

- All it does is deny humanity the full spectrum of humanity.
- And really that's-- it's actually a very common human trait. It's something that everyone falls under. We tend to look for the easiest answers that we can. And that's one of the reasons behind stereotyping, maybe even some of the-- well, not maybe. It is some of the root causes for racism or classism or sexism and--
- Right. And I believe that this book is fundamentally sexist at its core that--
- Yeah, I agree.
- The very foundations of his entire existence is based on this kind of very deep-seated sexism that is going to be really hard to combat. And it's going to take me a while to come up with a clear conversational way to describe this to people because it's really complicated. And it throws into questions a lot of stuff that people think are natural.
- But he's reaching these easy conclusions. It's very lazy research.
- It's lazy research and it's lazy thinking. It's just a simple, straightforward way to just dehumanize people. It's like back-- it's like taking another race analogy. It's like the people who are deeply invested in the idea that there's two races. We're very troubled by the people who fell in the middle and it came up with all of these creative ways to control them and to categorize them.

So there were mulattos or there were-- I don't know if you've ever heard of the idea of they used to think you had Black blood. And so if you had a fourth Black blood you were called a quadroon. And if you had an 1/8 of a Black-- of Black blood, meaning it's like one grandparent, then you were an octoroon. And in order-- you could own an octoroon, but you couldn't own anybody. You had less blood than that.

So there were all these rules so that they could keep people in certain places. And just like with us, I feel like we're in this borderline and we can cross back and forth. But it's all about trying to control us and keep. And sort of maintain these boundaries that he considers very important.

- I'm sorry. I thought I heard someone getting ready to speak.

- Go ahead. Go ahead.

- I'm trying not to dominate. One of the theories that he tended to dismiss very easily was the Netherlands study. And that played into my point that he's basically focusing on one conclusion, one particular opinion from Blanchard in dismissing everything else that's a possibility and to me it seemed like he approached this with a very, I guess, a narrow focus, a tendency to put the blinders on. Exactly. I guess the scientific myopia.

- Well, as I said earlier, I don't really care about the science stuff. I look at our condition like any other treatable condition. It's like in a way, it doesn't matter what happens because they have treatment for it now. So it's like they can treat certain kinds of cancer very well, but they don't know exactly what causes it, but who cares. It's like in a lot of ways, that doesn't matter for right now. It's like eventually that will be important and that'll be great.

So as far as the science stuff, I don't even care about that, to be honest. It's like that side of the argument doesn't really matter. To me, it's like what I want to talk about is the kind of language that he's using and the clear biases that he's bringing in his observations, which are colored by the way that he feels about us. He has this personal relationship to transgenderism that he's not being fully honest about. And that's what I'm really interested in looking at.

He's always talking about, oh, as a straight, single, heterosexual man, this is what I see. But the only reason he's saying that is because those categories are extremely important to how he self-identifies

- I wish he would have been at the UCLA lecture. He actually mentioned a couple of very telling, I guess, little sentences that he threw in at various times. One of which was that he had no problem with effeminate men. And, in fact, he wished there were many more effeminate men. He loved effeminate men.

And to me, I thought, well, I thought this man was straight, but for some reason or another, I did have the little pinging going off in my head. There's some-- I tend to think he's got some issues of some type that he hasn't dealt with that he's trying to explore.

- Well, that's sort of what I'm interested in exploring too. We've got some investigations going on in Chicago, and it'll be very interesting what comes out of all of it. The initial reports are pretty eye-opening as far as like what he's really all about.

And I'm sort of seeing a picture. At first, I sort of had a very angry response to this book. And now I'm sort of seeing that this is somebody who's deeply conflicted and just needs somebody to sit down with him and say, look, I think that-- you need to look inward instead of looking outward.

There's some things going on that you're not really thinking very hard about yourself.

- Yeah, well, he understood from the onset that this was going to be a controversial book. But he kept repeating his claim that he was not doing this to harm the gay community or to harm the transsexual community.

- Oh, whatever. That's a bunch of crap.

- Well, true.

- That may not be his intention, but that's his result.

- Right.

- Exactly.

- I don't buy that for a minute. I think that he has a lot of issues about how he feels about all this and that he's taking those out on us and that I see a clear pattern of that which I'll be exploring in detail on my site as time goes on. It's just so much to deal with on this because it's kind of like fighting a Hydra.

It's like you cut off one head, and two more grow because there's no science to grasp on to and refute him on those grounds because as you said, he dismisses a lot of the stuff. So I'm going to take it outside of that and look at why this is so important to him.

- So this isn't the first book of this kind of controversy that's come along. I'm thinking of Janice Raymond's *Transsexual Empire* in 1979. And it's probably got a lot of parallels to that.

- Oh, absolutely. I see them as sort of arguing the same thing, which is this sort of idea of biological essentialism, where-- the phrase is biology is destiny.

- Yeah, your biology controls your destiny. Yeah.

- And there's a lot of real problems with thinking that way because I don't think that humans can be reduced to something as simple as that because I think that once you get consciousness into the equation that-- it really changes a lot of things that-- we may have certain tendencies that Bailey's right about, that there are certain average things that can happen. Like, you can say about a demographic group that they tend towards this or they tend towards that.

And I don't disagree with that. But the problem is when you have such a rigid sort of biological construction of what male and female are that that in itself is sexist. And a lot of people don't think of it that way because it seems like it's natural. But the medicalization of sex differences is really part of the construct of gender, if that makes sense.

- Oh, yeah. Well, go ask an intersex person how fair male and female is.

- Exactly.

- Exactly. So it's just-- there's a lot of stuff to unpack out of this little suitcase of bad ideas. So it's going to take me a while to do it all.

- Well, the one thing that I'm most concerned with-- is this actually making it out into academe and becoming in essence the-- oh, I'm sorry. Are we ready for break right now?

- Well, we're ready for the station ID.

- Yes, we are. You're listening to *After Hours*, queer radio with attitude, on KPFT Houston, KEOS College Station, and 89.5 in Galveston.

- Well, sorry for the little interruption.

- It's 2:00 AM. Yes, queer radio with attitude, and we've got attitudes for a damn good reason. Who?

- So yeah, you were talking about this book getting into academia, and that's my concern is because in some ways, it's like this book is like the poison pill in the candy or something because it--

- It becomes the authority.

- --it's got more sort of veneer of caring and concern around it that a lot of people are going to look at it superficially and think, oh, here's somebody who claims to be a friend of the community. And look, he knows some transsexuals. And he's talked to some women about this and that.

But what they don't see is that there's a lot going on underneath that veneer of science and academics that is really problematic.

- Well, she didn't actually say who it was. But on Lynn Conway's website, she quotes that this book is finding a ready audience in mainstream psychology courses at major universities, and it's now being heavily marketed and is already being adopted by undergraduate psychology courses at major universities throughout the United States, presumably because it has the stamp of approval of the National Academy of Sciences.

- Right. In fact, I saw it on the University of Wisconsin website. It was already listed as a resource on transsexualism.

- Yeah. We'll see it on more.

- And there's some little information. I didn't get to finish my thought earlier, but there is so little information out there that was already available on the subject of transsexualism or even the distinctions between transgender--

- So little accurate information.

- Yes, exactly. And it's something that we've been basically begging for the longest time. And now we finally got something that comes out from the National Academy of Sciences.

And rather than being something that's comprehensive and very detailed and takes a good definitive look at the overall community, instead of doing something that, I guess, would be more accurate in an overarching term, instead we get something that is basically, well, here it is folks. It's one-size-fits or two-size-fits-all. And it's going to be one of these two. Plug it into one of the two.

If you can't get it to fit to gay male, then by God, there are an autogynephile. And forget what they said.

- Well, I'm curious to know what his-- as it were his sample size was because it came out long, long, long, after the fact that Janice Raymond didn't actually ever meet any transsexual people before writing her book. And so it makes me wonder how many and exactly who were the kinds of transsexual people that were--

- Used to write that book.

- --the people that Bailey worked with in order to get his research. I mean-

-

- Right. As you mentioned, Lynn Conway has been very busy doing investigations in Chicago and speaking with several of the people who were showcased in the book, several who were very unhappy with the portrayal.

In fact, Lynn was the first to show them how they were portrayed, some of them, in the book. And one of them, in particular, was very hurt because Bailey said some very unkind and ungenerous things about someone who had been kind to him. And so I just think it goes to show what kind of person he is.

I think that he's got difficulties having human interaction with people. So by reducing us to these types and these more easily sort of manageable, less complex individuals, then he can sort of handle us better or something.

- It was very exploitative kind of sitting through the various clips, and I know-- I guess probably one of the subjects that you're speaking about, she was detailed actually quite prominently and played in a fashion to where even the members of the audience, some of the transgendered members of the audience, stood up and said, look, I don't know why you're putting this person up here. It's a negative portrayal.

And obviously, this person's psychotic. And I know the person myself, the one from Chicago. And there is some eccentricities. She's a bit of an artist, but this was taken out of context.

And unfortunately, it skews it to make her look maybe even much more pejorative than would normally be the case. And--

- Exactly, exactly.

- --it evokes emotions that I don't think really should have been intended with that kind of a study, especially if it was supposed to be, I guess, structured as a sensitive study.

- Right. And if you look at what Bailey's project is as far as categorizing transsexuals, he says pretty early on in his chapter on transsexualism that anybody who has serious thoughts about changing sex as a transsexual in his book-- which means it's like saying a divorced guy is anybody who's seriously thought about getting a divorce. It's like, to me, that's inaccurate.

It's like that there is a certain amount of action that transsexualism implies that he's decided on this large overarching way of thinking about transsexuals and said he can include people who have mental disorders. In his definition, the Unabomber would be a transsexual because he's seriously thought about having a sex change. And Richard Speck, this mass murderer, was a transsexual according to Bailey because he had these serious thoughts about changing his body.

And to me, those people don't fit the strict clinical definition of transsexualism, which is people who are living these sort of quiet, productive lives and who are interested in assimilating into a social role that matches how they feel about themselves.

- And it's kind of again reinforcing the pathologization--

- Exactly.

- --of the transgenders. It basically states that, in essence, yes, they are gender dysphorics that--

- Yeah, we're sickies, aren't we?

- Yeah.

- Well, if he can categorize us all as prostitutes as he does in the book or socially stunted deviance or can compare us to the killer in *Silence of the Lambs*, which he does, then he can make his case that we should be disordered. There's a point in the book where he says some people who don't think homosexuality should be considered a disorder have a problem thinking that a subset of homosexuals might be disordered.

So you can kind of get a sense of where he's going with this argument that well, OK, we can't anymore say it's not PC to say that homosexuals are disordered. But we can pick on this more vulnerable group within what I consider homosexuals.

- And it's a very easy target for him too.

- Well, that's the thing. And I feel like our community is just now at the cusp of finding its own voice and having people who are both assimilated, successful, and out. And that's what's really exciting is that even though this book is really negative, there's so much positive stuff happening right now that we're about to start speaking in our own voices and show that we are productive members of society in every field, in every career.

And that's what we're trying to get out with some of the projects that we're doing beyond this silly book.

- Yeah. My one concern, though, is that I'm hoping we're not kind of getting into the game a little bit too late. It's, I guess, looking at it from more of a political vantage point. I've noticed that time and time again it's very easy for people to just, in essence, write us off, that we're damaged goods.

- Yeah. I think we're about to see a bit of a backlash because we've made a lot of gains in the media. And there have been some depictions that were good and that we've made some legal gains as well. We've had some setbacks, like in Kansas and Texas. But we also had the [? Contreras ?] case in Florida, so.

I think given the current political climate, that we're going to see a sort of retrenching of sort of conservative ideologies. And so he's in a perfect position to paint us as these kind of people who are on the fringes of society.

- And even in the gay community, we've kind of put on the recourse defense since everything switched over. We're like, uh--

- Yeah, exactly. We were over at GLAAD the other day, and they're pretty busy right now. It's not pretty out there. And unfortunately, this book only-- it just spans the flames for the conservative elements because it has this veneer of reasonability and science and all of this kind of stuff that--

- Yeah, and the stamp of approval of the government effectively and in the eyes of the National Academy of Sciences.

- Automatic credibility.

- Right. So luckily. I honestly believe that we'll be able to show that this guy is kind of the new John Money as far as conditions like ours are concerned. But it's going to take probably about a year or so before all that stuff goes down. But it will happen.

- For those out there who aren't the old-timers like us, can you explain your John Money comment there?

- John Money was the head of Johns Hopkins Gender Identity Clinic, and he was very famous for coming up with a number of studies that made claims about our condition, as well as intersex conditions and about gender identity and transsexualism.

- Especially as it relates to nature over-- or nurture over nature. Yeah.

- Right. And it turns out that his most famous case, which was called the John/Joan case, was actually a young man named David Reimer, who had a terrible circumcision accident. And his parents took him to John Money who said, oh, well, we should raise this child as a girl. And because--

- Yeah, it's the typical thing. Penis equal male. Therefore--

- Right, exactly.

- --penis equals male.

- And you're kind of seeing that in Bailey as well, which it's going to take me a little while to write that essay. But I'll put something up about that.

- Well, it is very similar. In his approach to it, he pretty much-- speaking about money now, went into this with a pre-ordained conclusion that this is what I believe it is. And I'm going to set out to ensure that I prove my theory. And--

- And the worst part is that even after he started to see evidence that his theory was a bunch of crap--

- He hid it.

- --he hid the data. And I believe that that's the level of intellectual dishonesty that we're dealing with with Bailey. I believe that he knows things that he's not sharing because he wants to hold his pet theory together.

- Yeah. And a lot of it-- actually, Sarah Fox had mentioned this to me that there's a lot of ego. And really, I guess this goes with a lot of professions.

When you're highly educated, you're presumably someone who's an expert in the field, the last thing you want is to have someone come up and just completely and totally debunk your theory or, worse yet, debunk your own theory.

- Exactly. So that's kind of what we're running into here is that he's got this self-identification as like a powerful and respected authority. And so now that he just became chair of the psychology department at Northwestern University, he's kind of like this little petty hilltop chieftain.

And he's like, oh, I'm going to start branching out, reinforce my little area here. And we're saying, no, the emperor has no clothes. And he's like, yes, I do. Yes, I do.

And so it's just going to get really ugly and messy before it's all over. But in the end, I really do know that we'll prevail.

- Yeah, it's just-- I wonder how long that's going to take. To me, I foresee a very, very steep uphill climb because of the fact that he's gotten, in essence, this legitimacy via the National Academy of Sciences.

And now all of a sudden, this particular cat is out of the bag, and they're already pushing this forward at, to me, a lightning speed as being--

- Yeah, well, I believe that I'll be able to demonstrate his bias pretty clearly and pretty quickly. So with luck, that'll be enough to get most people to realize that this is pretty crackpot academic nonsense. And then he can go back to doing his little gay stuff or whatever he wants to do and retrenched there because he's really out of his league on this stuff, and it's, I think, beyond the scope of his understanding.

You know what he kind of reminds me of? Is he's like one of these dweeby little guys who writes a book on baseball because he can't really do it himself or some square nerd, tone-deaf music critic, or something. He's like somebody who--

- So you write the book on research because he can't do it himself.
[CHUCKLES]

- Well, he's just so out of his element that it's like, dude, man, you got to step back. It's like we're trying to tell you something, and you're not listening.

- He self-identifies as a straight White man, and his connection with the community is to observe it from the outside and somehow gather the information he thinks he needs to do the research without ever having any experiential knowledge of any of it.

- Well, that's the thing. I think he does have experiential knowledge, but he's pretending to be objective. And that's the problem is that he is completely subjective, and he's not willing to admit his subjectivity. He is not an outsider. He likes to think that he's standing outside and observing us, but he can't do that because he's not an objective observer.

He's got an agenda, and--

- Oh, yeah.

- --he's got a theory and all of this stuff that is coloring his view of all of this.

- I think even in one point, he does mention that it's very difficult for him to separate that objectivity as the outsider dealing with these women in the specific bars and to be able to, I guess, kind of retain that along with his-- oh, I'm sorry.

- Oh, go ahead. Yeah. I was just going to say that's because he's attracted to some of us. And so all of a sudden, he's freaked out. He's like, hey, whoa, I'm a straight heterosexual macho male man.

It's like, what's going on here? And so he's created this very elaborate system in which he can remain this straight heterosexual male man but still be attracted to transsexual women, but only a certain kind, because the ones that want me to be attracted to them are the ones that I'm attracted to. They're making me do it.

I'm just this straight macho man. But these transsexuals who are really hot, they're trying to get me to be attracted to them. It's this really bizarre thing, but that's the only way in his mind that he can still say, oh, I'm this outside observer.

It's like, I'm the straight male observer, which has been his shtick since he started all this case out of his, I'm the only straight man who studies homosexuality.

- One of the topics that we've kind of talked around here a little while is what can we do. I mean, I've seen some of the work that you've been-- great work, wonderful work that you've been doing on your website. And I've seen the letter that-- the letter writing campaign that Lynn Conway mailed out.

Is there anything that the transgender community as a whole can do to represent ourselves as we are rather than colored through his viewpoint?

- Yeah, there's a couple of things that we can do. One of the problems is besides the fact that he says we're liars if we disagree, he also completely dismisses any sort of anecdotal evidence. In other words, if someone agrees with his theory, he calls them open and honest. But if they disagree, then they're guilty of--

- Denial.

- --common lies. And so it's kind of a no-win situation. So what we're going to need to do is just tell our stories in our own voices.

- Set a good example.

- And blanket it.

- Exactly. And what I'm hoping to do is-- I've been collecting responses, so if people want to write an essay, they're welcome to send it to me. And I'll consider it to put up. It's getting to be so much information already that I'm probably going to--

- You're going to need a separate site.

- What's that?

- You will need a separate site.

- I know. I think I might. I've already had to spin off my hair removal site into a general market site. So who knows?

Maybe I'll have to get BaileysAnIdiot.com or something and go to town. But the other thing that people can do is there's certain things that we're going to be needing, including full text of the papers that are referred to and a lot of sort of--

- Background.

- --little things like that. It's like we're in the process of doing like investigations that costs a little bit of money. So if people have any information on how to do that stuff or they want to contribute financially, it's like [? Linda ?] and I have set up places where people can come.

And if they have more money than time, unlike most of us, they can help out that way. But the main thing, I think, is to send along your thoughts and feelings because everybody that's written to me has said something or phrased something in a way that has helped shape my thinking about all this. And what comes out of that is something that's-- it's a coalition.

It's something that the community is built together. And it's going to be that much stronger if it contains all the viewpoints.

- One of the things I want to touch on before we, I guess, kind of wrap this up--

- Yeah, we've got about 12 more minutes.

- Yeah, about 12 more minutes. I was actually kind of curious at the response from some of the publications, especially within the-- not necessarily the transgender community. That was pretty much kind of along the same lines. But from the gay and lesbian press.

- Well, they were probably caught unaware. We're working on that right now. I can't say what's happening, but we've got something that we'll be announcing on the site in a couple of weeks about gay and lesbian magazines and publications and stuff. So--

I was actually kind of surprised

- --there's a lot going on right now that I can't talk about because--

- It's in progress.

- I'm actually a little concerned about things like litigation and stuff like that, so we're trying not to say anything until we've got plenty of evidence. But believe me, there's going to be plenty of evidence and plenty of work being done to counter this book.

- I was really kind of shocked in a way at some of the, I guess, very glowing reviews of the book. To me, especially with some of the readership that were-- well, I don't want to say trying to make the separations or the distinctions between the various factions of the community. But a lot of folks don't, I guess, quite see things as all of us are the same creature.

We face a lot of the same situations, face a lot of the same discrimination. But there are pretty distinct differences between the various categories. And--

- Yeah, I guess what I would say is that we were very glad the other day. And they're sort of looking at our issues as the next boundary. They sort of understand that transgender issues, even though they're not welcomed by some in the gay and lesbian community, are very important parts of the equation for gay and lesbian rights.

And so what we're really hoping to do out here in Los Angeles is to start building those bridges, especially in media depictions and in helping people consult on films and in television and that sort of stuff, because somebody needs to be out here doing that because so many movies get it wrong, so many TV shows aren't quite right. We see an opportunity to correct that, as well as work with other groups.

- Definitely. That's why there's T on the end of GLBT. [CHUCKLES]

- Exactly.

- And media really does have an effect on people's lives and upon the public's opinion.

- Absolutely. Look at you guys. I mean, look what you're doing. It really does make a difference. And so I worked in advertising for like 10 years, and I became very aware of how powerful the media is.

It's like you could write one little commercial and sell \$30 million worth of stuff. It's pretty staggering when you start thinking about the potential for misuse, as well as good uses.

- You know what we haven't done yet?

- What's that?

- Well, a listener called in who's listening to us on the web from, of all places, Los Angeles, California.

- Oh, really?

- And we've never actually named this book. The name of the book is *The Man Who Would Be Queen*. It was written by J. Michael Bailey.

It was released just this year. I mean, we didn't get the who, the what, the when, the where, and all that stuff at the beginning.

- Yeah, it's almost like I don't even want to promote it. I just want to talk about the lame theories.

- So really, if you want to know more about this book, I wouldn't be looking for *The Man Who Would Be Queen*. I would be looking for www.tsroadmap.com and find the link in there for the Bailey-Blanchard-Lawrence Clearinghouse.

- Yes. And it's under info sources on that.

- Yeah, if you wrote the whole URL, which is www.tsroadmap.com, like I said, --slash info slash bailey-- B-A-I-L-E-Y-- --dash blanchard-- B-L-A-N-C-H-A-R-D-- --dash lawrence-- L-A-W-R-E-N-C-E-- --dot html. It's a great place to start.

- That was a big one.

- Yeah, it's a great place to start. Another good place is on Lynn Conway's website, www.lynnconway.com. And she's got quite a bit of her research up there already, and I'm sure there's plenty more to come.

- It's true. And speaking of Lynn, she and I have been working together a lot on more positive things as well. And I wondered if maybe we might close on that part.

- Please. Yeah, let's.

- Lynn has put up one of the very best pieces of media that is online and possibly in all of media, which is the TS success pages.

- Yes, that's wonderful.

- --for both women and men.

- I'm overdue. She asked me to put mine up there.

- Yeah, get it up there. Come on.

- OK. Hey. You're a success.

- I've been overemployed and had no time to do it for the longest time until I recently-- so folks out there, I'm going to tell you now. I've just recently become unemployed, and I'm looking for a new job. My profession is not probably going to find me a spot in Houston.

So unfortunately, I'm not going to have a whole lot more of these shows. But as long as I'm in Houston, you can count on me being here for the even months. But in any case, the way it's going, I'm not finding anything either. So we may both be.

But in any case, now that I have a little time, maybe I'll write that up.

- Yeah, I think you should. So anyway, so Lynn and I are working hard on that. And also--

- It's a wonderful piece.

- --at the beginning of your show, you mentioned *Soldier's Girl* with--

- Yes.

- Which featured the life of my business partner, Calpernia Addams. And she and I run a company called Deep Stealth Productions.

- [LAUGHS] What a name.

- [LAUGHS]

- Which for people who don't know, that's a wink to a term that's used in our community by some people to mean living without people knowing your gender identity issues from your past. And so we just came out here, and we started off doing a couple of instructional videos. But now we're sort of branching out into doing other things, including a short film which is based on one of our instructional videos actually.

And we think it's going to be kind of cool. And the other thing that we're really, really excited about is that we just signed on with Eve Ensler to do a transgender-themed *Vagina Monologues*.

- Oh my God.

- And that's going to happen in early 2004 here in Los Angeles.

- Please keep us updated on that.

- Yeah, we're really excited about this. When we were at Sundance, we got in touch with someone who was able to put us in contact with Eve. And everything just clicked really well.

As I said, we're trying to build bridges between communities. And Eve has this great program called V-Day, which is to stop violence against women worldwide. And we said, hey, our community suffers from disproportionate amounts of violence because of our vulnerability and being pushed to sort of the fringes of community-- of society, I mean, by a lot of different groups.

And so she said, yeah, let's do this. And so it looks like it's probably going to be early March.

- Cool.

- That's excellent.

- Excellent news.

- Yes. It's really exciting.

- Oop, sorry.

- I was going to say because Eve and other progressive feminists understand that gender issues are everyone's issues and that transgendered women face the same issues that nontransgendered women do and that we have a lot to offer them, as well as they have a lot to offer us, and that-- I don't even like to think of it as them and us. It's that we're all together in this. And so that's what we're hoping to demonstrate with this.

- You talked a little bit of memory here, mentioning the educational material and gender identity. I'd like to announce that Hewlett-Packard has become the latest company to include in their employment non-discrimination-- or their equal opportunity clause and their anti-harassment clauses, the inclusion of gender identity or expression.

- When did that happen?

- This week.

- That happened about a week ago or so.

- Yeah, this week.

- Hon, I never got a word from you.

- I didn't get an official word until Monday, and I still don't have anything in print from them. But I attended the HP Houston Pride June program which was held Tuesday this week. And it was announced there vocally. So I haven't gotten anything in print.

No longer being an HP employee, I don't get the stuff directly. But I'll have that for you.

- Yeah, but Kelly too. I mean, I didn't get it from either.

- Yeah, well, it's very new.

- Yeah. And that's the kind of thing that's going to start happening is as we gather momentum-- and people see that we have so much to offer when we're given a chance. It's like the reason that we've had problems in the past is because our visibly gender variant members have been pushed into these sort of ghettos, these gender ghettos, I call them, of drag or underemployment or unemployment that keep us from moving up.

It's like it's this weird catch-22 where if society won't let us change our identity papers to female-- and so we get certain procedures done. But the procedures aren't covered by our insurance. And we need a job to get insurance, but we need the documentation to get a job. It's like this--

- Yeah.

- It's this vicious cycle that doesn't let us ever get out of our difficult spot.

- Earlier today, I attended the Galveston gathering, which for those of you not in the region, that's basically a gathering at the Rosenberg Clinic of-- as many people of the transsexual community who can make it to come back if they've been there before and contribute their stories to the people who are coming up. And the Rosenberg Clinic is very, very involved in Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association. And one thing that came out of there that I thought was very interesting is that the HBGDA at the top levels is now beginning to understand the classification into two different groups.

And that is those who can get access to services and those who can't. And traditionally, those who can't get accesses to services have been completely under the radar at HBGDA. And I think that's about to change.

- Yeah. There's several underserved communities within the transsexual population. And to me, the very worst one are our youngest members--

- Oh, yeah.

- --especially the ones who don't have family support. So--

- Exactly.

- --one of the big pushes that Calpernia and I have been trying to do-- because she came up through a scene where her family was not supportive at all. And she ended up coming up through the club scene. And that's a tough scene to come up through. A lot of people don't make it out of that.

And so we're really working hard with Deep Stealth and with her website, calpernia.com, to create places where people who find themselves in that situation can get a leg up.

- OK, so we're running real tight on time here. I just wanted to give you an opportunity to once again get your contact information out there for people. And anything else you wanted to say before we wrap up here?

- Yeah, just log on to deepstealth.com, D-E-E-P S-T-E-A-L-T-H.com, all one word. And you can find out all the stuff we're doing, especially the positive stuff, like the Eve Ensler thing in our instructional videos and stuff like that. So check it out. And thanks so much for the opportunity to come on and talk tonight.

- Oh, yeah, that's--

- Anytime.

- You've got a lot of great stuff to-- between the websites and the Deep Stealth work, we'll be happy to have you on any time.

- Very good.

- And thank you for coming on.

- Well, you guys have a good morning, I guess it is.

- 2:30, our time.

- Whoo.

- Oh, that's morning in your time, too, now.

- It's now Father's Day here.

- [LAUGHS] Oh, yeah. I've got to make a call.
- Thanks, Andrea. Really appreciate it.
- Well, thank you. And I'll talk to you soon.
- All righty. Will do.
- Yeah, take care then.
- Bye.
- Thanks.
- Thanks. That was Andrea James of the TS Roadmap website who has the Bailey-Blanchard-Lawrence Clearinghouse categorically wrong.
- Very, very good website. Oh, how about that?
- Yeah, Stephen's been kind of watching me page through it here as I've been looking at things to ask Andrea.
- Very good website, laid out real well.
- She's done a great job of organizing.
- Very big website. I was surprised--
- No, no, no. This is one page on the very big website.
- Yeah, I see all the links to it. That's great. I love her, the way she-- it's really good.
- Yeah. So Jimmy, are we ready to roll into the next segment?
- We certainly are. We've got Dean Becker on the line with a five-minute review of what's going on with medical marijuana with *Cultural Baggage*.
- Well, thanks for having us back again this month.
- Oh, you betcha.
- And Vanessa's month is next month. And I'll be back in August, keeping fingers crossed.
- Yes, me too.
- And until then, to thine own self, be true.
- There you go. Yeah, I need the headphones now. Sorry.

[LAUGHTER]

And Stephen, thank you for engineering for us during that segment while I was in the-- OK, we're ready to go with Dean if you hit air and his button. And Dean should be on the line.

- Good evening.

- Hello, Dean Becker. How are you doing?

- I'm well, Jimmy. I have a couple of stories for you and a couple of somber ones actually this time around about medical marijuana. It's funny. You can't copyright a title because we'd never be hearing this when it's called Reefer Madness. It's coming to us from William F. Buckley, Jr. Out of the *National Review*.

He's talking about the experience of Ed Rosenthal in Oakland, California and that it accelerates the day when the heavy dilemmas in our legal system might just force a fresh look at our marijuana laws. Now presumably, that will have to happen when the state legislators, the congressmen, and the president are in recess because the great enemy of sensible reform has been, of course, politicians high from righteousness.

- You bet.

- And what happened to Rosenthal? He says was that he was convicted of marijuana cultivation and conspiracy, facing a conceivable sentence of 100 years in prison, and a fine of 4 and 1/2 million dollars. The judge took the flat position that local laws do not override federal laws.

Therefore, the verdict could not be influenced by the legal contradiction. And therefore, the jurors shouldn't be sidetracked by hearing about it. The reasoning was identical to that Judge George King had used in the case of computer guru and poet Peter McWilliams. A Judge King did not permit McWilliams to base his defense on the California initiative either.

McWilliams died from AIDS while awaiting sentencing unrelieved by the marijuana that critically lessened his nausea. The judge would not allow him to take it. And yesterday, June 14th, marks three years since Peter McWilliams has passed away.

Now, Peter, he was unable to shake the medicine that enabled him to retain the other medicines. The marijuana made it possible to hold those pills down, and he died in a pool of his own vomit.

- Ugh.

- This next one, I kind of teared up when I read it. I'm going to try my best to contact her tomorrow. But a wheelchair-bound cannabis campaigner plans to take her own life with an overdose of pills and champagne after putting her case to legalize the drugs in court next week. And she lives in Scotland.

Her name is Biz Ivol. She suffers from multiple sclerosis, and she's already planning her own funeral. Has bought a cardboard coffin. Had it delivered to her home. She lives in Orkney. And she's pledged that she will fight this case with all her might.

She's going to court in a few days. And she's been charged with possessing and supplying cannabis, which alleviates her suffering. She pleaded not guilty to three charges of possessing cannabis, of producing two cannabis plants, and being concerned in the supply of drugs to others. And these others, it relates to her giving cannabis-laced chocolates to fellow sufferers of MS.

She said they can't put me in jail because of the condition I'm in. They can't fine me for anything because I don't have any money. And I'm already a prisoner trapped inside a body that's full of pain and doesn't work anymore.

She says her pain is like barbed wire being dragged through her spine. Now her neighbor, Bobby McCutcheon, is the name they give here says that her friends are devastated by her decision but understand her desperation. And you just have to visit or see some of these MS patients to understand. They go on to say that it's just sad to see the coffin sitting there waiting for - and they say she has no interest in staying alive.

Now I'm going to my comment here. And I want to say something. So what we have is a worldwide policy of noncompassion. It's a jihad of the pharmaceutical companies, and their henchmen are elected officials. And they desire every last ounce of obedience.

They desire every last bit of profit they can get from their manufactured drugs. And it's just so terrible to see a tortured individual like her smile. Is that worth the destruction of lives and the pain inflicted? And I don't know what else to say, Jimmy, but it's time to stand up.

The proof is all on our side, and I'm hoping more friends will join the DPFT, dpft.org. There's doctors, lawyers, judges, people that you can feel comfortable of being involved with. It's time, folks.

- Yes, it is. On another note, I got a letter from one of my MBBs, men behind bars. And he sent an article to me from the *Rolling Stone*, the June 12th issue, about an 18-year-old high school student who was caught with 3 ounces of pot on him.

And they are charging him with possession for intent to sell. And he's looking at 26 years in prison for this. His name was Webster Alexander.

- [INAUDIBLE]