

Still Sockpuppeting After All These Weeks

By Marti Abernathey

Published February 10, 2011 | Updated March 31, 2026

https://www.transadvocate.com/still-sockpuppeting-after-all-these-weeks_n_2967.htm

Abstract

Or, to pilfer from the oeuvre of Paul Simon's wife: Shooting Rubberbands at Sockpuppets (Because That's All I Can Do Without Violating the Patriot Act.) Soooooooooooooooooooooo... Now, where to begin? Where to begin? Where to begin? Well, lets start at planetransgender and word that Pam's House Blend isn't the only venue that is actively impeding [...]

Article

Or, to pilfer from the oeuvre of Paul Simon's wife: Shooting Rubberbands at Sockpuppets (Because That's All I Can Do Without Violating the Patriot Act.)

Sooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo...

Now, where to begin? Where to begin? Where to begin?

Well, lets start at planetransgender and word that Pam's House Blend isn't the only venue that is actively impeding and/or denigrating views that don't rigidly adhere to the 'all gay marriage, all the time - and all gay marriage all the time is good for trans people even though none of the reasons we put forth to support that claim hold any water' dogma. (Now, to be fair to PHB, I haven't noticed any erasures lately - but, then again, if you don't know what you're looking for when you're prowling around there, you won't find any evidence there regarding what happened to Kathleen - or me for that matter - so I'm not sure what my lack of noting any erasures, et. al., is worth.)

Free State Just Us (d/b/a Equality Maryland) has a Facebook page and, not surprisingly (and I truly don't intend any sarcasm with that) there are a lot of items up related to the Senate hearing on the marriage bill that took place Tuesday.

By itself, no problem.

However....

According to Kelli Busey, on Facebook (IN)Equality Maryland has been deleting comments by Dana LaRocca and other trans people opposed to the lack of public accommodations language in the sacrificial lamb trans anti-discrimination bill that was recently introduced in the House to microscopic fanfare:

In doing so Equality Maryland is misrepresenting the wishes of trans people to make appear we approve of the 'equality' bill without the all important public accommodations provisions.

What brought about EQMD's silencing of it's most critical transgender ally? What is Equality Maryland's investment in a transgender equality bill without the volatile bathroom provisions?

LaRocca is banned by EQMD after commenting on this this thread about the above picture.

Dana explains “As I said other dissenters opinions have been deleted, I don’t know if they have been blocked though. I think I have been polite. I sometimes use colorful language but I don’t curse or call people names or any of that childish nonsense. I think about a week ago I asked if anyone knew when certain legislators planned to propose a pissing license to avoid having to inspect genitals at the door.”

“In certain places that would be considered rude, but we are talking EQMD here. On February 4 they linked to a sex toy shop with a picture of a woman about to swallow a dildo. They were fund raising at the sex toy shop. Frankly I find that sort of thing in poor taste. My word “pissing” pales in comparison.”

“What upset them yesterday was the fact that I called them out on their lack of diversity. I don’t know my exact words but I have the responses from others to give you an idea of the discussion.”

“Next I posted jokingly that I was wearing my little red dress but that I was afraid of getting tossed out of the ladies room in Annapolis because my attire was illegal. Note; my avatar is Betty Boop in a red dress.”

Kelli opined:

Why was Dana LaRocca’s comments deleted? Why was she blocked from commenting on EQMD facebook? Why were so many people’s comments disagreeing with EQMD agenda and methods deleted? Many people myself included believe HB235 was striped of the public accommodations and served up as a sacrifice to transphobes so EQMD can get a marriage equality bill passed. Now that we bloggers have let the cat out of the bag we will be a lot harder to silence.

Well, unlike what happened when Kathleen was erased at PHB, other people’s comments to the offending comments remain in that Facebook thread...

Which leads to the money shot:



Yes, look who is right in the middle of it: Lurleen ‘The Magical Erasing Sockpuppet of Pam’s House Blend Land’ Blogovitch.

Isn’t that just fucking special?

Well, actually, its not anywhere as special as the precise words o' oppression that she attempts to cram down Dana's uppitness (and nowhere near as special as the Maryland-centric sockpuppet shtick that she's trying to pull right now at PHB, peddling the story of a trans woman - a story that includes discrimination in homeless shelters, something that definitely would not be covered by the non-public-accommodations-inclusive trans bill that's on the plate right now. Know thy neighbor - especially when the 'neighbor' migrates from gay-marriage-primacy state to gay-marriage-primacy state like a cyber-coconut (or maybe even a cyber-swallow.)) If you can't read the screensnap, here's the first one:

@Dana I'm curious about this statement you made: "it is ILLEGAL for me to use the public toilets in Annapolis". Unless there is a restraining order against you, this cannot be true. Now if you're saying that because you are trans someone could kick you out of the "wrong" public restroom, that is true. But it is not illegal for you to be there. The truth is that you have no legal right to be there. The difference is important and you do nobody any favors by misstating the legal situation.

Misstating the legal situation?

Remember, that paragraph is coming from someone who insists that New Hampshire having gay marriage somehow helps trans people. And it comes from someone who is not an attorney (not to mention not a trans person of any stripe.)

Unless there is a restraining order against you, this cannot be true.

I do believe that the comment I have to most often make on papers that I grade is "stay away from absolutes."

Now if you're saying that because you are trans someone could kick you out of the "wrong" public restroom, that is true. But it is not illegal for you to be there.

Huh? First of all "illegal" and "criminal" are not synonyms. The latter is a subset of the former. Certain types of contracts are illegal, but are not criminal; considering what Free State Just Us, er..., (In)Equality Maryland's only real goal this year is, I think you can hazard a guess as to what one such type of contract is.

The truth is that you have no legal right to be there.

If someone actually has legal authority to kick Dana (or any trans woman), as Non-Lawyer Non-Lurleen so quaintly phrases it, "out of the 'wrong' public restroom," then it is illegal for Dana (or any trans woman) to be in that restroom.

Non-Lawyer Non-Lurleen might want to consider this little gem from the City of Annapolis code of Ordinances:

11.12.010 - Disorderly conduct.
No person shall act in a disorderly manner by:
A. Using violent or indecent language;
B. Behaving in a disorderly manner to the annoyance of others;
C. Disturbing lawful assemblages.

(Ord. O-1-99 § 1 (part): prior code § 17-5)

Because we all know that its impossible for a trans woman to use the women's restroom without being "disorderly" and annoying 'real' women - like Non-Lawyer Non-Lurleen, who apparently has no knowledge of the history of non-crossdressing-specific ordinances (such as, depending on how specific terms were defined in specific jurisdictions, 'lewsness', 'obscenity' and, of course, 'disorderly conduct') being used to target crossdressers and transsexuals even where there was no specific anti-crossdressing ordinance.

Of course, perhaps the potty isn't the only thing that a trans person who wants to go to Annapolis needs to worry about:

11.32.010 - Policy.

It is the policy of the City, in the exercise of its police powers for the protection of the public safety, public health and general welfare, to assure equal opportunity to all persons to live in decent housing facilities and to eliminate discrimination in all housing accommodations regardless of race, color, religion, disability, familial status, sexual orientation, marital status, sex, lawful income, or national origin, and to that end to prohibit discrimination in all housing accommodations by any person.

Tough shit if someone - say a trans woman - wants to move to Annapolis to set up shop to actually lobby full time for a law that will actually help trans people, eh? Say, by renting an apartment while the Legislature is in session?

Oh wait...

According to the Incremental Progress Follies of 2001, trans people were (and, by definition, still are) already covered under Maryland's legal definition of "sex," right? Which is what a local ordinance would use in all likelihood, right?

Oh wait...

That housing ordinance doesn't even have "sex" in it - even though it does have "sexual orientation" in it! But certainly, no lesbian apartment owner would refuse to rent to a trans woman, now would she?

But I digress...

Lets get back to criminal law, shall we? And this time lets not limit ourselves to the local law of Annapolis. Here's a nugget o' Maryland state law:

§ 10-201. Disturbing the public peace and disorderly conduct

...

(c) Prohibited -

...

(2) A person may not willfully act in a disorderly manner that disturbs the public peace.

(3) A person may not willfully fail to obey a reasonable and lawful order that a law enforcement officer makes to prevent a disturbance to the public peace.

So, Non-Lawyer Non-Lurleen, Maryland state law has the same broad procription against disorderliness

plus a separate proscription against ignoring a cop telling you not to engage in said disorderliness.

Am I advocating for trans women's usage of women's restrooms to be deemed "disorderly"?

Hell no.

I am, however, saying that sockpuppets without any legal training shouldn't go around making declarations about what the law is.

(d) Penalty.- A person who violates this section is guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction is subject to imprisonment not exceeding 60 days or a fine not exceeding \$500 or both

I'm only licensed to practice in Texas and Minnesota - not Maryland - but I can make this general statement that is applicable anywhere: Even if a court ultimately holds that neither of those "disorderly conduct" provisions encompasses trans women's use of women's restrooms, the 'legal scholarship' of someone who (a) isn't an attorney anywhere and (b) isn't even using her real name is not an amulet. If a cop - lets say an obnoxious lesbian cop who has more knowledge of Janice Raymond than Judge Judy - decides that "disorderly conduct" provisions do encompass trans women's use of women's restrooms and decides to run a trans woman in for daring to tinkle, that trans woman can't wave Lex Lurleenica at the cop and walk away.

Well, she could try - but then she'd also be facing a charge of resisting arrest.

The difference is important and you do nobody any favors by misstating the legal situation.

Sad Dana that you constantly make LGBs out to be the opposition when it is radical-right straight people who want to vote on your & my rights, not LGBs. Not all LGBs have been fair to Ts that is sadly true, but your argument is very much out of proportion to reality.

Uh huh...

Dana's is the argument that is out of proportion to reality?

you constantly make LGBs out to be the opposition when it is radical-right straight people who want to vote on your & my rights, not LGBs

I guess I can see that.

Sort of.

After all, its LGBs who make sure that no trans-inclusive laws ever get passed in the first instance for "radical-right straight people" to vote up or down on.

Ya know...

Maybe I was wrong what I posted that Lurleen Blogovitch is Laurel Ramseyer.

I think maybe she's Glenn Beck.

[Cross-posted at ENDABlog]

Suggested citation

Marti Abernathey. "Still Sockpuppeting After All These Weeks." TransAdvocate, February 10, 2011.
https://www.transadvocate.com/still-sockpuppeting-after-all-these-weeks_n_2967.htm