

Sadly Not an April Fool's Joke

By Kat

Published April 1, 2011 | Updated March 31, 2026

https://www.transadvocate.com/sadly-not-an-april-fools-joke_n_3182.htm

Abstract

Over at PHB, Monica Roberts commented: When multiple civil rights attorneys tell me it won't do what EQ MD claims it will, the bill needs to die. Naturally, Laurelurleen Ramseyerogovitch chimed in afterward. But, more interesting than any of the sock's puppeting (something about her trying to tell Monica that Monica was "missing the point"; [...]

Article

Over at PHB, Monica Roberts commented:

When multiple civil rights attorneys tell me it won't do what EQ MD claims it will, the bill needs to die.

Naturally, Laurelurleen Ramseyerogovitch chimed in afterward. But, more interesting than any of the sock's puppeting (something about her trying to tell Monica that Monica was "missing the point"; memo to Monica: I'd consider that to be an endorsement) was this:

I so get why people are against this bill

I so get why people are against this bill -- it's not the bill we expected or wanted, and many are worried this is going to set precedence for passing less than desired civil rights legislation as the norm.

But if we in trans community accept antitransgender sentiment from legislators as a reason to kill this far from perfect bill, then there is something wrong with us as a community.

~~~~~  
 ~~~Autumn~~~



As if there were safety in stupidity alone.
 --Henry David Thoreau

by: Autumn Sandeen @ Fri Apr 01, 2011 at 11:32:31 AM CDT
 [Parent]

In case your monitor's graphics aren't up to par, I'll repeat the, um..., interesting line:

[I]f we in trans community accept antitransgender sentiment from legislators as a reason to kill this far from perfect bill, then there is something wrong with us as a community.

Ummmm....Autumn?

Seriously...

Autumn?

I'm over here.

Doesn't the entire premise of HB235 - that affording trans people the same "public accommodations" rights that homosexuals wrote into law for themselves a decade ago doesn't comfortably (read: apparently some margin higher than a "60 percent bi-partisan majority") fit under the 'politics of the possible' umbrel-la-la - amount to "accept[ing] antitransgender sentiment from legislators as a reason to kill" the legitimate trans civil rights coverage that Sen. Rich Madaleno, if he can be taken at his word, wanted to push for until some amorphous and undefined (and certainly never definitively defined to demonstrate that no non-Marylanders were included therein) "advocacy coalition asked [him] to not introduce the bill"?

Suggested citation

Kat. "Sadly Not an April Fool's Joke." TransAdvocate, April 1, 2011.
https://www.transadvocate.com/sadly-not-an-april-fools-joke_n_3182.htm