



*Time, Power, and Resistances in Latin America:
Narratives, Democracy, and Global Reconfigurations
(English Version)*

ISBN: 978-9915-704-40-1

DOI: 10.62486/978-9915-704-40-1.Ch08

Pages: 77-88

©2026 The authors. This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) 4.0 License.

From recovery to reconfiguration and concept construction: a proposed theoretical framework for addressing gender-based violence against trans women

De la recuperación a la reconfiguración y construcción de conceptos: una propuesta de marco teórico para abordar la violencia basada en género hacia las mujeres trans

Manuel Vázquez Sejjido¹  

¹Universidad de Guadalajara, Doctorado en Ciencias Sociales. México.

Corresponding author: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido 

ABSTRACT

Gender-based violence has long been intensely overlooked, and its theoretical and empirical approaches do not have a long history. Its place within the analytical landscape of the social sciences is linked to women's resistance to epistemic injustice, which in turn forms part of a broader struggle: their fight against patriarchy and its multiple forms of oppression. This presentation shares reflections on the construction of a theoretical framework robust enough to support inquiries into gender-based violence experienced by trans women. In this sense, it argues for the relevance of drawing on feminist and transfeminist theoretical references in order to recover, reconfigure, and even propose conceptual formulations capable of sustaining a scientific endeavor of this kind. The theoretical-conceptual proposal is built around five core pillars of reflection: epistemic injustice in relation to the erasure of trans women within social theory and feminist critical theory; the expansion of the conceptual margins of the category "woman" in connection with the theoretical construction of the category "gender"; the reconfiguration of the concept of gender-based violence; the understanding of trans women as epistemically privileged subjects; and the critical recovery of the intersectional approach, considering gender identity and gender expression as key axes of oppression for analysis.

Keywords: Violence; Gender; Trans Women.

RESUMEN

La violencia basada en género ha sido un problema omitido con intensidad y sus abordajes teóricos y empíricos no tienen larga data. Su ubicación en el panorama de análisis de las ciencias sociales está relacionado con la resistencia de las mujeres ante la injusticia epistémica que a su vez hace parte de una lucha aún mayor: la que libran frente al patriarcado y sus múltiples opresiones. La presente ponencia comparte algunas reflexiones sobre la construcción de un marco teórico lo suficientemente potente para desarrollar indagaciones sobre las violencias basadas en género experimentadas por las mujeres trans. En tal sentido se sostiene la relevancia de partir de los referentes teóricos feministas y transfeministas para recuperar, reconfigurar e incluso proponer las formulaciones conceptuales que sostengan una empresa científica de este tipo. La propuesta teórico-conceptual se formula sobre la base de cinco pilares de reflexión:

la injusticia epistémica en relación con la eliminación de las mujeres trans en la teoría social y en la teoría crítica feminista; la ampliación de los márgenes conceptuales de la categoría mujer en relación con la construcción teórica de la categoría género; la reconfiguración del concepto de violencia basada en género; la comprensión de las mujeres trans como sujetas privilegiadas epistémicamente y la recuperación crítica del enfoque interseccional en relación con la identidad y expresión género como ejes de opresión claves para el análisis.

Palabras clave: Violencia; Género; Mujeres Trans.

INTRODUCTION

Constructing a theoretical framework is one of the most important tasks in the research process across any field. To this idea, we must add its complexity in the field of social sciences, especially if the problem being studied is one of the so often subordinated by the masculine logic of discovery that has characterized traditional social science (Harding, 1998).

Gender-based violence has been a severely neglected issue, and its theoretical and empirical approaches are relatively recent. Its place in the social sciences' analytical landscape concerns women's resistance to epistemic injustice, which, in turn, is part of a broader struggle: the one they wage against patriarchy and its multiple oppressions. This paper shares some reflections on the proposal for a theoretical framework powerful enough to develop inquiries into gender-based violence experienced by trans women, which is part of the results of the ongoing doctoral research project "Gender-based violence against transgender women in health services in Cuba" of the Doctoral Program in Social Sciences at the University of Guadalajara.

The theoretical-conceptual proposal is formulated based on five pillars of reflection: epistemic injustice in relation to the elimination of trans women in critical feminist theory; the broadening of the conceptual margins of the category of woman in relation to the theoretical construction of the category of gender; the reconfiguration of the concept of gender-based violence; the understanding of trans women as epistemically privileged subjects; and the critical recovery of the intersectional approach in relation to gender identity and expression as key axes of oppression for analysis. For this presentation, and for practical reasons, we will only develop the first two pillars.

DEVELOPMENT

Why use feminist theoretical references as a starting point?

Gender-based violence has been recognized globally as a human rights issue (Merino, 2008); it is one of the most worrying and urgent phenomena in our contemporary society (Pérez, 2018), ostensible as a social reality (Zurbano & Liberia, 2014), but whose understanding in all its complexity is still a challenge for the sciences.

Part of this complexity is constituted by the violence experienced by transgender women, for which systematic studies at the national level are scarce (Boivin, 2014), and there are no research developments or conclusive figures on its multiple expressions (Lasso, 2014). In this sense, academia owes transgender women a debt for drawing attention to the limited production of knowledge on the subject (Schneider, 2007) and their annulment as epistemic subjects by not considering them as valid interlocutors but as passive subjects. Notwithstanding the above, in the last ten years, it has been possible to identify some results

of scientific investigations that place violence and trans subjects as victims at the center of the analysis. Most of these investigations have been formulated from the health sciences, medical sciences, nursing sciences, psychology, psychiatry, and, to a lesser extent, the social sciences.

Without detracting from the merits of the theoretical frameworks that have supported scientific endeavors in this particular field, it is possible to argue that the absence or weak formulation of the interpretive framework offered by critical feminist theory is a point for critical debate. Let us bear in mind that the phenomenon being addressed is gender-based violence, with gender being the category that structures, locates, and individualizes it. If we assume that violence exists in a wide variety of expressions and is not necessarily connected to gender, it is clear that it is this category that distinguishes it and gives it complexity.

The centrality of gender requires the feminist theoretical apparatus for its analysis, without excluding possible dialogues with other theoretical constructions from other areas of knowledge. Critical feminist theory on the relationship between knowledge production and power practices offers a framework for interpreting reality that highlights gender as a power structure, thereby allowing us to penetrate the density of gender-based violence as a phenomenon, which would be extremely complex to investigate solely from other theoretical perspectives.

The theoretical and methodological reflections of feminism have been formulated peripherally, from positions of resistance, and, in this dynamic, have generated the main debates in the social sciences related to the issues that inform this reflection. Epistemic proposals from this perspective have enabled the breakdown of the masculine logic of discovery, thereby nullifying or reducing the relevance of the issue addressed here.

Therefore, a theoretical framework for addressing gender-based violence against trans women must align itself with the disruptive logic of epistemic production that replaces men's experiences as a scientific starting point. We can affirm that a rebellious theoretical framework is used, which, through its resistance, erodes scientific power and its dominant academic structures and complicates the production of knowledge by dynamiting the methodologies that cement androcentric, heterosexual, cisgender, and racist scientific hierarchies of power (Ruiz Trejo & García Dauder, 2024).

Epistemic injustice in relation to the elimination of trans women in critical feminist theory.

As we have already mentioned, women have been excluded as epistemic subjects across all areas of knowledge; in this case, we will focus on the social sciences. This issue has been carefully addressed by feminist authors who have questioned the production of knowledge to reveal how this process of elimination has occurred and the mechanisms used. Lengermann & Niebrugge (2019) have produced a deeply critical work that directly challenges what continues to be referred to as the sociological canon and the well-known epithet of the fathers of sociology. Both authors put forward very powerful ideas for debate that not only support their own reflections but can also be used for analyses such as the one we want to carry out in this paper. They argue for the relevance of using the term 'elimination,' which implies recognizing that, behind this act of annulment, there is an exercise of power. It is not random or spontaneous; rather, elimination contributes to the eradication of voices and ideas that undermine values, principles, procedures, and findings established and legitimized by masculine logic.

Elimination is basically explained by the weakness of these women's authority in a culture made by men. This weakness is, in turn, understood by the authors through the analysis of how a person is present for, or is consciously recognized by, other people, thus returning to the feminist reworking of Schutz's phenomenological theory.

This line of thinking then presents the idea of epistemic injustice, closely linked to the issue of elimination, no longer only of women, but seen in a broader sense. This proposal allows us to understand that the process of elimination is not a matter that can only be discussed in the past tense, that it does not only occur towards women by men who dominate the sciences, but also within them as an epistemic community, and that it also extends to other subjects who share experiences of oppression. Fricker (2007) develops her concept of epistemic injustice as part of a much broader reflection that questions how power relations affect the production and transmission of knowledge and highlights specific forms of injustice towards certain subjects in their ability to participate in epistemic processes. According to the author, this is expressed in two main ways: in the nullification of the ability to bear witness to one's existence and the questioning of the value of that expression of experiences, and in the impossibility of having the interpretive resources necessary to understand and communicate one's own experience due to unequal access to frameworks of social meaning. We should not view these forms of epistemic injustice as a closed set of possibilities; the essence of the concept allows us to consider a wide variety of dynamics in which, as a result of the power exercised in the production of knowledge, subjects are eliminated, silenced, and invalidated.

Crucial to this analysis is Fricker's (2017) argument about the intrinsic relationship between epistemic practices and power relations, leading to the understanding that epistemic problems are not merely cognitive but also ethical, political, and a matter of domination. The author gives substance to these structural prejudices and mentions racialized people, especially women, and people with non-heteronormative sexualities. These prejudices operate as selectors of who has a voice and who does not, and, even more complexly, of what knowledge is valued and legitimized, or discarded. Epistemic injustice accounts for the exclusion of certain social groups from the processes of knowledge creation and validation and, in turn, is a manifestation of broader oppressions that do not only involve men as oppressors.

There is a constant variable in both contributions: power relations. In one case, these are materialized in what Lengermann & Niebrugge (2019) refer to as gender and knowledge policies within sociology that men operated to remove the women who founded the discipline; in the other, and from a broader logic adopted by Fricker (2007), as part of operations of domination based on structural prejudices that shape the way scientific knowledge is produced and disseminated. Both references function as a fair interpretive framework for addressing the issue of epistemic injustice that trans women have been subject to in gender studies.

The broadening of the conceptual margins of the category of woman in relation to the theoretical construction of the category of gender: which women?

At this point, it is not necessary to provide an exhaustive overview of each of the theoretical debates on the category of gender. Instead, we will attempt to select some reflections that, viewed along a continuum of increasing complexity, account for how trans subjects were excluded from debates and later placed within the already polymorphous idea of being a woman. It is worth noting that the selection of discussions around the aforementioned category

does not attempt to follow a logic of starting point and end point in the sense of understanding the inclusion of trans women as the culmination of debates on the subject, but to note part of the path traveled, in which the broadening and increasing complexity of conceptual margins is evident.

Gender as a category of analysis has been and remains key to understanding the dynamics of power, identity, and inequality in societies. Its understanding has been shaped by critical perspectives that challenge traditional constructions and explore the intersections between gender, power, race, class, and other social categories. Bedia (2005) discusses this relevance, noting that since Gayle Rubin coined it, it has been positioned as one of the central categories of feminist thought, endowed with great complexity in terms of both material and symbolic reality.

The debate on this category will unfold within the effervescence of the beginnings of feminist theoretical production, within the margins that entail the obligatory, binary reference to men and women. Although gender is understood as a prescriptive cultural construct, it will be tied exclusively to a supposed anatomical reality that is indisputable. Theoretical inquiry had not yet managed to question this collective reference point, being a woman, in greater depth, and therefore a key question had not been sufficiently addressed: which women? This question, which would soon arise, would lead to questioning whether analyses of the category were more firmly anchored in certain experiences, creating a kind of universalizing idea about women and leaving out so many other ways of living as women.

The contributions of Rich and Wittig were central to the complexification of feminist analyses of gender by rescuing the relevance of non-heterosexual women and the particularity they imply in the logic of patriarchal oppression. Although they have not been the only ones to focus attention on these bodies, their reflections deserve our attention on a couple of issues. The first raises the fact that in debates on the sexual imbalance of power between men and women, there is no critical reference to compulsory heterosexuality as a phenomenon. She therefore proposes an analysis of the forms that male power takes to manifest itself, which clearly show the imposition of heterosexual sexuality on women and, therefore, the denial of their own sexuality (Rich, 1996). On the other hand, the reflection on the category of sex as a political category that founds society as heterosexual and establishes as natural the relationship that is at its basis, the heterosexual relationship, is extremely powerful. Through this relationship, women are heterosexualized and subjected to the reproduction of heterosexual society (Wittig, 2006).

Another major challenge to the category of women was that relating to racialized women, above all, because it opened the door to other questions and theoretically cemented the unavoidable analysis, in the field of gender studies, of the multiple oppressions that operate on women's bodies in their tremendous diversity.

The resurgence of the debate on racism within feminism in the United States and the demand by black feminists to be heard generated a tension that obviously dynamited one of the hard cores of feminist thought. It was a reflection that denounced a clear exclusion of the lives of racialized women, who were considered irrelevant in the category of womanhood that had until then been at the center of the debates. The solution was obvious: it was urgent to break down the limits that contained the category; other bodies that experienced oppression to varying degrees had to be placed in the same place. This epistemic effervescence also had

its place in the Latin American and Caribbean context, where the fact that the emancipatory potential of feminism had not been the same for all the great diversity of women in existence was questioned, and that black and Amerindian women felt alienated from a movement in which their experiences and demands did not have the same place as those of non-racialized women.

The institutionalization and subsequent development of the theoretical-methodological perspective on intersectionality have been central to expanding the conceptual margins of the category of woman. Although the perspective essentially involves analyzing the confluence of multiple oppressions on women's bodies, the triggering issue at the heart of this epistemic construction was the impossibility of placing black women as subjects whose rights were protected as women, or, as we have already said, the placement of certain bodies outside the boundaries of an artificially constructed concept, or rather, a concept under construction. Intersectional analysis was, and continues to be, key to challenging the hegemonic model of the universal woman (Dorlin, 2009; Viveros Vigoya, 2023). Nor was it possible to universalize the idea of the black woman.

As we have been showing, feminist theory has produced the subject whose emancipation is sought. In that process, the mechanisms of hierarchization that produce exclusion and that are the same ones that structure the system that oppresses them have not been absent. Therefore, feminist critical practice should reveal and understand how the very power structures through which emancipation is sought produce and restrict the category of women as subjects of feminism (Butler, 2001).

Judith Butler's provocative reflections, which began to amplify in the early 1990s, argued that gender is not just one identity trait among others, but rather has the centrality of being the minimum condition for the intelligibility of persons. Based on the above, the proposal to deconstruct gender involves a critical review of the concept of identity, and the critical path followed is precisely the investigation of cultural spaces where the intelligibility of gender is not possible without substantive modifications of traditional heteropatriarchal binaries (Pérez Navarro, 2003).

Gender is thus shown to be something we do, not something we are, in a logic of multiple possibilities that subvert its initial ordering and are therefore the key to its re-signification and to new ways of recognizing and interpreting it. This idea of Butler (2001) is based on the attempt to conceptualize gender through a theory of performativity, which, in turn, dynamizes it and distances it from contested essentialism. According to Pérez Navarro (2003), it is therefore a question of overcoming binaries through the production of a diversity of gender configurations that destabilize models of cultural intelligibility, revealing their phantasmal functioning and their inability to "completely contain their own ideals" (Butler, 2002, p. 73).

At this point in the analysis, it is clear that such questions lead us to understand two fundamental elements: first, that women as subjects of feminism are a category necessarily endowed with a plasticity that allows us to understand the extremely varied ways of being and experiencing womanhood; and second, that they share the space of the subject represented by discourse based on openness to more varied forms of production and exclusion of subjects. The place of feminist emancipation thus begins to be inhabited by a plurality of identities situated on the border between oppression and subversion (Pérez Navarro, 2003), and it is in this space of reflection that the bodies of trans women emerge.

The theoretical and political effervescence of feminist thought occurred at the same time that the bodies of trans women were invaded and devastated, but they also resisted. It is possible to access evidence about these women and their patterns in the history of transgender resistance; their bodies and mere existence have been, in most cases, their main vehicle and strategy of struggle. Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera were instrumental in 1969 during the Stonewall riots, which sparked the gay, lesbian, and trans liberation movement in the United States (Blakemore, 2022). Both women, who were trans, racialized, and poor, continued their political activism into the 1990s. The same was true in Latin America, where sharp figures such as Lohana Berkins in Argentina took solid action from the early 1990s onwards, leading to an impact on the legislative sphere in relation to the recognition of the human rights of trans people and the construction of a Latin American transvestite theoretical thought (Vidal-Ortiz & Simonetto, 2021; Saxe, 2022).

At the same time, even before Judith Butler and other feminist thinkers proposed the destabilization of the category of woman in the sense we are reviewing, Sandy Stone's ideas were already on the table in her interesting work "The Empire Strikes Back: A Posttranssexual Manifesto" (Stone, 1987), a kind of interpellation to Janice Raymond and her work *The Transsexual Empire: The Making of the She-Male* (1979), where she discusses autonomy in relation to the body and identity in a context of domination from medical and social narratives. In the early 1990s, Susan Stryker burst onto the scene with her work "My Words to Victor Frankenstein Above the Village of Chamounix: Performing Transgender Rage" (Stryker, 1994), proposing her concept of trans monstrosity in an emerging context of transgender studies and criticizing transmedicalism and the reification of hegemonic gender identities (Terán Fustero & Tarancón de Francisco, 2020).

We also find Kate Bornstein's critical reflections in her work *Gender Outlaw: On Men, Women, and the Rest of Us* (Bornstein, 1994) on the reduction of the trans experience to hegemonic narratives of transition, as opposed to the opportunity it presents to explore a diversity of ways of living and understanding gender. Likewise, Leslie Feinberg presents a political manifesto that situates the struggle for transgender rights within a broader framework of social justice, human rights, and structural transformation. Her text *Transgender Liberation: A movement whose time has come* (Feinberg, 1992) not only addresses issues of trans identity and visibility, but also the intertwining of transgender struggles with other social movements and the critique of oppressive structures.

Without a doubt, and for some time now, the powerful reflections of trans authors have been revealing in understanding the normative fictions of identity, its cis-sexist system, and the exclusions it causes (Rodríguez & Almagro, 2021). Another issue has been their elimination from academic spaces linked to gender studies. They have been part of the epistemic maelstrom that allows us to talk about feminisms, whose plurality is grounded in the non-existence of a single, stable, or universal body of principles or a canon of feminist ideas (Harding, 1998).

CONCLUSIONS

The violence experienced by trans women is a social reality that has not been sufficiently researched in different national contexts. Therefore, although there is an increase in empirical evidence, there is still a debt to be paid regarding the production of knowledge in this field.

Trans women have been eliminated as epistemic subjects, and this has had an impact on how their life experiences are addressed, especially in relation to gender-based violence. Their epistemic power is completely reviled, and even when they are studied as subjects, they are subordinated and instrumentalized.

Therefore, a theoretical framework for addressing gender-based violence against trans women must align itself with the disruptive logic of epistemic production that replaces the experiences of men as a scientific starting point. In this sense, critical feminist theory on the relationship between knowledge production and power practices offers a framework for interpreting reality that highlights gender as a power structure, thereby allowing us to penetrate the density of gender-based violence as a phenomenon, which would be extremely complex to investigate solely from other theoretical perspectives.

This does not imply accepting feminist critical theory without questioning it; in fact, quite the contrary. In fact, it is necessary to critically reflect on the debates surrounding the category of gender and the subject of feminist representation, which allows us to understand that the process of producing the subject whose emancipation is sought has not been immune to the mechanisms of hierarchization that produce exclusion and that are the same ones that structure the system that oppresses them.

This critical exercise reveals how the very power structures through which emancipation is sought produce and restrict the category of women as subjects of feminism.

Women, as subjects of feminism, are a category necessarily endowed with a plasticity that allows us to understand the many different ways of being and living as women. The place of feminist emancipation then begins to be inhabited by a plurality of identities situated on the border between oppression and subversion, and it is in this space of reflection that the bodies of trans women emerge.

The theoretical and political effervescence of feminist thought occurred at the same time that the bodies of trans women were invaded and devastated, but they also resisted. It is possible to access evidence about these women and their patterns in the course of transgender people's resistance; their bodies and mere existence have been, in most cases, their main vehicle and strategy of struggle. It is also possible to trace their theoretical reflections. However, when filtering the main discussions and the authors behind the arguments on gender and the category of woman, trans thinkers do not stand out as relevant interventions.

These theoretical reflections on epistemic injustice in relation to the elimination of trans women in social theory and critical feminist theory, and on the broadening of the conceptual margins of the category of woman in relation to the theoretical construction of the category of gender, are two indispensable theoretical nuclei for the construction of a theoretical framework that supports the scientific inquiry at hand. This allows us to move forward toward three other pillars: the reconfiguration of the concept of gender-based violence; the understanding of trans women as epistemically privileged subjects; and the critical recovery of the intersectional approach in relation to gender identity and expression as key axes of oppression for analysis.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Bedia, R. C. (2005). El género en las ciencias sociales. *Cuadernos de Trabajo Social*, 18, 249-258.

- Boivin, R. R. (2014). "Se podrían evitar muchas muertas": Discriminación, estigma y violencia contra minorías sexuales en México. *Sexualidad, Salud y Sociedad (Rio de Janeiro)*, 86-120.
- Bornstein, K. (1994). *Gender outlaw: On men, women and the rest of us*. Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2001). *El género en disputa: El feminismo y la subversión de la identidad*. Paidós.
- Butler, J. (2002). Críticamente subversiva. En R. M. Mérida Jiménez (Ed.), *Sexualidades transgresoras: Una antología de estudios queer* (pp. 55-79). Icaria Editorial.
- Dorlin, E. (Ed.). (2009). *Sexe, race, classe, pour une épistémologie de la domination*. PUF.
- Feinberg, L. (1992). *Transgender liberation: A movement whose time has come*. World View Forum.
- Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.
- Harding, S. (1998). ¿Existe un método feminista? Debates en torno a una metodología feminista, 2, 9-34.
- Lasso, R. A. (2014). Transexualidad y servicios de salud utilizados para transitar por sexos-géneros. *Revista CES Psicología*, 7(2), 108-125.
- Lengermann, P. M., & Niebrugge, G. (Eds.). (2019). *Fundadoras de la sociología y la teoría social 1830-1930* (Vol. 23). CIS.
- Lugones, M. (2008). Colonialidad y género. *Tabula Rasa*, 9, 73-101.
- Merino, V. M. (2008). La (re)configuración del concepto de violencia contra las mujeres en el sistema de derechos humanos. *Revista jurídica de igualdad de oportunidades entre mujeres y hombres*, (22), 6-11.
- Pérez, R. (2018). El concepto de violencia de género como espejismo hermenéutico. *Igualdad, autonomía personal y derechos sociales*, 8, 69-88. <https://www.aacademica.org/blas.radi/36>
- Pérez Navarro, P. (2003). Performatividad y subversión de la identidad: A propósito de la obra de Judith Butler.
- Rich, A. (1996). Heterosexualidad obligatoria y existencia lesbiana. *DUODA: Estudis de la diferència sexual*, 15-48.
- Ruiz Trejo, M. G., & García Dauder, D. (2024). *Epistemologías feministas: Cuerpo y emociones en investigación*. Universidad Autónoma de Chiapas.
- Saxe, F. N. (2022). *Lohana teórica: Apuntes para un mapa textual de los aportes de Lohana*

Berkins al pensamiento travesti transfeminista latinoamericano.

Schneider Callejas, C. (2007). Transgenerismo (transgénero, transgenerista): Una deuda pendiente de la academia, el poder ejecutivo, el poder legislativo, la cultura, la sociedad y el Estado en general. En B. Espinosa Pérez (Ed.), *Cuerpos y diversidad sexual: Aportes para la igualdad y el reconocimiento* (pp. 58-67). Universidad Javeriana.

Stone, S. (1987). *The empire strikes back: A posttranssexual manifesto*. <https://sandystone.com/empire-strikes-back.pdf>

Stryker, S. (1994). My words to Victor Frankenstein above the village of Chamounix: Performing transgender rage. *GLQ*, 1(3), 237-254.

Terán Fustero, M., & Tarancón de Francisco, J. A. (2020). *Subversive sutures: A counter-hegemonic reading of trans monstrosity*. Universidad de Zaragoza. <https://zaguan.unizar.es/search?f=author&p=TeránFustero,Mario&ln=es>

Vidal-Ortiz, S., & Simonetto, P. (2021). Lohana Berkins. Apuntes sobre la teoría encarnada travesti latinoamericana. *Política, deliberação pública e organizações sociais na contemporaneidade*, 20.

Viveros Vigoya, M. (2023). *Interseccionalidad: Giro decolonial y comunitario*. CLACSO. <https://www.clacso.org/interseccionalidad-giro-decolonial-y-comunitario/>

Wittig, M. (2006). El pensamiento heterosexual. En *El pensamiento heterosexual y otros ensayos* (pp. 45-57).

Zurbano, B., & Liberia, I. (2014). Revisión teórico-conceptual de la violencia de género y su representación en el discurso mediático: Una propuesta de resignificación. *Zer*, 19(36), 121-143.

FUNDING

None.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

Conceptualization: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Data curation: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Formal analysis: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Research: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Methodology: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Project management: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Resources: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Software: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Supervision: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Validation: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Visualization: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Writing - original draft: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.

Writing - review and editing: Manuel Vázquez Sejjido.