



W. Burlette Carter @wddaughter

11 May 20 · 12 tweets · [wddaughter/status/1259703722566914053](https://twitter.com/wddaughter/status/1259703722566914053)



Keep your eye on the Wikipedia page for unisex public toilets. A year and a half ago, the page spouted tons of nonsense claiming sex separation in public toilets did not begin until the late 19th century.

That same erroneous theory claimed that the reason for sex separation in intimate spaces was sexism/patriarchy, not safety and privacy.

So called scholars who spouted this theory built careers on it.

Activists widely disseminated this theory, helped by the male-bodied biases in internet access and a sexist press (including women) willing to advance their careers by disseminating disinformation favored by those who controlled their access to upward mobility.

The goal of this disinformation campaign was to affect public policy, public opinion (especially among the young) and the courts.

In 2018-19, I produced an article that clearly debunked this theory. With evidence, I proved that sex separation well predated the late 19th century and that the primary reason for it was women's safety and privacy. See my pinned tweet.

I had to fight to get that article published & to retain its integrity through editing. That is another long story. My battle was consistent with the stories of those who say that there is a bias in scholarly publications against work that acknowledges the importance of biology.

But once it was finished, I then moved to correct the record on the internet. I contacted outlets that had disseminated the false histories. They ignored the contact. Many were mainstream outlets. They continue to keep these lies online.

I also turned to Wikipedia. The Wikipedia effort revealed that many individuals and organized groups support the dissemination of misinformation about sex and gender history through that source.

Even today, there are continued efforts to push the false claim that sex separated bathrooms emerged in the late 19th century & that the goal was sexism, although it is simply no longer defensible. Wikipedia treats it as an alternative theory merely because some still espouse it.

Activists also use Wikipedia to give favorable press to fundraising advocacy groups supporting the erasure of biological sex in public discourse and policies —and to criticize and marginalize groups that oppose that erasure.

The US Supreme court is soon to rule whether our nondiscrimination statute (Title VII), which prohibits discrimination “because of sex,” also prohibits gender identity and sexual

orientation discrimination by its reference to “sex” —or whether a new statute is needed.

• • •