



Ánfora

ISSN: 0121-6538

ISSN: 2248-6941

anfora@autonoma.edu.co

Universidad Autónoma de Manizales

Colombia

Londoño Jurado**, Jenniffer; Orozco Ospina***, Juan Felipe
Encrypted Gender Ideology? The Seminal Violence Underlying the Accusation
Ánfora, vol. 26, no. 47, 2019, July-, pp. 87-108
Universidad Autónoma de Manizales
Colombia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30854/anf.v26.n47.2019.634>

Available in: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=357863763004>

- How to cite
- Complete issue
- More information about this article
- Journal's webpage in redalyc.org

UAEH
redalyc.org

Scientific Information System Redalyc
Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America and the Caribbean, Spain and
Portugal

Project academic non-profit, developed under the open access initiative

Encrypted Gender Ideology? The Seminal Violence Underlying the Accusation*

[English Version]

¿Ideología encriptada de género?
La Violencia seminal subyacente a la acusación

¿Ideologia de gênero criptografada?
a violência seminal subjacente à acusação

Received March 3, 2019. Approved May 6, 2019.

Jenniffer Londoño Jurado**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3298-8335>

Colombia

Juan Felipe Orozco Ospina***

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9182-2020>

Colombia

Abstract

› To cite this article: Londoño-Jurado, Jenniffer; Orozco-Ospina, Juan-Felipe (2019). Encrypted Gender Ideology? The Seminal Violence Underlying the Accusation. *Ánfora*, 26(47), 87-108. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30854/anfv26.n47.2019.634>
Universidad Autónoma de Manizales. ISSN 0121-6538 / e-ISSN 2248-6941

Objective: the article addresses the accusation that gender ideology is a falsification of the true nature of human beings and society. The argument that this

*The document is the result of the project "School of Gender and Law" of the Socio-Legal Clinic of Public Interest of the University of Caldas (VPU-CJS-976) and the Public Policy Studies with a differential focus of the Law Program of the Luis Amigó Catholic University (Manizales). The project establishes a space of the broadening and feedback of knowledge whose function is to serve as a link between the academy and civil society groups for the purpose of investigating, understanding and combating against gender violence.

** Masters. Lawyer. Professor at the Autonomous University of Manizales and the Luis Amigó Catholic University. E-mail: jennifer.londonoj@autonoma.edu.co

*** PhD. Masters. Lawyer. Professor at the University of Caldas. Coordinator of the Socio-Legal Clinic of Public Interest, University of Caldas. E-mail: juan.orozco@ucaldas.edu.co

accusation, paradoxically, encrypts seminal violence in the socio-cultural base that prevents political subjectivism of diversity and as a result, it is incompatible with democratic politics. The exercise aims at understanding and supporting the demands and claims of diversity of gender -both of women and of the identities registered in the LGTBIQ community- against the naturalization, perpetuation and propagation of the encrypted violence in such accusation. **Methodology:** based on the methodological presumptions of the decryption of power, that is, concealed instruments and strategies that maintain and catapult the political power achieved through the encryption of language. **Result:** it was evident that the discourse studied, paradoxically, encrypts a seminal violence incompatible with the democratic politics that impedes political subjectivism of the diversity of gender and propagates the violence experimented in the cultural, economic and political arenas. **Conclusion:** the concept of gender-encrypted ideology must be rejected because it lacks political-conceptual rigor in the use of the category "ideology", moreover, it invalidates an important tool for diversity justice encoded in politics.

Keywords: Gender ideology; Encryption/decryption of power; Gender Diversity; Seminal violence; Political subjectivism.

Resumen

Objetivo: el artículo aborda la acusación sobre ideología de género como una falsificación de la verdadera naturaleza del ser humano y la sociedad. Se argumenta que esa acusación, paradójicamente, encripta una violencia seminal en la base socio-cultural que impide la subjetivación política de la(s) diversidad(es), por lo cual resulta incompatible con la política democrática. El ejercicio se direcciona a comprender y favorecer las demandas y reivindicaciones de la(s) diversidad(es) de género -tanto de las mujeres, como de las singularidades inscritas en la comunidad LGTBIQ-, en contra de la naturalización, perpetuación y reproducción de las violencias encriptadas en la acusación mencionada. **Metodología:** se parte de los presupuestos metodológicos de la descriptación del poder, esto es, dispositivos y estrategias que se ocultan a sí mismas para mantener y catapultar el poder político conseguido en la encriptación del lenguaje. **Resultado:** se evidenció que el discurso estudiado, paradójicamente, encripta una violencia seminal incompatible con la política democrática que impide la subjetivación política de la(s) diversidad(es) de género y reproduce las violencias padecidas en las dimensiones cultural, económica y política. **Conclusión:** el planteamiento sobre ideología encriptada de género debe ser rechazado porque carece de rigor político-conceptual en el uso de la categoría "ideología" y, además, invalida una herramienta central para hacer justicia a las diversidades en clave de Lo Político.

Palabras-clave: Ideología de género; Encriptación/desencriptación de poder; Diversidad(es) de género; Violencia seminal; Subjetivación política.

Resumo

Objetivo: o artigo aborda a acusação de ideologia de gênero como uma falsificação da verdadeira natureza do ser humano e da sociedade. Argumenta-se que essa acusação, paradoxalmente, criptografa uma violência seminal na base sociocultural que impede a subjetivação política da (s) diversidade (s), motivo pelo qual ela é incompatível com a política democrática. O exercício tem por objetivo compreender e favorecer as demandas e reivindicações da (s) diversidade (s) de gênero –tanto das mulheres, quanto das singularidades registradas na comunidade LGBTQIA–, contra a naturalização, perpetuação e reprodução das violências criptografadas na acusação mencionada. **Metodologia:** parte dos pressupostos metodológicos da deciptação do poder, ou seja, dispositivos e estratégias que se escondem para manter e catapultar o poder político alcançado na criptografia da linguagem. **Resultado:** evidenciou-se que o discurso estudado, paradoxalmente, codifica uma violência seminal incompatível com a política democrática que impede a subjetivação política da (s) diversidade (s) de gênero e reproduz a violência sofrida nas dimensões cultural, econômica e política. **Conclusão:** a abordagem da ideologia criptografada de gênero deve ser rejeitada porque falta rigor político-conceitual no uso da categoria "ideologia" e, além disso, invalida uma ferramenta central para fazer justiça à diversidade na chave do político.

Palavras-chave: ideologia de gênero; Criptografia / descriptografia de poder; Diversidade (s) de gênero; Violência seminal; Subjetividade política.

Introduction

The president of Brazil, Jair Bolsonaro, stated in his inaugural speech that the irresponsibility of the left led Brazil to "the greatest ethical, moral and economic crisis of [its] history" (Bolsonaro, 2019, párr. 7). Progressive thinking, said Bolsonaro, adjoined the Brazilian society to the ideological ties of immorality and he will be the one who unbounds them through a national restoration pact between society and the established powers. Thus, "the homeland" will be liberated definitively "from the yoke of corruption, criminality, economic irresponsibility and ideological submission" (paragraph. 3). This pact of national restoration will unite people in order to: "value the family, respect religion and our Judeo-Christian traditions, combat the gender ideology, preserving our values", and, additionally, it will "place Brazil above all else and God above all" (Bolsonaro, 2019, párrs. 1, 12).

In addition to these statements, Damares Alves (2019), who on the eve of her appointment as Minister of Human Rights, family and women of Brazil, said that "the State is secular, but this minister [referring to herself] is terribly Christian" and harangued against gender ideology, pointing out: "Attention, attention. A new era begins. Boys wear blue, girls pink" (Alves, 2019, párr. 1). When questioned on her statements, the Minister replied that it was "a metaphor against gender ideology, but boys and girls can wear blue, pink, any color, in short, as they see fit" (Alves, 2019, párr. 3).

These accusations against the gender ideology are not far from the statements by Alejandro Ordoñez (2016), then Colombian Attorney General and now Colombian Ambassador to the OAS [Organization of American States]. Who went against the original text of the peace agreement between the Colombian State and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), because it instilled and indoctrinated gender ideology and, that this veiled intentionality of the agreement went against the Liberal State and nuclear institutions of society: the provisions of family, freedom and religion. In step, the special prosecutor, Ilva Hoyos (2016), stated that the text of the peace agreement encrypted a focus on diversity, identity and sexual orientation that, it being a falsified anthropology of the human being, could ruin institutions and society. Therefore, gender ideology should be impugned.

These are examples¹ of the ignorance on the old separation between State and religion and/ or cases of religious intolerance spearheaded by the same "secular" authorities committed to the preservation of religious neutrality and

1 The manifestations of the public officials described throughout the article are illustrative and intend to exemplify the use of a negative conception of ideology, which attempts to delegitimize the cause and distort the concept of gender used by women and diversity' emancipation movements.

impartiality in a liberal secular State. The antidote, hence, would be the in the development of secular institutions and liberal thought education. Nevertheless, this observation is too superficial and falls short. A less superficial interpretative alternate, would be that the fight against a supposed gender ideology encrypts seminal violence: bogs down the processes and forms of political subjectivism based on gender². Also, to an extent, naturalizes and perpetuates the classes of entrenched –but nonetheless visible– violence inherent in the colonial, patriarchal and hetero-normative endeavors of religious societies such as ours, where theocracy is an option because religion or the dogma of a cult or church can either, totally or partially replace politics.

In context, this paper is a reaction to the misuse of the denaturalization *fabrics* of a methodology designed for emancipation: the victim is the de-colonial bet of *the decryption of power*. The gender inquisitors intend to make use of this tool with the purpose of unmasking a supposed "ideology" that would make false an alleged anthropological and social "truth" to which language should respond. The abovementioned, leads to a confrontation against the anti-gender accusation by appealing to the foundations of the de-colonial decryption of power.

With this concern in mind –and anchored in the methodology of de-colonial decryption of power–, A challenge to the imputation that gender is only ideology takes shape and decryption of the seminal violence that belies the accusation begins. The possibility of incorporating the vindications and diversity identities into valid modes of subjectivisms, carved by human decision making, with the purpose launching said incorporation into the political community or establish communities, is substantial for the survival and decolonization of political and democratic grammar³.

2 Based on Butler's thesis on gender: "The issues that will be at stake in the reformulation of the materiality of bodies will be: (...) the construction of 'sex' no longer as a given body data on which the construction of gender is artificially imposed, but as a cultural norm that governs the materialization of bodies" (Butler, 1993, p.19). In this process, the subject is modeled by assuming a sex and identity from the discursive means. This identity is used by the heterosexual matrix to accept, exclude and repudiate sexed identifications.

3 With emphasis on the diversity(ies) "women" and those registered in "the LGTBIQ community" (Lesbian, Gay, Transgender, Transsexual, Transvestite, Transformist, Bisexual, Intersex, Queer, singularities and events)

Methodology

Decryption of Power

The decryption of power is a novel research project derived from the Global Souths⁴ aimed at revealing the capture operations of political power for the privilege of the few initiatives in the code and language of "encryption". It was, in principle, utilized to show how elite jurists took constitutional power and dissolved the power of people –the suppressed-invisible people– (Méndez and Sanín, 2012). Obscure instruments and strategies that maintain and catapult the political power achieved through encryption operate in this process.

This phenomenon, in general terms, coincides with what Cárcova (2006) calls *the Obscurity of modern law*, where legal discourses are unavailable to subjects and "ideology plays a central role in [their] formation" (p. 123). It is about the concealment of dilemmatic situations in which everything can acquire the title ideology. This is one of the most worrying variants of *the legislation of human life domains*; the de-politicization and privatization of what, in principle, is political and public, at the very least, this is how it has been interpreted and portrayed in Political logos⁵.

The decryption puts emphasis on the dispute by imposing meanings made by controlling the signifiers. The language domain is a political battlefield. Hence, the decryption methodology acts as an antidote against the states of domination fostered by language encryption. With language encryption, comes power to homogenize reality. Decryption attempts to free power relations from its metaphysical prison (whatever that may be) and in this case is, a counter-hegemonic stand.

The issue at hand is that explanations on the meaning of language can only be made in line with its pragmatic use, expectedly, said use is practical and intersubjective (social). Richard Rorty (1996) argues that the objectivist tradition (particularly linguistic representationalism) employs a strategy that denies the

4 According to Gutiérrez (2015), "In the pluriverse there is not one south but many -enough designed according to the capitalist pattern as sure that are nortes or pretend to be- and many designs with other names. Every idea of the south is a pluriversal ontology" (p. 120).

5 The bottom line is that it is very forced to argue that there is something like the gender ideology from the conceptual perspective. Then, the use of the "gender ideology" of the aforementioned conservative sectors is a pejorative use that attempts to veil the gender approach and the rights of diversities. Thus, the fact that it deals with valid approaches and legitimate rights is overshadowed by putting them in the parenthesis of a supposed ideology understood as a falsification of the truth.

finite quality and characteristic of human nature (pp.15-29)⁶. We are encouraged to transcend out of *ourselves* and out of our communities in search for a longed-for but unattainable universality and trans-culturalism. Thus, ultimate truths are established and represented in the language, in a proportion that, Hilary Putnam (1981) terms as the strategy of assuming the eye of God. The issue for Putnam on the interaction through language lies in identifying the meaning of the terms used by the interlocutor (could be of another culture) from the terms or expressions available, against metaphysics or any linguistic ontotheology.

In our interpretation, the assumption of the eye of God coincides with the attempt to dominate social reality by means of the appropriation of meaning as signifier and the submission of that series of relationships to transcendentalism and indeterminacy. Whoever dominates what the language supposedly represents, in reality possesses the power to determine meaning and puts himself in contact with an improbable dimension in order to command the signifier. This refers, mainly, to oracles, theologians and experts who become culturally empowered to dominate and determine that meaning " T " ($y_1, y_2, \dots y_n$) is equivalent to the signifier " X ", outside of political domain and public controversy⁷.

Thus, whoever imposes meaning gains the language mastery that facilitates interaction between social practices and power relations. We know, based on Foucault (2000), that in all "human relations there is a whole array of power relations" (p. 259). In the arena of these inter-human relations, states of domination are identified "in which power relations, instead of being mobile, allowing the various participants to adopt strategies modifying them, remain blocked, frozen" (Foucault, 2000, p. 259). In those states, Foucault says, "the practices of freedom do not exist or exist only unilaterally or are extremely constrained and limited" (p. 259). What is interesting here is that certain language operations can lead to states of domination, in lieu of power relations.

The suggestion that power decryption opens the path for a genuine policy based on power relations emancipated from domination, be it in manner of ecology or sensible encounter of life, recognizes itself as a logic conflict that favors

6 The bottom line is that it is very forced to argue that there is something like the gender ideology from the conceptual perspective. Then, the use of the "gender ideology" of the aforementioned conservative sectors is a pejorative use that attempts to veil the gender approach and the rights of diversities. Thus, the fact that it deals with valid approaches and legitimate rights is overshadowed by putting them in the parenthesis of a supposed ideology understood as a falsification of the truth.

7 Méndez (2016) emphasizes it this way: "Encryption supposes a progressive entanglement of the language of interpretation, not only of the constitution and the law, but of the images and of all the chains of information that "constitute" reality. To snatch the very reality of the sense and the common knowledge to such an extent that it becomes the exclusive capital of experts. Move the decision making of politically open forums to spaces of experts that are subtracted from the most elementary rule of responsibility (accountability) and public discussion" (párr. 9).

the interaction of all, by means of the production of differences⁸. It becomes imperative to emancipate power relations from all kind of encryption present in both interaction and language. There is a challenge to the class complaints represented in the Trojan horse consistent with the concept that gender is an ideology (in a pejorative and even satirical sense), in the case that we want to materialize, the political purposes that influence our life in communities: this crystallization could be the perseverance drawn from the kaleidoscope of diversities⁹.

For the existence of difference and diversity, it is necessary to rehabilitate what fundamentalisms wants to shut down due to their weakness: the unavoidable need for plurality needed for our interaction to have democratic meaning. This means recognizing that the absence of diversity, the exclusion of the "others" and the concealment of alternatives represent seminal violence; without losing sight of the fact that this plurality of conflicts are part of even more complex problems and negations in the South, such as the colonization of knowledge¹⁰ and the generation of colonial subjects. To achieve emancipation, multiple forms of subjectivism are necessary, because the existing ones, with their burden of omission, impede emancipation through decolonization. The liberation of life in conditions of diversity is required¹¹.

Thus, a demonstration that perseverance and decolonizing trajectory lead to the deployment of diversity: all possible forms of political subjectivity, inclu-

8 In the decryption of power, Sanín (2016) advocates the construction of the political domain of life with no other condition than to be architects and producers of difference. The logic of that interaction necessarily resorts to conflict. This is the link between the display of power relations in Michel Foucault and domination understood as *potestas* in the Baruch Spinoza current. 'The Difference' is a concrete way to inhabit the world by producing it; instead of being attributes, properties or elements that would distinguish human beings from each other.

9 Allowing the relationship with the world, living being part of ... and, in that direction, favoring politics between radically different ones. In *Five theses to the decryption the power: the amendments XYZ* (Méndez and Orozco, 2014), we defended that the purpose crystallizes when diluting the encrypted legal power. It requires amendments that precipitate the expiration of the Constitutions

10 The notion of coloniality of knowledge highlights the epistemic dimension of the coloniality of power; the effect of subalternization, folklorization or invisibilization of a multiplicity of knowledge that does not respond to the production modalities of "western knowledge" associated with conventional science and expert discourse. The coloniality of knowledge is the epistemic dimension of the coloniality of power and, therefore, is a constitutive aspect (not derivative or accidental) of coloniality (Restrepo and Rojas, 2010, pp. 131-148).

11 In Méndez and Orozco (2018) it was stated that the power of life liberation is the basis of fair cultural practices and allows to decrypt some states of domination. This would serve to establish the conditions for the unfolding of Life in circumstances of full diversity (the *Potentia* of Life). This process goes through the emancipation of the common ones and the achievement of cognitive justice. This operation is called *Survival (Pervivencia)* and comes to coincide with the production of human, cultural difference or ecology, etc. (Méndez and Orozco, 2018, pp. 213-238).

ding those based on gender, is reason enough to challenge their violent denial spearheaded by gender inquisitors.

Results

Encrypted Gender Ideology?

The tentative summarization of the accusation against gender ideology is as follows: gender is an "ideology" that can be encrypted in socio-legal discourses and documentation. That ideology falsely portrays the true nature of human beings and society, a falsity that must to be rejected. Ilva Hoyos (2016) derives this thesis from the Havana peace agreement. As prosecutor, she stated that there are two distinguishable uses for the term "gender approach". One being a legitimately and constitutionally valid use while the other is not. The first use –"genuine gender focus"– refers to a criterion that makes possible to make evident the different kinds of discrimination against women in order to offer differential treatment under constitutional material equality. The second use –"diversity, identity and sexual orientation focus"– is invalid because it advocates overcoming false "stereotypes of a sexual nature to promote, execution and development of public policies based on sexual and gender identities and orientations" (Hoyos, 2016, p. 17).

For the prosecutor, the first use is valid because it acts as a custodian of an anthropology that recognizes the sexual difference between man and woman as natural truth. The second use, which establishes gender as a social and cultural construct, is invalid because it attempts to establish a

New anthropology focused on gender identity and sexual orientation on the basis of which modifications are needed in line with essential societal institutions such as marriage, family, adoption, filiation, and marital status, should not only continue to garner constitutional recognition, but should also be reinterpreted through "gender" (Hoyos, 2016, p. 25).

The alleged lack of constitutional recognition of this second use, and its omission from the legitimate claim of the constitutional rights of women and LGTBQI, converts this use into a gender ideology, instead of a constitutionally legitimate focus¹². Hoyos (2016) thinks it is an:

12 Faced with the supposed conflict of rights between a majority and minorities, a religious encrypted hate speech is used here by a supposed minority, against LGTBI minorities and women in circumstance of historical discrimination. In that sense, this article does not address the assumption that discriminatory

Ideology in its most radical sense as a set of ideas or system of thought that adopts one part of reality and discards the other, and that through language seeks to reconstruct reality, which will be, therefore, a partially true reality but not totally and plainly true. Everything that opposes "this new reality" are arbitrary stereotypes, generally founded on moral or religious beliefs, which must be overcome through non-discriminatory nor exclusive language (p. 25).

Then, for the defenders of sex as a natural truth that subordinates gender, the existence of gender ideology would make sense. It is logical to suppose that through language, the "true reality" is hidden and "a new one" its imposter is used. The language would opaque "sex" based on new language categories (gender identity, sexual orientation, sexual difference, etc.).¹³ The conclusion is that reality would be hidden and redefined through language with an ideological and propagandistic touch. This new fraudulent reality would impose "a new way of thinking and conceiving the person, the society, the State, the right (...) a social agenda to modify (...) the meaning of institutions" and a minimization of moral and religious beliefs by the restriction of "the rights of freedom of thought and religion" (Hoyos, 2016, p. 25).

According to the detractors of gender –considering it an ideology–, this circumstance would come from the recognition that "one is not born as a man or woman, but through the exercise of freedom one constructs his gender identity and determines their sexual orientation" (Hoyos, 2016, p. 25)¹⁴. Of course,

discourse comes from a minority that sees their rights affected because this is a fallacious argument. First, to defend the rights of diversity does not imply that anyone is forced to be diverse. Second, in societies such as Colombia one, the radical Christian groups are the ones that define themselves as a minority, but, like any group that aspires to exercise their rights, they must not pervert or attempt against the rights of others; especially of the minorities that make their gender diversity their way of political subjectivation. The argument according to which religious minorities are subjects with equal rights and special protection, for which reason cannot and should not be imposed on them a conception of a good life -those of the majority-. Following Prada et al. (2018) and Leirner (2018), interestingly, in the theme of the essay, Christian radical minorities argue that "gender ideology" violates the rights of majorities in trying to "refund" society.

13 According to the principles of Yogyakarta (UN, 2007), gender identity is the internal and individual experience of the gender as each person deeply experiences it, which may or may not correspond to the sex assigned at the time of birth; including the personal experience of the body. Sexual orientation is independent of biological sex or gender identity; it refers to the ability of each person to feel a deep emotional, affective and/or sexual attraction for people of a different gender, their own gender, or more than one gender, as well as the ability to maintain intimate and sexual intercourse with them. It is accepted that the proposed definition is subject to historical change and cultural differences.

14 Hoyos considers Beauvoir's classic formulation (2016) to be an aberration: the human female is not defined within society by any destiny (biological, physical or economic); on the other hand, the civilizing whole produces the intermediate of castrated and male that goes through what it defines as feminine. Thus, the participation of the external - an alien to the process - constructs an individual in another, for which, *one is not born a woman, one becomes one*.

those who are against the thesis of the cultural construct of gender understand that the effects of the "diversity, identity and sexual orientation focus" must be rejected because they would destroy the "natural" institutions, which coincide with the traditional institutions founded on coloniality. It is understood that, in traditionalist societies like ours, the reasons that motivate the prosecution of gender ideology are not entirely understandable without some essentialist dogma to support them, as would be the case of a religious dogma or some type of biologicism¹⁵ that occupies the place of democratic politics.

Hoyos interpretation, as well as the accusation made by the aforementioned public servants, is based on the consideration of gender as a negative ideology and an instrument of power. Jorge Scala (2010) states that ideology is a closed doctrinal body that starts from a false basic premise that is accepted without criticism. The standing ideologue would manipulate language to change people's minds and hearts; he would utilize terminology of common use to inscribe another meaning; consequently, people would repeat an old word with a new meaning. In contrast, according to Althusser (1971), ideology is above all structures that do not obey a conceptual representation of the world, but rather the way in which individuals live in an unconscious and the material consequent world.

For this process to be successful it would require terminology that can be manipulated through language. In other words, an equivocal "word" such as "the gender" –which is not univocal– and, would generate confusion of due to its equivocal meanings. It would then be a perversion of the "true" meaning of what one wants to be representative of reality through signifiers. This is to say, words like "gender" would be intentionally encrypted by the standing ideologue using a language that undermines the true essence of usurped reality. According to Scala (2010), biologically one could only be male or female.

Thus, the thesis of a socio-cultural construct would separate the biological aspect from the psychological (spiritual) one, which would lead to an aberration that would break the complementarity between male and female. In this regard, Scala also argues that if any form of relationship between the sexes is equally good, valid and just, the conclusion would be that all relationships should be

15 Reference is made to biologicism in perspectives such as those assumed by The American College of Pediatricians (2016), which in the case of child and adolescent transsexuality concludes that the distinction between sex and gender precipitates an ideology about gender because it lacks scientific foundations in its assumptions and propositions. Its point is that facts, not ideology, determine reality. According to this position, gender ideology is about a set of countercultural assumptions and political slogans lacking scientificity, through which sexual identity is split from its genetic basis and from its natural phenotypic expressions. This is without ignoring the fact that the family and social roles of men and women vary culturally, but the morphological, hormonal and neurological differences between the sexes indicate that there is naturally a basis for explaining the differentiated and complementary aptitudes to ensure the reproduction, evolution or successful development of the species.

given equal recognition, and this would lead to the end of the sole "human nature". For this very reason, Hoyos (2016) emphasizes gender focus as a new anthropology and, in step with Scala, thinks that it is intended to "create" a new human being by denaturalizing reality. That ideology according to Scala is totalitarian, so it would formalize behaviour in social life and appeal to the control of propaganda media in a globalized world.

In this sense, for the theocrats, gender focus would be based on the ideologizing of human rights as instruments of power to establish a new and denatured society¹⁶. Gender focus, therefore, would be an ideology that would be part of a hidden political project of social re-engineering. Scala (2010) and Trevijano (2015) from their respective perspectives present this issue as the new battle that Christians must wage; a kind of new crusade against anyone who thinks differently. This is the scope of the aspirations of the president of Brazil: the family and the people must be rescued from the immorality represented by the ideological submission of human rights and the demands of gender diversity. His proposal is the return of regimes characterized by terror and explicit genocide: national restoration anchored in respect for the Judeo-Christian family and religious traditions, in war against gender ideology. Jair Bolsonaro –a serviceman adept to the genocidal dictatorships in Latin America– will try to use the power of the State and its "secular" institutions to put his God above all. And this is also what Hoyos (2016) wants when he affirms that "the encrypted gender ideology must be unveiled" because:

(...) Missing In the construction of this new country, in this new social pact, in this new culture, is the inclusion of moral or religious beliefs, as if religion was not also shaping factor in the Colombian society, as if the Church and the churches had not contributed to the development and peace of this country. There is no reference to God or beliefs in the 297 pages. Nor is there any mention of the freedoms of religion and thought. Can stable and lasting peace be achieved without taking into account Colombian believers? Can the inclusive language that is intended to be adopted exclude those who profess a particular religious'

16 Reference is made to biologicism in perspectives such as those assumed by The American College of Pediatricians (2016), which in the case of child and adolescent transsexuality concludes that the distinction between sex and gender precipitates an ideology about gender because it lacks scientific foundations in its assumptions and propositions. Its point is that facts, not ideology, determine reality. According to this position, gender ideology is about a set of countercultural assumptions and political slogans lacking scientificity, through which sexual identity is split from its genetic basis and from its natural phenotypic expressions. This is without ignoring the fact that the family and social roles of men and women vary culturally, but the morphological, hormonal and neurological differences between the sexes indicate that there is naturally a basis for explaining the differentiated and complementary aptitudes to ensure the reproduction, evolution or successful development of the species.

denomination? Is denying the religious fact a presupposition of the new social contract that is to be adopted? (p. 35).

From the assertions of Trevijano (2015), gender focus implies the construction of a "new social pact" in absence of God, religious facts and dogma of the Christian church, understood as theological constitutes of morality and politics. That the established meanings traditionally assigned to sex, gender identity, sexual diversity and the social roles would be defiled when diversity challenges their premise.

That is why Bolsonaro proposes a new social pact where God is above the human. In this operation religion is superimposed on politics. The latter, of course, is the fruit of human desiderative capacity in community life, while the former –in the distorted version by the theocrats– cuts that capacity by imposing the need for respect of the dogma established by oracles, shepherds, military, etc.

In *his theological-political Fragment*, Walter Benjamin states: "Therefore the order of the profane cannot be built up on the idea of the Divine Kingdom, and therefore theocracy has no political, but only a religious meaning." (2009, p. 63). Theocracy lacks political sense, nothing historical can refer by itself to the messianic. The Kingdom of God cannot be placed as a historical goal, but as a messianic end. The messianic creates and consummates historical events and leaves no room for the political as an order of the profane. In the case where everything is included and historical options are omitted, then The Political which is viewed as the universe of election possibilities, and democratic politics as the practical activity of updating said potentialities would cease to make sense.

Seminal Violence encrypted in Accusation

The word "ideology" has been strongly caricatured and stigmatized throughout history; those who oppose studies and actions with a gender perspective often adjoin the category "gender" with the outlawed word "ideology" to discredit it from the outset, or without presenting compelling reasons. This is a form of symbolic domination as Bourdieu and Eagleton (1992) understand it: the word ideology "has very often been misused, or used in a vague. It seems to convey a sort of discredit. To describe a statement as ideological is often an insult, so that this ascription itself becomes an instrument of symbolic domination" (p. 220).

At this point, it is clear that the accusation against gender ideology is bait that is intended to force the understanding of gender and sexual diversity as a sort of ideology. On one hand, it is argued that both are misconceptions. On the

other, that their meaning is false in relation to natural reality (be it biological, established by some God or dogma). Subsequently, these false beliefs would be adopted by people given the influence of secular propaganda and the globalization of human rights. Posteriorly, they would inform social reality, denaturalizing it. Traditional social institutions and dogmatic truth would be destroyed: sex subordinates gender.

This thesis is paradoxical. It assumes ideology as false thought, but hides the excluded. It supposes that this concealment of the "true" meaning of language is not unleashed by real power relations, but by the imposition of a set of false meanings. In this sense, power and its relations cease to be the driving force behind the encryption of reality. This central aspect is excluded from this distorted attempt to explain ideology¹⁷.

Based on the multiple traditions that study ideology and gender, it is very taxing to argue that there is something like "gender ideology". For example, although Althusser (1971) points out that ideology is first and foremost structures that impose itself on the vast majority of men, for Eagleton (1997) it is possible to identify 16 different meanings of the word "ideology" –he left some out–. He concluded that:

To try to compress this wealth of meaning into a single comprehensive definition would thus be unhelpful even if it were possible. The word 'ideology', one might say, is a text, woven of a whole tissue of different conceptual strands; it is traced through by divergent histories, and it is probably more important to assess what is valuable or can be discarded in each of these lineages than to merge them forcibly into some Grand Global Theory" (p.19).

Symbolic domination and uncontroversial discrediting suggest that the seminal violence that encrypts gender repugnance acts by denying the possibility of the Existence of gender diversity and to close off access to a political subjectivism that disregards religious dogma, parishioners and submission to traditional colonial models (family-ownership-tradition). The existence of those who

17 Scarecrow of well-founded criticisms. The crux of the matter with Samuel Moyn (2010) is that human rights are a hegemonic discourse justified through an elaborate historical mythology, whose force discursively raises it as the last utopia of these times. But, in reality, it solidifies geopolitical imperialism and the cultural dominance of the Western power(s) over the rest of the "world". However, even for the detractors of the hegemonic approach to human rights, it is worth paying attention to Robin Blackburn (2011): although hegemonic, the discourse of human rights has also served for emancipatory causes and to dispute the sense assigned to the world through orders of domination, exclusion, etc. (pp. 115-127). From human rights, alternative socio-cultural discourses can also be constructed, of the type that question reality, the status quo and the series of liberal discourses that support and benefit from hegemony (their consensus through ideology and coercion). The latter is what many diversity collectives precisely do.

identify themselves in diversity is annulled and the possibility of political subjectivism is outlawed on the basis of that diversity, which disrupts the constitutive base of the political communities coded in The Political. Essentially, those who deny gender diversity do nothing more than not only belittle the equal value of all but also and their parity in the structures of the political community¹⁸.

The accusation against gender ideology replaces the morality of political systems with participation in religious practices; the latter would be the only valid sign of belonging to the "community" after theocratic restoration (the new social pact with the gods at the forefront). In this contested framework, theocrats attempt to gain metaphysical control of the pragmatic functions of language and the law of meaning of the regimes of enunciation and truth¹⁹. In this order, the hidden slogan of the theocrat is to encrypt the Political. That this ceases to be an autonomous domain of "secular" democratic power and a terrain for controversy, where there is worth in utilizing rights, identities and claims as a form of incorporation into the political community; aligned with the creation of friendly –just environments conducive for Life and diversity.

At this point the understanding of the seminal character of the violence encrypted in the accusation takes form. Differences are outlawed and the norm of communities without diversity is implanted. This is the seedbed for other, more palpable forms of violence. For example, in light of Nancy Fraser's (2008) proposal for the theory of social justice, if we were to make the mistake of conceding that gender is an ideology that must be suppressed, we would be doing injustice to diversity on account of the cultural denial of its subjectivities, the deprivation of equality in the economic sphere and the impossibility of raising demands for participation in the public sphere in terms of affirmative actions and gender equality rights.

18 We come back to the constitutive topic. The exceptional thing about democracy is its basis: autonomous participation in governance structures. Castoriadis (2010) points out that this is the substance of the democratic principle (pp. 45-74). Within this framework, democratic politics seeks an explicit foundation of community and institutions based on self-criticism. Thus understood, autonomy presupposes both the freedom and equality of citizens as political subjects. Without it, the democratic adventure is wrecked. In a similar line Nancy Fraser (2008) raises the principle of all subjects -all subjected principle- as the morality that supports the political systems: "all those who are subject to a determined governance structure are in moral position of being subjects of justice in relation to that structure" (p. 126). This principle, more than others, would allow to assure the legitimacy and the effectiveness of public opinion in a post-westphalian framework –of short circuit of the national States– with a view to the realization of justice(s).

19 The implicit strategy is to homogenize the regimes of enunciation and truth. Jean-François Lyotard (2012) shows that "incommensurability" and the consequent "untranslatability" lie in the impossibility of subjecting the different enunciation regimes to the same law; unless they are neutralized and lose their meaning (prescriptive, descriptive, evaluative, etc.) (p.150). Thus, the pragmatic functions of language would be submitted by the law of religious dogma that evades the language and claims of diversity (s) (or of anyone who thinks differently).

In response to *recognition*, the establishment of a world hostile to differences would be, where only the exclusion of diversity or the assimilation of dominant cultural norms would be possible will come to fruition. There will be cessation of demands for recognition from different experiences, beliefs and perspectives. At the same time, curtailing the movements that have revalued unjustly devalued identities, such as cultural feminism, black cultural nationalism or the identity politics of the LGBTBIQ community. The end of the politics of recognition implies the invisibility of cultural injustices rooted in the social patterns of representation, interpretation and communication, which would now be subject to the law of religious dogma.

In terms of *distribution*, the equal participation of the diversity in the resources and assets of the community would be restricted, as they would not be considered participants. What has been achieved would be ruined by the redistribution policy that encompasses class-centred orientations (such as liberalism, social democracy and socialism) and those forms of feminism and anti-racism that seek transformation or socio-economic reform as a remedy for gender, ethno-racial or gender injustices. In the absence of differentiated rights and approaches, the exploitation, marginalization and economic deprivation historically endured by diversity would be perpetuated.

Two social conditions would be uprooted on the scale of *participation*. Diversity would not have a voice and the intersubjectivism required in institutionalized cultural value systems capable of expressing the same respect and social esteem for all participants would be occluded. Thus, the cornerstone of social systems structured on the basis of the maxim that informs the participation of all members of society on an equal footing would be demolished.

Inarguably, we have described the injustices endured by many in our colonial-patriarchal-sexist-heteronormative reality. What is alarming is that the theocratic barrage tries to deprive diversity of the few tools they have to confront them: the capacity for political subjectivism based on their Being. The seminal violence encrypted in the accusation that gender is *ideology*—in a pejorative sense—consists of depriving the diversities of political communities by closing off their possibility of political subjectivism. Consequently, myriads of violence and injustices swarm against them.

This is why it is urgent and imperative to confront gender inquisitors, beyond the proposals of the post-secular liberals with their emphasis on translating religious demands into secular key. Habermas (2006), for example, maintains that the undeniable role of religion in the public sphere in a post-secular era makes it necessary to rethink the separation between the public and religious spheres and the traditional role of secularism and the religious neutrality of States, now suffocated by post-secularism (pp. 121-155). Commitment to mo-

dernity would lead to translating religious pretensions into the public sphere through the language of liberal Constitutions and rights.

The decrypted problem in this translation scenario is that the democratic stinger cannot be used against theocrats. Light tolerance proposes an appropriation of religious language through its secular-liberal taming. Another form of encryption where the post-secular consensus that would capture the theological potency or, as the case may be, would be legitimized in those porous terms. Clearly, the fundamental operation lies in the indistinguishable power between political and religious power; the result is a temporal power based on "spiritual" immutability: a secularized liberal religion that, in turn, would exploit the possibility of political subjectivism of gender diversities.

Conclusions

From a decryption of power, we question the accusation that gender is an *ideology*. An attempt is made to prescript the legacy of thought and emancipatory movements agglutinated in gender focuses. The gender inquisitors reject a network of beliefs that, supposedly, would establish new anthropology and, consequently, tear down the traditional structure of the subject, the family, property and culture.

This "ideology" (in the sense of falsifying the true essence or human nature and society) would be veiledly incorporated, ruining them. From the perspective of the opposing side, this network of beliefs is the conceptual apparatus built by the women's liberation movements –and the LGBTBIQ community– claims for the recognition of their gender and sexual diversity as a legitimate and worthy strategy and, at the same time, a valid mode of political subjectivity in our communities. It also confronts the violence they have historically endured (with special emphasis on the denial of cultural recognition, socio-economic inequality and lack of participation). Then, outside of the political controversy, the theocrats want to deprive diversity of that apparatus by accusing it of ideology.

Accusation, paradoxically, is a strategy of encrypting the power of traditionalist elites (we focused on theocratic). The above accusation is a by-product of a social re-engineering plan via the establishment of "natural truths" (as in the well-known socio-cultural project of "tradition-family-property") that replaces democratic politics with a religious dogma with theocratic aspiration. This theocratic program tries to re-found society avoiding the political-democratic confrontation.

Genuine decryption, in favor of the cause for gender diversity, involves stripping any dogma that disposes and encrypts the Political. The encryption we

expose as seminal violence impedes the political subjectivity of diversity. For there to be democratic politics, it is indispensable that all diversity be asserted as genuine political subjects. In this way, the conditions that allow for the existence of communities are sustained.

The hypothetical case in which the accusation against gender ideology is translatable through decryption of power was not addressed. If the theocrats accept the political-conceptual use of the category "ideology" the concession that the gender focus is ideological would be permissible. Such accusation would be part of a confrontation between ideologies in the political arena. The political dispute between a patriarchal ideology of sex that advocates for a colonial-patriarchal-sexist-hetero-normative society, and another, marked by the emancipation of Life, diversity and difference. Which community do you want to belong to?

References

- Alves, D. (2019). Las niñas de rosa, los niños, de azul. Elpais.com. https://elpais.com/internacional/2019/01/04/actualidad/1546602274_498637.html [Accessed November 11, 2018].
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses. Literary Theory: an anthology*. Madrid, España: FCE.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *En Busca de la política*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: FCE.
- Beauvour, S. (2016). *El segundo sexo*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Penguin Random House Editores
- Benjamin, W. (2009). Fragmento teológico-político. In J. Fava y T. Bartoletti (Trans.). *Estética y Política* (pp. 63-64). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Las Cuarenta.
- Blackburn, R. (2011). Reivindicando los Derechos Humanos. *New left review*, 69, 115-127. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/ejemplar/288650> [Accessed November 11, 2018].
- Bolsonaro, J. (2019). *Discurso de juramento como nuevo presidente de Brasil*. <http://www.rtve.es/noticias/20190101/bolsonaro-toma-posesion-su-cargo-como-presidente-brasil/1862080.shtml> [Accessed November 11, 2018].

- Bourdieu, P. (2003). Los juristas, guardianes de la hipocresía colectiva. *Jueces para la democracia*, 47, 3-5. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=668790> [Accessed October 10, 2018].
- Bourdieu, P & Eagleton, T. (1992). Doxa y vida ordinaria. *New left review*, 1(191), 219-231. <https://newleftreview.es/issues/0/articles/terry-eagleton-pierre-bourdieu-doxa-y-vida-ordinaria.pdf> [Accessed October 18, 2018].
- Butler, J. (1993). *Cuerpos que importan. Sobre los límites materiales y discursivos del "sexo"*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.
- Cárcova, C. (2006). *La opacidad del Derecho*. Madrid, España: Trotta.
- Castoriadis, C. (2000). *Ciudadanos sin Brújula*. México D.F.: Ediciones Coyoacán.
- Douzinis, C. (2008). *El Fin de los Derechos Humanos*. Bogotá, Colombia: Legis y Universidad de Antioquia.
- Eagleton, T. (1997). *Ideología. Una introducción*. Barcelona, España: Paidós.
- Foucault, M. (2000). La ética del cuidado de sí como práctica de la libertad. *Revista Nombres*, 15, 257-280. <https://revistas.unc.edu.ar/index.php/NOMBRES/article/viewFile/2276/1217> [Accessed August 8, 2018].
- Fraser, N. (2008). *Las escalas de la justicia*. Barcelona, España: Herder.
- Gutiérrez, A. (2015). Resurgimientos: sures como diseños y diseños otros. *Nómaditas*, 43, 113-129. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1051/105143558008.pdf> [Consultado el 8 de agosto de 2018].
- Habermas, J. (2006). *Entre naturalismo y religión*. Barcelona, España: Paidós.
- Hoyos, I. (2016). *El "enfoque de género" en el acuerdo final para la terminación del conflicto y la construcción de una paz estable y duradera*. <http://www.altocomisionadoparalapaz.gov.co/procesos-y-conversaciones/Documentos%20compartidos/24-11-2016NuevoAcuerdoFinal.pdf> [Accessed October 19, 2018].

- Leirner, P. (2018). Uma contribuição para o anti-Bolsonarismo. *Blog Sul 21*. <https://www.sul21.com.br/opiniaopublica/2018/10/uma-contribuicao-pa-ra-o-anti-bolsonarismo-por-piero-leirner/> [Accessed August 8, 2018].
- Lyotard, J. F. (2012). *La diferencia*. Barcelona, España: Gedisa.
- Méndez, G. (2016). La democracia liberal: ¿una forma de disimular la perpetuación de la tiranía? *Razón Pública*. <https://www.razonpublica.com/index.php/politica-y-gobierno-temas-27/9891-la-democracia-liberal-una-forma-de-disimular-la-perpetuaci%C3%B3n-de-la-tiran%C3%ADa.html> [Accessed November 10, 2018].
- Méndez, G. & Orozco, J. (2014). Cinco tesis para descryptar el poder: las enmiendas XYZ. *Culturas Jurídicas/Legal Cultures*, 1(1), 1-30. http://periodicos.uff.br/culturasjuridicas_teste/article/view/22815/13395 [Accessed January 11, 2018].
- Méndez, G. & Orozco, J. (2018). Polyvalent Anarchism as a Hypothesis to Decrypt the Constitution. In R. Sanín (Ed.). *Decrypting Power* (pp. 213-238). Londres, Inglaterra: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Méndez, G. & Sanín, R. (2012). La constitución encriptada. Nuevas formas de emancipación del poder global. *Redhes*, 8, 1-25. <http://www.derecho.uaslp.mx/Documents/Revista%20REDHES/N%C3%BAmero%208/Redhes8-05.pdf> [Accessed October 15, 2018].
- Moyn, S. (2010). *The last Utopia: Human Rights in History*. Cambridge, London: Belknap
- Organización Naciones Unidas, ONU. (2007). *Principios de Yogyakarta*. http://yogyakartaprinciples.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/principles_sp.pdf [Accessed October 15, 2018].
- Ordoñez, A. (2016). En los acuerdos de paz aparece encriptada la ideología de género. [Entrevista]. *La W radio*. http://www.wradio.com.co/escucha/archivo_de_audio/en-los-acuerdos-de-paz-aparece-encriptada-la-ideologia-de-genero-alejandro-ordonez/20161012/oir/3271857.aspx [Accessed April 15, 2018].

- Prada, N., Torres, F., Sánchez, M., Ramírez, F. M. & Suárez, P. (2018). Todo debate es ideológico. Reflexiones acerca de la ideología de género. *Polisemia*, 12(22), 115-125. <http://revistas.uniminuto.edu/index.php/POLI/article/view/1492/1441> [Accessed January 11, 2018].
- Putnam, H. (1981). *Reason, truth and history*. Cambridge, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Rancière, J. (1996). *El desacuerdo. Política y filosofía*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Ediciones Nueva Visión.
- Rancière, J. (2007). *En los bordes de lo político*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Ediciones la Cebra.
- Restrepo, E. & Rojas, A. (2010). *Inflexión decolonial*. Popayán, Colombia: Universidad del Cauca.
- Rorty, R. (1996). *Objetividad, relativismo y verdad*. Barcelona, España: Paidós.
- Sanín, R. (2016). *Decolonizing democracy: power in a solid state*. London, Inglaterra: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Scala, J. (2010). *La ideología de género. O el Género como herramienta de poder*. Rosario, Argentina: Ed. Logos.
- The American College of Pediatricians (2016). *Gender Ideology Harms Children*. <https://www.acped.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/8.17.16-Gender-Ideology-Harms.pdf> [Accessed January 11, 2018].
- Trevijano, P. (2015). *Relativismo e ideología de género*. Madrid, España: Ed. Libros Libres.

