

Familiarism. Archaic Futurism of Radical Conservatives and Latin–American Feminist Specters

Natalia Romé

Abstract: A renewed coalition between neo-liberalism and conservative forces is visible today, particularly in reactionary discourses against the so-called “gender ideology”. A renewed familialist morality is once again taking the scene of political antagonisms and public discourses. However, the phenomena we are witnessing today are part of a long and complex genealogy in which three tendencies are intertwined:

- 1) Capital’s advance to subsume labour (paid and unpaid) along with its class struggle against all forms of workers’ and popular organisation.
- 2) Based on old colonial traces, it requires a reinforcement of colonialist racism. But this should not be thought of in terms of a “reminiscence” of pre-capitalist forms of life, but as the necessary effect of capitalist reproduction in its renewedly non-capitalist “peripheries”.
- 3) Forms of under-wage, neo-colonial slave and unpaid reproductive labour constitute the point of convergence of historical processes of racialisation and genericisation of marginalised (albeit massive) population sectors, in the service of the expanded reproduction of capital on a global scale. Within this confluence, the return of familialist morality must be seen both as a renewed strategy of capital - particularly since the dictatorial processes of the 1970s - and as a sign of its current systemic crisis, which shows itself to be a peripheralisation of the world and an expansion of post-dictatorial culture from the margins towards the so-called central countries.

We can thus understand the strategic role of feminist movements in Latin America and also understand why they are the target of attack by the international right-wing vanguards.

Keywords: social reproduction, postdictatorship, Latin-American feminism, familiarism

A renewed paradoxical coalition between neo-liberalism and conservatism has become visible nowadays, notably in reactionary discourses against the so-called “gender ideology”¹, in which ultra-liberal so-called “libertarian” positions turn into traditional discursive forms of anti-liberal conservative morality.²

Moreover, it could be said that a renewed familiarist morality takes the stage of political antagonisms and public discourses and constitutes the field of a renovated encounter between the previous liberal-right forces and the more traditional ultra-conservative tendencies (Collazo and Pulleiro, 2019; Anzorena, 2009; Schuster, 2018; Verbal, 2022). This may look quite original in many regions, however, it should be recalled, as David Pavón Cuellar (2018) has recently done, that in Latin America, the partnership between pro-capitalist modernising tendencies, especially in the economic sphere, and extremely conservative and anti-democratic positions in political, moral and cultural terms, is more than a century old.

It is worth recalling that in Mexico, from 1913, the Mexican Catholic Union contributed political activists to the anti-revolutionary cause. In Argentina, in 1919, the Liga Patriótica (Patriotic League) was created, a parastatal organization formed by the sons of wealthy sectors to hunt down immigrants suspected of participating in workers' organization processes, especially those with anarchist affiliations, coming from the convulsed Italy or deported after the experience of the Paris Commune. In many cases, conservative positions of a segregationist and even xenophobic nature were adopted by the same representatives of the intellectual field who a decade earlier advocated a liberal modernization of American societies. In the 1930s, conservative conservative groups of a nationalist and Hispanic-inspired nature in various Latin American countries fed off the ideology of Spanish Falangism, with varying degrees of influence on the political and cultural scene. In some cases, during this period, the liberal-conservative coalition experienced internal distancing and contradictions. Shortly afterwards, and since the post-war period, however, their interventions have converged once again, when they aligned their outlines with the anti-communist ideology of the Cold War.

In short, it could be said that these types of expressions never left the scene and that, in fact, they had a strong influence during the military dictatorships that shaped the region during the second half of the century.³ The counter-revolutionary organisations that actively participated in actions deployed in the framework of Plan Condor and in the various forms of state terrorism, acting as paramilitary forces, in the intelligence services or as ideologues in the media, educational and cultural spheres and universities can be recalled in this regard: Bandeirantes in Brazil, the Triple A (Argentine Anti-Communist Alliance), the so-called Caza Tupamaros in Uruguay, the Acción Patriótica in Colombia, Mano Blanca in Guatemala, are some of its exponents.

The aim of this essay is not to concentrate on a historicization of these specific trajectories. A history of the processes that converge at different moments in the 20th century in this articulation between heterogeneous fractions of the dominant sectors requires a genealogical analysis that considers diverse historicities articulated in an overdetermined way, in order to identify the specific determinations of each juncture and each country. However, it is interesting to recognise, in somewhat more global or abstract terms, a common singularity that is structural to the Latin American capitalist periphery and that runs through the specific forms of each conjuncture. This makes it necessary to consider aspects of a more structural nature in order to understand the contradictory confluence between liberal-modernising forces and ultra-conservative and even anti-liberal forces. Understanding this structural dimension of the contradictory articulation between liberalising tendencies and anti-liberal tendencies is key to understanding the current anti-feminist onslaught in our region.

To put it briefly, the processes of liberalisation required and driven by the expanded reproduction of capital, especially in its imperialist forms, coincide in exposing their contradictory matrix in the form of internal limits to the liberal-modernising tendency itself, which, at the same time, requires and feeds racist social relations and an anti-liberal morality of a conservative-heteropatriarchal nature.

In a broad, non-economicist sense, this crossroads can be linked to that already famous one posed by Gunder Frank, when he argued that:

...historical research shows that contemporary underdevelopment is largely the historical product of past and present economic and non-economic relations between underdeveloped satellites and today's developed metropolitan countries. Moreover, these relations are an essential part of the structure and development of the capitalist system on a world scale as a whole (1967, p. 160).

This already classic idea in dependency theory and in the broader field of Latin American Marxism can be tested to explore the current revival of the liberal-conservative alliance in the region, especially with regard to anti-feminist activism, to reveal the extent to which the impulses of regressive and illiberal ideologies converge in the current strategy of reproduction of capital.

This strategy is conceived by David Harvey (2007) as a new regime of reproduction characterised by forms of violent dispossession and by some feminist theorists as a resurgence of neo-colonial processes of original accumulation (Federici, 2010).

In this framework, focusing the question on the paradoxical coincidence of liberalising and ultra-conservative tendencies in Latin American history allows us to understand the current relevance of the so-called “conservative”, “punitive” (Davies, 2016) or “neo-colonial” (Federici, 2010) of global neoliberal capitalism and to trace in it the resumption - in the form of a furious anti-feminist activism - of an old alliance that is rooted in its structural and expansive dynamics of reproduction, as Rosa Luxemburg ([1913] 2012) pointed out early on.

However, this entails some significant consequences. The first of these is that what various theorists from central countries conceive of as a feature of a late stage of the neoliberalisation of capitalism - by which I mean the emergence of anti-democratic discourses that are confrontational with the classical liberal ideology of civil and personal rights (cf. Brown, 2020) - has a history in Latin America as long as its name itself. This forces us to ask ourselves whether it might not be necessary to reverse, at least for once, the epistemic logics that tend to identify the theoretical and analytical production of the central countries as the production of a “general” conceptuality applicable to the “particular cases” offered by the peripheral regions. Indeed, so it is my belief. The

question that concerns us demands starting from a theoretical elaboration inquiring into the forms adopted by the reproduction of capital in the “marginal” zones, in order to understand the contradictorily anti-liberal, anti-democratic, racist and semi-slavery character of modern capitalism “in general” and of neo-liberalism in particular.

The second consequence is that, posing the question in this way, it loses epistemic value and analytical rigour to assume the novelty or originality of the so-called “new” right. Because in the peripheral regions, the processes of tendential subsumption of non-capitalist social relations to the logic of the reproduction of capital, which from the beginning have involved non-capitalist forms of political repression, non-wage or sub-wage forms of economic exploitation, relied on racist, segregationist, anti-egalitarian and anti-democratic ideologies which are far from endorsing the legal-political ideology of the bourgeois states of the central countries (cf. Grüner, 2010; Tristán, 2022; Federici, 2010). In these regions of global capitalism, the “new right” has never been new. Its emergence is that of an archaic restitution within the peripheral countries, although now - and perhaps this is what is so new - projected onto the central countries that think of themselves as beacons of modernization. This is the lesson that Latin America - along with other “backward” regions - can teach the world today.

This means that these phenomena, appearing again today in the form of this coalition between representatives of the confessional ultra-right, conservative political spaces, negationists and defenders of the dictatorships of the 1970s and the Spanish Franco regime, with representatives who present themselves as young men, NGO staff, legislators, members of foundations, even influencers on social media⁴, must be understood within a long and complex genealogy that marks the singular history of Latin America, but which must be taken into consideration in order to understand the global processes of the expanded reproduction of capital.

In this alliance we clearly see how three tendencies are knotted together:

- 1) An advance of capital to subsume labour (paid and unpaid) along with its class struggle against all forms of workers’ and popular organisation.
- 2) This global vanguard is built on old colonial traces and, therefore, requires a reinforcement of racism and colonialism. But this should not be thought of in terms of a reminiscence of pre-modern or pre-capitalist forms of life, but as the necessary effect of capitalist reproduction in its renewably non-capitalist “peripheries”. In this sense, and modifying a little the classic thesis of Rosa Luxemburg, it is not a question of thinking the reproduction of capital as a tendential expansion on a previously existing non-capitalist space (which would be a pre-capitalist reminiscence), but as a process of spatialization and temporalization that produces zones

and relations as non-capitalist (or less than capitalist), according to the needs of a new regime of reproduction. In short, it is necessary to think of a spatialization that actively primitivizes social relations, at the service of “capitalist development”.

3) Finally, this capitalist-racist alliance has a key foothold in familialist morality, in gender inequality and in the production and reproduction of hetero-patriarchal relations. The forms of sub-wage, neocolonial slave and unpaid reproductive labor constitute the point of convergence of the historical processes of racialization and genericization of marginalized (though massive) sectors of the population, at the service of the expanded reproduction of capital on a global scale.

This overdetermined articulation of oppressions, inequalities and hierarchies of gender, race and class becomes especially palpable throughout Latin American history. It is in relation to this that we can understand the strategic and particularly sensitive role that the feminist movements of this region play and also understand why they are the targets of international right-wing attacks; why the referents of the so-called new right, be they traditional confessional sectors or renewed opinion leaders, have dedicated and still dedicate so much effort to prevent or hinder the conquest of the abortion right in various countries or the consolidation of educational forms attentive to sexual and reproductive health.

Family and capitalism

Feminist theory is a key to understanding that the alliance between conservatism and liberalism is not a conjunctural novelty. As Melinda Cooper emphasizes in *Family Values: Between Neoliberalism and the New Social Conservatism* (2017, p. 17), the “family question” offers a privileged ground to address the processes of apparently paradoxical alliance between “liberal” and “conservative” forces for more than a century. In this respect she takes up Reva Siegel’s idea, according to which the legal history of the modern family can be understood, rather than as a progressive liberalization, as a process of preservation through transformation, in which gender and generational hierarchies are reestablished under new, perhaps more democratic, though no less implacable, legal structures.

Now, as we have suggested in the previous section, a consideration of historical transformations placed in the capitalist periphery compels us to critically question the remnants of the Eurocentric philosophy of time that is trafficked in the character of “survivals” attributed to social relations that are not immediately capitalist, when thinking of the coexistence of “progressive” (modernizing) tendencies with tendencies towards the “preservation” of the old.

If, from Latin American feminism, we take up the proposal to think of underdevelopment as an effect of development, we should also be

suspicious of any primitivization of patriarchal relations as “survivals” of pre-modern relations and ask ourselves instead about the active production of these so-called primitive relations within the framework of the transformations of global capitalism. To put it another way, from Latin America we can think of the processes of primitivization as processes framed within the expanded reproduction of capital. And this sheds a different light on the current resurgence of familialist morality in our region, as well as the resurgence of racial segregationism.

From a decentered approach to the relations between class, race and gender, such as the one proposed here, the movement of transformation of capitalism in its various moments can be approached in a complex way.

Thus we can review the process of transition from absolute surplus value to relative surplus value, which occurred towards the end of the nineteenth century, resulting from the limitation of the working day and the emergence of the notion of productivity. This process, as S. Federici has shown, has a strong impact on the emergence of the figure of the proletarian housewife and the separation between productive and reproductive work. But there is more: at the same moment in which the (invisible) relationship between paid and unpaid labor is consolidated in the form of the gendered division of labor, new imperialist distributions of the world are also consolidated, bringing with them other forms of unpaid surplus labor formally subsumed to capital in the framework of the international division of labor. Forms of semi-slave labor considered proper to countries considered “underdeveloped” whose non-capitalist relations in necessary coexistence with the expanded reproduction of capital, complexify the temporality of the capitalist world system.

This leads us to consider the overdetermination of the gendered division of labor by the international division of labor and to note that whatever the “housewife” or “mother of the family” may be, it cannot be thought of as a homogeneous figure between central and peripheral countries. This is something that black feminists have noticed early on. But we even find it much earlier in Flora Tristán’s memoirs from her visit to nineteenth-century Peru (2022).

What is interesting to underline here is that the “survival” of conservative hetero-patriarchal relations responds to a complex and decentered temporality, since it is subordinated to the temporal contradiction of the “development of underdevelopment”. In this sense, the links between capitalism and patriarchy are not “contemporary” but structurally dislocated in relation to the links between capitalism and racism. To put it another way, in the capitalist periphery, the sex-gender division of labor is modulated by the international division of labor, in such a way that the processes of generization and racialization affect each other, in their links with the strategy of expanded reproduction of capital over non-capitalist zones of production and social reproduction,

tendentially subordinated to the dominance of capitalist relations of production.

Finally, this organization of the problem allows us to return in another way to the transformations in the framework of the processes of neoliberalization of capitalism in order to question the causes of the return of the familiarist morality in its conjuncture and the differential strategic role of these processes of right-wing radicalization in Latin America.

The first point to be considered is that the actualization of the “family question” is associated with the reformulation of the question of Human Nature that each crisis of reproduction of capitalism has brought with it. Testimony to this is the attention paid by Gary Becker, 1992 Nobel laureate in economics, celebrated neoliberal theorist, author of *Human Capital* (1984), to the so-called “domestic economy” in his *Treatise on the Family* (Becker, 1987).

Melinda Cooper (2017) finds in Becker the marks of the alliance between neoliberalism and conservative familiarist morality that allows us to think the constitutive plot of the neoliberal historical bloc.

Becker’s interest in the reelaboration of an economic theory that takes into consideration what Nancy Fraser calls the new “regime of reproduction” with two salaries (2015), is based on the reformulation of intrafamilial relations for economic theory; it is about, as the author warns, the economic consideration of the collaborative and conflictive aspects of conjugal and filiation bonds. We cannot fail to read in this concern of a Chicago School economist for divorce, birth planning, contraception, etc., the traces of a strategy of capital aimed at understanding and processing in its terms the new family forms, heirs of significant transformations in the field of sexuality after the cultural schism of the sixties in the West. Yet there is something else: a reading from a perspective situated in peripheral countries requires us to pay attention to the differential treatment of the “family form” that this strategy implies and that can be read in some passages of Becker’s studies. To put it in another way, the family morality re-driven by capital on a global scale in the framework of the consolidation of a new regime of reproduction coinciding with late capitalism is not uniform for central and peripheral countries.

Reading Becker’s book from a peripheral perspective, we find that his economic studies not only economize family relations by discarding the classic theory of a single income per household, which leads him to pay attention to gender differences within the domestic space. Becker also introduces variables such as “children of quality” or “children in quantity” to quantify differential family planning strategies between families in rich and poor countries.

This differential approach, which is conceptually formulated in Becker’s economic theory, is identified in a series of concrete historical processes in *Patriarcado y acumulación a escala mundial*, written by Maria Mies (2019). In this study, Mies pays special attention to the differentiated

strategies of capital in reproductive matters and to the way in which, under the same idea of social “modernization”, policies of liberalization of reproductive relations in central countries are drawn up towards the beginning of the 1970s, while “traditional” heteropatriarchal forms are reinforced (or produced) in peripheral countries, in order to guarantee, through the ideas of *domesticity*, the precarization of hiring conditions.

Hence, a complex question of a strategic nature arises concerning the chances and limits of processes of internationalism when one considers how, as Mies shows, the so-called third sector organizations from central countries, dedicated to “empowering” African, Asian or Latin American women through microcredits for traditional handicraft manufacturing or agricultural production, played a key role in these capital reproduction strategies. Considered as activities carried out by “mothers of families”, they could legitimately be made precarious. In George Caffentzis’ (2013) analysis, the precarization of certain forms of labor - in our terms, their actively produced primitivization - restores forms of absolute surplus value in the twenty-first century and is correlative to the emergence of a new form of surplus value which he calls “surplus value by transfer” and which is based on the capacity of certain fractions of capital to parasitize surplus value from others whom it subalternizes and pauperizes. This subalternization of the productive fractions of capital responds to a need for the global reproduction of capitalism. The author recognizes this logic especially in the capital associated with the extraction and production of energy, but undoubtedly also acts in financial capital and in the capital of communicational and digital technology itself, which share with the first the same capacity to transversalize the economic and social processes.

According to the theoretical and analytical coordinates I propose here, it is possible to recognize the differential role adopted by the relations of solidarity between the neoliberalization of capitalism and the restitution of familialism in its peripheral zones, and this leads us to consider current forms of violence - and especially patriarchal violence in the capitalist periphery - as a symptom of a conjunction of diverse crises with heterogeneous temporalities:

1) the crisis of the imperialist distribution of the world in force since the end of the 19th century, when the passage from forms of absolute surplus value to forms of relative surplus value coincided with the establishment of internal divisions in the field of productive labor and the marginalization and subalternization of important zones of the (peripheral and domestic) economy under forms of sub-wage exploitation.

2) The crisis of the specific regime of reproduction rehearsed since the 1970s in the framework of the homogenizing and unhindered expansion of the capitalist world-system, under the globalizing utopia. This crisis

coincides not only with a renewed expansion of forms of absolute surplus value, but also with the emergence of new forms of “surplus value by transfer” which once again place the question of social reproduction at center stage. Around the question of reproduction, once again, the vanguards of capital dream of the replacement of a large part of the labor force - this time with a technological breakthrough based on algorithms and artificial intelligence - while rehearsing their renewed laws of population, involving familialist policies, biological management, metaphysical theories on the human condition, manipulation of the frontier between nature and culture and everything within their reach to arrange the articulation between new regimes of technical division of labor with renewed regimes of reproduction of life.

From this diagnosis we can draw some conclusions. First of all, it allows us to think of the present moment as that of a systemic crisis rather than that of a total war. It is not a question of denying current or future wars, but of thinking of them as a symptom of a collapse rather than a victory of capital.

Secondly, we can avoid finding in any resistance to feminism, whether deliberate or not, the expression of an “enemy” (unique, homogeneous and pre-existing to the dispute). Instead, we can begin to think that the positions engaged in the struggle are the effect of compositions that take place at multiple levels articulating heterogeneous levers. This is because the relations between capitalism, patriarchy and racism cannot be thought of as “abstract relations in general” but rather situated in specific conjunctures in which there are relations of overdetermined articulation, that is to say, concrete relations of combination, hierarchy and contradiction. The political analysis of the concrete situation thus allows us to move beyond the classic controversy over the delimitation of the “main enemy” to embrace the idea of the struggle as an overdetermined process of composition whose strategy cannot be traced in abstraction or in a general way in terms of a friend-enemy binary logic, but rather calls for an analytical and strategic intelligence around tactical alliances and obstacles.

In the third place, thinking about the strategic aspects of the struggle, under conditions of structural complexity such as those that characterize dependent social formations, opens an incomparable opportunity to produce an epistemological leap in the field of critical thought that reveals itself to be politically strategic and without which, I dare say, leftist thought remains captured by analytical categories of the 20th century, while the vanguards of the global right have already launched their program of political imagination for the 21st century. In this sense, the long tradition of Latin American, African and Asian critical studies can open up a series of considerations that challenge the functioning of Eurocentric schemes as pure models for theoretical and political thought. But fundamentally, it allows to bring into play in the

analyses and diagnoses, and not only as titles or intentions, a historically articulated perspective of oppressions that puts into virtuous connection the description of effects and the question of causes. An imperialism in crisis calls for an anti-imperialist reformulation of our theories. And the “underdeveloped” world can give clues to the future, because sometimes the future comes from behind.

Finally, the mobilization of a perspective from the margins with pretensions of universality can shed a new light on global processes and show that, just as familialist morality makes its reentry into the framework of the cultural policies of the Latin American dictatorships of the South (cf. Rodríguez, 2009), breaking liberalizing tendencies of sex-generic relations of the 1960s while deploying its counter-revolutionary violence with the Third World and national liberation struggles, so too can it be seen as a fundamental axis of the reproduction of capital in the framework of neoliberalism. I propose to call this tendency postdictatorial culture and to think of it as a fundamental axis of the reproduction of capital in the framework of neoliberalism. The exposure of the post-dictatorial face of the utopia of globalization is the clearest symptom of the current crisis of capital reproduction whose expansion works (contrary to what is usually thought) from the peripheries towards the central countries. It is a conjuncture that we can characterize as the “peripheralization of the globe” and that reveals itself in forms of feminization of labor, precarization of life and primitivization of social bonds under new logics of racialization and domestication that destroy the coordinates with which modern capitalism imagined public space and the relations between the public and the private, nature and culture, the educated and the plebeian.

This allows us to understand the strategic character of feminist struggles in the capitalist peripheries as a cause of global concern and a beautiful coven of specters.

- 1 The phrase “gender ideology” can be found in such places as *Lexicón: Términos ambiguos y discutidos sobre la vida familiar y la cuestión ética* (2003), prefaced by Cardinal López Trujillo, president of the Pontifical Council for the Family. The entry on “gender” in this document is written by the theologian Jutta Burggraf, who points out an affinity “between gender ideology and an ‘individualist anthropology of radical neoliberalism’ that can be traced back from Judith Butler’s contributions to Engels, Simone de Beauvoir and the Frankfurt School to locate human nature and the family as the nucleus of heteronormative reproduction as the target of the ideological threat (Gago, 2019, pp. 211-212).
- 2 In this regard, it is enough to recall a short excerpt from the anti-liberal speech given by Hungarian leader Viktor Orbán on 22 July 2023 at the Summer University in Bálványos, Transylvania: “Liberal constitutions do not describe a world of attachment, but of detachment; they do not seek to affirm something, but to reject something, in the name of individual freedom. Our Constitution, however, affirms that the place where our children will live is our homeland. It affirms our identities as men and women because that is what we call family. It also affirms our borders because then we have the power to say with whom we want to live. When, in 2011, we created the new constitution - a Hungarian, national, Christian constitution, different from other European constitutions - we did not take a bad decision. In fact, let’s say we didn’t take it wrong, but we made the right decision because, since then, we have been beset by the migration crisis, which clearly cannot be dealt with on a liberal basis. And then we have an LGBTQ+, gender offensive, and it turns out that it can only be repelled on the basis of community and child protection” (Roger-Lacan 2023).
- 3 Although the authoritarian and repressive processes of the 1970s had as their motivation and effect processes of ultra-liberal “modernisation” of Latin American societies, because they involved profound restructuring of economic relations that to a large extent anticipated the global trends of neoliberalisation of capitalism, this does not prevent us from noticing the substantive gravitation of ultra-conservative sectors, institutions and individuals in these same processes of supposed modernisation.
- 4 For a closer approach to the various manifestations of this scene, multiple materials can be reviewed. In the case of Argentina, for instance, Agustín Laje’s video “15 lies about abortion” (*15 mentiras sobre el aborto*); in Mexico, the website of organisations such as the *Frente Nacionalista Mexicano*; in Brazil, the book *O Cristão e a sexualidade* by Bolsonaro pastor Silas Malafaia; in Chile, Axel Kaiser has published books such as *La tiranía de la igualdad. Por qué el igualitarismo es inmoral y socava el progreso de nuestra sociedad*, among many others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Becker, Gary (2009 [1984]). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, Gary (1993 [1987]). *A Treatise on the Family*. Harvard University Press
- Brown, Wendy (2019). *In the Ruins of Neoliberalism. The Rise of Antidemocratic Politics in the West*. Columbia University Press
- Caffentzis, George (2013). *In Letters of Blood and Fire: Work, Machines, and the Crisis of Capitalism*. PM Press/Common Notions/Autonomea. London.
- Collazo, Carolina y Pulleiro, Adrián (2019) La reacción conservadora en el debate sobre la Ley de Educación Sexual Integral (ESI) Documento de Trabajo Num.1. *Instituto Tricontinental de investigación social*. <https://www.thetricontinental.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Documento-ESI-baja.pdf>
- Cooper, M. (2017). *Family Values: Between Neoliberalism and the New Social Conservatism near futures*. NY: Zone Books
- Davies, William (2016) "The new neoliberalism", *New Left Review*, 101. 129-143.
- Federici, Silvia (2010). *Calibán y la bruja. Mujeres, cuerpo y acumulación originaria*. Madrid: Traficantes de sueños
- Federici, Silvia (2018). *El patriarcado del salario. Críticas feministas al marxismo*. Buenos Aires.: Tinta Limón y Traficantes de sueños.
- Frank, Gunder (1967). "El desarrollo del subdesarrollo" *Pensamiento Crítico*, 7. La Habana., pp. 159-172.
- Fraser, Nancy (2015). "Contradictions of capital and care", *New Left Review*, 100, sep-oct 2015., 111-132
- Frente Nacionalista Mexicano: <https://web.archive.org/web/20161012042640/http://frenamex21.net/principios>
- Gago, Verónica (2019). *La potencia feminista*. Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón
- Kaiser, Axel (2017). *La tiranía de la igualdad. Por qué el igualitarismo es inmoral y socava el progreso de nuestra sociedad*. Madrid: Universidad de Deusto.
- Laje, Agustín. "15 mentiras sobre el aborto". 2018 *Youtube*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uHqrfp259hc>
- Luxemburg, Rose (1951 [or. 1913]) *The Accumulation of Capital*. London, Routledge.
- Malafaia, Silas (2023) *O Cristão e a sexualidade*. Sao Paulo: Gospel.
- Mies, María (2019). *Patriarcado y acumulación a escala mundial*. Madrid: Traficantes de sueños.
- Pavón Cuellar, David (11 de abril de 2018). La ultraderecha latinoamericana: cien años de lucha por la desigualdad *La Gaceta*. <https://davidpavoncuellar.wordpress.com/2018/04/15/la-ultraderecha-latinoamericana-cien-anos-de-lucha-por-la-desigualdad/>
- Roger-Lacan, Baptiste (26 de julio de 2023). Postliberalismo. El mundo de Viktor Orban. *El Grand Continent*. <https://legrandcontinent.eu/es/2023/07/26/postliberalismo-el-mundo-de-viktor-orban/>
- Rodríguez, Laura G. (2009). La Historia que debía enseñarse durante la última dictadura militar en Argentina (1976- 1983) <https://hear.unr.edu.ar/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/La-Historia-que-deb%C3%ADa-ense%C3%B1arse-durante-la-%C3%BAltima-dictadura-militar-en-Argentina-1976-1983.pdf>
- Torres, Carmen y Piantadosi, Giulio (12 de octubre de 2018) Santiago Abascal (Vox): "El PP y Cs son cobardes, el Gobierno un traidor y Podemos el enemigo". *El independiente*. <https://www.elindependiente.com/politica/2018/10/12/abascal-vox-el-pp-y-cs-son-cobardes-el-gobierno-un-traidor-y-podemos-el-enemigo/>
- Tristán, Flora (2022). *Peregrinaciones de una paria y otros textos recobrados*. Buenos Aires. CLACSO
- Verbal, V. (2022) "La ideología de 'la ideología de género'" *Femeris. Revista Multidisciplinar de Estudios de Género*, 7 (1). 56-74