THE MAKING OF A TRANSNATIONAL ANTIGENDER LANGUAGE:
Enregistering `gender ideology`
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“GENDER IDEOLOGY”

1) A DISCOURSE

2) A POLITICAL STRATEGY

3) A TRANSNATIONAL PHENOMENON

(Paternotte and Kuhar, 2017)
As a discourse, “gender ideology” transforms feminist and LGBTIQ+ policies into a totalitarian scheme to destroy the nuclear family and draw children into a cultural revolution. This is done via discursive maneuvers that turn human rights concepts inside out to mean their opposites.
“GENDER IDEOLOGY”

- Contemporary antigender campaigns are well-documented.

- An analysis of “how this discourse emerged and how it shifts shape as it circulates” is in urgent order (Gal, 2021:100).
OBJECTIVES

• To investigate early antigender texts and their circulation

• To understand how these different texts are bound together into a cohesive and dangerous textuality that challenges the precarious enfranchisement of women, queer, and trans people
ANTIGENDERISM AS A REGISTER
AN ELUSIVE IDEA

EMPTY/FLOATING SIGNIFIER
Corrêa 2018

RHETORICAL DEVICE
Corredor 2019

SPECTRE
Butler 2019

FIELD OF ACTION
Miskolci and Campana 2017

CARICATURAL ASSEMBLAGE
Bernini 2020
“A conventionalized aggregate of co–occurring texts and expressive forms, of which ‘gender ideology’ is the most famous shibboleth.”
“Registers are cultural modes of action that link diverse behavioral signs to enactable effects, including persona, interpersonal relationships, and types of conduct.”

(Aga 2007:145)

Registers are ideologically constructed and emerge over time from activities in which “forms and values become differentiable from the rest of language (i.e. recognizable as distinct, linked to typifiable social personae or practices) for a given population of speakers.”

(Agha 2007: 168)
ENREGISTERMENT: CLASPING

LINKING CATEGORIES OF SPEECH TO FIGURES OF PERSONHOOD
(or linking action to objects they name)

Eg. “agressive feminist”, “authoritarian gay activist”, etc.

“creates or re-creates an exertion of authority that is keenly felt by those competing to categorize persuasively as well as by those who are thereby classified and characterized.”

(Gal 2019: 462)
Registers (or fragments of a register) that “are used (but not necessarily assembled) at one arena of social organization are taken up by other, institutionally distant and dependent organizations.”

(Gal 2018:4)

“relaying invites and displays alliances among groups and organizations.”

(Gal 2019: 462–463)
Grafting is an ideological maneuver that “draws on or attempts to ride (and sometimes transform) the sociocultural authority established by already existing and highly legitimated institutions and their discourses” (Gal 2019: 464)
Antigender texts have tied religious and secular factions of society together who now attempt to institutionalize aversion of gender equality and sexual diversity in various national contexts.
CLASPING AT THE UN

THE TOTALITARIAN FEMINIST
GENDER AND THE UN CONFERENCES

UN CONFERENCE ON POPULATION
1994 (Cairo)

UN CONFERENCE ON WOMEN
1995 (Beijing)
Without fanfare or debate, the word *gender* has been substituted for the word *sex*. We used to talk about sex discrimination, but now it’s gender discrimination [...] *Sex* has a secondary meaning – sexual intercourse or sexual activity. *Gender* sounds more delicate and refined. But if you think the change signals a renaissance of neo-Victorian sensitivity, you could not be more wrong [...] The militant feminists have learned from their defeats. When they couldn’t sell their radical ideology to ordinary women, they repackaged it. Now, they are very careful not to reveal their actual goals. They have worked themselves into positions of power within existing institutions. They intend to achieve their ends not by open confrontations but by changing the meaning of words.

(O’Leary 1997: 1–2)
By depicting feminists as distorting reality with concepts that disguise their true intentions through semantic engineering, O’Leary projects a way of speaking onto the group, and thus forges a metapragmatic label: not only do “gender feminists” speak a language of their own, but they also use it in violent ways to further their objectives.

“feminism is a giant rationalization created by hurt women to justify their anger, grudges, and self-destructive behavior.”

(O’Leary 1997: 15)
Construction of the totalitarian feminist whose cunning use of words and aggressive speech style is anathema to “authentic women” who believe that “men and women are different but completely equal, complementary in nature” (O’Leary, 1995: 17).
While the profamily antifeminist forces orchestrated by the Holy See (Corrêa 2018) wanted “gender” to be unequivocally defined as “male and female: the two sexes of the human being” (O’Leary 1997: 187), feminists and other progressive delegates strived to keep the broad definition, as it was well-known and had been used in UN documents before Beijing.
“In the context of the Platform for Action the commonly understood meaning of the word gender refers to the socially constructed roles played and expected of men and women in society, as well as the responsibilities and opportunities of men and women arising from these roles.”
EXPANSION:
RELAYING DISCURSIVE FIELDS OF ACTION
FEMINISM AGAINST WOMEN?

“EQUAL IN DIGNITY BUT DIFFERENT AND COMPLEMENTARY IN NATURE”

PIUS XII (1950)  
PAUL VI (1965)  
JOHN PAUL VI 1995  
BENEDICT XVI 1997
“EQUAL IN DIGNITY BUT DIFFERENT AND COMPLEMENTARY IN NATURE”

“theology and natural sciences are understood as two different languages that express the same meaning: the precepts of natural law defining the structure of reality as created by God and known by human beings through the faculty of the reason.”

(Garbagnoli 2016: 188)
In this new Marxist dialectic, women [...] will control their fertility. Its final objective [...] is to abolish every single class distinction [...] and all differences between men and women. This gender ideology combines, thus, themes from the socialist ideology in its Marxist rendition with the liberal ideology in its neo-Malthusian form.

Schooyans 1997:45
1 – Conspiracist content and nationalist frame

2 – Juxtaposing feminism, Marxism, socialism and dictatorship
Alfonso López Trujillo

Famiglia, matrimonio e ‘unioni di fatto’

2000
Threatens the “foundations of the family and other interpersonal relations” since it promotes the “gradual cultural and human disorganization of matrimony” by classifying as “‘family’ all kinds of consensual unions” and by “justifying any sexual attitude, including homosexuality”

(Vatican 2000: n.p.)
Remarkable in the antigender register is the adoption and distortion of well-established rights and antidiscrimination vocabulary to contest rights and promote discrimination.
ANTIGENDER LEXICON
GRAFTINGS:

TURNING WORDS INSIDE OUT
who is not opposed to all forms of discrimination? This seems to derive from respect for human rights. However, […] in the name of non-discrimination, bills are introduced for *de facto* unions [i.e. heterosexual couples] and for those between homosexuals and lesbians even with the possibility of adopting children.

—Trujillo 2007:xvi
1 - Approximates religion to science

2 - Graftings: resignifying human rights words

“linguistic, social, and material practices that are indexical of existing authoritative personae and organizations [...] provide the sap (authority) for the graftings (practices) added to them from another arena” (Gal 2018: 4)
HOMOSEXUALITY AND HOMOPHOBIA

“homosexuality represents a serious psychological handicap in sexual growth” (p. 437)

“active minority that becomes dominant without being the majority” (p. 433)

“heterosexuals feel guilty” (p. 436)

“make us believe that those who choose this lifestyle are constantly threatened” (433)
“there is nothing discriminatory [...] in saying that only men and women can marry and become parents” (p. 436)

“goes back to a primary fantasy which they depend upon, heterophobia [...] the fear of the other sex, of the stranger to one’s sex” (p. 436)
Co-opting rights and nondiscrimination vocabulary grants antigenderism and “gender ideology” the discursive and institutional authority such discourse has acquired over the years while simultaneously inverting its semantics. In such a way, a reversal in the semiotic and discursive fields is also accomplished: the oppressors become the oppressed.
Far-right populists mobilize fears about a decaying social world to further nativist and/or nationalist projects that depend on immutable patriarchal orders.

Neoliberal pundits use the metapragmatic figures of the endangered family and the threatened child to extract the family from the state’s purview, privatizing its every need.

Once the antigender register finds its way into national contexts it easily overlaps with other registers such as scientific denialism, anti-intellectualism, and disinformation-mongering, which depend on the invention of enemies.
Challenging antigenderists’ portrayal of feminists, trans, and queer people as enemies is not easy, though. The analytical toolkit for close textual analysis that sociolinguists and discourse have developed should prove useful in fortifying forms of counteraction that challenge textuality upholding antigenderism and its performative power.
ありがとうございます。
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