



Repositorio Institucional de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
<https://repositorio.uam.es>

Esta es la **versión de autor** del artículo publicado en:
This is an **author produced version** of a paper published in:

PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review 45.1 (2022): 56-76

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/plar.12484>

Copyright: © 2022 the American Anthropological Association

,

El acceso a la versión del editor puede requerir la suscripción del recurso
Access to the published version may require subscription

Cabezas, Marta (2022), *Patriarchal Authoritarianism Reloaded: Gender Violence, Policy Conflict, and the Resurgence of the Far Right in Spain*. *PoLAR*, 45: 56-76.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/plar.12484>

PATRIARCHAL AUTHORITARIANISM RELOADED: GENDER VIOLENCE, POLICY CONFLICT, AND THE RESURGENCE OF THE FAR RIGHT IN SPAIN

The virulent opposition to gender violence policy championed by the Spanish Far Right Party Vox since it gained political representation in December 2018 has been remarkable. This opposition has turned gender violence into a language of political struggle at a time of intense feminist mobilization and feminist influence in government. What does this ideological battle over gender violence reveal about Vox's political project? This article argues that this policy conflict provides a window through which to understand the authoritarian core of the Spanish Far Right and shows that feminist critique is key to its unpacking. It proposes further research venues for an anthropology of the state and of policy informed by feminism and engaged with the pressing problems of our times.

[gender violence policy, anthropology of the state, feminism, Vox, authoritarianism]

***Acknowledgements::** I would like to thank Angeles Ramírez for giving me the terrific suggestion of publishing with PoLAR; to Alexandre Pichel and Begonya Enguix for many insightful exchanges and to my informants. This research has been possible thanks to the InterTalentum fellowship (GA 713366), co-funded by the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (MSCA) of the European Commission and the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.*

When Madrid City Hall held a minute of silence for a victim of gender violence on September 19, 2019, Spanish Far Right Party Vox members appeared unexpectedly holding a banner that read “Violence has no gender” and, below in smaller letters, “Against all forms of violence within the family.” This was in opposition to the sign that read “Stop now! No to gender violence,” around which all other city councilors had gathered. The conservative mayor, despite being in an alliance with the Far Right to govern Madrid, confronted Javier Ortega Smith, Vox’s leader of the Municipal Council. In front of the media, he told him that while he disagrees “with gender ideology and 8M feminism,” gender violence is “the number one cause of violent homicides in Madrid” (*El Mundo* 2019) (Figures 1–3).¹ This confrontation illustrates the tensions between the traditional Right and the Far Right, as well as the crucial role of gender politics in the ambivalent process of competition and collaboration between these two right-wing parties.





[Source: Agencia EFE]

Spanish exceptionalism as related to the rise of the Far Right in Europe ended abruptly when, in December 2018, Vox, a scission of the conservative Partido Popular, gained representation. Since then, Vox has relentlessly targeted gender violence policies. There is an emergent body of gender-sensitive journalistic, activist, and academic research on the rise of the Spanish Far Right (Casals 2019; Rubio-Pueyo 2019; Urbán 2019), including from feminist researchers (Alabao 2018, 2020; Cabezas 2022; Carreras 2019; Pérez Colinas 2020). Overall, this burgeoning field recognizes antifeminism as a defining feature of the Spanish Far Right, and that public policies on gender violence are under attack. Even with this work, the “symbolic centrality” (Wright and Reinhold 2011, 88) that this feminist policy has for the Far Right in Spain, and the significance of gender at large in the rise of Vox, remains undertheorized.

Spanish legislation on gender violence has focused on the mistreatment of women, specifically by intimate heterosexual partners or ex-partners. This limited definition, often considered reductionist by feminist movements, only considers gender violence within the context of intimate relations between a heterosexual couple. Opening these sites up to the scrutiny of the state, such policies therefore present a challenge to the normative ideal of the patriarchal family as an autonomous private sphere under the authority of men as fathers and as husbands, whose defense is the common ground of heterogeneous right-wing religious and nationalist movements (Bjork-James 2020; Cooper 2017). Moving beyond previous right-wing resistance to gender violence

regulation, this new Far Right Party flatly maintains that “violence has no gender,” thus reframing it as a genderless violence within the family and labeling feminists as “feminazis.”

What does this “ideological struggle” (Hall 2005, 76) on gender violence policy reveal about the political project of the Spanish Far Right? What is at stake in this policy conflict? I argue that gender violence policy has become a symbol of the democratic politics that the Spanish Far Right opposes. This turns gender violence into a privileged “window” (Shore and Wright 2011) from which to explore the authoritarian process and the forms of gendered governmentality (Foucault 1991) that Vox embodies and pursues. This opens new venues for a feminist anthropology of the state in the actual context of “shameless normalization” (Wodak 2021) of the Far Right worldwide. This normalization is largely an outcome of the Far Right’s increasing representation within state institutions, through which they are then in a position to instrumentalize democratic procedures for de-democratizing ends. The result is a blurring of the boundaries between what is legitimate and illegitimate in democratic politics. The Spanish case provides insight into this process at its early stages.

The emergence of Vox in Spain is often related to the territorial crisis brought about by Catalan separatism, the statewide austerity measures that followed the financial crisis of 2008, and even with the legacy of the fascist dictatorship of Francisco Franco. In this article, I link Vox’s emergence with the transnational “anti-gender movements” that

oppose gender and sexual democracy (Kuhar and Paternotte 2017), a key piece of the Spanish Right's "political ecology" (Holmes 2019, 63). The "gender ideology" discourse is the lingua franca of this antidemocratic movement. This is a discourse crafted initially by the Vatican in the 1990s to counter the de-naturalizing of the sex-gender order and to accuse feminism and LGBTBIQ+ movements of imposing "ideological" interpretations of reality. Creating moral panic and juxtaposing a "family approach" to so-called "gender ideology," these antigender movements target abortion, same-sex marriage, trans people's rights, inclusive sex education, gender studies, and, recently, gender violence policies.²

In recent years, feminist scholars have analyzed European Far Right politics, creating an emergent research field visible in academic journal special issues and edited books (see Dietze and Roth 2020; Graff, Kapur, and Walters 2019; Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Tuzcu, and Winkel 2018; Kötting, Bitzan, and Petö 2017; Spierings et al. 2015; Verloo and Paternotte 2018). This research stems from contexts in which the Far Right is in office, such as in Hungary or Poland, or has gained momentum over the years. The Spanish case has been absent in these groundbreaking publications. Feminist scholars have stressed that gender is a relevant lens through which to analyze the double dynamic of identification and differentiation between the conservative right and the Far Right. Grzebalska, Kováts, and Petö (2017) have formulated the notion of "gender as symbolic glue," in which they articulate how antigenderism has become the rallying point through which diverse right-wing groups converge. For these Eastern European scholars, gender

has come to signify all the evils of “(neo)liberal democracy,” turning gender into an enemy figure. Similarly, Mayer and Sauer (2017) have conceptualized gender as an “empty signifier” that is used to create emotionally charged antagonism against social democratic politics in the context of populist Far Right discourse in Austria. Rounding up these arguments, Dietze and Roth more recently have posited that gender has turned into a “meta-language” in hegemonic struggles (2020, 8).

Despite this growing body of feminist research, authoritarianism, nativism, and populism are largely recognized as the threefold ideological core of the European radical Right, while gender relations are often understood as a relevant but nonetheless secondary issue (Mudde 2007). In separating authoritarianism, nativism, and populism from gender, we lose sight of their mutually constitutive relationships. The crucial role of gender in the authoritarian processes that are reshaping current political struggles for state power as well as everyday life— both fueled and harvested by the Far Right—remains undertheorized. Understanding the diversity and commonalities of “far-right gendered ideologies” (Wodak 2021, 221) is a more fruitful path. By moving gender from the margins to the center of analyses of authoritarianism, scholars gain further insight into the intersectional “matrix of domination” (Hill Collins 2002) that the Far Right advances. For these reasons, the arguments of the Spanish Far Right around a *dispositif* (apparatus; Foucault 1979) of male domination being historically rooted and pervasive as gender violence within the family offer an opportunity to unpack patriarchal authoritarianism and the role of the state within this process. The question is not so much how the present

was produced, but: “What is the present producing?” (Moore 1987, 727). What new forms of patriarchal-authoritarian governance are emerging and becoming authoritative while the Far Right enters the dispute for the symbolic power of the state? Consequently, the scope of this ethnography is largely prospective because it tries to capture “unfolding dynamics” of uncertain consequences (Holmes 2019, 65).

Blurring the Patriarchal Boundaries of the State: A Feminist Perspective

The groundbreaking work of Philip Abrams proposed that the state is twofold: the “state-system,” an institutional structure, and the “state-idea,” an ideology that masks power ([1977] 1988), 58). Stressing that the latter requires further research, Abrams defines the ideological dimension of the state as a “message of domination” (81), which legitimizes the illegitimate. This includes male domination, as states are embedded and entangled in long-term patriarchal processes that feminist authors such as MacKinnon (1989), and more recently Segato (2016), have theorized about from different latitudes. But the legitimacy of domination cannot be taken for granted. Counter-hegemonic disputes over the symbolic power of the state over the power to name and classify (Bourdieu, Wacquant, and Farage 1994) can reshape the boundaries between the legitimate and the illegitimate (this includes violence). In fact, feminism has engaged with the state in multiple ways to delegitimize male domination: via oppositional grounds that consider the state as part of the problem, not part of the solution, or through “state feminism”

(McBride and Manzur 2010), creating interfaces with the state to negotiate rights and resources.

In a provocative shift from the usual approach to theorizing the state from its power centers, Das and Pole (2004a) propose that the state is built at its margins. Meanwhile, Sanford (2004) suggests that scholars look for the margins of the state in those places where violence is exercised by the state and its proxy forces. From this perspective, gender violence within the family can be conceptualized as a crucial state-building dispositif that draws a gendered boundary in the state's social territory, distributing power in a capillary form and producing a patriarchal continuum. This is a biopolitical apparatus, historically supported and regulated by the state, that delegates women's governance as "body-territory" (Segato 2016, 47) to the proxy forces of the paterfamilias—of men as fathers and as husbands. The effect is an imposition of a permanent "state of exception" (Agamben 2005) on women's citizenship and human rights.

But where violence is exercised, claims of citizenship might also emerge and a different research object along with it: the movement of violence from the silenced margins to symbolic power centers through collective action. This way, feminist activism engaging with the state on this issue is a collective "encounter" (Gupta 1995) that makes the state's gendered boundaries contentious in a complex effort to redefine them and to make women's complaints heard. Using the slogan "the personal is political," second wave

feminism politicized what the public-private divide of the modern nation-state hid, showing how the “sexual contract” (Pateman 1988) excludes women from the political community. In its translation to the family, the marital contract has subjected women and their offspring to the *patria potestas* (paternal power) of their husbands and fathers by subordinating them as wives and daughters to the masculine power over them.

Historically, that paternal power has included the legal and legitimate use of violence, one of the features of patriarchal societies most criticized by feminism worldwide. In this sense, combating gender violence against women within the gendered institution of the family can be interpreted as a movement to redefine the gendered boundaries of the modern nation-state in more democratic terms while simultaneously recognizing women’s suffering.

Gender Violence Within the Family and Authoritarianism in Spain: A Genealogic Approach

A genealogic approach to gender violence policy shows that it is the outcome of a thick process of politicization, led by transnational feminist networks both at international and domestic levels (Merry 2009). When the United Nations inaugurated the Decade for Women in 1975, Francisco Franco’s dictatorship was about to end. His regime extended from the end of the civil war provoked by his military coup (1936–1939) to 1975, which was far longer than those of his fascist allies Hitler and Mussolini. During his forty-year National-Catholic regime in Spain, in this vernacular fascism interwoven with religious ultraconservatism, women were considered minors and husbands had the right to

discipline their wives, who owed them obedience. Men were the sole representatives of the family, and women needed their fathers' or husbands' permission to work, dispose of their property, and travel.

The democratization process that followed the dictatorship was fertile ground on which a “state feminism” (McBride and Manzur 2010) gained momentum in Spain, when public policy and institutional arrangements for equality between men and women were established and family legislation was democratized. By the 1990s, gender violence became “The Issue, in capital letters,” as a feminist activist told me during an interview. In Spain, as in other locations during this period, regulations to “govern violence” (Marugán and Vega 2002) focused on direct violence exercised by a man on his female intimate partner—a policy move that targeted those previously held norms of male control within the patriarchal family unit.

Eventually, the consolidation of a gender violence policy field came with the unanimous approval by Spain's Parliament via the Comprehensive Law on Gender Violence in 2004, presented by the government of Rodríguez Zapatero as a hallmark of its Social-Democrat progressiveness. The social debate that preceded included feminist criticism of the positions of the “official feminism” that was used to frame the law, which considered them punitivist (Larrauri 2007). The conservative Partido Popular, while voting for the law in Parliament, supported the question of unconstitutionality of an ultraconservative judge as discriminating against men. The Constitutional Court (Sentence 59/2008)

dismissed the case, declaring the law in accordance with the constitutional principle of equality between men and women. Meanwhile, the law achieved international acclaim for its comprehensive approach that went beyond criminal punishment of direct violence by including preventive and educational measures.

The ratification in 2014 of the Council of Europe's Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence—best known as the Istanbul Convention—legitimized further feminist demands, such as expanding the definition of gender violence to include other forms of violence, particularly sexual violence. In fact, Spain's Parliament approved the State Pact on Gender Violence in 2017 to advance the country's international commitments. In short, gender violence policy had become a legitimate policy field in Spain with large international visibility.

But Vox's virulent attack on gender violence policy since their electoral breakthrough has shattered the aura of consensus of the State Pact. It has also revealed links between Vox and the transnational "antigender movement," which has a node in Spain and campaigned for Vox through the organization HazteOir-CitizenGo (Ramsey and Provost 2019). Despite the antigender network's attempts since the turn of the twenty-first century to avoid the regulation of same-sex marriage and restrict abortion in Spain, they have not been successful in reversing policy in a country where the population is reluctant to follow the dictate of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in gender and sexuality (Pichardo and Cornejo-Valle 2017). After the failure of the anti-abortion and the anti-

same-sex marriage campaigns, this movement is now targeting gender violence, as in Central and European countries where the Far Right is in office or has gained influence over the years (Roggeband and Krizsán 2021).

The Challenges of Researching “Through” a Policy Conflict

When I was in Madrid at the end of 2018 and about to begin a research project entitled “Gender Violence in the State Labyrinth,” I had not foreseen that it would have anything to do with the Far Right. Neither had I anticipated that Vox candidates would relentlessly attack gender violence policy while they campaigned in Andalusia, where they achieved representation for the first time. In that Autonomous Community (a level of governance in Spain), Vox was under the leadership of a former judge and legal activist for men’s rights, Francisco Serrano. Even though I did not expect these developments, I had previously experienced some troubling encounters with Vox and the “men’s rights activists” (also known as MRAs; for an overview, see Kimmel 2013) linked to this party. After the approval of the Comprehensive Law on Gender Violence in 2004, a woman with whom I shared social circles divorced her husband and later sued him for gender violence. What struck me was that after the divorce her ex-husband started a blog in which he called her a “feminazi” and depicted himself as a victim, while he illegally disclosed her private correspondence and documents. I discovered later that he was meeting with a group of men organizing to defend their rights in divorce and gender violence court cases. Ten years later, a young man enrolled in my course on Gender and Human Rights at a Latin American university and presented himself as a member of Vox

during the first class. My students and I experienced at a small scale the same resonance-silencing dilemma that my feminist informants narrated during fieldwork: If we responded, we made him the center of the course. If we did not, we could be engaging in a form of self-censorship. I realized that he often reversed victim and perpetrator in his interventions on gender-based violence by defending men. Much of what I initially knew about Vox's discourse, I learned from that experience. At the end of 2018 I would encounter Vox outside the classroom, as its electoral breakthrough moved this Far Right Party into mainstream politics.

As a researcher-citizen who experienced gender violence, my research is motivated by "the energizing effect of indignation" (Nader 1972, 285). I have named my methodology an ethnographic "drift" (Precarias a la Deriva 2004) through the mobile, unpredictable, and open-ended conflict on gender violence. Following this policy conflict was a highly intuitive challenge that required a great deal of openness, reflexivity, and methodological flexibility. Inspired by Nader (1972), Wright and Reinhold have proposed the strategy to study policy "through" sequences of events across a political space and time, as they move "up, down and sideways" (2011, 292) from local to national and transnational sites and back again, cutting across different social fields such as media, law, or politics. The goal of this processual approach to policy is to observe "how a new governing discourse emerges, is made authoritative, and becomes institutionalized" (101). In this case, my aim was to reveal how a patriarchal-authoritarian discourse emerged in response to moves made to recognize gender violence as a public problem through policy.

This article draws on research conducted over a fifteen-month period in Madrid, Spain's political center, through a "polymorphous engagement" with different actors across different sites and "collecting data eclectically" (Gusterson 1997, 116). This required following both the place-bound events and the more diffuse meaning-making processes attached to them. The notion of "resonance" (Snow, Vliegenthart, and Ketelaars 2018; Wodak 2021) was important in tracking the critical events of this meaning-making process from "symbolic elites" (Van Dijk 2006, 362) to media to Far Right voters and to feminist publics. I began by following the party's elite discourse online via Twitter and YouTube and offline by attending public events in person. Most of my participant observation took place in the form of an "ethnography of interfaces" (Ortner 2010, 211) in public sites (Souleles 2018, 51), where I could observe Vox's elite presentation of themselves to different audiences, mainly in electoral rallies and legislative debates. After a year of tracking, it became apparent that Vox's "frontstage performances" (Goffman [1959]2002 quoted in Wodak 2021, 15) on my research topic followed a pattern that revolved around two annual events of feminist activism: March 8 (the International Women's Day, known as 8M) and November 25 (the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women). I concentrated my field research around those events by zooming in on the gender violence conflict: observing parliamentary debates, interviewing members of Parliament (MPs) and feminists, and keeping a journal on press and social media. I conducted diverse focus groups with voters to gauge the resonance of these discourses. From a feminist standpoint (Harding 1986), I developed strategies to

gain access to the resonance of Vox's discourse among feminists "native" to this conflict by participating in feminist events, discussing with its participants and interviewing feminist MPs. To gain a larger processual perspective, I also engaged in archival research in Parliaments, the Judiciary and media outlets.

Additionally, I applied critical discourse analysis to policy documents and statements from Vox, looking for discursive strategies that manipulate information and audiences (Van Dijk 2006). This required paying close attention to the modulations for the Spanish context of the "rhetoric toolkit" of the populist Far Right identified by Wodak (2021, 9); this includes the reversal of victim and perpetrator, scapegoating, circulation of conspiracy theories, and strategies of denial, dramatization, provocation, and scandalization to set the public agenda (19–20). I also focused on the underlying process of "othering" victims of gender violence and feminists more specifically, as well as to the role of gender in the construction of the populist cleavage between "us" (the "pure people") and "them" (the "corrupt elite").

This article is the second meander of this winding drift. The action takes place in three scenarios: electoral campaigns, legislative chambers, and discussion groups. My research spans from December 2018, when Vox first achieved representation in Andalusia, to spring 2020, when the state decreed a lockdown to tackle the COVID-19 crisis. This is a significant period to understand the emergence of this Far Right Party.

Vox: From the Silenced Margins to Center Stage

The Spanish 8M movement joined the International Women's Strike in 2018 and 2019, each one achieving higher levels of participation. Only a few months after the massive feminist strike of 2018, Vox erupted onto the political scene after a series of defeats since its creation in 2013, when it split from the Partido Popular. It soon became clear that gender was being mobilized by Vox while campaigning, in responses to these movements.

Scene 1: Campaigning to "Reconquer" Spain

Spain is a highly decentralized country with three levels of government (local, Autonomous Community, and national). Between December 2018 and November 2019, four electoral cycles took place across these three levels, plus the elections for the European Parliament. During this unusual concentration of elections, Vox used the same frame of *La Reconquista de España* (The Reconquest of Spain) (Cabezas 2022). This revived the national myth of the "recovery" of Christian rule over an imagined preexisting Spain that, in this narrative, had been occupied by Muslims. Francisco Franco used this narrative against *los rojos*, the Republicans who had resisted his military coup during the civil war and who were then severely repressed during Franco's dictatorship. Along with evoking the dictatorship, this "Holy War" frame imbued Vox's campaigns with an authoritarian, masculinist, and nativist Spanish nationalism. The party performed a model of "heroic masculinity" (Kimmel 2013, 140), depicting Vox leader Santiago Abascal as a hypermasculine, muscular hero; a knight with a transcendental mission

justified by religion. During campaigns, Vox targeted “supremacist feminism” as an enemy of the Spanish nation, together with a long list of other enemies of their imagined national community (Anderson 1983): the “progressives,” the “Islamic invasion,” and the Catalan “separatists.”³ Within this frame, feminist politics were categorized as “ideological” and therefore as false and illegitimate.

During the period covered by this article Vox campaigned with the same electoral program, titled “A 100 Measures for the Living Spain,” which specified a section on “life and the family” but not on gender or women.⁴ Moreover, defending the “natural family,” Vox proposed repealing gender violence legislation and replace it with a more general law against violence within the family. They also proposed cutting funding to “radical feminists,” who it describes as *chiringuitos* (beach bars) that waste public resources on nonexistent problems. The program also emphasized Vox’s commitment to the “defense of life from conception to natural death” (18), although while campaigning the party focused less on this and more on attacking feminists and gender violence policies. Along with this antifeminist position in the electoral program, a “femonationalist” (Farris 2017) stance was staged by Rocío Monasterio, Vox’s prominent woman leader, to advance the party’s xenophobic agenda. Idealizing gender relations between Spanish men and women and advocating for a mythical “Spanish feminism” of the past century, she blamed foreign men—mostly Muslims—for machismo (Cabezas 2022).⁵

“The progressive consensus is over,” declared Vox’s secretary general at the closing rally of the general elections.⁶ While women made up only 28.7 percent of Vox voters (*El Español* 2019), by the end of 2019, Vox had received the third highest number of votes at a national level. Despite the relative success of Vox, at the national level the Socialist Party won the elections and formed a coalition left-wing government with Unidas Podemos, claiming to be feminist. In certain Autonomous Communities and city halls, however, the right-wing Partido Popular won the elections, and it depended on Vox to sustain its right-wing municipal and Autonomous Community governments. This occurred in the Andalusia, Madrid, and Murcia Autonomous Communities as well as at Madrid City Hall. In those territories, Vox had an outsized influence, pushing Partido Popular to repeal gender violence policies in exchange of their support.

After gaining representation in Madrid City Hall, Vox posted on Twitter the meme, *Ya hemos pasao* (We have already passed), which went viral. This was the title of a pro-Franco popular song that responded to the internationalist antifascist motto, *No pasarán* (They will not pass), used by the Republican resistance before Franco gained control of Madrid during the civil war (Figures 4 and 5). Identifying with a fascist “we,” Vox members seemed to suggest that their electoral success nonetheless represented a transgression of the democratic process. At the same time, the Far Right constantly denied their links to the dictatorship and complained about being called *fachas* (fascists).⁷



1:26 a. m. · 27 may. 2019 · Twitter Web Client

[Source: @vox_es, May 27, 2019]



[Source: Mikail Kolostov (1937)]

Vox tried to manipulate the memory of the dictatorship by simultaneously denying links to this heritage while also evoking it. This triggered the memory of the forty-year National-Catholic dictatorship, with its ultraconservative gender politics revolving around religion, nationalism, and the patriarchal family, and its broader backlash against women's rights. At the end of 2019, as Vox was setting out to attack gender violence policies, the state count of femicides reached a total of one thousand women murdered by their intimate partners or ex-partners since 2003 (*El Diario* 2019).

Scene 2: The Subnational Parliamentary Theaters

In the last plenary debate of Madrid's Autonomous Community Parliament before the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women, on November 25, 2019, Vox MP Alicia Rubio, made a provocative intervention. Interrupting a discussion of a left-wing initiative on sexual education in high schools, she ridiculed state reports on gender violence, saying they make Spain "look like Saudi Arabia." She complained that the Comprehensive Law had spent public resources that had yielded no impact. Rubio doubted women's testimony on gender violence processes, maintaining that "women do not always tell the truth" and declaring that "we all know cases of women who have denounced [men for gender violence] to get benefits in the divorce process." She also claimed this as a generalized social experience. She went on to describe feminism as a "cancer" composed of "lesboterrorists" and "pornofeminists" who "fraudulently represent women." Returning to the theme of the plenary session, sexual education in high schools,

Rubio opposed the courses on feminism included in the initiative, advocating instead for sewing courses, “Because, you know, sewing empowers.”⁸

Shortly after this performance, I interviewed one of Vox MPs, who requested to remain anonymous. Referring to the scandals that these Vox interventions produce, she told me that Vox discourse is systematically “misunderstood,” effectively making out Vox members as the victims of media attacks. In the next plenary session, left-wing feminist MP Mónica García of the local party Más Madrid replied to Vox by exhibiting a piece of cloth she had embroidered with “Fuck machismo” that she had posted on social networks. This had much less media resonance, despite the audacious mise en scene. In a corridor talk with Mónica García, we discussed the smoke screen hypothesis in which antigenderism is interpreted as a way to distract attention from “real problems.” While recognizing the “noise” Vox makes with its antigender violence policy stance, she stressed that defending the patriarchal family is at the core of its value system and suggested that its use is both strategic to produce polarization and a nodal point of their political project. I later encountered Beatriz Gimeno and Isabel Serra, who represent the left-wing Unidas Podemos as MPs. Serra shared with us that, in her view, Vox’s strategy of scandalization was unfair because “we cannot compete against them with arguments.” She reflected that the disproportionate resonance created by Vox on issues such as gender violence was louder than the Vox MP’s complaint that the Far Right was being made a victim by the media. The socialist MP Lorena Morales concluded: “women’s rights have turned negotiable.”

On November 25, 2019—the day devoted to feminist activism against violence—Vox boycotted the annual official declaration against gender violence that was held at Madrid City Hall. As a symbolic instrument that requires unanimity, the same thing happened in every city hall and autonomous community where Vox had achieved political representation. Despite Vox’s veto of the official declaration, Madrid City Hall organized as usual—an institutional act to which associations working against gender violence and the media were invited. Here, Vox performed its dissent once more, declaring that men also suffer violence and that feminist chiringuitos are “awash” with public funds. The women’s associations present at the event reacted in several ways, ranging from replying in situ, leaving the area, or stamping their feet. These clashes went viral from all the media attention. This attention and the heated political debate shifted the public conversation around the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women from discussing gender violence to centering the Far Right.

Scene 3: Discussing Gender Violence with Voters

The ultimate test of how effective a collective action frame is lies with whether it resonates with the audience being targeted (Snow, Vliegenthart, and Ketelaars 2018, 401). What are the everyday experiences that mobilize voters to align with Vox’s rejection of gender violence? In February 2020, after the perfect storm created by Vox during the November 25, 2019, day against violence, and just a few weeks before the first pandemic lockdown, I conducted three discussion groups with Far Right voters of

middle-upper class in Madrid, with one group of young men and women, one group of middle-aged women only, and the third group of middle-aged men only.

With the topic of “relationships between men and women,” participants of all three groups spontaneously brought up gender violence as central to their views on gender. Two masculinist discursive positions emerged, in a continuum from androcentrism to misogyny and claims of male victimhood to claims of male superiority. The “softer” androcentric discourse was prevalent in the younger mixed group. The discussion on gender violence drifted toward an expression of young men’s complaint of being discriminated against, which the young women appeared to support sympathetically. The much-repeated expression *hombres durmiendo en el calabozo* (men sleeping at the dungeon) after false allegations of gender violence by their female intimate partners synthesized their verdict on a law that, from their view, “humiliates” men. The male participants of this younger group described feeling disempowered, in contrast with Santiago Abascal’s display of “heroic masculinity” (Kimmel 2013, 140). “It is the end of society,” declared one of the young men, attributing a hyperbolic destructive power to feminism.

The “harder” misogynistic version went beyond identification with men, and it appeared only in the middle-aged men’s focus group. If the androcentric version of antifeminism was expressed in plaintive tones, the misogynistic stance was formulated within an aggressive war frame, where feminism was labeled as “feminazi” and Spain was in

danger of becoming a “feminist dictatorship.” The group discussed wives’ mistreatment of their husbands, stressing that in the bidirectional “marital conflicts,” men abuse with their strength and women abuse through what they described as psychological superiority. Concerns were expressed about the strategic use of gender violence legislation by “bad” and “manipulative” women in divorce proceedings to further their economic interests and to infringe father’s rights. Minoritarian expressions of dissent from Vox’s opposition to gender violence policy came from a conservative stance, closer to the Partido Popular discourse. In a moral tone of defense of the traditional family, one participant confirmed the existence of gender violence as an exception to the ideal of respectful treatment between husband and wife and supported state intervention to confront “rotten apples.”

A third femonationalist stance appeared in the groups, with more diffuse contours, only in relation to sexual violence against women, which was always represented as happening outside the Spanish family. A participant in the women-only group evoked an idealized “Spanish culture” anchored in the faraway golden age of the sixteenth century that, from her point of view, was feminist because, at that time, “men protected women.” Vindicating “our traditional Spanish feminism,” this participant also expressed nostalgia for the well-educated “Spanish gentleman” that she juxtaposed with the ill-mannered “Iberian macho,” producing a classist dichotomy. In parallel, a member in the men-only group interpreted the Reconquest as being a “feminist feat” in which Queen Isabel the Catholic had expelled “real machismo” from Spain and the whole of Europe, as long ago

as the fifteenth century, attributing to Spain a transcendental role in the construction of a Christian Europe.

Official reports estimate that fewer than 0.01 percent of the convictions relating to cases of gender violence involved false accusations by women against their intimate partners or ex-partners (Fiscalía General del Estado 2019). Nevertheless, participants in each focus group repeatedly claimed to know of men who had been victims of false accusations of gender violence. While the groups sympathized and identified with men as victims, there was little identification with women who suffered gender violence, and support for gender violence policies was hesitant and minoritarian. Vox's reframing of gender violence policy as discriminating against men was effective in mobilizing and legitimizing men's grievances and putting men's as fathers and husbands, rather than women's, rights at the center of the problem of gender violence.

Scene 4: Back to the National Scenario

These moves to boycott women's rights in relation to gender violence were intensified during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic in Spain, in spring 2020, even as the imperative to quarantine and government-mandated lockdowns exacerbated conditions of violence within homes. In an alliance with the Partido Popular, Vox tried to blame feminism for the pandemic, using a scapegoating strategy (Wodak 2021). They sued the left-wing coalition government of the Socialist Party and Unidas Podemos for not prohibiting the 2020 8M demonstrations where, they claimed, COVID-19 spread. The

court acquitted the state official who had authorized the demonstrations of the charge of a criminal offense against public health. This “judicial tsunami” (*El Plural* 2020) took place while Spain was under a state of alert, displacing the much-needed debate on public health. The feminist demonstration was used as a weapon both by Vox and the Partido Popular against a progressive, feminist, government.

What the right wing did not mention is that Vox held its third Vistalegre Rally in Madrid, also on March 8, to counter-attack the feminist demonstrations. I attended the Far Right rally in the morning and the feminist demonstrations in the afternoon, my last face-to-face participant observations before the lockdown. I found the emotional tone of this third Vistalegre Rally more troubling than the preceding one, since it appeared to be increasingly grounded in militaristic language and affect. Indeed, the military and the police were glorified throughout rally. A detail caught my attention. For the first time at a Vistalegre Rally organized by Vox, Santiago Abascal, the party’s leader, made an explicit salutation to Victor Orbán, president of Hungary, whose government banned gender studies in Hungarian universities. My stomach clenched. Javier Ortega Smith, the Vox party leader, coughed in front of the audience during his own speech in the rally. The young woman sitting next to me, cloaked in a Spanish flag, said jokingly, “I hope he doesn’t have Coronavirus!” He acknowledged the following day that he had what Vox called the “Chinese virus.” Two days later, in an official statement, the party apologized publicly for putting the party’s followers at risk, but also suggested the government should assume responsibility for not having prohibited their rally.⁹

Only a few weeks later, during pandemic lockdown in spring 2020, the Equality Minister from Unidas Podemos reported that the number of calls to the 016 telephone, the hotline to report gender violence, was significantly increasing during the lockdown. Carla Toscano, the Vox MP appointed to work on gender violence, blamed the government for wasting public resources on gender violence to the detriment of the pandemic, and of lying: “You start from a basic lie when you affirm that there is gender violence.” She called the Partido Popular “lap dogs of the left” for supporting policies against gender violence. I was later told by one of my informants that the *Acuerdos de la Villa* (city agreements) established by Madrid City Hall to tackle the COVID-19 crisis in Spain’s capital city had to remove the term “gender violence” in order to avoid Vox’s veto (Público 2020).

Final Thoughts: Gender Violence and the Unpacking of the Patriarchal

Authoritarianism of the Far Right

What does this ideological battle on gender violence reveal about the political project of the Far Right? First, as I have shown in this article, gender is not a secondary issue for the Spanish Far Right but a “primary field”—borrowing Joan Scott’s words (1996, 292)—where their struggle for power unfolds. This conflict has been crucial in shaping the political identity of the Spanish Far Right. Opposition to feminist politics has become a vector of right-wing radicalization, pushing the Partido Popular to antifeminism and producing a split between the conservative and the radical right.

Second, through this policy conflict, the place of feminist struggles in Spanish politics is at stake. Vox has put the political and social support of the State Pact on Gender Violence—an emblematic feminist policy—at risk and has dismantled the consensual ethos surrounding it. The relentless delegitimization of feminism pursued by the Far Right within democratic institutions should not be ignored. Yet, ironically, this opposition takes for granted that women have become ungovernable inside of historical patriarchal structures, especially within the traditional family.

Third, and most importantly, Vox has revealed its antidemocratic and authoritarian leanings by working to make gender violence banal, evoking Francoism while campaigning, and ultimately by defending the centrality of the patriarchal family. The (re)legitimization of historical patterns of patriarchal-authoritarian governmentality and the gendered boundaries of the state are renewed risks to the process of democratization. By zooming in on the political struggle over gender violence in Spain, I have shifted the perspective on analyzing rising authoritarianism. I have argued that gender violence is a capillary form of authoritarianism that runs through society in everyday life, imposing a permanent state of exception on women's citizenship and human rights while governing women through harm. Delegitimizing feminism and reframing gender violence around the seemingly neutral “family” rather than women-are means of restoring patriarchal authority in the family, in society, and in power centers. In the Spanish case, the rise of the Far Right is often linked to Catalan separatism. And there is a common thread that

links the territorial crisis and the crisis of patriarchy, as they can both be interpreted as two halves of a sovereignty crisis: over territory and over women.

If governing women has become a challenge that the Spanish Far Right has taken up, then a feminist critique is central to unpacking the situation. Examining the patriarchal authoritarianism embodied and pursued by the Far Right in everyday politics requires further research. I suggest four venues. First, a longer period of observation and more study sites are needed as the Far Right consolidates, including in the courts where men's rights activists are investing considerable efforts. Second, research is needed to understand how this policy conflict shapes the encounters of gender violence victims with state officials, impacts public services, and undermines social support. Third, scholars must engage in comparative ethnographies on other policy conflicts that acquire symbolic centrality in restoring patriarchal-authoritarian governance across locations. And fourth, a closer examination of transnational connections between locales could broaden understandings of the ways this patriarchal-authoritarian process travels and is vernacularized. A key point here would be to analyze how the Far Right creates contextually meaningful policy targets, as is happening with gender violence policy in Spain. In this long-term endeavor, a feminist anthropology of the state engaged with the democratic challenges of our times is crucial. The drift must continue.

Notes

I would like to thank Angeles Ramírez for giving me the terrific suggestion of publishing with *PoLAR*; to Alexandre Pichel and Begonya Enguix for many insightful exchanges and to my informants. This research has been possible thanks to the InterTalentum fellowship (GA 713366), co-funded by the Marie Curie Program of the European Commission and the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

¹ “8M” refers to the feminist platform that organizes the yearly feminist activism campaign on March 8 in Spain for International Women’s Day.

² For an overview of antigender movements (also called “antigenderism”) and their “gender ideology” discourse, see Corredor 2019 and Bracke and Paternotte 2016. For a comprehensive approach to the European context, see Kuhar and Paternotte 2017. For the Spain context, see Pichardo and Cornejo-Valle 2017.

³ Vox, *Presentación De Candidatos Vox–Cubierta De Leganés* [Presentation of Vox candidates in Leganés bullring], April 6, 2019, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=29ScqmbAwho>, video, 0:15 seconds. All translations from the originals are by the author

⁴ *100 Medidas para la España Viva* [100 measures for the living Spain], program, 17–19, https://www.voxespana.es/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/100medidasngal_101319181010040327.pdf.

⁵ Vox, *Las feministas no quieren oír hablar de las familias* [Feminists don't want to hear about families], April 2, 2019, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RGywDeJIarM>, video, 6:09.

⁶ Vox, *Acto De Cierre De Campaña En Colón* [Campaign closing rally in Colón], April 26, 2019, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKqw21dqDVg>, video, 1:15:08.

⁷ Vox, *¡Fachas!* [Fascists!], October 8, 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KKayOL-HE30>, video, 2:44. (Extract from the first Vistalegre Rally.)

⁸ Asamblea de Madrid, “Sesión Plenaria” [Plenary session], November 14, 2020, <https://mediateca.asambleamadrid.es/library/items/sesion-plenaria-2019-11-14?part=a5c81264-2e5b-43e8-b3e6-ad195f6af82a&start=1749>.

⁹ Vox, *Comunicado oficial de Vox sobre el COVID-19* [Vox official statement on COVID-19], <https://www.voxespana.es/actualidad/comunicado-oficial-de-vox-sobre-el-covid-19-20200310>.

References Cited

- Abrams, Philip. (1977) 1988. "Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 1 (1): 58–89.
- Agamben, Giorgio. 2005. "State of Exception." In *Politics, Metaphysics, and Death: Essays on Giorgio Agamben's Homo Sacer*, edited by Andrew Norris, 284–298. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Alabao, Nuria. 2018. "La Guerra De Vox Contra El Feminismo" [Vox war against feminism]. *Revista Contexto*, December 4, <https://ctxt.es/es/20181129/Firmas/23216/Nuria-Alabao-machismo-en-vox-masculinizacionneofascismo-Santiago-Abascal.htm> .
- . 2020. "Defender a la Familia contra Migrantes y Mujeres: Convergencias entre Antifeminismo y Soberanismo" [Defending the family against migrants and women: Convergences between antifeminism and sovereignty movements]. In *Familia, Raza y Nación en Tiempos de Posfascismo* [Family, race and nation in times of postfascism], 111–26. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Bjork - James, Sophie. 2020. "White Sexual Politics: The Patriarchal Family in White Nationalism and the Religious Right." *Transforming Anthropology* 28 (1): 58–73.
- Bracke, Sarah, and David Paternotte. 2016. "Unpacking the Sin of Gender." *Religion and Gender* 6 (2): 143–54.

- Bourdieu, Pierre, Loic J. D. Wacquant, and Samar Farage. "Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field." *Sociological Theory* 12, no. 1 (1994): 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.2307/202032>.
- Cabezas, Marta. 2022. "Silencing Feminism? Gender and the Rise of the Nationalist Far Right in Spain." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 47 (2): 319–45.
- Carreras, Judith. 2019. "Neoderechas y Antifeminismo" [The new right and antifeminism]. *Viento Sur* (166): 51–62.
- Casals, Xavier. 2019. "Vox Contra el Feminismo" [Vox against feminism]. *El Periódico*, March 21. <https://www.elperiodico.com/es/opinion/20190320/articulo-opinion-vox-contra-el-feminismo-por-xavier-casals-7364670>.
- Cooper, Melinda. 2017. *Family Values: Between Neoliberalism and the New Social Conservatism*. New York: Zone Books.
- Corredor, Elizabeth S. 2019. "Unpacking 'Gender Ideology' and the Global Right's Antigender Countermovement." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 44 (3): 613–38.
- Das, Veena, and Deborah Poole, eds. 2004a. *Anthropology in the Margins of the State*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- . 2004b. "State and Its Margins: Comparative Ethnographies." In *Anthropology in the Margins of the State*, edited by Veena Das and Deborah Poole, 3–33. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Dietze, Gabriele, and Julia Roth, eds. 2020. *Right-Wing Populism and Gender: European Perspectives and Beyond*. Bielefeld, Germany: Transcript Verlag.

El Diario. 2019. “La violencia machista deja mil mujeres asesinadas por hombres en los últimos dieciséis años” [Male violence leaves one thousand women murdered by men in the last sixteen years], June 10,
https://www.eldiario.es/sociedad/violencia-machista-mujeres-asesinadas-hombres_1_1510288.html

El Español. 2019. “Vox sólo tuvo un 28% de votantes mujeres pero Unidas Podemos tampoco pasó del 35,9%” [Vox only had 28% of women voters but Unidas Podemos did not exceed 35.9% either], May 3, Politics,
https://www.elespanol.com/espana/politica/20190503/vox-solo-votantes-mujeres-unidas-podemos-paso/395461331_0.html

El Mundo 2019. “Almeida se enfrenta a Ortega Smith por boicotear el minuto de silencio por la última víctima de violencia machista” [Almeida confronts Ortega Smith for boycotting the minute’s silence for the latest victim of gender-based violence], September 19, Madrid,
<https://www.elmundo.es/madrid/2019/09/19/5d835746fc6c83e8778b4644.html>

El Plural. 2020. “España, el único país del mundo en el que la derecha llevó el 8M a los tribunales culpando a las mujeres de expandir el coronavirus” [Spain, the only country in the world where the right wing took 8M to court blaming women for spreading the coronavirus], June 12.
https://www.elplural.com/politica/espana/espana-unico-pais-mundo-derecha-llevo-8m-tribunales-culpando-mujeres-expandir-coronavirus_261293102

- Farris, Sara R. 2017. *In the Name of Women's Rights: The Rise of Femonationalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Fiscalía General del Estado. 2019. *Memoria De La Fiscalía General del Estado* [Report of the State's General Attorney]. Madrid: Ministry of Justice.
- Foucault, Michel. 1979. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. London: Allen Lane.
- . 1991. *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Graff, Agnieszka, Ratna Kapur, and Suzanna Danuta Walters. 2019. "Gender and the Rise of the Global Right." Special issue, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 44 (3): 541–60. doi:10.1086/701152.
- Grzebalska, Weronika, Esther Kováts, and Andrea Petö. 2017. "Gender as Symbolic Glue: How 'Gender' Became an Umbrella Term for the Rejection of the (Neo)Liberal Order." *Political Critique*. <http://politicalcritique.org/long-read/2017/gender-as-symbolic-glue-how-gender-became-an-umbrella-term-for-the-rejection-of-the-neoliberal-order/>
- Gupta, Akhil. 1995. "Blurred Boundaries: The Discourse of Corruption, the Culture of Politics, and the Imagined State." *American Ethnologist* 22 (2): 375–402.
- Gusterson, Hugh. 1997. "Studying Up Revisited." *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 20 (1): 114–19.
- Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Encarnación, Pinar Tuzcu, and Heidemarie Winkel. 2018. "Introduction: Feminisms in Times of Anti-Genderism, Racism and Austerity."

- Special issue, *Women's Studies International Forum* 68: 139–41.
doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2018.03.008.
- Hall, Stuart. 2005. "The Rediscovery of 'Ideology': Return of the Repressed in Media Studies." In *Culture, Society and the Media*, edited by John Storey, 61–95. London: Routledge.
- Harding, Sandra G. 1986. *The Science Question in Feminism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hill Collins, Patricia. 2002. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. London: Routledge.
- Holmes, Douglas R. 2019. "Fascism at Eye Level: The Anthropological Conundrum." *Focaal* 84 (2019): 62–90. doi:10.3167/fcl.2019.840105
- Kimmel, Michael. 2013. *Angry White Men: American Masculinity at the End of an Era*. New York: Nation Books.
- Köttig, Michaela, Renate Bitzan, and Andrea Petö, eds. 2017. *Gender and Far Right Politics in Europe*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kuhar, Roman, and David Paternotte, eds. 2017. *Anti-Gender Campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing Against Equality*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Larrauri, Elena. 2007. *Criminología Crítica y Violencia de Género* [Critical criminology and gender violence]. Madrid: Trotta.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. 1989. *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Marugán, Begoña, and Cristina Vega. 2002. "Gobernar la Violencia. Apuntes para un Análisis de la Rearticulación del Patriarcado" [Governing violence. Notes for an analysis of the rearticulation of patriarchy]. *Política y Sociedad* 2 (39): 415–36.
- Mayer, Stephanie, and Birgit Sauer. 2017. "Gender Ideology in Austria: Coalitions Around an Empty Signifier." In *Anti-Gender Campaigns in Europe: Mobilizing Against Equality*, edited by Roman Kuhar and David Paternotte, 23–40. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- McBride, Dorothy, and Amy Manzur, eds. 2010. *The Politics of State Feminism: Innovation in Comparative Research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Merry, Sally Engle. 2009. *Human Rights and Gender Violence: Translating International Law into Local Justice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moore, Sally Falk. 1987. "Explaining the Present: Theoretical Dilemmas in Processual Ethnography." *American Ethnologist* 14 (4): 727–36.
- Mudde, Cas. 2007. *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Nader, Laura. 1972. "Up the Anthropologists! Perspectives Gained from Studying Up." In *Reinventing Anthropology*, edited by Dell Hymes, 284–311. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Ortner, Sherry B. 2010. "Access: Reflections on Studying Up in Hollywood." *Ethnography* 11 (2): 211–33. doi: 10.1177/1466138110362006.
- Pateman, Carole. 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Pérez Colina, Marisa. 2020. “Instrumentalización de la Defensa de los Derechos de las Mujeres y Racialización del Sexismo” [The instrumentalization of the defense of women’s rights and the racialization of sexism]. In *Familia, Raza y Nación en Tiempos de Posfascismo* [Family, race and nation in times of postfascism], edited by Fundación los Comunes, 99–110. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.
- Pichardo, Jose Ignacio, and Mónica Cornejo-Valle. 2017. “La ‘Ideología de Género’ Frente a los Derechos Sexuales y Reproductivos. El Escenario Español” [“‘Gender ideology’ against sexual and reproductive rights. The Spanish scenario”]. *Cadernos Pagu* (50). <https://doi.org/10.1590/18094449201700500009>.
- Precarias a la Deriva. 2004. *A la deriva por los circuitos de la precariedad femenina* [Drifting through the circuits of women’s precarity]. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.
- Público*. 2020. “Los Pactos de la Villa” consiguen un acuerdo de 352 puntos pero se ‘olvidan’ de la movilidad y de la violencia de género [“Pactos de la Villa” reach 352-point agreement but ‘forget’ about mobility and gender-based violence], July 7, <https://www.publico.es/publico-tv/publico-al-dia/programa/882779/los-pactos-de-la-villa-consiguen-un-acuerdo-de-352-puntos-pero-se-olvidan-de-la-movilidad-y-de-la-violencia-de-genero>
- Ramsey, Adam, and Clare Provost. 2019. “Revealed: The Trump-Linked ‘Super PAC’ Working behind the Scenes to Drive Europe’s Voters to the Far Right.” *Open Democracy*, April 25. <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/5050/revealed-the->

[trump-linked-super-pac-working-behind-the-scenes-to-drive-europes-voters-to-the-far-right/](#)

Roggeband, Conny, and Andrea Krizsán. 2021. *Politicizing Gender and Democracy in the Context of the Istanbul Convention*. London: Palgrave.

Rubio-Pueyo, Vicente. 2019. *Vox. ¿Una Nueva Extrema Derecha en España?* [Vox. A new extreme right in Spain?]. New York: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung.

Scott, Joan W. 1986. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *American Historical Review* 91 (5): 1053–75.

Sanford, Victoria. 2004. "Contesting Displacement in Colombia: Citizenship and State Sovereignty at the Margins." In *Anthropology in the Margins of the State*, edited by Veena Das and Debora Poole, 253–77. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Segato, Rita Laura. 2016. *La Guerra Contra Las Mujeres* [The war against women]. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.

Shore, Cris, and Susan Wright. 2011. "Conceptualising Policy: Technologies of Governance and the Politics of Visibility." In *Policy Worlds: Anthropology and the Analysis of Contemporary Power*, edited by Cris Shore, Susan Wright, and Davide Però, 1–31. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Snow, David, Rens Vliegthart, and Pauline Ketelaars. 2018. "The Framing Perspective on Social Movements: Its Conceptual Roots and Architecture." In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah A.

- Soule, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Holly J. McCammon, 392–410. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Souleles, Daniel. 2018. “How to Study People Who Do Not Want to be Studied: Practical Reflections on Studying Up.” *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, 41 (S1): 51–68. doi:10.1111/plar.12253
- Spierings, Niels, Andrej Zaslove, Liza M. Mügge, and Sarah L. de Lange. 2015. “Gender and Populist Radical-Right Politics: An Introduction.” *Patterns of Prejudice* 49 (1–2): 3–15. doi:10.1080/0031322X.2015.1023642.
- Urbán, Miguel. 2019. *La Emergencia de Vox. Apuntes para Combatir a la Extrema Derecha Española* [Vox’s emergence. Notes on combating the Spanish extreme right]. Barcelona: Crítica & Alternativa.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 2006. “Discourse and Manipulation.” *Discourse & Society* 17 (3): 359–383.
- Verloo, Mieke, and David Paternotte. 2018. “The Feminist Project Under Threat in Europe.” *Politics and Governance* 6 (3): 1–5.
- . 2019a. “*Las Mujeres De Vox Rompen Con La Huelga Feminista*,” March 4. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xmZYJxOwHuE>.
- . 2020. “*¡Fachas! Discurso de Santiago Abascal en Vistalegre*” [Fascists! Santiago Abascal discourse in Vistalegre]. October 8. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KKayOL-HE30>.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2021. *The Politics of Fear: The Shameless Normalization of Far-Right Discourse*, 2nd ed. New York: Sage.

Wright, Susan, and Sue Reinhold. 2011. “‘Studying Through’: A Strategy for Studying Political Transformation. Or Sex, Lies and British Politics.” In *Policy Worlds. Anthropology and the Analysis of Contemporary Power*, edited by Cris Shore, Susan Wright, and Davide Però, 86–104. Oxford: Berghahn Books.