

Transgender Marxism



‘A terrific collection of essays – I couldn’t put it down.’

—Kathi Weeks, author of *The Problem with Work*

‘Is there a transgender Marxism? This pioneering collection shows that the answer is there are many – inspired by psychoanalysis, union organising, queer communities, Black struggles and more. Material realities matter, tremendously, in trans lives; and trans experiences can change our thinking about both capitalism and liberation.’

—Raewyn Connell, author of *Gender: In World Perspective*

‘What lives and thinks on through the staggering failures of contemporary trans visibility and rights-based claims? This stunning collection answers in the collective form of a transgender Marxism. We find ourselves remade, hungrier and braver, in this book. Trans becomes in these pages the vibrant event of a historical materialism from below, intimate and urgent.’

—Jules-Gill Peterson, Associate Professor of English and Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies at the University of Pittsburgh and the author of *Histories of the Transgender Child*

‘Refusing to cast trans subjects as either figural others or exemplary proletarians, this timely and powerful collection of essays carves out a space for accounts of self-knowledge to ask how gender nonconformity can survive in a capitalist context. With stunning sophistication and insights, *Transgender Marxism* challenges capitalism’s social foundations in gendered patterns of property, work, and entitlement to develop new forms of sociality beyond the family and its dyadic sexual division.’

—Petrus Liu, Associate Professor of Humanities at Yale-NUS College and author of *Queer Marxism in Two Chinas*

Transgender Marxism

Edited by
Jules Joanne Gleeson and Elle O'Rourke

Afterword by Jordy Rosenberg

PLUTO  **PRESS**

First published 2021 by Pluto Press
345 Archway Road, London N6 5AA

www.plutobooks.com

Copyright © Jules Joanne Gleeson and Elle O'Rourke 2021

The right of the individual contributors to be identified as the authors of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978 0 7453 4165 1	Hardback
ISBN 978 0 7453 4166 8	Paperback
ISBN 978 1 78680 732 8	PDF
ISBN 978 1 78680 733 5	EPUB
ISBN 978 1 78680 734 2	Kindle

Typeset by Stanford DTP Services, Northampton, England

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
Introduction	i
<i>Jules Joanne Gleeson and Elle O'Rourke</i>	
1 Social Reproduction and Social Cognition: Theorizing (Trans)gender Identity Development in Community Context	33
<i>Noah Zazanis</i>	
2 Trans Work: Employment Trajectories, Labour Discipline and Gender Freedom	47
<i>Michelle O'Brien</i>	
3 Judith Butler's Scientific Revolution: Foundations for a Transsexual Marxism	62
<i>Rosa Lee</i>	
4 How Do Gender Transitions Happen?	70
<i>Jules Joanne Gleeson</i>	
5 A Queer Marxist Transfeminism: Queer and Trans Social Reproduction	85
<i>Nat Raha</i>	
6 Notes from Brazil	116
<i>Virginia Guitzel</i>	
7 Queer Workerism Against Work: Strategising Transgender Labourers, Social Reproduction & Class Formation	132
<i>Kate Doyle Griffiths</i>	
8 The Bridge Between Gender and Organising	156
<i>Farah Thompson</i>	
9 Encounters in Lancaster	165
<i>JN Hoad</i>	

10	Transgender and Disabled Bodies: Between Pain and the Imaginary <i>Zoe Belinsky</i>	179
11	A Dialogue on Deleuze and Gender Difference <i>The Conspiratorial Association for the Advancement of Cultural Degeneracy</i>	200
12	Seizing the Means: Towards a Trans Epistemology <i>Nathaniel Dickinson</i>	204
13	'Why Are We Like This?': The Primacy of Transsexuality <i>Xandra Metcalfe</i>	219
14	Cosmos Against Nature in the Class Struggle of Proletarian Trans Women <i>Anja Heisler Weiser Flower</i>	230
	Afterword: One Utopia, One Dystopia <i>Jordy Rosenberg</i>	259
	<i>Notes on the Contributors</i>	296
	<i>Index</i>	299

Introduction

Jules Joanne Gleeson and Elle O'Rourke

Subcultures and separation

There seem to be more of us around, lately.

Trans aesthetics, stylings, and tastes have swollen well beyond the set of subcultures they spanned a handful of years ago. Transgender culture has popularised itself to an extent previous generations of Western gender subversives could have barely imagined. This blossoming form has expanded faster than even those most plunged into it can keep track of.

What had once been strictly clandestine – or otherwise associated with political radicalism – has now been embraced outside its niche constituency. Transgender culture has increasingly appeared as a *mass* culture. As such, we might expect to see a dwindling of trans politics as a subversive force. Instead, transgender communism has bloomed, with revolutionary movements around the world often enough being led by those whose lives have been reshaped around transition. Whether the struggle is liberation from prisons and policing, poverty and austerity, combating fascist street movements, or averting ecological collapse, trans people are found in disproportionate numbers, and full voice. Our unlikely prominence in revolutionary organisations and subversive circles is often as baffling to us as anyone else.

The role of this collection is not to birth a new perspective: clearly, Transgender Marxism exists already. For those minded to find it, marginal publications and private accounts have fostered this vein of thought for years. It does not fall to us to *bring into being* a coupling of transgender theory and Marxist politics.

Transgender Marxism is already a flourishing field, if one that has found itself confined to the most esoteric and fleeting outlets. This anthology collects theoretical perspectives by transgender writers that we had noticed spreading across ephemeral spaces: activist circles, book clubs, and social media, in zines and social media DMs.

Again and again, frameworks originating in the loose and meticulous tradition known as Marxism were to be found being brought to bear on questions around gender transition, or how gender nonconformity can survive in a capitalist context more generally. But how did the analysis of economic modes and historical epochs come to be so intuitively directed towards gender transitions, the most immediate and ethical of processes?

Let's begin with our cultural denigration, which remains a pervasive feature of our lives (popularisation of our experiences notwithstanding). Due to the stigma we still encounter so routinely, trans theorisation most often unfolds as a process of confiding and confessing. We speak about our own experiences more often than we attempt to speak more comprehensively. We gather audiences that are as much our confidants as our comrades. This style of publication has the blessing of the concrete, while also finding itself locked into inevitable repetition. Critical vocabularies for grasping (and one day defeating) transphobia are invented, then reinvented anew.¹ Commonalities between our epiphanies and attempts at repression result in extensive in-joking, moments of recognition that our most freakish features are also from another view quite easily predictable. Our struggles are at once life-or-death and laughable, unique and hackneyed. Slang comes into existence and becomes dated across seasons; gender positions that previously went unnamed are barely christened before becoming fuel for furtive in-joking. A resulting terminological churn threatens to become an end-in-itself, rather than an emancipatory tool.

This seems a revealing fate: our genders exist at once in normative and abstracted terms (women do this, men do that ...), and intimately concrete ones ('I have been on HRT for nine months now ...'). Transgender experiences straddle the conventional limits of political and private life, workplace and household. Transition is at once a procedure with far-reaching social ramifications, and an intimately personal matter.

But given this balance, why are so many transgender people apparently drawn to Marxism, and to revolutionary theory more generally? As workforces have been driven apart into ever more splintered formations, reduced in many instances to the casualised 'gig', why has systemic thought blossomed rather than contracted over the first decade of the twenty-first century? Most obviously, the same

stigma that causes us to confine our thinking to private venues leads to our appearances in politics proving so eruptive. Transgender life is harsh enough that many are easily led to conclude that our conditions are beyond redemption; that no centre-left party or Third Sector trend can be relied upon to truly loosen the grip of oppression.

And so in recent years, for those introducing themselves to others in revolutionary circles, to hear ‘trans’ and ‘communist’ in the same breath has become quite routine. Again: we move between the freakish and outlandish to the predictable, the cliché.

Through collecting these essays as a mass-marketed book, we aim to capture the recent proliferation of gender-deviant Marxist thought in a more lasting and accessible form; to move us beyond the limits of ornate in-joking, and communal self-referentiality, and towards social revolution. Or at least to avoid unwitting repetition, and hopeless clashes of lingo, as divergent scenes and traditions come to the same conclusions using different terms.

Already, through this unsteady process of parallel analysis and reinvention, an array of trans people have deployed historical materialist approaches to gender. Our struggle for political emancipation has become understood as one progression within a broader process of class war, and our transitions as reshaping the demands of social reproduction.

We believe that the existing breakthroughs achieved by transgender Marxists will transform the scope for revolutionary action in the coming years. We were determined not to limit ourselves to the theorisation of trans lives available through traditional academic channels. What one faculty or another might deem sufficiently ‘scholarly’ could never be our standard. While we’ve held contributors to a high standard, fitting neatly into the existing division of intellectual labour is not one of our concerns. We aimed to include a global range of perspectives, without burdening any author with the role of serving as local ‘representatives’, or native informants.²

This collection will doubtless cause outrage in certain quarters *within* Marxism. Many have taken class politics as somehow in opposition to any consideration of gender minorities, who are framed as a sideshow to the simplicity and ordinary concerns of workers. What Eric Hobsbawm called ‘vulgar Marxism’ (the set of doctrines popularly associated with Marx’s thought, but with a dubious foundation in his

actual writings) has become a noisier trend in recent years.³ Vulgar Marxists see class as a social division run out of uneven control of the means of production, and the deployment of labour required to keep these lopsided relations operative across generations. Strictly relating political struggles to a steadfast focus on this divide is taken to be the sole sound basis for a 'materialist' view of social relations. Middlebrow Marxists have increasingly come to juxtapose this rigid realism with the vagaries of 'identity politics'.

Yet, from Marx's earliest communist writings onwards, we see a sharp concern with questions of social particularity. From his writings on the American Civil War to the question of anti-Semitism, Marx refused to set aside the fate of minority groups from the structuring of society as a whole. In one of his earliest published works, 'On the Jewish Question', Marx introduces the distinctive operation of the state:

The political annulment of private property not only fails to abolish private property but even presupposes it. The state abolishes, in its own way, distinctions of birth, social rank, education, occupation, when it declares that birth, social rank, education, occupation, are non-political distinctions. When the state proclaims – without regard to these distinctions – that every member of the nation is an equal participant in national sovereignty, when it treats all elements of the real life of the nation from the standpoint of the state. Nevertheless, the state allows private property, education, occupation, to act in their way – i.e., as private property, as education, as occupation, and to exert the influence of their special nature. Far from abolishing these real distinctions, the state only exists on the presupposition of their existence; it feels itself to be a political state and asserts its universality only in opposition to these elements of its being.

In other words, we find in Marx's writings and political concerns still of much relevance to our own struggles. If we are charged with operating outside of Marxism proper, we can only gladly assent and proudly take our place among 'improper Marxists', along with Marx himself.

The state that Marx described has not vanished. Still adopting a supposed impartiality, still supporting social oppression, the

enmeshment of official civic identity and the communities which provide us lives worth surviving through continue to be confronted by successive generations of revolutionaries. Civic identity is always selectively extended in its official form (for instance, a migrant obliged to demonstrate herself as 'skilled' and well behaved in order to be given leave to remain) and then tacitly undermined by structural dispossession (a racialised minority of citizens may have equal rights in many respects from birth, yet still face oppression daily). This tension is one that confounded emancipatory movements of the twentieth century: formal emancipatory processes generated new constituencies willing to 'quit while they were ahead', and retire to private life, rather than press for more contentious 'structural' transformation, or through to social revolution. These same tensions are still struggled with in the present: participants in revolutionary political movements inevitably at once have to be minded with doing what they can to overturn the existing order, while fashioning a liveable life in the meantime. In much of Europe and the Anglophone world, the successes of generations of struggle for trans liberation are bringing victories which run aground in these terms. Granted official sanction approval for our shifting identities, trans people find ourselves drawing closer and closer to a formalised equality. Notable reversals have appeared in nations overtaken by right populism, such as Hungary and the United States under four years of Trump. Yet this simplification of bureaucratic processing has fallen far short of providing true relief from our everyday torments and humiliations.

The 'mainstream' of trans activism has focused on smoothing over the process of transition as it runs through institutions, including those belonging to the state. Our domination by state bureaucracy, by landlords and employers, is often enough treated as a given, to be reeled with sensitivity training workshops and pronoun go-rounds. In many national contexts, considerable breakthroughs have been won in affirming the doctrine of 'self-identification', as well as streamlining the process by which states validate legal sex changes. Although certain British feminist circles have reacted furiously against these breakthroughs – a backlash that has since metastasised into the wider liberal intelligentsia – this rainy backwater seems to be something of an outlier.⁴ For the most part, left-wing circles and youth movements

worldwide are coming to accept the call for ‘trans rights’ as a basic principle.

But what if the emancipation of trans people cannot be won through the securing of ‘rights’? What if, however, smoothed-over the process of state validation were to become, a meaningful liberation remained out of view? What if even the most thoroughgoing political defeat of fascism would not be guaranteed to achieve our social liberation?

It’s these questions which Transgender Marxism will begin to answer.

We offer our answer as a polyphony. There is no authoritative approach to Marx and his legacy, and nor have we sought to impose one. Marxism is a broad and living tradition, defined by its continual internal disputations, its vying schools, and its contested orthodoxies.

Each of these finds inspiration in a different facet of Marx’s practice. For some, it is Marx the ur-sociologist with a voracious appetite for empirical research, huddled over a table awaiting deliveries from the archives in the British Library, steadily concocting a monumental achievement that still closely informs contemporary researchers’ inquiries. Employment statistics, mainstream psychology and economic literature, journalism, workers’ inquiry and testimony – the blue books of our age – are marshalled for our own purposes. Like Marx studying the political economists he sought to critique, we use this dry material to reveal the absurdities of our social system, in the terms of the very authorities who speak in its defence.

Others find consonance in Marx the philosopher, versed in the history of thought from Epicurus right up to the fevered esotericism of the German idealists of his day – a Marx who sought to apprehend the tangled relations of modernity, capitalism, colonialism, and the arrival of mass politics. Marx’s mastery of philosophical terms of art left him at once working against their detachment, and embedded in their frames of reference. Marx responded to the output of these thinkers where it seemed relevant to his political concerns, while never being fully integrated into, or ingratiated with, any scholarly community – a common enough fate for transgender Marxist theorists today.

Still others take their cue from Marx the propagandist – a dedicated organiser, doggedly focused on developing autonomous power. A strategic monomaniac, involved almost exclusively with organisations

founded by workers for the promotion of workers' interests. A rigid proponent of political struggle as the successive development of worker power who refused the fragmenting of politics into a series of 'issues', to be resolved by respective national parliaments, polite societies, and the intelligentsia. This aspect of Marx offers nothing less than a total break from what is conventionally considered 'political': it urges abstinence from the usual flurry of parliamentary gossip, earnest immersion in NGO reports, and reliance on sturdy electoral conventions which narrow the horizons of the possible. The grandiose chambers and stifling committees of national and global governance offer us only one dimension of the political. *Transgender Marxism* directs our attention towards the *power* on which any shop floor, building site or office truly relies.

But as much as any feature of Marx's life and work itself, what has surely drawn many trans theorists towards Marxism is frustration at what we might call the 'mainstream' of trans activism (as strange a notion as this may seem to many). From the reluctance of many organisations to either think beyond the state and the NGO complex, to those groups, self-styled as 'communities', that are clearly riven by the divided class positions and interests of its participants. Too often we have found ourselves expected to set aside questions of exploitation or modes of production, to quiet that part of us that might detect any differentiation within the commonality. The consequence is always the same: it will always require a dose of bad faith to maintain the conceit that all transgender people share precisely the same interests. For all the Global Right's panicked insistence that the state's willingness to tolerate our presence indicates a seismic rift in the course of history, in reality, whatever minor breakthroughs we win pose no threat to the much sturdier relations of exploitation on which society rests.

In this context, Marxism can offer explanations that prevent inevitable burnout from backsliding into mere cynicism. It can reorient us away from liberal optimism, and the predictable shocks that follow on from it. It directs us against the state, and the naturalisation of human exploitation. And, at times, it can direct us away from Marx himself. Marxism is, for us, a practice of immanent critique; that is, a practice of thinking with Marx in spirit rather than in letter. We think *with* him in order to think *against* and *beyond* his limits.

The old mole and the endocrine system

Transgender Marxism focuses wilfully on that which others might dismiss as vulgar, inappropriate, besides-the-political. It aims to provide a materialist account of the distinctive conditions of lack in which we find ourselves, and to help us wriggle free through unlikely means.

Political economist and pornographer Georges Bataille, writing between the wars, distinguished between the work of earlier revolutionaries and Marx's baser materialism. Whereas previous generations had sought out a transcendent principle as a means of drawing 'above' the grisly realities of imperialism, Marx, Bataille argued, chose a humbler metaphor:

The eagle's hooked beak, which cuts all that enters into competition with it and cannot be cut, suggests its sovereign virility...Politically the eagle is identified with imperialism, that is with the unconstrained development of individual authoritarian power, triumphant over all obstacles ... Revolutionary idealism tends to make of the revolution an eagle above eagles, a *supereagle* striking down authoritarian imperialism. An idea as radiant as an adolescent eloquently seizing power for the benefit of utopian enlightenment. This detour naturally leads to the failure of the revolution and, with the help of military fascism, the satisfaction of the elevated need for idealism.

Meanwhile, brought back to the subterranean action of economic facts, the 'old-mole' revolution hollows out chambers in a decomposed soil repugnant to the delicate nose of the utopians. 'Old mole', Marx's resounding expression for the complete satisfaction of the revolutionary outburst of the masses, must be understood in relation to the notion of a geological uprising as expressed in the *Communist Manifesto*. Marx's point of departure has nothing to do with the heavens, preferred station of the imperialist eagle as of Christian or revolutionary utopias. He begins with the bowels of the earth, as in the materialist bowels of proletarians.⁵

Following the mole's tracks, Transgender Marxism unearths the base needs of trans proles and brings them above ground, into clearer view.

Much work remains to be done expanding the earthy, intestinal visions of Marx and his successors outwards, moving from the bowels towards the glands and receptors that make up our endocrine system. Transition, too, must come to be understood by revolutionaries as a response to its own form of *hunger*. The longings that drive so many to reforge lives for ourselves that leave us thoroughly proletarianised, or cast out, rendered surplus. Those cravings and cavings-in that clinicians have long attempted to desiccate under the catch-all term 'dysphoria'. In truth, our moments of euphoric coping are enmeshed with the moments in which we are struck dumb by gut-churning dread. These are the moments that define our everyday lives. The restless energies that produce for us new needs; needs that can be difficult even to describe. Transphobic strands of 'revolutionary' thought would rather these yearnings be set aside, left unspoken; to be repressed (at least in the political arena), or perhaps to be exterminated altogether.

Too often, what passes for revolutionary thought on sex has done little better: endocrinology is reduced to a corporate plot. Just another opportunity for polluting human bodies in pursuit of profits. For us, the flows of hormones which can condemn or revive us are no more natural than capitalism, and no more sinister than filling our bellies with food. Our needs bury themselves measurably through our bloodstream, then define our contentment on levels still not possible to fully isolate, or reliably record.⁶

We do not recognise readings of Marx which see him as unconcerned with matters of physicality and bodily involvement in exploitation. Contemporary Marxist scholars, including Keston Sutherland and Maya Gonzalez, have drawn attention to Marx's definition of labour as consisting of 'a productive expenditure of human brains, muscles, nerves, hands etc.'⁷ And Marx was certainly not oblivious to the ways in which the forces of production determine what counts as an acceptable or a useful body.⁸ We follow in this tradition closely, understanding that our physical forms are reshaped first and foremost by the demands of capital. From muscle mass to skin, skeletons to hair follicles, our forms take shape in the face of history. But transitions never *belong* to capitalism. Even as they are always routed through it, they also run against it. The transgender revolutionary is one who can neither deny their cravings, nor curse themselves for their untoward identity. We resent the society that birthed us, just as we refuse to set

aside the tools it has offered us. We find ourselves at once immersed and resistant.

Key to our agenda is ensuring that trans life *itself* comes clearly into view: we are opposed to the entrenchment of a transcendent principle of ‘trans’ that comes to obscure the particular struggles of trans people to survive in the face of capitalism (or indeed, other modes of production). The false promise of transcendence is that our experiences can soar in the manner of Bataille’s eagle, offering a view of worldly affairs from such a distance that the grime and stretch marks are out of sight. We reject this approach. Our struggle is one that must be understood as intimate, concrete, and particular; just as it restlessly casts shadows over more universal questions, upsets attempted settlements between classes, and erodes otherwise tidy attempts at systemic thought. Transition is not a dive into unbounded expansiveness, but a mess that a thousand failed attempts at comprehensive sociology have tried to push out of view. A persistent irritant, disturbing the smoothness of grand narratives.

We are forced to hide ourselves, while pinned in clear view. We are human refuse or exotic delicacies, depending on the website. To see us clearly evokes cringes and trembling, yet we are driven onto the streets.

True to this nature, trans people occupy an awkward space in social theory and Marxist politics. When not actively vilified, or included as a polite footnote, many assume an interest in trans people thanks to our *marginalisation*. As we are more likely to experience poverty, destitution, engage in sex work, experience abuse and mistreatment by wider society, and the police and the criminal justice system, we tend to be more radical than the general population, and thus a source of special interest. By dint of our positionality, this argument runs, we are readymade comrades.

In particular, because we occupy a ‘liminal’ and ‘ambiguous’ space in the gender order, we are taken to embody (or at least provoke) a space of subversion and rebellion. One that can, perhaps, shake existing society out of its complacency vis-à-vis sex and gender – a gender vanguardism of sorts. The upshot is that trans people are perhaps a useful source of recruits, or a fashionable cause to follow – and, *sotto voce*, bearers of a special responsibility.

We might call this the ‘auxiliary’ move: transgender workers are cast as playing a prominent role within a shared struggle due to the extent

of their proletarianised condition. The upshot is that trans people and trans struggles are taken as being relevant *only in so far* as they boost struggles in which socialist groups are already participants, or in which they wish to participate. This runs at odds to drawing from the obvious questions thrown up by the lived experiences of trans workers. From sex work to 'trans in tech', the fields most stereotypically associated with trans people are generally also those notoriously resistant to unionisation, to strikes, and other standard fare for workerist organising.

As an account of trans and queer life this 'auxiliary' argument is precisely *negative*. We are of note due to our suffering, and by dint of our stigmatisation and its travails. In short, we serve the cause as exemplary proletarians. Little space is left for the actual substance of trans life, the experiences of surviving in the context of separation that we already share among ourselves, and the resultant insights for a broader and refreshed view of capitalism's reproduction.

But while ever more popular, this is hardly a new move. Emma Heaney has shown that throughout modern history trans women find themselves and their experiences always represented as an allegory for *something else*. Rather than being treated on their own terms, trans women serve to ground the universality of cis experience.⁹ Literary modernism is replete with examples of trans women as metaphorical figures for the destabilisation of inherited gender traditions. We are stand-ins for broader destabilisations brought about by urbanisation, suffrage, and women entering new roles in the workforce, and with that, attendant anxieties over masculine self-assurance and patriarchal entitlement. In other accounts, transgender experiences serve as an example of the dizzying achievements of techno-scientific modernity. In Freud's hands, we appear as a degraded figure who is, nevertheless, a critical allegory for the unconscious that clarifies his theory of same-sex desire as inversion and castration anxiety. Here, wilful feminisation is a looming threat of egoic injury, clarifying the operation and universality of *cis-sex*.¹⁰

Yet here we find a double bind: in so far as the transgender woman is seen to be speaking of herself, she is taken to be trafficking in mere particularity. She appears as a marginal concern of no wider import, easily corralled. But in so far as she is taken to be speaking on a more general, more universal register, she effaces her very particularity. As she is brought to bear on all topics of social weight, she instrumentalises

herself – trans as condition, as a way of being, as a mode of life – and is made to bear the burden of the entire gendered order. Whatever she is, the trans woman is always not herself; she is a representation of gender trouble writ large. Her own account can only be received with suspicion, yet much is demanded from her. Not only must she offer an account for her gender, but for yours as well.

The figure of the trans woman interloper, disrupting otherwise stable and harmonious relations within the community of women, functions to relieve radical feminism of the indignity of acknowledging the incoherence of the radical feminist project as such.¹¹ Conveniently, the trans woman as pest distracts from long-running doubts around radical feminism's claimed ability to speak for, represent, and defend the sanctity of women-in-general: women's rights, women's interests, women's spaces and women's knowledge. Here, the grit of trans women is abraded into the pearl of a rear-guard defence of female universalism. What the earlier feminist movement had sought to destabilise now becomes anxiously reasserted. If one is inclined to wonder how successfully the predominantly white, professionally-trained, and well-off ladies who have always dominated feminist 'leadership' might serve in that role, those self-appointed representatives find themselves with a readymade riposte: 'Well, we will at least do a better job than males'. By 'males', of course, they mean trans women.

Our answer to this is simple enough. Rather than a second-order modality of feminine embodiment, we insist that trans women face down the same imperatives of capitalist exploitation, exacerbated by patriarchal relations, as anyone else.

But something else is elided here. What about trans men? Thus far, the distinctive struggles and joys of transmasculine life have been downplayed to the point of being disappeared in much revolutionary theory. The question of how a proletarian manhood, or something like it, can be forged in the face of separation is a fraught one; like many such questions, it is too often avoided altogether. Most relevant revolutionary thought in the Anglophone context has been articulated under the label 'transfeminism', a designation which often seems to relegate trans male activists to a secondary standing.¹² This tendency self-perpetuates through a cycle of reaction, as transphobes take particular offence at the notion of trans womanhood, meaning attempted rebuttals of their bigotry tend to centre around a defence

of trans women. The consequence is that the particular position and distinctive struggles faced by those transitioning to male are unthinkingly downplayed. We have little time for analysis which weighs up diligently who ranks as most oppressed among the oppressed. Let's move beyond this dead-end evaluation, and towards the shared emancipation which can only be achieved by comrades. Scholarly attempts to do so have featured freewheeling endocrino-romanticism (Paul Preciado), tenuous comparison (Maggie Nelson), and academic phenomenology (Gayle Salamon). Transgender Marxism offers a different approach.

Marx in transition

So how can we develop a theory which views trans politics as neither figural nor instrumental, but an account of self-knowledge? One generative of its own theoretical conclusions?

The beginnings of an answer appear in Marx and his critique of value. The categories Marx presents in *Capital* – commodity, capital, money – are performatives. While Marx attempts what he terms a 'scientific' approach to grasping capitalism, this is always a partial science. To accept Marx's view of value unsettles the naturalisation that ideology coats earlier accounts of capitalism (as well as more schools that rose to prominence in the wake of Marxism, particularly marginalism.) Marx's presentation of these categories is intensely parodic and deconstructive, in intent and effect. He operates with the gaze of a critical anthropologist, bringing in one character after another, before disassembling their roles in reproducing an emergent assemblage called capitalism.¹³

As a text, the structure of *Capital* bears more of an ironic resemblance to a play, or to the thrilling arc of Alexandre Dumas' *The Count of Monte Cristo* than to François Quesnay's *Tableau économique* or David Ricardo's *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. Marx's point is that beneath the reified social spheres of 'markets' and 'commerce' as objects of knowledge for the ascendent social science of political economy is a historically-bounded, emergent form of social organisation. One deeply invested in regulating the behaviours, bodily comportments, and affective dispositions of its subjects – and one whose underlying logics had heretofore escaped the attention of