

Chapter 3

Building Process of “The Feminine” as a Gender Base Violence Artefact

David Berna, Almudena Cabezas Gonzalez

Introduction

We concern about connections between modern nation-state’s political forms and individuals, their bodies and their subjectivities, a complex issue addressed by large corpus of literature in which we find a common conclusion about identity as a fiction (Radcliffe & Westwood 1996, Staeheli et Al. 2003, Preciado 2009, Foucault 1984, Butler 1993, Lauretis 1986, Sedgwick 1993, Hall 1996). However we know how identity is naturalized in order to sequester any possibility of awareness of its construction, for us it is a lived fiction produced by political action on the bodies.

Identity, as an intersectional action of multiple actors and power devices which raises the impossibility of existence outside itself, emerges as a control mechanism which construction is never haphazard. It is produced from crossing institutional strategies of enunciation and historical actions and, in the midst of specific discursive formations and practices. Identity arises within specific games and modalities of power, being more a result of marking difference and exclusion than an identical and unit sign naturally formed (Hall 1996).

To research in the institutionalization processes of “*the feminine*” we will not talk on woman or women, femininity or feminization. By *The feminine* we refer to a larger space to raise a kind of genealogical approach to its construction. By doing we address nation-state’s histories and national policies, as well the processes of subjectivity that they generated, considering the enormous State’s capacity to regulate gender relations and bodies, as well the actions involved in process of recreating and transforming its specific forms (Radcliffe & Westwood 1996). Power and identity contribute to constituted people and places as subjects, as well as nationality, gender, religion, class, caste, age, nation, ability and sexuality are situations within

a network of relationships that transcend political recognized boundaries (Grewal & Kaplan 1994, Davids & Anthia 1989, Massey 2004, Dowler & Sharp 2001), not surprisingly the state is the sand from which it would be possible to challenge the sex-gender clamps (Cravey, 1998).

Our intention here is to situated abject subjects -fags (gay), butch, dykes (lesbians), *travelos* (transgender and transsexual), transvestites, transsexuals-, who are inhabiting the space of “the feminine” to national and global maps (Rose, 1993), taking it as central political question to understanding the contemporary reality of gender base violence. To do it, we address political speeches emerge as part of subjectivity processes that allow the government of populations, departing from a dialogue between socio-spatial analysis and queer theory that is nurtured by Foucault’s work.

We try to address the never ending process of identities’ construction taking in account biopolitics and nation-states building process in Europe from eighteenth century’s approximately. We focus on biopolitic as a new form of power governing European population and gender as a technology product by government that reveals how power-knowledge connected to social reproduction of biopolitics (Foucault, 2011). Our narrative bellow has forks and folds because we renounce to chronological desire as a history of closed narrative truths. Rather our argument is developed in a moving narrative from times to places to approach a live and complex political artefact we have called “the feminine”. We don’t just remember that “*everything is political*” to consider how sexuality is a product, but also a production of power relations.

Biopolitics, identity and space

Recently, a relation between construction/clamping bodies and identities and the logic and dynamics of government has taken relevance (Deleuze & Guattary 1989; Agambem 1998, Butler 1993; Preciado 2002, 2009; Davids & Van Driel 2005, Rose 1993, Moss 2005). Biopolitics and biopower concepts outlined by Foucault (2005) have guided an academic production that open questions about connections among politics, bodies and space and, expand greatly our understanding of how sexuality orders the world in all spatial scales.

Biopolitics as government of populations involves a set of strategies that pursue national collective goods to govern people’s lives—both their bodies and practices—in order to achieve a complete management of biological, demographic and economic phenomena of population, and each of its individuals. Scientific-political power-knowledge is essential to formation and evolution of “the feminine” because the linkages between public health,

territorial organization and education, appear early and, new scientific disciplines were central to legitimate the institutional structures of national states and the building of identity processes.

Social change on Eighteenth and Nineteenth centuries conduced to new forms of government and subjection of life within ideological framework of modernity. The complex process of nation-state conversion in the hegemonic political organization of space is a modern one in which were conceived and building main structures to administrate territory, social and intimate life. The point is that women and men bodies will be crucial to national identities and cultures construction as important as territory and history: people and their lives, once they have become citizens and population are symbols and representations of nations (Radcliffe & Westwood 1996, Pequeño 2007).

We emphasize here just two aspects of this complex processes. By one hand, how narratives of identity will be nationalize and sanctify not just over territories and people, but also on their bodies. And, the paths in which life ceases to be a mere object and becomes result of a number of causes, strengths, interests, actions, reactions and policies managed by life (Esposito 2004: 23).

Respect the first, the establishment of national boundaries will allow to close territory and to hold bodies to the nation. The process is connected to individual identification where the differences between nationals and others—against whom or front who we affirm us—result on self-assertion. Therefore, political identities linked to certain places not arise solely from social interactions, as largely stems precisely the specificity of their interactions with outside world (Massey 1994). Although any geographical unit can accumulate additional meanings to construct a process of politicized identities the ability to set a border, to establish an outside and an inside, is the key. Furthermore, the establishment of territorial and symbolic boundaries transforms the frame of meanings and actions of people in a territory and their subjectivities and, always involves different interest groups and power relations.

From eighteenth century modern forms of government will govern people's life and of each its individuals through an alliance between producers of knowledge and political structures. Then, bodies were be limit with identical pathways that maps make borders on territory, following identical objectives to subject individuals and build populations. Bodies' forms are defined to check normality and abnormality of individuals and then truths over female and male bodies are produced even before surgical techniques were developed in nineteenth century as genealogical analysis of representation techniques and discourses on bodies are show (Laqueur 1994).

Next to bodies, development of territorial mapping allows delimit territorial nations and their cultures, manage and administer territories. For example,

in nineteenth century Mexican bodies and territories were measured and studied from surfaces, arches, distances and heights, which make intelligible the regulatory regimes (Cházaro 2009). Some of these functions stand the role of armies and police who ascribe the monopoly of legal violence and then act as guarantors of normality and status quo. For example, police officer include between their chores monitoring the private and public health observation by individuals and their attention to control population's body practices and of course sex will be fast increasing in a process where the so-called physical illnesses are going to become social illnesses when strict notions about hygiene and aseptic serve to maintain appropriate social behaviors.

Processes of building truths crystallize on sexual and gender, and their articulation with anthropological and geopolitical discourses, for example, about race differences and civilizations allocate and re-located to each subject in a particular position in a time of States' formation world. The modern pedagogical school as well the work of scientific societies, museums and foundations serve to concentrate and disseminate evidences about nature of knowledge, population and nations. At them new and main knowledge emerge to meet, plan and, manage nations and its people, that is: population. The modern scientific notion of population is constructed from statistics and demography (Stoler 1995), a science that incorporated into its development a strong methodological nationalism and a Eurocentric mark what is shared with others sciences under construction as Political Geography, Sociology or Anthropology.

By short, the irruption of government's institution on bodies and subjectivities also expressed concern about the national body. For example, B. Mandeville argues and defense creating public brothels to control sex workers, practices and disease (bodies) and, morality (soul/ subjectivity). The control of the prostitution was central to maintaining strength of men and also family, a central institution to government intimate life. In fact, political concerns about care and construction of life increasingly become more important, going beyond birth control and disease transmission, to propose control of processes in which life occurs.

Modern political discourse is plenty of evidence and deterministic connections between human social life and space (Wallerstein 1996)¹, specially

¹ As well as Montesquieu establishes determining relations between environment, society and government, considering that earth's sterility makes industrious men as well as her fertility cause extreme laziness; Malthus urges birth control to avoid imbalance between resources and population, famine, disease and war, when overpopulation specter threatens survival of race as a divine punishment (Wrigley and Souden, 1986). While, neo-Malthusian argument, as Condorcet, pays special attention to quality of human beings, approaching what later became eugenics (Avery 1997), although some regimes supported by scientific legitimacy; and

after *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* (Darwin, 1859). Sum in excess, Darwin defines living matter as its object of study and invents an entirely new way of studying life. His works consolidate Biology as modern science that encompasses both issues matter of flesh, as to the behaviors and practices of animal and, then matter of human -spirit (Foucault 1994). The reception and impact from on social sciences development will be decisive, especially when the social Darwinist metaphor—the analogy between natural selection and domain of strongest—will be considerate the main principle to organize social life.

Furthermore, Eugenics, biotopology and others branches emerged during late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. So called as “*true seed or noble birth*”, the eugenetics coined by Galton (Darwin’s cousin) affirm race’s selection to improve human race as other animals. He established a discourse on differences between human beings and races that feeds on Darwinian evolution, Malthusian ideas and concerns of bourgeois upper classes by growing impoverishment and increased disease among suburbs population of large cities and increased crime.

As bio-topology, B. A. Morel psychiatrist begins broadcasting his theory of degeneration of humans as a species combining anthropological and philosophical concepts of degeneration (G. J. Rousseau and Buffon, dissimilar ideas from Prosper Lucas and Lamarck). Degeneration is not just a single event but is an expression of human development (Campos, 1998), so that he claim and argue for an intervention to modify this dangerous evolution of populations.

After Darwin organicism will be a salient scientific trend. Social and political issues should be thought in terms of biology and zoology and relationships between people understood from survival of the fittest. And, social Darwinism naturalizes domain of some people by others, for example, those of greater spiritual and cultural greatness on the lower labeled as culture and, therefore, inferior in spirit (Ratzel 2011). Moreover, the line between social Darwinism and racism is a direct one which connects them to European imperialism.

State-centrism on political thought and, geopolitical one in particular, next to organicism and environmental determinism also guide European “encounters” with others during imperialist expansion. Accompanying the rise of nation-state and capitalism in Europe, modern geopolitical imagination as a way of seeing the world and its geographical works is stimulated

thus, anarchist intellectual, Eugène Humbert through *Régénération* magazine, emphasizes need to expand hygienic conditions in order to avoid degenerative defects (Cleminson, 2008).

by encounters with people from rest of the world (Agnew 2005). Scientific objects of inquiry reflect the interest or problems of powerful, because there is no needed for critical social sciences, rather scientific narratives feed institutionalization of state power and legitimization of imperial dynamics in which European states are involved.

Anthropology and Geopolitics, and later International Relations as well, appear as guardian's sciences deployed—temporally and spatially—twin discursive border: between “normal” and “pathological”; between authentic community where democracy is possible and the world of strangers and dangers which lie outside (Walker 1993). Different characters of identity tied to subjectivity processes of modern being result on biological dichotomies of superiority of white/the other, man/woman, Western/ barbarian, and don't forget the superiority of some states on others. In this sense, the narrative of international anarchy, which is the fundamental picture of world politics throughout the twentieth century, came about due to space limit that sees “the enemy” as an absolute other, sliding temporarily define the “primitive”, the “oriental” then, and the “Third World” or “World Underdeveloped” later during the Cold War.

Fictions of Identity: Nation, Citizenship, Bodies and Gender

State and capital need strong and healthy bodies, breeders and caregivers bodies, producers and productive bodies to maintenance the state's borders, the imperialist expansion and wars, the work at factories and so on. The purpose of disciplinary regimes is the reproduction and control of national bodies and souls. Through biopolitics nation-states builds citizens and transforms individuals into labor. In such logic of government sexuality plays a central role: bourgeois society represses sex and sexuality in order to drive desire and libido only to capitalist production (Foucault, 2005).

A number of institutions—schools, correctional facilities, hospices, asylums, prisons and constitutions—and discursive practices (records, censuses, maps, grammars, dictionaries, manuals of etiquette and hygiene-treated), proliferate to articulate a set of technologies that subtly coerce, control, secure and govern bodies and subjectivities. The purpose is to make them domesticated subjects of State and also aim to neutralize any norm's deviation.

Sex and desire are shown as powerful vehicles of power-knowledge. Since Eighteen Century the discourses on sexuality have been extended when mandatory disclosure of each subject's sexuality appeared publicly.

Then we found proliferation of discourses of knowledge and power by hygienists, physicians and psychiatrists ranging from unusual way (Lopiz, 2010). For example, Puritanism is a tactical turn using the unveiling mandatory in order for subjects to find truth of self from their sex. To the extent thereof, modern subjects are produced from disciplinary power devices. The care of population is produced by material and discursive practices (Meloni 2010: 19) which act capillary, stealthy, and almost invisible.

New power of life will become less coercer and more builder and bra (Foucault 1995 & 2005). Power’s subtlety hinders establish linkages between political forms of the modern world, the nation states and individuals, their bodies and subjectivities. Modern subject emerges as a consolidated construct, a political-philosophical category, a fiction under modernity’s project based on progress, development, and rationality and universal ideas. It generates uniqueness of individuals, their autonomy and freedom, which is embodied in other political fiction: the citizen. Not casual, debates on democracy, whether on political representation or participation as well as about freedom and equality, focus and run from the two abstract sovereignties of modern world: state and individual (Walker 1993).

The invention of citizenship homogenized populations to make viable its government therein laid its success: citizenship created sameness and otherness identity against external pollutants and threatening. Nationals will join henceforth against other no nationals (*foreigners*), giving their life as a labor or war force to defend and exalt the nation. Nationality brings citizens while obscures its multiple axes of difference and inequality (Cairo 2001). Furthermore, this device is about transform inmates “barbarians” who were still beyond the reach of modern forms of government into citizens (rural, ethnic minority groups such as Roma and other subaltern and excluded populations), as essential subjects for nation’s existence. Any of these barbarians that don’t acquire identity fiction of citizenship will suffer the sentence of stateless; a statement that in our modern world is final (Arendt, 1956).

National identity narratives have as purpose and performance being apparently expression of a “real” story, but they are regimes of truth’s construction. Then they are inextricably linked to sex-gender and racial constructions. National identity is not a cognitive internal state but a set of discourses and practices, many of which are part of a routine established by nation-states (Billig 1995). No doubt, discursive order generates emergence of subjects, places and spaces in which it is held, from the location in which it emerges. Thus, identities are not defined by intrinsic “character” of group—not even skin’s color, sex, religion or place of birth—, but the

identification processes is constructed. Populations and individuals as subjects “need to identify with something because there is a lack of original identity and insurmountable” (Laclau 1994: 3), that is: there is not *a priori* to existence (Butler, 1990) because practical and discursive materials that build identities depend on contingency.

We are interested in processes that essentialized characteristics of the groups and naturalized groups and identities in the ongoing process of their affirmation. Here is a needed to prevent emergence or questioning of different subjectivity possibilities by marking identities as normal by biopolitical technologies.

The construction of this material-semiotic space that brings people together identifying subject as such is mainly performed on establishment of a territory, a history, a national culture. As well as language, religion and other collective-attributes, the existence of symmetric fictionally bodies is key to conform the pattern. Here the construction of we call “the feminine” is relevant because meets some specific roles especially connected to sex-gender violence that we deal in the following captions.

The Discursive Order of Otherness: A Step on *The Feminine* Building Process

The space of the feminine is captured and confined to people who do not control their production (Moss, 2005: 41). Body practices and morphologies will be crucial to modern individual’s identities who were boulder established around “men” and “women” devices and, the underlying categories of heterosexuals and homosexuals. A wide range of policies converge to shape modern bodies and identities to construct gendered, sexualized, racialized and nationalized bodies. The logic of the identity-difference is that nonwhite and non-male, no-enriched and not straight bodies are not considered normal. These bodies are essentially and automatic negative, lower, dangerous and polluting regarding and for normal bodies that are white, male, enriched and heterosexual

If identity’s fiction is thought as fixed, immutable and homogeneous, being also part and representation of the nation-state, the articulation of gender, race and class technologies take place across social, scientific, political/institutional and fiction stories, which play as multiple and interconnected devices. But when we stop taking the “feminine”, homosexuality, heterosexuality, and racial categorizations (and others such as ranges) as natural events, our analysis of identities is enriched.

We approach to The Feminine as institutional action from the language and agency (Austin 1996, Searle 1995), which generate specific frameworks of intelligibility in which people exist, within and for certain parameters. Subjects are formed, defined and, reproduced with requirements and interests of structures that produce us, which ensures our docility and self-subjection (Butler, 1990)².

Crossroad between different force fields, speeches, political actions and institutions intersect to make identity a centerpiece of biopolitics, which mainly seek to normalize and discipline. New subject identity emerges in a context of intelligibility that connects individual with a specific spatial and concrete expression of capitalist production. Each individual as part of state must, therefore, follow normal model that is imposed, representing nation in identity dynamics of creating a common superior and modern us. Modern subject is part of a state and when State is conceived as an organism all parts have to be consistent and properly fulfill its function (Ratzel 2012). In this correlation, bodies that do not approach normal model will be built as sick, abject and dangerously bodies, which contaminate social body.

Identities are constructed through difference and not outside it. The outsider constitutive of other is not oneself, that is: the self is result of a commitment that should exclude others abject to exist (Derrida 1981, Butler 1993). Then bipolarities identities such as heterosexual/homosexual, male/female, white/black, domestic/foreign, normal/abnormal, healthy/sick, bring into play otherness' dynamics. There are intersectional and mutually constitutive, and what is more important always violently. In fact, as more otherness is intersecting in a subject then more forms of violence will fall on her/him.

Finding for constitutive otherness standardized identity is used both: subjects near and historically criminalized, persecuted, killed and excluded—as crazy, whores, witches, cripples, fools, Gypsies, and Jews undeserving poor, but also other beings that come from the new discourses of post-Darwinian otherness. Here are people and individuals who are discursively constructed from institutional and external practices as no normal, for example, non-Caucasian peoples, defined on countless occasions by more orthodox biological science as inferior zoological varieties in evolutionary terms (Sanchez 2007). Then, anatomical features are analyzed to show how different individuals from other cultures are biologically more similar to simians than

² In this sense, legal systems of power produce subjects that will represent below, especially, when ideology challenges subject from before birth and, therefore, are constructed by it (Althusser 1978: 1).

humans (Haller, 1995). While, they will seek, find or create examples of their inferiorities. Scientific discourses of power-knowledge from physical anthropology and human biology among others will legitimize disappearance of many ethnic groups, given its alleged but scientific inferiority to civilized man.

During civilizing (1815-1875) and naturalizing (1875-1945) geopolitical eras, in which industrial capitalism generates and expands industrial capitalism (Agnew 2005), these alternative bodies were introduced and exposed at the self-styled civilized countries in order to mark otherness. A wide range of practices are used to introduce them from zoos (where each human group is commonly grouped exotic as nuclear family, behind bars or railings) to circus, where a number of freaks are shown (beings with skills or body shapes branded as rare and/or monstrous presented from multiple forms of physical, mental, other human variability) ... Many human groups are moved to cities to entertain growing audience, but they are also shown with the aim of passing through their bodies and ways of being in the world discourse of otherness.

Two well known examples of these practices are the life of Sarah Bartman and Julia Pastrana. First life clearly illustrates the individual and national construction. Born in present South Africa and belonging to Khoisan tribe, named by Dutch settlers as *Hottentot*, is brought to Europe in 1810 as a slave by an English surgeon dedicated to export of wild animals. Their body shapes—"exotic and monstrous"—were studied, played and topographed in museums and medical schools, circuses and feasts of nobility and emerging bourgeoisie. Booming Lamarck's evolutionary theory of human races marked on Sarah a different phenotype: *black savages* representing previous stages of evolution of human species, and makes it an otherness somatographic artifact³. People who make up metropolitan society can see Sarah and find that she is all that bourgeois women are not: wild, slave, black and violent. Sara has a body far from controlled and subtle body of civilized and well-mannered woman.

The Mexican Indian known as gorilla or ugliest world's woman, called Julia Pastrana, served to expand evolutionary and otherness discourses between Western or Westernized bourgeois. Julia had a hypertrichosis syndrome

³ We can differentiate somatographia what would be the somato-power or power through the body as something more specific (Mandoki, 2003, Foucault 1976, 1983), as *somateca* used by Preciado (2011), which includes the bodies as political and cultural archives, taking into account that doctors, politicians and audiovisual discourse representing the body produce normal or intended to describe the pathology.

and she was sold and shown in circuses, fairs and museums while she was alive, but also after his death, when her body was embalmed and exhibited in circuses and festivals.

The new bourgeois subject, the citizen, has a barbarians (non-Europeans) and monsters as constitutive outsider. In nineteenth-century this space is inhabit by different actors whose existence threatens order established by/ to nation, property and business. Emerging proletariat, urban marginalized, "monstrous beings" and, always, colonial subjects dance anchored in otherness, when Darwinists are looking for and building missing links between *homo sapiens* and primates. Julia and Sara are some of those missing links that confirm both Darwinian evolution of species and need for domestication of lesser beings⁴. As them, many others are created and recreated in the oblique mirror to fill the necessary function to adorn the new men and women who build modernity (Badou, 2000, Fausto-Sterling, 1995). But "monstrous" beings belong to a queer universe because skirt boundaries of gender, sex and species. They are not built as women or as men, animals or humans, but all at together and no one at time. They inhabit a monster space, saved and shown both in palace, museum, and university or square, around which develops technologies and introduce boulder. They show centrality of otherness in new modern bourgeois society, legitimized in progress and collective well-being rigged to it, and demonizing barbarism, designed as an obstacle to progress.

Women and the Biopolitical Artifact of The Feminine

Exoticism and difference were not solely created from colonial subjects with different racial and animalized phenotypes, but also occurs from local otherness. In this case, otherness process is concentrate on criminals and feminine bodies named as pedophiles, *uranians*, sodomites, and much later as homosexuals. They play a major role to new order of populations and

⁴ Teratology born as new science, one that set out to collect, dissect, study and theorize about all those beings with physical "abnormal" forms, but unlike medieval tradition monster was not a divine punishment or devil's action. Now, monster is a representation of arbitrariness or product of female wanderings (Gorbach, 2000). In a context of discursive production expands about anatomy and human gestation process as scientific discoveries, "deformed", "monstrous" or "abnormal" is seen as part of a natural order and biological processes governed by laws of nature. Teratology created taxonomies and categories, and were vital for establishing biological boundaries, demarcated natural and unnatural, normal and pathological, sanity and madness.

individuals subject construction. To forge new forms of governance of life and, therefore, security technologies and governance of the subjects, man/woman and masculinity/femininity bipolarities are created, with heterosexual/homosexual bipolarity too.

As noted by Butler (1990), echoing Simone de Beauvoir and Lucy Irigaray, on Western tradition women are built as a subject located from first moment in a non-being space. Women inhabit the maximum space of otherness, and the fiction woman will be the opposite mirror of men, being from the beginning defined by a lack. Childishness, weakness, dependence, idiocy and a long list of derogatory adjectives make female subject definition of nineteenth-century. Consequently, fiction man must be defined by positive opposition to these alleged qualities of women, being located at top of social scale, as maker or producer of history, science and backbone of company and its development. Not surprisingly, only men acquire recognition as citizen⁵.

But to be female covers a large and variable spectrum, with large shades and variations and, the subjects inhabit homosexuality semiotic material space will be part of what we called "the feminine". This space welcomes anything that is not a man, which is a sex-gender outer constitutive identity.

The formulation of the rule constructs subjects and introduces them in violence and subordination as an essential part of being a woman and, therefore, to entire female political fiction. Feminine space is inhabited by women, gays, lesbians and transsexuals, and a range of sexualities beings diverted from standard practices that build otherness and reaffirm rules allow a fiction man identity. As Badinter noted (1996) man reaches manhood through three basic denials that must constantly test: he is not women, he is not a baby, and he is not gay. These three categories of identity underpin the outside constitutive of masculine identity, since not be a woman shared with not be a baby and not be gay a range of defining traditional notions of femininity (physical and emotional weakness, lack of bravery and intelligence and heightened emotionality). These features are the defining rules of normal womanhood bourgeois morality that were denounced by Flora Tristan and Emma Goldman, among others, when discursive order only allows woman for two bipolar roles: being a prostitute or a mother. At this time the modern myth of romantic love was forge, we find a range of inexhaustible source of legitimating of violence against women.

On other side, the classical hegemonic model of femininity is also linked with moral superiority development of Western civilization through proper

⁵ This issue has been extensively addressed by feminist theories means that man is everything that is not the woman who becomes dependent of men.

subjection of women body of victorious nations. Sexuality creates, transforms and reproduces social and spatial hierarchies, and dominant nations will be associated with a greater capacity for self-restraint and discipline. In fact, sexuality is often thought as a space of affirmation of a civilized culture. Here one again, bodies are distinctive: to others, she and he, incivility, brutality, violence, bestiality, pornography or barbarism; to the powerful of the world, identified with the West, purity, holiness, monitoring, control and domestication of units that turn or deviate naturals model (Blidon & Roux 2011). Not surprisingly, process of civilization is, to a large extent on the ability to restrain instinctive sexuality, resulting spatially on a classificatory logic that justifies and reinforces territorial hierarchies (Hyndman 2004, Sharp 2004).

On parallel, a civilized society is one in which monogamous heterosexual nuclear family is naturalized. The modern family model is great antidote to prevent degeneration of population that spent decades denouncing social hygienists. The monogamous heterosexal family turned woman into "angel's home". Motherhood emerges a new political figure, as a central household subject to maintenance and reproduces monogamous and heterosexual bias. The mother plays a role as an antibiotic to prevent contact with harmful bacteria and pollutants. This role is single most significant and relevant for women, who are subject to all other duties as wives, daughters, etc., and makes women mothers repositories of national essence. They will be *las paridoras* of homeland's sons.

Liberal state makes heterosexual nuclear family a public issue. The paradigm of family "immunity" is a device able to regulate subjects' privacy practices (Donzelot 1979). Family introduces a clear and unambiguous hierarchy with role's and tasks assignment based on age but especially around sex-generic identities. In fact, family received from the state to play a function and to restrain its members as power needs. In this sense family becomes capillarity of biopower: subjects are a single and indivisible representation of unit, that is family; and under its modern form, all family members happen to be controlled and controlling others. The role of women is central to the development of these practices for police. The success of this exercise precise control each member of family has well defined roles and fields. In fact, bodies read as female or male, have some forms of action, aesthetics and feelings that should not be abandoned under any possibility.

Therefore, increasing participation of women in some public activities, as teachers, midwives, vendors, artisans, writers, composers and performers-sector lawyer makes eminently masculine, incorporate it into their speeches on the nation. Female is incorporated into national accounts in order to

regulate participation of an emerging subject, rather than as active and independent in national imaginary. Then, politicization of motherhood to link them to nation and nationalism is a recurring aspect used to date (Davids & van Driel, 2005).

By other side, in definition of the feminine we found others characters as perversion and stealth, which have defined discursively gay men since eighteenth century. And precisely this coincidence, which we don't believe as such, leads us to consider space of "the feminine" and its constitution as a key for understanding sex-gender based violence and regimes. "The woman" does not have a place in society (real place is on family), she is designated as social sexual object, a character also attributed to lack to homosexual relationship (Hocquenghem 2009, 54). We note here how category of "woman", *the female* will fall repeatedly, heteronormative and misogynist on bodies and subjectivities of anyone individual who, for whatever reason, be read with any lack defining masculinity⁶.

Hetero-normative hegemonic discourse that defines political fiction "woman" maps to identical features of fragility, vulnerability, dependence and little or no rational capacity, introducing beings remain weak, shy away from confrontation and, therefore, act in underground and individual. because we know that women were not subjects or citizens' rights and that acquisition of this condition was a painstaking process, remains unfinished. Thus, the structure of male/female feminine notes as a constant threat to truth: mythologized order from and for men, to their power.

In a chain of considerations, origin is negative and not just different; *the feminine* has established itself as a permanent threat to the order and reality that designated masculine as normal. At this point, where identities are result of crossing between truth's practices and discourses about bodies and their forms, and bodies are read on a bipolar scheme that can only be male bodies, male social practices, and vice versa, we wonder how may have been placed in the category of female subjects with male body shapes?

Next we address the origin of discourses of truth that enable this apparent incongruity. In doing so, we give relevance to psychiatric and medical discourses, by their connection with power structures in biopolitics task of population control. We give an account of material and discursive practices that generated homosexual normative model, prevailing since the nineteenth century until a few decades ago, leaving outside changes introduced by dif-

⁶ Medial discourse creates female body as an independent body, as opposed to men, since discovery of ovaries and fallopian tubes (1918) banishes be an erroneous belief of the male body.

ferent struggles gay identity and, subsequent discovery of new subject/object to build and secure the service of capital high profit.

From Sodomite to Third Sex: Feminization of Male Homosexuality

Since nineteenth century doctors, psychiatrists, lawyers and social hygienists will focus on the degeneration of the human race from sexual practices. Their intention was to mark and distinguish potential degenerate people to isolate real perverts from those with obscene or vicious behavior, which are not be considered real homosexual but were categorized as depraved taste. It launches a real social eugenics multilateral strategy (Vazquez 2001).

In parallel to this process is based and naturalizes the model monogamous heterosexual nuclear family, control of sexuality and reproduction of hand labor requiring industry and the military. This model is the great antidote to prevent degeneration of the population that spent decades denouncing social hygienists, within which the woman is turned into the "angel of the home" and there is the new political figure of the mother, the central subject household maintenance and reproduction monogamous and heterosexual, which acts as an antibiotic to prevent contact with harmful bacteria and pollutants. The role of mother is the single most significant and relevant for women, who are subject to all other duties as wives, daughters... This condition makes women mother the repository of national essences; those who give birth to the children of the nation. And national discourses on women are combined with the medical discourse that creates female body as an independent body opposed to men body, since the discovery of the ovaries and fallopian tubes (1918) banishes be an erroneous belief of the male body.

The liberal state makes the heterosexual nuclear family a public issue and the paradigm of the "immunity" the family is the device able to manage and to regulate the privacy practices of the subjects (Donzelot 1979). This family introduces a clear and unambiguous hierarchy with assignment of roles and tasks based on age as well as on sex-generic identities. In fact, the family plays a key function: to restrain its members as power needs becoming a capillary tentacle of biopower. Under its modern model subjects are a single and indivisible representation of the unit that family was, becoming an institution where every member has to be controlled and every member control to others. Now, women are central to the development of these policy which success is depended on control each member of the family

and on well roles and fields definition. The objective is that bodies read as female or male have forms of action, aesthetics and feelings that should not be abandoned under any possibility.

By other side, the increasing participation of women in public activities as teachers, midwives, vendors, artisans, writers, composers and performers conduced to their incorporation as part of national discourses by lawyer, philosopher and politician. Women were incorporated into national discourses in order to regulate their participation as emerging subject rather than as an active and independent actor in the national imaginary. In this process the politicization of motherhood links the nation and nationalism, an aspect used to date (Davids and van Driel 2005).

First decades of XX Century show relevant changes in gender relations of European bourgeoisie and a re-definition of male and female roles. In the eyes of some authors the major European cities were becoming "... a carnival, where they dress up in our costumes, headdresses masculine look ..." (Saldaña, 1929: 74). The new aesthetic trends for like women's clothes and hairstyles masculinised as well the growing presence of them and "gay" in political, intellectual, cultural and leisure activities, so far defined for men causes concern. Not surprisingly, these practices challenge the hegemonic masculinity and come to question their hierarchical position, creating an urgent need to reorganize the reality and stop this apparent "*debauchery*".

The shock is reflected in talk shows and publications⁷ and the solutions come from the hand of science: the taxonomies, categorizations and psychiatric diagnoses serve to dissect and organize the set of practices considered "abnormal". Once again the knowledge-power is the strategy that works because while divided, serves to reinforce the differences among both "abnormal" as between normal that inhabit the fictional heterosexual normalcy (Hocquenghem 2009). Psychiatric and medical discourses with its echoes in literature and press invented the third sex, creating this new figure was none of the previous two: no man, no woman, from men who have sex with men, tomboys, the suffragettes, the *garçon* women who had sex with women, among others, will be included in this new fiction alive.

Homosexuality and the homosexual identity are generated from Westphal (1870) defining the concept of a reverse sexual awareness created by Kart Marie Benkert (1869). Research and medical-psychiatric work produce truths that land on homosexual identity which until now had never existed nor throughout Western history, or in other geographies, highlighting the

⁷ The feeling that "the world [*had*] gone completely the opposite of what it was in our [*his*] youth" is palpable (Recanses 1928: 5; in Aresti, 2007: 177).

contribution of Tardieu who considered it as physical and social pathology. His work is fundamental to create the homosexual identity fiction because from ethnography file (near a hundred cases observed), conducts a thorough social profile and even individual anatomical pederast. It has statistical guarantee and established from the physical signs to the sociological study of the lives, customs, language, the forms of association and their codes with such detail that the seemingly innocent signs and trivial gestures are taken as symptoms of a specific type and quality peculiar sexual behavior and, of course, clear signs a type of person (Vázquez 2001: 150).

Specific emotional forms, morphologies bodily forms of expression, tastes, concrete and traumatic childhoods, sexual practices and univocal desires were invented and built as a scientific unquestionable truth to define a "type" of people from the scientific discourse: the homosexual. The progression of the medical-psychiatric discourse is unstoppable, especially since Freud. He clearly defined the otherness space in which subjects will be placed as "abnormal" versus the heterosexual fiction as the only possible space of life. The creation of this Third Fiction underlines the difference and otherness, while introduced it into the framework of the standard. This the similar physical entity providing it social identity, along with the two other sex-gender identities that already existed. Therefore, the third sex is subjected to the same laws.

We find here the seed of fiction homosexual identity with the passing of time and the weight of the different technologies will become just as an artefact and securing control of bodies. The ratings of the third sex/homosexual happen quickly. Doctors and psychiatrists and Juquelier French Vigoroux considered "sexual inversion" as the manifestation of a degenerative anomaly where the individual feels male body and soul of women. And Sandor Ferenczi, a disciple of Freud, addresses the "homoeroticism subject" and "object homoeroticism", referring to a man who feels like a woman, and not only during intercourse but for all facets of his life giving life to the figure of the passive homosexual. Its emergence is key to the genesis of the artifact is called "feminine". The passive homosexual as a delicate, weak and hysterical one is occupied the space populated inhabit by women too and, he becomes the constitutive otherness that masculinity needs to exist.

In many European countries homosexuality involves a fruitful alliance between medicine criminology, justice and political and religious discourse, also present in literature and theater. As result of this partnership psychiatric medical discourse is extended with the discourses of social dangerousness linking homosexuality to child prostitution and child sexual abuse. Here remains, and will never disappear, the eugenic idea that homosexuality is a

social evil polluting showing degeneration of the population, being necessary and justified the direct intervention of all state mechanisms to control it.

One of the greatest dangers of men's feminization was be the act of prostitution, thought from the passivity of the subject who exercised: the problem lies in the lack of firmness with which masculinity and femininity were defined and separated, causing certain individuals fall into this evil sick and infect others, especially youngsters and children. The Spanish physician Gregorio Marañón says it is highly necessary to fortify the differences between the sexes, exalt the barony of men and femininity of women to avoid: "It is therefore clear that a woman should be a mother at all, forgetting everything else if necessary, and this for inexcusable obligation of sex, and as man must use his energy to the creative work of the same law inexcusable your male sexuality" (Marañón 1969: 438).

The Spanish doctor echoes the thoughts of their European contemporaries but he writes from a benevolent position not asking about killing, murder or criminally prosecutes homosexuals. He defines homosexuality as a disease that needs to control and cure. It is able to end the evil to apply rational methods to urgent regenerate the Spanish population. One again the discourse of population illness is related to nationalism because national identity is affected/infected by the existence of homosexuals. In addition you can always point out that this phenomenon—homosexual disease, overall being from the outside, which is really the danger of contagion for a pure society that never has been (Vázquez 2001; Cleminson 2008). And this is not a new operation because the loss of Cuba and Philippines colonies was interpreted in very similar way. There was a reference to the need for regeneration, a political thought whose rhetoric is filled with metaphors about the "physical weakness" and "effeminacy" of population as causes of those national disasters. The hygiene and social medicine address population degeneration because what it is called "la raza" in Spanish was intended as constant danger (García and Alvarez, 1994). As Joaquín Costa wrote, if the modern nation reflects and is reflected in the bodies and practices of each man, the root of their woes is the lack of masculinity of its members, as Joaquín Costa writes: "Spain was a nation unisexual, composed of eighteen million women" (Galvan, 1971, in Vázquez García, 2001).

We see once again how lack of strength, inability and failure define a feminized space, an identity that is not suitable for the nation. If the otherness of nations set an understanding of the global space's hierarchy from the notions that those lower are feminize (McDowell, 1999), the discourses of degeneration are used to analyze the decline of national populations and criticize the policies mismanagement opponents, as well as to establish

the hierarchy between the different spatialities. In this regard, the early twentieth century, a renowned sociologist and jurist, asked: "[...] ... wait maybe to Europe and America the destination of Asia, that is, sexual corruption, effeminacy and decadence ..." (Bunge 1908: 88, in Miranda & Vallejo, 2004).

The Feminine: Pain and Violences

We have seen how the gay that individual who is not a man then becomes "as a woman", but in history and in different geographies the boy/man or sissy/feminised has not always been associated with an identity or a particular object of desire or sexual homoerotic practices. For example, before the nineteenth century effeminacy could be a sign of belonging to the nobility and did not denote any relation to sexual practices or deviations from standards (Halperin 2004). The identification between effeminate and homoerotic sexual practices take place during the nineteenth century when discourses around the marginal effeminate with public sociability almost exclusively female, occupations and tastes socially assigned to women, emotional weak and expressiveness histrionic, a victim of assaults and abuse by those who believe and seek to embody hegemonic masculinity, was present in many European countries.

The incarnation of legitimate scientific discourse and institutional practices in the population generates a hegemonic identity model. Only possibility of existence for those who "were not men", who could not or do not let them be men differently. The gay is assimilating to women while body provided from the hetero power position (Lamas, 1998: 59). Violence, aggression, the buried exception and micro-current of biopolitical life care are an essential part of the construction homosexual identity model as well as the women one, as they define the space of "the feminine" as constituents of masculinity otherness.

Today it is easy to find in any secondary school that when a child does not want or can not play football—a privileged space for the construction and demonstration of masculinity in childhood and adolescence (Anderson, 2009)—, be insulted by the accusation of girl, sissy or fagot, in a long list of nicknames that lead to lack of normative masculinity or space of the feminine. We are interested in the role of insult and injury as a foundation for all other forms of violence (Eribon, 2001), because life of homosexuals, their mere existence is a contaminant threat to those who embody the fiction heterosexual around you (Vance 1984).

The homosexual is the threat that individuals construct their life, those who believe themselves as man living in fiction heteronormative to keep away from homosexuality, reject and attack if necessary violently to mark their difference. Then the injury as material-semiotic serves to show the insane and abject nature of the subjects who inhabit the “feminine” without really being women. Moreover, the company aims to light on a range of subjects and despicable practices. Accordingly, body injury and defines brand identities but not only damages but builds to be stated under *Althusserian* interpellation operation.

Injury marks a body long before this body knows of that mark and reaches its greatest violence when transformed into shame (Eribon 2001). The injury is introduced into our subjectivity and makes us aware of breaking rules, a negative-punishing, self-subjection, and acts as an alarm and tremendously violent self control (Halperin & Traub 2009). On the one hand, the shame defines the identity and removed it, at the same time (Sedgwick 1999).

The fact that many homosexuals are read under the normative discourses of femininity makes them inferior and denigrated as passivity and decline symbols acting unwittingly as looming threat (Badinter 1992). Thus, every subject that inhabits the political fiction of heterosexual man must turn off any signs of femininity before it can happen and become socially identified. The individual man as political fiction is validated through the rejection of the “object” and differentially opposite, the feminine as something abnormal that should not exist. And, this operation demonstrates that we-like man is not a real space of belonging but a place which you enter in order to build it permanently, so always unfinished.

Man is erected from its own enunciation as the recipient of the strength and moral values of normality anti perversion, for every subject who embodies the fiction man is capable of being injured and located in the feminine space in a read as monstrous abnormality. Therefore, the position of power conferred upon the belief of being male legitimates the action or exercise of violence towards others abject: the force of heteronormativity in this systematic and planned use of violence lies in the ignorance, naturalization and invisibility of that place of really unstable enunciation that is masculinity. The heteronormativity not need to be justified, it is; the power of the person who inhabits this fiction lies in its ability to appoint by injury (Butler 1993; Eribon 2001), where the term “fagot” with wounding appointing a form to deifying and strengthen homosexual identity from its own abjection.

The abjection produced by homosexuality is the result of social identification to be denying in public (Butler 1993), allowing fictionally normative

subjects to be understood in what denounce and revile. But, we insist it is an identification that can not be done alone by the dangers involved. Masculinity as a discursive fiction is built from birth, which involves inhabiting a space of power and domination over all of those who inhabit the feminine. In fact, if the male identity is not established like a continuous inner and homogeneity sample can be challenged in social interaction and lead to exclusion: that places the individual in an exclusive and border externality. Before this can happen the selfhood develops mechanisms that address the subject back to the fold, as the conversion of sameness in otherness itself questions the general sameness, showing the gaps on that apparent entirely homogeneous and perennial masculinity (Pereda 1991:45). Among the warning and sanction common strategies for re-driving of sameness, injury is revealed as a great power: rumor, insult, sardonic joke, looks and attitudes of rejection, withdrawal or questioning are and have been present in the lives of most of western and non-western men, causing not few sweats, and subsequent samples and forced performative "true masculinity", to ward off any doubts about their bodies and identities.

As highlighted by Sedgwick (1990) the overwhelming panic against homosexuality itself becomes the force that leads to the systematic murder and other forms of violence against gay and transgender people. The ongoing process of sanction and re-enactment assumed life of many subjects is developed emphasizing the masquerade and self-subjection to the rule, while for those who could not be there were two possibilities: the incarnation and reproduction of homosexual identity rules, with its various forms and variations by spaces and contexts, or the development of a major survival strategies for men (women) who had sex-affective relationships with other subjects of their same-gender sex called the closet, which is a continuous bargain with life on visibility, concealment and danger of the unveiling.

To finish

Violence against the artifact called "the feminine" that brings together all people expelled from political fiction of living man, it is not a individual matter, or is tied to a particular geographical space, geopolitical and cultural moment, or class or stratum concrete social. The feminine has not been gestated suddenly but it is a highly complex social product whose evolution we have tried to address in a simplified form. We have not drawn a real genealogy that far exceed the scope of this article, because our goal was to delve only subjects defined as bio-male bodies but whose practices, desires

and social performance places them in the political fiction of homosexual, gay or fagot.

We have tried to place the various phobias towards men as result of crossing processes among which are: the political development of modern nation-states, the transition from sovereign to disciplinary regimes, new industrial and urban economic forms, new science and scientific forms from theological to positivist one and geopolitical eras. In their conjunction is possible the emergence of new forms of biopolitical government to build and care populations, bodies, subjectivities and individuals, always in the form of benevolent shepherd, making individuals self-holding and grip to the people around them in order of their own welfare.

The new identities are extremely important to biopolitical government and the new knowledge-powers defined then in exquisite detail, even taxonomic, identity possibilities that individuals must live and from which processes are constructed subjectivity of people. Particularly, will be marked with hot iron the bodies and subjectivities of men and women who are read as subjects other, non-normal, with violence, stigma, injury and death present in their lives especially in the case of non-inhabit masculine space: women and gay men, lesbians and transsexuals.

In this sense, we see *violences* derived from the action of the sex-gender technologies as a result of the existence of these identity categories: inhabit political fiction of man, naturalized and essentialised, involves an ongoing exercise of self-control and rejection and the use of violence against those other men who inhabit the feminine. Inhabiting the feminine, in fact being female, homosexual, lesbian or transsexual, born and built leads to violence as part and parcel of our people and of our identity fictions.

So when we argue that man is by definition not a woman and not a gay, opened a field of analysis to understand the dynamics of identity and a field of reflection on the forms of men's violence against women and to those men who have lost the ability to be treated as men themselves. Hegemonic masculinity is revealed not only as misogynistic, but essentially defined by otherness with/to all practices and subjectivities that are not it. In this sense, the forms of production of otherness enhance violence as a bordering mechanism. Masculinity fixed in bodies appointed as masculine in the performative process of subjectivation is related with violence against to that no man, political artifact we call "feminine".

We have tried to explore foundations and some technologies and devices for controlling and securing bodies since second half of the eighteenth century to early XX century. Our intention was to mark the genesis of a process that allows us to establish continuities and ruptures with the forms

of violence stemming from gender regimes at present, such as homophobia and lesbophobia. Whereas neither the identities nor gender, nor the places are stable, fixed or given, nor are they freely chosen or easily transformed (Massey, 1993), we open the way to establish these connections in the future, addressing the changes and continuities that occurred in the last 70 years.

From queer approaches and policies whose analytical possibilities are not confined to the field of non-heteronormative sexualities, not limited to highlight heterosexism as abnormalities configuration device, we were able to advance a radical critique of standardization devices sedimented identities, outlawing certain subject positions and subjectivities that become abject, a "critique that results in a rejection of all normative imposition involving essentialism, censure or exclusion" (Ortega 2008: 48, Sedgwick 1998).

Queer visions in dialogue with socio analysis has allowed us to link the actions of building and securing of the bodies to the production process of the main political artifact space of modernity: the nation-state and its social counterpart, citizenship; taking into account, in turn, as the study of bodies and power can be performed across multiple spatial scales.

We conclude that the power is not an epistemological obstacle around the question of sex, as pointed out for decades in the sexual liberation movements, but rather it encourages and promotes their production, catalyzes the knowledge and gives the possibility of being from creating visibility fenced fields, legitimized by the power-knowledge. Needless to say, we have not addressed or explored the practices of resistance that have sought and seek to transcend, overcome or inhabit crevices such frameworks of intelligibility. The analysis of these paradoxical spaces is a necessary line of research which we hope to realize shortly.

References

- Agamben, G., 1998, *Homo sacer. El poder soberano y la nuda vida*, Pre-Textos: Valencia. Traducción: Antonio Gimeno Cuspinera.
- Agnew, J., 2002, *Geopolitics: a re-view of world politics*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Althusser, L., 1988, *Ideología y aparatos ideológicos de Estado*, Buenos Aires: Ed. Nueva Visión.
- Anderson, E., 2009, *Inclusive masculinity: The changing nature of masculinities*, New York: Routledge.
- Arendt, H., 1966, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Austin, J., 1996, *¿Cómo hacer cosas con palabras?*, Madrid: Paidós.

- Avery, J., 1997, *Progress, Poverty and Population: Re-reading Condorcet, Godwin and Malthus*, London: Routledge.
- Badinter E., 1996, *XF: La identidad masculina*, Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Badou, G., 2000, *L'énigme de la Vénus Hottentote*, Paris: JC Lattès.
- Biersteker, T. & Weber, C., 1996, *State Sovereignty as Social Construct*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, M., 1995, *Banal nationalism*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Blidon, M. & Roux, S., 2011, L'ordre sexuel du monde, *L'Espace Politique* 13 :1, <http://espacepolitique.revues.org/index1813.html> May 5, 2012
- Browne, K., Lim, J., Brown, G. eds., 2007, *Geographies of sexualities*, Burlington: Ashgate.
- Buffon, G. L., 1997, *Las épocas de la naturaleza* (Vol. 872). Madrid: Alianza Editorial S.A., [1779].
- Butler, J., 1990, *Gender in Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York: Routledge.
- ___(1993). *Bodies that matter: on the discursive limits of "sex"*, Routledge.
- Cairo, C. H., 2001, Territorialidad y Fronteras del estado-nación: Las condiciones de la política en un mundo fragmentado, *Política y Sociedad* 36, Madrid, pp. 29-38.
- Campos M., R., 1998, La teoría de la degeneración y la medicina social en España en el cambio e siglo, *Llull* vol. 21, pp. 333-356.
- Cleminson, R., 2008, *Anarquismo y Sexualidad. (España, 1900-1939)*, Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz Publicaciones.
- Dauids, T. & Van Driel, F., 2005, *The Gender Question in Globalization. Changing Perspectives and Practices*, Aldershot: Asghate.
- Deleuze, G. y Guattari, F., 1989, *Mil mesetas*, Valencia: Pre-Textos.
- Donzelot, J., 1979, *La policía de las familias*, Valencia: Pre-textos
- Eribon, D., 2001, *Reflexiones sobre la cuestión gay*, Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Esposito, R., 2004, *Bíos. Biopolítica y filosofía*, Buenos Aires: Paidós
- Fausto-Sterling, A., 1995, Gender, Race, and Nation: The Comparative Anatomy of 'Hottentot' Women in Europe, 1815-1817, in J. Terry, J. Urla (eds.), *Deviant bodies: Critical perspectives on difference in science and popular culture*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 19-48.
- Foucault, M., 2005, [1976]. *Historia de la sexualidad. 1. La voluntad de saber*, Madrid: Siglo XXI de España.
- Foucault, M., 1994, *Vigilar y Castigar: nacimiento de la prisión*, Madrid: Siglo XXI de España .Traducción de Aurelio Garzón del Camino.
- Foucault, M., 1992, *Nietzsche, la genealogía, la historia*, Valencia: Pretextos.
- García, D. & Álvarez, V., 1994, *Regeneracionismo y Salud Pública. El bienio de Ángel Pulido*

- al frente de la Dirección General de Sanidad (1901-1902). Acta Hispanica ad Medicinae Sciatarumque Historiam Illustrandam*, Vol. 14: 23-41.
- Gilmartin, M. & Kofman, E., 2002, "Critical Feminist Geopolitics", in *Mapping Women, Making Politics: Feminist Perspectives on Political Geography*, New York: Routledge, 2002: 113-125
- Grewal, I. & Kaplan, C. ed., 1994, *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Gorbach, F., 2000, Mujeres, Monstruos e Impresiones en la medicina mexicana del siglo XIX, *Relaciones, Estudios de Historia y Sociedad*, Saber, Creencia y Corporalidad XXI: 81, 39-55.
- Halperin, D., Traub, V., 2009, *Gay Shame*, Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Hekma, G., 1996, "A female Soul in a Male Body: Sexual Inversion as Gender Inversion", en Thomas Hobbes (1650) *Elements of Law*, II, cap. XXII [en Internet: <http://xet.es/books/Hobbes/Elements%20of%20Law%20Hobbes.pdf>, visited January 14th 2013]
- Hall, S., 1996, Introduction: Who Needs Identity?, S. Hall, P. Du Gay (eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, London: SAGE.
- Haller, J. S. Jr., 1995, *Outcasts from evolution. Scientific attitudes of racial inferiority 1859-1900*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press.
- Hyndman, J., 2004, Mind the gap: bridging feminist and political geography through geopolitics, *Political Geography*, 2004 23: 3, 307-322.
- Hocquenghem, G., 2009, *El deseo Homosexual*, Barcelona: Melusina.
- Irigaray, L., 2009, *El sexo que no es uno ni dos*, Madrid: Akal.
- Laqueur, T., 1994, *La construcción del sexo. Cuerpo y género desde los griegos hasta Freud*, Madrid: Cátedra.
- Lauretis, T. de, 1986, *Feminist Studies/Critical Studies*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Laclau, E., ed., 1994, *The Making of Political Identities*, London: Verso.
- Lopez Cantó, P., 2010, *Michel Foucault, pensar es resistir*, Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Ediciones Idea, Estudio General.
- Nelson & Seager, 2005, *A Companion to Feminist Geography*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Marañón, G., 1969, (1926). *Ensayos sobre la vida sexual*, Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Marañón, G., 1968, (1929) "Diálogo antisocráticos sobre Corydon" en *Obras completas* Madrid Espasa Calpe I, pp. 465- 472.
- Maseey, D., 1994, *Space, Place and Gender*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McDowell, L., 1999, *Gender, identity and place: Understanding feminist geographies*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Meloni, C., 2010, Más allá del Biopoder: el arte de la existencia, in S. Arribas et al., *Hacer vivir, dejar morir. Biopolítica y Capitalismo*, Madrid: CSIC, Catarata, pp.15-38.
- Miranda, M., Vallejo, G., 2004, *Hacia la perfección humana: Raza y evolución en el pensamiento de Carlos Octavio Bunge*, Buenos Aires.
- Moss, P., 2005, A Bodily Notion of Research: Power, Difference, and Specificity in Feminist Methodology, in Lise Nelson y Joni Seager (eds.), *A Companion to Feminist Geography*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 41-58.
- Pedraza, P., 2008, *El síndrome de Ambras y el eslabón perdido*, Madrid: Valdemar.
- Pequeño B., A., 2007, *Imágenes en disputa, Representaciones de mujeres indígenas ecuatorianas*, Quito: Ediciones Abya Yala y FLACSO.
- Pereda, C., 1991, La identidad en conflicto, *La Jornada Semanal*, 99 (5 mayo 1991).
- Preciado, B., 2008, *Testo Yónqui*, Madrid: Espasa.
- Rancière, J., 1987, El maestro ignorante. Cinco lecciones sobre la emancipación intelectual.
- Radcliffe, S., Westwood, S., 1996, *Remaking the Nation. Place, Identity and Politics in Latin America*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Ratzel, F., 2011, Las leyes del crecimiento espacial de los Estados. Una contribución a la Geografía Política científica, in *Geopolítica(s)*, Clásicos Geopolíticos, 2011 Vol. 2: 1, 135-156.
- Rose, G., 1993, *Feminism and geography*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Sánchez A., J., 2007, *La razón salvaje: Tecnociencia, Racismo y Racionalidad*, Madrid: Lengua de Trapo.
- Sánchez A., J., 2006, *Las teorías biológicas sobre el origen de las «razas humanas» (1859-1900). Elementos para una crítica antropológica de la racionalidad tecnocientífica*, Tesis doctoral inédita. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 2007.
- Searle, J. R., 1995. *The construction of social reality*, London: Penguin Books.
- Sharp, J., 2005, Guerra contra el terror y geopolítica feminista, *Tabula Rasa* Bogotá 3, 29.46.
- Stoler, A. L., 1995, *Race and the Education of Desire. Foucault's History of Sexuality and The Colonial Order Of Things*, Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Sedgwick, E. K., 1990, *Epistemology of the Closet*, Berkeley-Los Angeles.: University of California Press.
- Sedgwick, E. K., 1993, How to bring your kids up gay: The war on effeminate boys, in Ead., *Tendencias*, Durham: Duke University Press,
- Sedgwick, E. K., 1999. Performatividad queer: The art of the novel de Henry James, *Revista Nómadas*, N° 10, pp. 198-214.
- Tuncay, L. y Otnes, C., 2008, The Use of Persuasion Management Strategies by Identity-Vulnerable Consumers: The Case of Urban Heterosexual Male Shoppers, *Journal of Retailing* 84 (4), 487-499.

- Ugarte P. J., 2006, Biopolítica. Un análisis de la cuestión, *Claves de Razón Práctica*, n° 166. Madrid: Progreso, octubre, pp. 76-82
- Vance, C. S., Ed., 1984, *Pleasure and danger: Exploring female sexuality*, London-New York: Routledge.
- Vázquez García, F., 2001, El discurso médico y la invención del homosexual (España 1840-1915), *Asclepio Revista de historia de la medicina y de la ciencia CSIC*, Vol. LIII-2-2001, pp. 143-162.
- Vigouroux, A. & Juquier, P., 1905, *Contagion Mentale*, Paris: Octave Doin.
- Viuda-Serrano, A., González Aja, T., 2012, Héroes de papel: El deporte y la prensa como herramientas de propaganda política del fascismo y el franquismo. Una perspectiva histórica comparada, *Historia y Comunicación Social*, 17, pp. 41-68.
- Wallerstein, I., 1996, Abrir las Ciencias Sociales, *Boletín del Social Science Research Council* Vol, 50: 1, marzo de 1996. Nueva York: Social Science Research Council.
- Walker, R. B. J., 1993, On the spatio-temporal conditions of democratic practice, R.B.J. Walker *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 141-158.
- Warner, M., 1999, *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, politics and the ethics of queer life*, Cambridge (Mass): Harvard University Press.
- Weitz, R., 2010, *The Politics of Women Bodies. Sexuality, Appearance, and Behavior*, Oxford: University Press, 3rd Edition
- Yuval-Davis, N., Anthias, F., 1989, *Woman – Nation – State*. London: Macmillan.