

Éric Laurent, From the trans

This is an interview that will leave its mark. Beyond the admiration for the alacrity of tone on these delicate subjects, there is so much to learn. Marty's reading of Butler needed a commentary. One can say of this interview what JAM said of Marty's book. It was expected. You'll have to read it along with the book.

My first reading leads me to respond to this outburst. I would like to return to what Éric Marty calls "the epistemological clash [...] between the *trans* question and the concept of gender" (p.7). In this sentence, *trans* is used as a synonym for transsexual. The transsexual is objected to because, as JAM says, "The T stands out because for the transsexual it is not a sexual practice, but a change of sexual identity." (p.12).

In the course of the development of gender discourse, the *trans* has become disjointed from the transsexual. In the discourse that has become detached from Butler, and in the course of Butler's own development, the paradigm of the *trans* wants to replace the *transsexual*. In a way, to make the *trans* a "mode of enjoyment" (mode de jouir), according to the equation that JAM proposes. It is not without an Other. This is what Susan Stryker says, quoted by Neus Carbonell in her text "La parodia de los sexos y la ley", published in *Lacan Quotidien* 925: "Some people change the gender assigned to them at birth because they firmly believe that they belong to another gender in which they could live better; others want to venture into a new place, into a space not yet clearly described or concretely occupied; and still others simply feel the need to defy the expectations related to the gender that was initially imposed on them." Butler herself, in *Bodies that Matter*, wants to reduce the transsexual to a borderline case, a remnant of the substitution, the metaphor, of the transsexual paradigm by the trans paradigm. The *trans* paradigm takes over the whole "*queerization*" of sex. This leaves transsexuals as borderline cases of the "binary" belief.

What has changed in the contemporary psychiatric clinic compared to the Stoller era, 1960s, is that it no longer relies on the transsexual paradigm, which is inadmissible in the new psychopathological classifications. Indeed, the 1970s and 1980s ensured the exfiltration of sexual self-determinations out of

psychopathology. The only things that remain in these classifications are those that target others without consent: paedophilia and perverse behaviours grouped under the label 'paraphilias'.

However, beyond the choices, there are still the sufferings of the subjects to assume them. In the conception cobbled together by US psychiatrists and the *DSM*, which leads the way, *trans* subjects are subjects who suffer from the inadequacy of their bodies, not from the belief that they are of the other sex. They suffer from "gender dysphoria". And the harm comes from the Other. They are unable to include their bodies in a *transphobic* society in the sense of the *trans* paradigm. That is, a society that has rigid heteronormative requirements for everyone.

The trans paradigm allows the malaise of the body to be extended to very young children, and to increase the category by 1000% in ten years or 400% in 5 years. It allows us to accept that more than 50% or even 80% of the subjects thus classified before puberty change their minds, and that it is no longer clear whether this is their own decision or a contamination by social networks, etc.

It is the justification through suffering that allows psychiatrists to keep their place in the loop, whereas the associations want to exclude them completely. Hence a new clinic. To which I only have access through the texts.