first members of Arune’s discussion list for the support of those who identify with autogynephilia, even though I disagree with autogynephilia as a scientific account. I know the “us-versus-them”<sup>2</sup> group polarization mentality Dreger describes and I tried to soften both extremes. My advice was largely ignored. Dreger’s opening remarks gave me hope for someone to succeed where I failed. She suggests that a scholarly history could lessen persistent tensions. I admire interdisciplinary work and hoped for her success at combining psychology with history. But as I read the coming pages, disillusion grew. I realized that I had read it before; it rehashes the pro-autogynephilia side. How could someone with such scholarship in writing history be pulled so much by one side that she misses so much of the other? To help answer this question, I fill in some gaps in Dreger’s history and offer tentative explanations using social psychology.

For me, the not-so-simple story is the struggle of transgendered persons to define themselves, rather than being

defined by others, such as some second-wave feminists and some clinical psychologists and psychiatrists. This story has many intertwined episodes; among them is the story of Blanchard’s model, and intertwined within that episode are many scenes, including Bailey’s book. Among the tragedies in this scene are the horrible personal experiences of Bailey. I personally feel for Bailey, which is why I urged members of the transgendered community to forgive him even if he never budges (Wyndzen, 2005). Even so, I can’t help but notice that giving so much attention to his experience with a journal article makes it seem disproportionately larger than the decades of struggle experienced by transgendered persons. Dreger notes that “no sexologist refused my request for an interview” after dedicating pages to the unwillingness of three anti-autogynephilia transgendered women to help. This could easily lead readers to the impression that sexologists are honest people whereas those transgendered women are not. As a consequence of the fundamental attribution error, we typically over-attribute others’ behavior to traits and neglect circumstances (e.g., Ross, 1977). When Dreger made the decision to define the story as about Bailey, she made many sexologists eager to talk as it makes their side look good in light of some over-the-top misbehavior; the same situation led the

<sup>1</sup> Madeline H. Wyndzen is a pen name that I use to compartmentalize transgenderism from other aspects of my professional and personal life.

<sup>2</sup> Describing this history as having only two sides is meaningful but could oversimplify. For example, I disagree with Blanchard’s model and this sides’ method of gaining publicity without a parallel improvement in the theory’s scientific rigor. At the same time, as a professor of developmental psychology, I share many underlying values with this side and may even disapprove of some of the other sides’ tactics even more than they do. Among the wide individual differences are two clusters of ideas and so, for sake of simplicity in this commentary, I will use terms like “side” and “pro- and anti-autogynephilia” without the additional qualification about the range of viewpoints and range of views on if the “sides” are best identified by attitudes toward Blanchard’s model.

M. H. Wyndzen (✉)  
GenderPsychology.org, Washington, DC, USA  
e-mail: Madeline@GenderPsychology.org

other side to be reluctant. Her choice dramatically influences how we appear.

What is the focal point of the “backlash” against Bailey’s book? Dreger thoughtfully acknowledges a wide range of possible factors, including transgendered persons’ discomfort with being defined by others instead of themselves. In the end, Dreger concludes that “it’s clear throughout the record... [that what backlash leaders] detested and rejected most about Bailey’s book was the idea of autogynephilia.” Dreger’s conclusion matches Bailey’s interpretation that his book’s harm was “a narcissistic injury suffered by a small number of autogynephilic transsexuals who wish we would all deny the truth.” Bailey and Dreger construe Blanchard’s model as in opposition with what they call the “feminine essence narrative,” the presumably sacred belief among some transsexuals that they are “a woman/man trapped in a man’s/woman’s body.” Yet, the cited e-mail messages and websites used to identify this focal point do not lead to (or against) this generalization. If this were true, then we should expect transsexuals to respond with proportional backlashes against others who oppose the feminine essence narrative or who support Blanchard’s model.

Have others who described transsexuality through an alternative to the “feminine essence narrative” experienced a backlash? When I was first coming out, there were few accounts of transsexuals’ lives that differed with the feminine essence narrative. Transsexual web stories came in two types, even among the sites I admired. One type was like Lawrence’s new personal website with very useful information that only a medical doctor would have the expertise to share. She did not write an autobiography, but described her experience in her letter for coming out at work. She knew from early childhood.<sup>3</sup> Others wrote much more involved stories that shared the basic framework of “always knowing” and how coming out was the inevitable consequence of being true to an internal essence. I did not always know. My experience was so at odds with the “feminine essence narrative” that it was one of the things that kept me from considering an identity as a transsexual. To help make sense of my experience, I wrote an autobiography to start my website. It was completely different from anything I’d ever read because I wasn’t going to say I knew it all along. Instead, I put it into a metaphorical puzzle with the pieces “All Mixed Up.” Putting the pieces together is what led me to transition (Wyndzen, 1998). I received an amazing amount of mail. Many transsexuals felt somebody had finally expressed

their experience in vivid concrete details and shared how they felt it was incredibly important to get beyond the cliché of a “man trapped in a woman’s body.” Not one message then, nor any to date, has been a backlash against my alternative to the feminine essence model. Many others have written autobiographies, before and after me, using alternative frameworks and I cannot find evidence of a backlash against them (e.g., Bornstein, 1994; McCloskey, 1999).<sup>4</sup> If transsexuals really were so upset by alternative viewpoints, why were these alternatives well received? Moreover, why are at least two people who offered alternatives to the feminine essence narrative skeptical of Bailey’s book while a book endorser at least felt a perfunctory obligation to endorse a small part of feminine essence?

Sadly, today any transsexual who endorses autogynephilia will experience a backlash. I still hope for a return to civility. We cannot discern if these harsh reactions are really about Blanchard’s model or the uncritical us-versus-them polarization that leads some to believe any support of Blanchard’s ideas is support for Bailey’s book. We need to look earlier in history. Before Lawrence (1998) popularized autogynephilia with her essay, “Men Trapped in Men’s Bodies,” I was about to start graduate school in psychology and, having discovered academic journals, I was reading everything I could find about transsexuality. I read Blanchard’s (1989) paper without preconceptions and completed his scales before reading it.<sup>5</sup> I had little reaction to his ideas about sexual fantasies. It was just another article in a giant stack. I felt studying sexual fantasies was interesting, but also not so illuminating. After all, wouldn’t you expect somebody, who hates being a man and wishes to be a woman, to fantasize about being a woman? I probably never would have read the rest of Blanchard’s articles had it not been for Lawrence’s essay. Though some transsexuals were very upset with Lawrence’s essay, I explained on several discussion lists how studies clearly showed that we have sexual fantasies about being our target sex. Perhaps some disagreed with me because some psychopathological models distinguished transsexuals from transvestites using a 1950s notion of women’s sexual purity. I never experienced a backlash for sharing the view that cross-gender fantasies are common among transsexuals. Still, I shared some of that jarring reaction to Lawrence’s essay. Her title implied that we had the essence of our biological sex. Even though I never believed I had the “essence” of womanhood, I felt it jarring to

<sup>3</sup> Lawrence’s website has changed quite a lot since then. Like me, her site has become less about herself and more about academic ideas. I still thought she kept her personal material on-line, like me, but when I went back to check the citation (and my memory of almost a decade ago), I found she removed the page. Her website is also missing from the web archive (archive.org). It is also important to note that Lawrence does not set up the same dichotomy between models as Bailey and Dreger, so she is not contradicting herself.

<sup>4</sup> I am puzzled that Dreger described McCloskey’s autobiography as endorsing the feminine essence narrative. It does not fit my reading of it or, for example, the *New York Times* book review. However, Dreger is consistent with Bailey’s interpretation.

<sup>5</sup> To provide context, my score at the time was the same as the average “homosexual” transsexual on the “core autogynephilia” scale and the same as the average bisexual transsexual on the “autogynephilic interpersonal fantasy” scale.



be portrayed as having the “essence” of manhood.<sup>6</sup> Lawrence not only endorsed a “male essence” view of MtF transsexuality, she also dismissed the possibility that anything but a sex drive could be powerful enough to explain transitioning. In my critique of Blanchard’s theory, I noted that research shows identity can be quite a powerful force too (Wyndzen, 2003).

Opposition to autogynephilia is clearly an element in the backlash against Bailey’s book. But is it the central element? The history of reactions does not support this inference. Those with alternative life stories have never experienced even a minor backlash and some who disagree with the feminine essence model also disagree with Blanchard’s model. Saying that we have cross-gender fantasies does not provoke a backlash either. The backlash occurred only when transsexuality was explained as only caused through sexuality and when this explanation trivialized other causal mechanisms. Bailey went further than Lawrence to suggest transsexuals lie when they disagree with him. The result was a stronger backlash.

“Most gender patients lie” (Bailey, 2003, p. 172). The beginning of the backlash is best summarized by this quote by Bailey of someone he calls an “ace gender clinician.” This accusation is very serious in this circumstance. Unlike other groups Bailey criticizes in his book (i.e., bisexual men, social constructivists, psychologists who do not endorse Blanchard’s model), transgendered persons are stigmatized by being labeled mentally ill for being who they are. Their disagreement can be reduced to part of their pathology, “That’s just your sickness talking.”<sup>7</sup> This is what Bailey argues when he says our disagreement with his perspective is part of our “obsession,” “something about autogynephilia creates a need not only to enact a female self, but also to actually believe in her” (Bailey, 2003, p. 175). Is Bailey right? It is very odd to accuse transsexuals of lying about their sexual fantasies when the primary evidence for the two types of transsexuals comes from self-report. In one of two studies Bailey implicitly references, even the authors acknowledge that if any type of transsexual is more preoccupied with presenting themselves favorably, it is the “homosexual” transsexuals and not those presumably with autogynephilia (Blanchard, Clemmensen, & Steiner, 1985). In the second study, phallometric readings

indicated to Blanchard, Racansky, and Steiner (1986) that transsexuals were concealing their sexual motivation. By re-examining their data, I suggest that transsexuals were actually being honest and that their data showed an interesting interplay between sexuality and identity worth further research (for elaboration, see Wyndzen, 2005).<sup>8</sup>

Dreger incorporates far more details underlying both the pro- and the anti-autogynephilia sides into her writing than perhaps anyone else. It is a great credit to her data collection abilities. Her bias is not primarily in the facts, but in the *framing*, how she organizes and presents the facts. Even something as minor as framing the exact same information as a gain or a loss can have profound implications for our decision-making (e.g., Tversky & Kahneman, 1981). I previously discussed two framing effects that may bias readers’ understanding of the history. First, Dreger focuses on Bailey’s plight. Second, she accepts Bailey’s frame of the scientific debate as between Blanchard’s model and a “feminine essence” model. I now examine her acceptance of the pro-autogynephilia frame of the social controversy: scientists versus activists.

If a man sought therapy due to unhappiness over his attraction to other men, a therapist would likely diagnose him with depression. If a transsexual sought therapy due to unhappiness over his or her biological sex, a therapist would almost certainly diagnose him or her with Gender Identity Disorder. Whereas gay men are diagnosed for *how they suffer*, transsexuals are diagnosed for *who they are*. I find the mental illness labels imposed on transgenderism just as disquieting as the label that used to be imposed on homosexuality. Similar to antiquated ideas suggesting that homosexuality is a deviant sex drive, Blanchard (1989, 1991) proposed that transsexuality is a mis-directed form of either heterosexuality (named “autogynephilia”) or homosexuality. Rather than asking the scientifically neutral question, “What is transgenderism?” Blanchard (1991) asks, “What kind of defect in a male’s capacity for sexual learning could produce... autogynephilia, transvestitism...?” (p. 246). Beginning with these unscientific value judgments is insensitive toward transgendered persons and leads to invalid scientific conclusions by reducing people to stereotypes (for elaboration, see Wyndzen, 2004).

Dreger strings together facts, however circuitously, to incorporate the other side, to frame the history as the almost “Galileo-like” struggling of truth-seeking scientists against seemingly powerful “fundamentalists.” She notes the uniformity of opinion in the peer-reviewed psychology publications that support Blanchard’s model in a way that legitimates Bailey’s lack of serious consideration of alternatives. She does this despite how the “peers” who review (psychol-

<sup>6</sup> I question if people have any essence at all. Maybe being human is about inventing yourself rather than letting a destiny unfold?

<sup>7</sup> An article commemorating the 30th anniversary of removal of homosexuality from the *DSM* list of mental illnesses provides a striking parallel. Veteran gay and lesbian advocate Gittings says, “[The mental illness label for homosexuality] was an albatross around our neck ... Yes, we were also viewed as sinners and as law-breakers, but there was room for legitimate differences of opinion about what should be immoral and what should be illegal.... The sickness label, on the other hand, was supposedly a scientific finding that couldn’t be questioned. And that made it tough to argue for our rights. Anything we said on our behalf could be dismissed as ‘That’s your sickness talking.’” (from “Instant Cure” by Robert DiGiacomo in “Philadelphia Gay News” on December 12, 2005).

<sup>8</sup> In recent years, Lawrence (2007) has expanded her view in a way consistent with my initial critique of her first essay and my re-examination of this data.

ogists and psychiatrists) are likely others in the same position of enormous power to diagnosis and authorize HRT/SRS for the other peer group (transgendered persons). Dreger fails to note how this uniformity among peers is strikingly different from the vibrant ongoing debates in nearly every other research area of psychology. She does not consider shared biases by pro-autogynephilia researchers that may lead to their conformity. For example, the representativeness heuristic (like goes with like) is a powerful mechanism of social cognition that, though often an efficient problem solving tool, can lead critical thinking awry and support pseudo-science (Gilovich & Savitsky, 1996). The most salient quality of transgendered persons is their sex so focusing on sexuality as a mechanism is natural. Bailey and Lawrence link Gender Identity Disorder and Body Integrity Identity Disorder with little more than analogy, a hallmark of the representativeness heuristic, instead of through scientific evidence (e.g., Lawrence, 2006). The possibility of groupthink is never considered (Janis, 1971), a surprise since Dreger notes evidence for groupthink: the feelings of moral superiority on the pro-autogynephilia side and the “mind-guard” role Blanchard played in protecting Bailey with his resignation from the HBGDA. Dreger notes how the term “autogynephilia” can be used descriptively or theoretically, a detail from the anti-autogynephilia side. She uses this almost to shock the reader with the fact that some on the anti-autogynephilia side “admit” to autogynephilia. But she does not see that when Bailey says the evidence for autogynephilia is overwhelming, he uses the term descriptively, and then capitulates that into support for its theoretical usage (Wyndzen, 2005).

Dreger describes Bailey as “bombarded” with claims that there are three kinds of transsexuals. Consistent with their frame, Bailey alludes to Sagan with “extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.” Though I feel it is a little silly to equate a claim that there are three kinds of transsexuals to the genuinely extraordinary claims of the supernatural, I certainly agree with Bailey that claims require evidence. In particular, if there is evidence for two kinds, evidence is needed to believe in three kinds (i.e., Occam’s razor). Oddly, I have been unable to find someone asserting as a scientific claim that transsexuals come in three kinds. What I can find are transsexuals who acknowledge that there probably are transsexuals who resemble Bailey’s two prototypes but who feel that they do not. To me, this is not a scientific claim, but a challenge to unscientific stereotyping with the polite aside that some transsexuals may fit some stereotypes. In contrast, I have made a scientific claim that there is insufficient evidence to believe transsexuals come in kinds (Wyndzen, 2003). As claims require evidence, I expect those suggesting any number of kinds (including two) to provide evidence. Sexual orientations of transsexuals are not distributed in clusters consistent with two kinds. Sexual orientation is a correlate in many studies of transsexuals (as it is among non-transsexuals) and

this makes sexuality an important variable to consider. It does not mean sexual orientation differentiates transsexuals qualitatively. If studies included social class, I am sure it would correlate with many things among transsexuals (as it does among non-transsexuals). But this would not mean transsexuals come in “rich” and “poor” kinds.<sup>9</sup> Dreger could have put arguments for one, two, or three kinds of transsexuals in one place, but she separates pairs. Activist transsexuals bombarding scientific Bailey fits her frame and she focuses and elaborates on two vs. three. Left beyond the scope of consideration is the one versus two debate. Here the evidence shows us pro-autogynephilia advocates making assertions without evidence, certainly not the behavior of truth-seeking scientists.

Dreger may honestly see herself as neutral in this conflict. Yet, I note at least three ways in which she chooses the pro-autogynephilia frames without serious consideration of their validity. Social psychology research illustrates the ease with which we show a correspondence bias; in an experiment, those who sat listening to a conversation among strangers interpreted the experience like those they merely sat nearest (e.g., Taylor & Fiske, 1975). In all likelihood, Dreger has spent much more time hearing and experiencing these events from the pro-autogynephilia side’s vantage point (e.g., her conflict with James, the overwhelming willingness of sexologists to speak with her). This may not be her fault. I hope her essay can help others who write oral histories become conscientious of the correspondence bias and aware of the importance of spending an equal amount of time and effort seeing a conflict from each sides’ perspective.

I hope the dialogue renewed by Dreger’s history can be the beginning of the end of imposing value judgments on one another for doing what we do and being who we are. Transgendered persons need to stop seeing any psychological research as inherently attempts to control and undermine personal experiences. Psychologists and psychiatrists need to remove transgenderism from the *DSM* and *ICD* so that it is studied as objective science instead of as something inherently bad. Once we start treating one another without suspicion and as equals, we can bring our expertise and experiences together to further understand the nature of gender and sexuality.

## References

Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen: The science of gender-bending and transsexualism*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.

<sup>9</sup> Many believe Smith, van Goozen, Kuiper, and Cohen-Kettenis (2005) is a response to this critique. For example, it appears as counter-evidence on Wikipedia. If this was their intent, it is missing the necessary evaluation of clusters and does not include the necessary control groups to account for base-rate information (a concern I have about most pro-autogynephilia research).

- Blanchard, R. (1989). The concept of autogynephilia and the typology of male gender dysphoria. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 177, 616–623.
- Blanchard, R. (1991). Clinical observations and systematic studies of autogynephilia. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 17, 235–251.
- Blanchard, R., Clemmensen, L. H., & Steiner, B. W. (1985). Social desirability response set and systematic distortion in the self-report of adult male gender patients. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 14, 505–516.
- Blanchard, R., Racansky, I. G., & Steiner, B. W. (1986). Phallometric detection of fetishistic arousal in heterosexual male cross-dressers. *Journal of Sex Research*, 22, 452–462.
- Bornstein, K. (1994). *Gender outlaw: On men, women, and the rest of us*. New York: Vintage.
- Gilovich, T., & Savitsky, K. (1996). Like goes with like: The role of representativeness in erroneous and pseudoscientific beliefs. *The Skeptical Inquirer*, 20(2), 34–40.
- Janis, I. L. (1971). Groupthink among policy makers. In N. Sanford & C. Comstock (Eds.), *Sanctions for evil* (pp. 71–89). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawrence, A. A. (1998). Men trapped in men's bodies: An introduction to the concept of autogynephilia. *Transgender Tapestry*, 1(85), 65–68.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2006). Clinical and theoretical parallels between desire for limb amputation and gender identity disorder. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 35, 263–278.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2007). Becoming what we love: Autogynephilic transsexualism conceptualized as an expression of romantic love. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 50, 506–520.
- McCloskey, D. N. (1999). *Crossing: A memoir*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcoming. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 10, 173–220.
- Smith, Y. L., van Goozen, S. H., Kuiper, A. J., & Cohen-Kettenis, P. T. (2005). Transsexual subtypes: Clinical and theoretical significance. *Psychiatry Research*, 137, 151–160.
- Taylor, S. E., & Fiske, S. T. (1975). Point of view and perception of causality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 439–445.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 21, 453–458.
- Wyndzen, M. H. (1998). All mixed up. A “Gender Identity Disorder” (GID) case study that’s an autobiography of a transsexual psychology graduate student. Available at [http://www.genderpsychology.org/gid\\_case\\_study/](http://www.genderpsychology.org/gid_case_study/). Retrieved 31 Dec 1998.
- Wyndzen, M. H. (2003). Autogynephilia and Ray Blanchard’s misdirected sex-drive model of transsexuality. Available at [http://www.GenderPsychology.org/autogynpehilia/ray\\_blanchard/](http://www.GenderPsychology.org/autogynpehilia/ray_blanchard/). Retrieved 31 Dec 2003.
- Wyndzen, M. H. (2004). The banality of insensitivity: Portrayals of transgenderism in psychopathology. Available at [http://www.genderpsychology.org/psychology/mental\\_illness\\_model.html](http://www.genderpsychology.org/psychology/mental_illness_model.html). Retrieved 31 Dec 2004.
- Wyndzen, M. H. (2005). The world according to J. Michael Bailey inside “The Man who would be Queen: The Science of Gender Bending and Transsexualism.” Available at [http://www.GenderPsychology.org/autogynpehilia/j\\_michael\\_bailey/](http://www.GenderPsychology.org/autogynpehilia/j_michael_bailey/). Retrieved 31 Dec 2005.

## Response to the Commentaries on Dreger (2008)

Alice D. Dreger

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2008

The Editor has recommended in his introduction to this special issue that, while one reads the responses to my history of the Bailey book controversy, one ought to “look all ways before crossing” the street. Having read the responses, I don’t feel quite like I’m crossing a street here as much as trying to cross a 16-lane highway complete with multiple entrance and exit ramps.

I am honored and glad that so many people have chosen to respond to this work, not only in the pages of this journal, but also in many other public and private venues. I have learned much through these responses—including some things not intended by my newest teachers, but worth knowing anyway. I cannot possibly remark upon everything I might in the space allotted, so I address here what I consider to be the most important issues.

First, what I think is *the* most important:

A number of commentators help, in their essays, to explain why the outcry against J. Michael Bailey’s book, *The Man Who Would Be Queen (TMWWBQ)*, was so loud, intense, and unrelenting (see, e.g., Bettcher; Clarkson; Lane; Lawrence; Nichols; Serano; Windsor; Wyndzen). I appreciate the way in which these commentators flesh out the horrific oppression trans people have faced. I also appreciate how several commentators spell out further the very negative way Bailey’s book was read by some trans readers (see, e.g., Bettcher; Clarkson; Lawrence; Moser; Rind; Wyndzen).

Nevertheless, I think what some of these critics simply don’t get—or perhaps don’t wish to admit—is that, no matter how reprehensible Bailey’s book was believed to be, it would not justify the production, broadcasting, and filing of essentially

false charges against Bailey by Lynn Conway, Deirdre McCloskey, and Andrea James to multiple authorities. Some have tried to argue that I should have told this as more of a “he-said-she-said” story, wherein one alleged personal affront was answered with another (see, e.g., Lane; Nichols). But to do so would be to obscure the critical fact that what three of the she’s said in this case were essentially falsehoods—damaging falsehoods reported to people in positions of significant power.

When people ask me why I focused so much on the actions of Conway, McCloskey, and James, I think the answer is obvious. The historical evidence indicates that it was chiefly these three women who actively worked to lead the campaign against Bailey. The historical evidence indicates it was the essentially groundless charges put forth by Conway, McCloskey, and James that attracted and energized many allies and journalists. And, most importantly, the historical evidence indicates that Conway, McCloskey, and James tried to destroy Bailey’s book and his reputation through these truly extraordinary measures because they didn’t like what he had to say. No one has offered any even-remotely persuasive evidence contrary to all this, nor do I believe they could.

I think how much that core history matters to others is evidenced by the significant public interest in my revelation of it (see, e.g., Anonymous, 2007; Carey, 2007; Krasny, 2007). What happened in the Bailey book controversy is a scandal—a scandal for trans rights, for sex research, for the press, and for free discourse. Whether the right of free speech, in a legalistic sense, extends to falsehoods aimed at eliminating an ideological opponent, I do not know. But I know that morally it does not.

Let me add, before addressing specific commentaries, that when I speak on this matter to audiences and to the press, I reiterate, every chance I get, that many trans people who spoke out against Bailey acted ethically and not without reason (though they may sometimes have acted under false assumptions because they had been misled). I also reiterate, every

---

A. D. Dreger (✉)  
Medical Humanities and Bioethics Program, Feinberg School of  
Medicine, Northwestern University, 750 N. Lake Shore Drive,  
Suite 625, Chicago, IL 60611, USA  
e-mail: a-dreger@northwestern.edu

chance I get, that Conway, McCloskey, and James are absolutely *not* representative of the trans community. I wish, honestly, that more people in the trans community would also make that latter point. I think it could only help. That said, I know why they won't do it; because they know perfectly well, including from my work on this history, what these three women are capable of.

As for the medical and scientific professionals implicated in this situation, I agree with Ben Barres's conclusion that "well meaning psychologists who genuinely do care about the welfare of transgendered folks [...] appear to have been intimidated into silence by a powerful minority," though he and I disagree about who that powerful minority is. I share Barres's and others' sense that psychologists who care about the welfare of transgendered people—which happens to include most psychologists that I know—should do what they can to *actively* promote the rights of gender variant people. I would say to them what one psychologist said to me recently, when I asked him how it could be—given what he's been through—that he was spending that very day testifying in a court in support of government funding for sex reassignment surgery (SRS) for transgender people: "Don't let the Lynn Conways of the world make you forget that transgender people deserve full rights and deserve to have us help with that" (Ray Blanchard, personal communication, July 23, 2007).

### Important Insights from Commentators

Several of the commentaries provide what I consider new or deeper insights into the Bailey book controversy and my history of it, and I would like to draw the reader's attention to those.

Brian Gladue may well be correct in his suspicion that the Bailey controversy has resulted in yet more mission-creep on the part of institutional review boards (IRBs). If it is the case, that would be ironic since, as I showed in my essay, the merit of the charges made against Bailey was, in fact, so very low. As Gladue hints, there ought to be a better way to deal with the sorts of things that happened here than to make *researchers* subject to yet more regulatory scrutiny. My essay suggests sometimes effort would better be spent subjecting accusers (especially those not even involved with the supposed "research") to more scrutiny.

Riki Lane gives us a tantalizing glimpse of a forthcoming major study of "the political and social implications of research into a biological etiology for transsexuality," including by quoting from some interesting original interviews. (One only hopes that in the ultimate publication of the work, Lane will be more accurate in attribution of quotations and claims—see below for examples of problems—and will not make the mistake of confusing what sources say is true with what is actually true.) Lane usefully says explicitly, when I only say implicitly,

that "Bailey appears in his writing to assume the naturalness and superiority of his heteronormativity, individualism, and scientific objectivity."

On that topic—Bailey's stance—I think Marta Meana nails it when she suggests "that Bailey was so convinced of his own unquestionably progressive, positive, non-homophobic, and non-transphobic self that he made the political/interpersonal mistake of over-familiarity." She goes on that "Bailey's other possible failing was a certain degree of dismissiveness regarding the dilemma of identity for sexual minority groups," and this, too, accords with my experience of Bailey. In this way, Meana's commentary points to something I perhaps underestimated in my essay, namely the role that individual personalities (and not just persons) played on both sides of this "battle." About Bailey's chief opponents, Meana writes: "Their attack was not only devoid of intellectual weaponry—it was anti-intellectual. It consisted of primitive tactics that bespoke a massive narcissistic injury with shockingly little emotional regulation."

Anne Lawrence independently arrives at the same conclusion regarding the role of narcissism and especially narcissistic rage among some of Bailey's biggest critics, but goes beyond, delving into the clinical literature to propose that narcissistic disorders may be common among the transsexuals she calls autogynephilic. In a subtle critique of Bailey's book, Lawrence "also suggest[s] that clinicians and scholars [...] try to avoid inflicting" narcissistic injury, especially since it results in harm to all involved. Although Lawrence and Meana differ on "autogynephilia," both made me realize that, to understand the history of this controversy, one really must understand the personalities of the major players.

I had the strangest reaction while reading Lawrence's essay: I found myself cringing and nodding at the same time. Nodding in part because, by the time I read Lawrence's piece, a number of strangers had already written to me to say they found Bailey's critics' behaviors to be explicable only as narcissistic rage. That said, Lawrence's is, by far, the most scholarly exposition of this I have encountered.

So why was I cringing reading Lawrence's essay? Much as her commentary may explain the often dishonest, self-centered, and obsessive pursuit of Bailey by *a few*, Lawrence's commentary will surely be read by Bailey's (and Lawrence's) critics as yet one more instance of the pathologizing of trans people *in general*. And they will probably overlook that Lawrence is careful to suggest in her commentary that it is the unjust process of being denied validation of self again and again which probably puts one at risk of developing narcissism as a sort of coping mechanism, such that clinicians themselves may accidentally become an active part of the problem when they deny sexual minorities their self-identities. Reading Lawrence's commentary, one does wonder how often activists and advocates *unjustly* get accused of narcissism for their devotion to a cause.

Relatedly, Charles Moser's piece remembers the era of the medicalization of homosexuality and the responses to activists who sought to demedicalize homosexuality. (For more of this comparative history, see Nichols.) And in her unique commentary, Madeline Wyndzen hints at how the medical "treatment" of gay men has moved on to where the "treatment" of transgender people might some day go. She writes eloquently, "Whereas gay men are [now] diagnosed for *how they suffer*, transsexuals are [still] diagnosed for *who they are*."

Regarding the theory of who transsexuals are: I believe I showed that, while Bailey's book was much more complicated than it has been portrayed as being, Bailey's account of Blanchard's theory of male-to-female (MTF) transsexualism generally lacked nuance (compare, e.g., Lawrence, 2007). Regardless, I think Wyndzen usefully elaborates on Bailey's problematic lack of nuance, including when she writes that "the backlash occurred only when transsexuality was explained [by Bailey] as *only* caused through sexuality and when this explanation trivialized other causal mechanisms" (italics added).

Wyndzen's response is especially interesting when read alongside that of Jonathan Adler. Where Wyndzen hints, Adler actually spells out the fundamental epistemological divide that separates Blanchard and Bailey from many of their critics. Indeed, Adler's point about this insurmountable epistemological divide seems to be illustrated by several of the other commentaries (see, e.g., Bettcher; Blanchard; Clarkson; Lane; Lawrence; Mathy; Nichols; Rind). While Blanchard, Bailey, Lawrence, and many other sex researchers employ a "paradigmatic mode" that treats humans as categorizable subjects and see science as the ultimate arbiter of those categories, many of the critics of Blanchard's theory, of Bailey's book, and now of my history of the controversy favor a "narrative mode" in which their autobiographical stories stand as the ultimate truth.

In his elegant essay, following his mentor Dan McAdams, Adler points out how operating in the narrative mode (by forming and telling a coherent life story) can provide a sense of "unity and purpose" to one's life. Adler illuminates both why some people fought Bailey so hard and why any scientific account of transsexuality may ultimately deny many trans people psychological relief that their own coherent autobiographies *can* provide—however factually problematic these autobiographies, like all autobiographies, are. Adler thus hints that, from a clinical psychological standpoint, Blanchard's theory could sometimes result in a case of "the surgery was successful but the patient died."

Adler also points out the irony that my work has, through its essentially narrative form, likely provided Bailey and his allies with some psychological comfort while not doing anything to convince Bailey et al. that transsexuals' self-narratives mean much at the end of the day. As I noted at the

end of my article, Bailey has said he will no longer "hesitate to say true things out of concern that the truth would cause someone pain. [...] Conway et al. took away any remaining inhibitions I had against telling the truth."

I was pleased that John Bancroft points out in his commentary that he was "particularly disturbed" by this remark from Bailey. (A number of readers seem to think I ended my article this way as a way of championing Bailey rather than, as I intended, illustrating the terribly ironic outcome of Conway's attempt at what one might call Bailey's "re-education," were one operating in Maoist China.) Without elaborating, Bancroft notes that he himself "in the past [...] used words or concepts that I would not use today because they are insensitive or potentially hurtful." Thus, in his commentary, Bancroft recognizes the importance of choosing sensitive language whenever possible (on this, see also Moser; Devor's comments in Lane; and Lawrence), while also providing some detailed personal history of what he observed in practice that (notably) occasionally accords with some of Blanchard's theory. Most importantly, Bancroft here essentially spells out what he meant by his "not science" remark about *TMWWBQ* at the International Academy of Sex Research (IASR) meeting in 2003, and all those who continue to tell me what Bancroft "really" meant are advised to stop interpreting for Bancroft and read his commentary.

Just as Bancroft helps to clarify his opinions, history, and theoretical stance, Ray Blanchard provides, in his commentary, some elaboration of his theory as well as a novel point-by-point critique of the feminine essence narrative that makes me hope for more productive, open scientific debate about the various theories of transsexuality. Several other authors also usefully (though necessarily briefly) explore problems with Bailey's version of Blanchard's theory (see Bettcher; Clarkson; Lane; Lawrence; Meana; Mathy; Moser; Nichols; Serano; Wyndzen). Amir Rosenmann and Marilyn Safir consider how culture may affect and effect how gender variant people act and live.

In her critique of my history, Antonia Caretto points to epistemological problems that she argues are shared by both Bailey and Conway, problems she feels I would have noticed had I not gone "down the rabbit hole." Meanwhile, without elaboration, McCloskey says in her commentary "I think [Bailey's] theories will result in more dead queers and I've said so." I'd be interested in seeing the actual causal link on that one. McCloskey is obviously sure it exists, since she assures her opponent Seth Roberts, a new supporter of Bailey, he's now part of that deadly chain: "The next time you hear of a queer being murdered, think what you've done" (quoted in Roberts's commentary).

Moser says that my "article fails to place the attack on Bailey in its historical perspective," which made me wish he had taken this opportunity to specifically compare his own experiences. He says I imply "that ad hominem attacks are a

*new* tactic in the attempt to discredit sex research,” and if that is the case, I regret that. Bruce Rind does helpfully compare his own experience to Bailey’s in his commentary. Wyndzen also helps by providing her own experience with debates, inside the trans community, over the nature of transsexuality.

Kendra Blewitt did not submit a commentary but wrote to me that:

The controversial chapter of Bailey’s book, i.e., the chapter about autogynephilic transsexuals and Blanchard’s theory, was available on-line for almost three years prior to the book’s publication. Anne Lawrence had posted it on her Transsexual Women’s Resources site for this duration. Thus, when you said of [Joan] Roughgarden that she condemned the book when [all] she saw was the cover [...] and that she couldn’t have read [some of] the book at this time because it had not yet been published, you were probably in error. (p.e.c., January 4, 2008)

Blewitt is quite right that this is a notable oversight and I am grateful to her for this correction. While it is still the case that Roughgarden could not have known what the book as a whole said, she may have known what the part she cared most about said.

### Errors by Commentators

Moving on now to misrepresentations and inaccuracies contained in some commentaries:

Richard Green takes exception to “my” characterization of research when, in fact, what he’s taking exception to is the U.S. federal definition for research that requires IRB oversight. Margaret Nichols chastises me for supposedly not noting the criticisms of Bailey’s book by members of the WPATH (World Professional Association for Transgender Health, formerly the Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association). She then goes on to specifically name three such critics, all of whose criticisms I, in fact, *do* note in my article. In fact, Nichols refers to the very same documents as me. Perhaps her point is that I didn’t note that those three critics (Eli Coleman, Walter Bockting, and Jamison Green) are members of WPATH. But if that is her point, i.e., to invoke specifically the prestige of WPATH, how is it she doesn’t notice that Anne Lawrence, Ray Blanchard, and Richard Green (all of whom praised *TMWWBQ* and defended Bailey) were also at that time members of the organization? Later in her work, Nichols says “Dreger practically ridicules the Southern Poverty Law Center report on Bailey and HBI,” i.e., the Human Biodiversity Institute. This is accurate, except for the word “practically.”

Rind generally praises my work while bemoaning the actions of “diversity-embracing progressives in academia and their counterparts in the liberal media,” without apparently

realizing I easily count as a member of both those camps, including in this work. He similarly seems to imply that many or even all transsexual activists use threatening language about perceived enemies, which is absolutely not the case. (My article was careful to specify who said and did what.) He also says I identify myself “as a longstanding advocate of transsexual causes” when I certainly don’t. Moser—who knows the difference between intersex and transsex—points out that that difference matters. (I have certainly written [e.g., Dreger, 2006a] and made donations in support of trans rights, but nothing of the magnitude of what I’ve done in support of intersex rights.)

Moser says Northwestern University’s investigation “basically concluded that Bailey had not violated any professional, ethical, legal, or moral standards; no penalties were levied.” That’s not what I found. It’s possible Moser knows something I don’t know, but I doubt it. In fact, as I note in my article, Northwestern and Bailey have not released the results of the investigation, and, following the investigation, Bailey’s status at the university did not change.

Robin Mathy says that Bailey’s “research” methods for testing Blanchard’s theory were exceptionally poor, which would be true had Bailey been testing Blanchard’s theory. McCloskey commits the same logical flaw. Moser makes a similar mistake when he calls what Bailey was doing “field research” as if he were testing Blanchard’s theory. As I note in my essay, Bailey was convinced of Blanchard’s theory; he wasn’t testing it, and he certainly wasn’t testing it with trips to bars as some continue to claim (see, e.g., McCloskey).

Moser thinks I should have been critical of Bailey’s “ignoring the transsexual activists’ perspective and complaints,” but I think I made clear *why* Bailey saw their perspective and complaints as consistently less persuasive than Blanchard’s theory. Moser notes correctly that I have argued that “the experiences and advice of adult intersexuals must be solicited and taken into consideration,” but that doesn’t mean I have ever believed their version of events must be considered the true one. (For the record, although I think studying self-narratives is critical to understanding identities, I don’t think seeking and repeating of self-narratives is the same as a scientific inquiry, whether the self-narratives come from sex variant people, gender variant people, sex researchers, or anyone else.) Moser says I “malign” Mildred Brown by mentioning her settling of a lawsuit with a former patient, but it is obvious I used the case of Brown (which is public record) to show how the airing of dirty laundry on sites like Conway’s and James’s is limited to the laundry of those who dare to disagree with them, which Bailey does and Brown doesn’t. How Moser could conclude the allegations made against Bailey were “basically true” is beyond me, and apparently beyond the scope of his article to explain in any evidence-based fashion.

In her remarks to Roberts, reproduced in his commentary, McCloskey claims Bailey was “fired [...] from the chairman-

ship” of his department following Northwestern’s investigation. Not true; see my article. In her own commentary, McCloskey also says that, after Bancroft made his “not science” remark at the 2003 IASR meeting, “Bailey resigned that afternoon as Secretary-Treasurer from the Academy.” Not true; written records demonstrate that he decided to step down a month before his book was even published, i.e., 4 months before Bancroft’s remark, because he had taken on the added responsibility of chairing his department (see, e.g., Bailey to IASR membership, p.e.c., March 21, 2003, subject “Very important IASR issues”). McCloskey says Bailey failed to ask permission to write about the women in the book. Not true; see my article.

McCloskey says “Dreger then describes at great length Kieltyka’s ‘remarkable sex life’” without noting that the phrase quoted is actually from Bailey, not me as she implies. (And is it not remarkable? Isn’t that part of McCloskey’s ongoing point about how Kieltyka is not representative?) McCloskey notes she is “introduced as ‘enjoying an international reputation’ literally on the next to last page” of my article. True that I acknowledge her that way, but that’s not where I “introduce” her, since literally on the first page of my article, I identify McCloskey as “a Distinguished Professor of Economics, History, English, and Communication at the University of Illinois at Chicago.”

McCloskey misleadingly implies I think her campaign to the Lambda Literary Foundation (LLF) was “tantamount to censorship,” but where I use that phrase in my article, I am clearly describing one side of the debate that happened within the LLF. McCloskey says “either [Bailey] was doing rigorous science, and therefore violated the norms of science; or he was doing casual journalism” Even a freshman logic student would recognize this as a false dichotomy, and I’m surprised she doesn’t, given the contents and style of many of her own books. How could McCloskey make such an obvious argumentative error like a false dichotomy, given that she is known specifically for her important studies of rhetoric? Reading her remarks to Roberts (reproduced in his commentary) as well as her commentary on my article, and knowing what she tried to do to Bailey and his book, one has to wonder whether she has been using this entire affair as an experiment to determine the limits of rhetoric. In any case, I believe she’s found them.

Mathy seems to think my article’s title purposely suppressed *TMWWBQ*’s subtitle (“The Science of Gender-Bending and Transsexualism”), when, in fact, I simply decided that using two colons in my article’s title would be too confusing for readers. Mathy might have noticed that the abstract and first page of my article both give the subtitle of Bailey’s book. (I sometimes wish I could be as full of intrigue and power as my public image would have me be.)

Riki Lane takes me to task for claiming in my blog that Andrea James “had no right to speak on campus” after her

behavior in the Bailey controversy, when in fact I explicitly said James *did* have the right. (“I want to make clear I am not saying Ms. James does not have the right to speak. What I am saying is that I don’t think we should be putting our university’s good name near her. I would feel the same way were someone to be interested in, say, inviting a neo-Nazi to speak on campus. I would defend that person’s right to speak but I certainly wouldn’t enable or support their speech” [Dreger, 2006b].) Lane also mistakenly claims Bailey calls women who have transitioned “men.” Lane even italicizes *men* to accentuate the offensiveness of this imagined-Bailey. (Incidentally, as others do, I always find Imagined-Bailey astonishingly offensive.)

Gladue presumes incorrectly that “Conway et al.” are social scientists and that therefore they would give a whit about the effects of their actions on “other” social scientists. I think it is safe to assume that Conway and James are not considered social scientists by anyone. I am not sure whether McCloskey would consider herself a social scientist specifically and whether, if she does, she cares what effects her actions have had on other social scientists. One doubts it. I think Meana says it best: “It is crystal clear that had Bailey promoted the feminine essence theory of transsexualism, none of the antagonists would have cared one bit about ethics. Their allegations were completely off-topic and simply an attempt to inflict as much damage as possible.” If “Conway et al.” have had an effect on institutional ethics, good or bad, it has not been because that is what they wanted to achieve.

Meana calls me “strangely naïve” in my original belief that my history might “calm and even quell some of the tensions that persist,” and I think she’s right that I was naïve in that. But I think she is wrong on two other points. First, I am sure she is in error when she says that I should not have investigated the charges against Bailey “because investigating them legitimizes them [and] because the misconduct charges are not what this story was about, in the slightest.” That’s what Bailey’s opponents *made* this story about, and thus that *was* what the story was about, though I think I have changed the story now by carefully looking at the facts of the matter.

Second, I think Meana is wrong in saying my “ultimate allegiance” is “to one side—Bailey’s.” My ultimate allegiance is to the truth. Incidentally, I don’t think my allegiance to truth makes me any different than the vast majority of other scholars and other activists out there. And if my allegiance to truth makes me look like I come down on Bailey’s side, well, points for Bailey.

Barres claims my article is neither “balanced [n]or factual on a great many points.” Such as? Well, he doesn’t say, except to tell us I should have “point[ed] out [...] that Bailey chose to present the information in his book in the most sensationalistic, insensitive, misleading, and humiliating way possible.” As anyone can see, my article *did* show how



Bailey was sometimes sensationalistic, insensitive, misleading, and humiliating in his book, but I guess it is true that I didn't argue that his approach was *the most possible* of all these. Barres briefly reiterates defaming and—as I show in my article—patently inaccurate claims about Bailey, including that he practiced clinical psychology without a license, slept with his “subjects” (now plural!), and did research that required informed consent but lacked it. In what one can only guess is an ironic attempt to use his own essay to buttress his claim about the low standards among scholarly journals where matters of transsexualism are concerned, Barres does not bother to support any of his claims. I guess Barres doesn't have to give any evidence whatsoever for *his* “sensationalistic, misleading, and humiliating” claims because, it would seem, Barres applies his standards according to a subject's level of oppression rather than any universal moral or intellectual principle.

Several commentaries contained factual errors that made me think I should have included a timeline of events with my original article, to help readers wade through the rather complex chain of events. Nicholas Clarkson says correctly that “the trans community should not be expected to gratefully submit to a medical gaze simply for the sake of receiving letters authorizing surgery,” but in doing so he incorrectly implies (as does Mathy) that the transwomen for whom Bailey wrote letters of recommendation were by that point his subjects in any way. As I show, early in their relationship, Anjelica Kieltyka talked Bailey into helping with her advocacy by providing these letters free of charge and without the standard hoops about which someone like Clarkson would rightly complain, and it was only *after* these letters—indeed, *after these women's SRS had already happened*—that Bailey decided to write about the woman (the *only* woman) who would ultimately complain, i.e., the woman known as Juanita. Recall also from my article that Juanita has admitted she had given Bailey permission to write about her in the book when he asked her, months after her surgery, if he could.

I agree with Clarkson's suspicion that Kieltyka “sought a relationship with Bailey to obtain his validation, particularly as an authority figure and scientist,” but I hardly think (as Clarkson seems to) that that would have been reason for Bailey to have said to her “no, you may not speak to my classes, or you must represent yourself in the way *I* require and not the way you want.” I get a little tired of people—Nichols most prominently—arguing that trans people should encounter absolutely no “paternalistic” barriers when it comes to major medical interventions, but that “authority figures” should not trust the poor dears to decide how and when they will *represent themselves* to classes or to authors. I certainly don't think, as Clarkson suggests I do, “that having sex researchers study [trans people] is unequivocally good,” but neither do I think—as apparently Nichols does—that

adult trans people are too “unsophisticated” to decide how they want to work with (or not work with) researchers, teachers, and clinicians.

I would take philosopher Jacob Hale's excellent argument for treating trans people in the clinic as fully capable decision-makers unless proven otherwise (Hale, 2007) and extend it to their encounters with researchers, professors, authors, filmmakers, reporters, courts, and, for that matter, everyone else. Pro-choicers rightly ask about abortion, “If you can't trust me with a choice, how can you trust me with a child?” I'd similarly ask, for this scenario, “If you can't trust me with a class of undergraduates, how can you trust me with a team of surgeons?”

Elroi Windsor thinks it “remarkable” that every sexologist I asked was willing to speak to me, and somehow takes that as evidence that my perspective was “uneven.” I think I wrongly gave the impression no sexologists were reluctant to talk (Wyndzen also assumes this), and that many transgender people were reluctant to talk. As I recall, approximately three sexologists were hesitant, and, besides McCloskey and Conway, there were only two transgender people unwilling to talk to me (and both of them had already had ugly public run-ins with Andrea James, which I got the sense was not a coincidence). I think the reason Conway and McCloskey were *very* reluctant to talk to me was because they knew what I would find.

Windsor suggests Conway's and McCloskey's general refusal to engage meant I had to relay “their ideas solely through static, secondary, and dated sources.” Had Windsor looked at my documentation, Windsor would have seen that Conway and McCloskey's productions are not static or dated but ongoing (one might even say relentless) and that they are primary—from the very hands of these two. Windsor also says I fail to note all sorts of things I do in fact note, like “Bailey's admitted sexual attraction to some transwomen” and how Bailey used the trappings of science to make his claims appear authoritative.

After reading John Gagnon's commentary, I was left with the thought that anyone who believes in social constructivism as much as Gagnon does nevertheless should be able to understand the difference between written regulations (however social) and his own opinion of what those regulations should say. Gagnon takes IRBs to task for “often (perhaps more often than not) [being] excessively intrusive, legalistic, and ignorant,” but I would say that they at least tend to know the regulations which they claim to be examining. Those who might share Gagnon's confusion are advised to start by reading my article. As for Gagnon's claim that “little that has happened to Bailey [...] has not happened in fights about priority, tenure, grants,” I would say that, if Gagnon seriously is aware of the filing of false charges in such instances, I would hope he has been a whistle-blower.

As for Gagnon's questioning of my “motivation” and “objectivity,” I would ask Gagnon how exactly that questioning

speaks to what I found. Gagnon amusingly says Bailey played, in his book, a “sort of Sergeant Friday of sexology.” Well, let me play the good sergeant for a minute, and ask Gagnon, “Got any actual critique of my factual findings, ma’am?” Even if I had been, as McCloskey (2007) told the *New York Times*, paid by Bailey to do my work—which I was not—how exactly would that speak to the incontrovertible facts I exposed? Gagnon’s—shall we say—*idiosyncratic* construction of this matter is unlikely to withstand, I think, even the first level of actual social construction wherein groups of humans compare a claim to what they see before their own eyes.

Perhaps my last remark answers Lane’s question about me: “How does a social constructivist end up writing [this] history?” The answer is that I’m not a social constructivist of the naïve sort, as Lane should know from having read my first book, which is referenced and quoted in Lane’s commentary (see also Dreger, 2006c). Lane seems to think, in the case of Bailey as in my own case, that one must believe *only* in social constructs or *only* in materiality. I find that idea silly. Obviously one can believe that the category of “pathology” is socially constructed while still believing HIV (and not magical spells) causes AIDS. Incidentally, I find even more silly the idea that social constructivists are Good People and their supposed opposites are Bad People. As we see again and again in the history of sex, ideology does not determine behavior.

Mathy finds “it a bit too convenient that another prominent sexologist at Northwestern University has risen to Bailey’s defense.” I guess I could find it a bit too convenient that most of Bailey’s critics were transsexuals, if I didn’t think that claims should be judged for their merit and not eliminated simply because you worry the source is lacking critical distance. Mathy also notes that, in an e-mail she sent me while she was writing her commentary (after the deadline), she objected to my “publishing [my] work in a prominent peer-reviewed journal edited by a close colleague of Blanchard (i.e., Kenneth Zucker).” Mathy doesn’t mention what I wrote back to her:

Why did I choose to submit my paper to *Archives of Sexual Behavior*? I considered other journals as well. I was interested in reaching primarily an audience interested in sex research, so that narrowed down the possibilities. I was also interested in publishing this major work in a prestigious, peer-reviewed journal with a high impact factor; *Archives* fits the bill there. I also wanted a journal that would allow responses to my article by the main players, because I felt that would model scholarly dialogue (an alternative to what happened in the Bailey controversy). Dr. Zucker not only was willing to publish responses, he insisted there be an open call for responses. Hence your ability to write a commentary. The fact that Dr. Zucker is apparently ext-

ending the deadline for commentaries for people such as yourself suggests to me that he is fully committed to open, scholarly dialogue on these matters. Obviously I made a good choice. (p.e.c., November 18, 2007)

Mathy wrote back, “You answered my question quite nicely. I agree that you made a good choice in selecting *Archives of Sexual Behavior*” (p.e.c., November 18, 2007), a judgment not reflected in her essay, which continues to question my choice as if she was aware of no good reasons behind it.<sup>1</sup>

Mathy makes the argument that Bailey has violated the American Psychological Association’s “Ethical Principles of Psychology and Code of Conduct.” Even if Mathy is right that the APA’s Code applies to Bailey, who is not a member of the APA but is a member of an APA-accredited program—and, as I write, I have been waiting for several months for the APA to answer an inquiry about whether this is true—it doesn’t really matter, because Bailey has not committed the violations of the APA Code that Mathy claims. Mathy muddles the timeline of events (see above) and reiterates “facts” that I think we have every reason to believe are false. For example, Mathy assumes Bailey violated the Code because he supposedly had sex with Juanita when she was his research subject. But, as I showed, Juanita was not, by any stretch of the imagination, his research subject in March 1998, when she claims the sex happened.

Moreover, what on earth gives Mathy the right to continue to claim the sex happened? Bailey says it didn’t and *has shown written evidence* he was not where Juanita said he was when it supposedly happened. Surely at this point the burden of proof is on Mathy (and on Barres, and McCloskey, and Roughgarden [in Krasny, 2007], and...) to support their claim that we should, against documented evidence, believe Juanita, a woman whose charge was, according to Kieleyka, designed by “Andrea James and [Lynn] Conway [...] as a way of getting Bailey,” a woman who has insisted on remaining unavailable and anonymous while making this damaging claim, and a woman who has—by contrast with her hesitancy to step up to the plate while making *this* claim about supposed consensual sex—been happy to boast on a published video, *with her real name and unobscured face*, of making over a hundred thousand dollars a year illegally as a sex worker.

Finally, Rind wishes I had “offer[ed] suggestions on sanctions against the aggressors in the Bailey affair as a matter of fairness and balance,” but I hardly think that would have been appropriate. I do like Lane’s suggestion that Bailey now “apologize for his insensitive portrayal of trans people.” Bailey may claim he was not insensitive, but given the number

<sup>1</sup> As this article was going to press, Mathy sent a letter to my dean complaining that I am unethical because, among other things, I decided to publish my article in *Archives*. Apparently she has also filed an ethics complaint about me with the American Psychological Association, in spite of the fact that I’m an historian (see Gsovski, 2008).

of people he offended with his prose, he is obviously, objectively wrong—being perceived as insensitive by this many people surely means you have been insensitive. (Especially if you don't get that.) Indeed, I like Lane's suggestion that Bailey apologize for his insensitivity as much as I like Lane's suggestion that "his opponents [...] agree that some of their tactics were over the top." I won't be holding my breath.

## Conclusions

So, what major lessons might we take from this set of rather extraordinary commentaries, other than that there appears to be no correlation between academic rank and likelihood of producing a commentary that is accurate, original, and well composed? (Kudos to many of the graduate students and non-academics who commented.)

I think most importantly these commentaries show that there are a lot more subtle thinkers out there than the on-the-street story of the Bailey book controversy would have people believe. The level of nuance and the depth of original thinking in a number of these commentaries suggest real hope for a more complicated understanding not only of this controversy, but also of transsexualism, of science, and of advocacy.

A number of these commentaries—mostly notably Julia Serano's and Elroi Windsor's—also help in arguing vigorously for responsibility, especially to those about whom we make claims that may harm. I would add a call to be responsible to facts, for it is in that responsibility that we enact responsibility to others.

It seems especially important, as there will likely be a reconsideration of the classification of "gender identity disorder" in the *DSM*, for clinicians, scientists, and transgender advocates to consider not only what we think is true about the nature of transsexualism, but what we really know (and don't know) about what can help and what can hurt transgender people, including in terms of language choice. Those who work on the *DSM*, the WPATH Standards of Care, and similarly authoritative documents must recognize that what matters most in the clinical setting is the well-being of gender variant individuals—not the well-being of careers and causes, of theories and legacies—and so clinical care must be consistently evidence-based and be focused on endpoints that matter for gender variant people themselves.

If medical professionals take seriously their commitment to gender variant patients and clients, then they will recognize that part of their responsibility is to help change society to be more tolerant of those who suffer from unjust social oppression. They should consider that they may occasionally help patients or clients most effectively by getting out of

the clinic to help change institutions that interfere with healthy lives.

As an activist, I admire many of the activist-writers here who were able to distinguish between what they believe to be true in an ontological sense from what they know to be right in a moral sense. I think, as we activists seek a more just world, it is critical that we be intolerant not only of foolishness masquerading as authority, but that we be intolerant of foolishness masquerading as progressivism. Let us hold ourselves to the same standards we hold those we seek to change. Thinking you are right is never an excuse for acting wrong.

**Acknowledgments** For assistance in formulating this response, my thanks (and none of the blame) go to Aron Sousa, Paul Vasey, a few colleagues who understandably wish to remain anonymous, and my colleagues in the Medical Humanities and Bioethics Program of the Feinberg School of Medicine at Northwestern University and in the Donnelley Family Disability Ethics Program of the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago.

## References

- Anonymous. (2007, October 23). Paper finds controversial Northwestern researcher acted appropriately. *The Advocate*. Retrieved January 28, 2007, at [http://www.advocate.com/news\\_detail\\_ektid49932.asp](http://www.advocate.com/news_detail_ektid49932.asp)
- Carey, B. (2007, August 21). Criticism of a gender theory, and a scientist under siege. *The New York Times*. Retrieved January 28, 2007, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/21/health/psychology/21gender.html>
- Dreger, A. D. (2006a). *Really changing sex*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from <http://www.bioethicsforum.org/New-York-City-plan-to-change-gender.asp>
- Dreger, A. D. (2006b). *The blog I write in fear*. Retrieved May 1, 2007, from [http://www.alicedreger.com/in\\_fear.html](http://www.alicedreger.com/in_fear.html)
- Dreger, A. D. (2006c). *The social construction of sex and me*. Retrieved January 25, 2008, from [http://alicedreger.com/social\\_construction.html](http://alicedreger.com/social_construction.html)
- Gsovski, M. (2008, February 27). Debate resumes on methods of psych professor's research. *The Daily Northwestern*. Retrieved February 27, 2007 at <http://media.www.dailynorthwestern.com/media/storage/paper853/news/2008/02/27/Campus/Debate.Resumes.On.Methods.Of.Psych.Professors.Research-3237442.shtml>
- Hale, J. (2007). Ethical problems with the mental health evaluation standards of care for adult gender variant prospective patients. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 50, 491–505.
- Krasny, M. (2007, August 22). Transgender theories (live radio program, KQED). Available at <http://www.kqed.org/epArchive/R708221000>. Transcript available at [http://alicedreger.com/kqed\\_forum\\_transcript.html](http://alicedreger.com/kqed_forum_transcript.html)
- Lawrence, A. A. (2007). Becoming what we love: Autogynephilic transsexualism conceptualized as an expression of romantic love. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 50, 506–520.
- McCloskey, D. (2007, August 24). Letter to the editor of *The New York Times* (not published). Retrieved January 27, 2007 from <http://www.deirdremccloskey.com/docs/times.pdf>