We are IntechOpen, the world’s leading publisher of Open Access books 
Built by scientists, for scientists

6,600 Open access books available
177,000 International authors and editors
195M Downloads

154 Countries delivered to
TOP 1% Our authors are among the most cited scientists
12.2% Contributors from top 500 universities

WEB OF SCIENCE™
Selection of our books indexed in the Book Citation Index
in Web of Science™ Core Collection (BKCI)

Interested in publishing with us? 
Contact book.department@intechopen.com

Numbers displayed above are based on latest data collected. 
For more information visit www.intechopen.com
Abstract

The claim of the recognition of individual and collective identities is in charge of the social and political debate. What have traditionally been struggles for material reasons, class interests now move to the cultural. In this way, a displacement of the material to the symbolic is produced. With this emphasis on the recognition of identities, regardless of many times, faced with each other, that is, gays, lesbians, transgender people, and transgender suffer very different discrimination in the field of cultural in this work we intend to reflect on whether identities are really as malleable and so dependent on the will of individuals as it is intended, and if social equality can be achieved exclusively through cultural policies, as well as analyze whether the emphasis on the identity helps to achieve the objectives of the collective or if, on the contrary, it ends up being harmful to it.
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1. Introduction

In this work, we intend to carry out a reflection on the identity or identities, on their alleged malleability and/or fluidity, in addition to their ability to achieve the social transformations that they supposedly have as their objective.

In our Western societies, the demand for social and political recognition of identities, both individual and collective, has taken on great importance in recent years. In other words, there has been a shift from struggles over economic and material issues to those aimed at cultural and symbolic aspects and of what is related to the tangible, measurable, and verifiable: the objective, to the level of the merely subjective: what a person can feel from their internal experience, although it cannot be perceived by anyone else.

These postulates defend that each person has the right to self-define as it considers in a flexible and fluid way and that, in addition, it can do it without further
limitations than those that he herself self-imposes. In this way, external conditions are denied: social, political, economic and even biological. It reaches the extreme of converting mere subjective perceptions elements of belonging so anchored in the position occupied by individuals in the social structure such as: social class, sex and gender; Basic elements in the social classification structure in our societies. That is, it is intended that people can choose freely without more external interference, what social class or to what sex or gender they belong, without taking into account factors as objectives as the capital they possess, the sexual organs or the education they have received. None of this is relevant, the only thing that matters is the internal perception of the individual and his will. In this way concepts such as: class identity, sex identity or gender identity are used, when class consciousness should be discussed, and extrapolating this terminology: sex and gender awareness. In some cases, it seems that they are essential characteristics of individuals, that is, they are born with them and are entitled to express them freely. Paradoxically, because this contradicts the approach to the fluidity and flexibility of identities, since, if they are essential, the will of individuals would not play any role in their creation. Therefore, two completely opposite, contradictory and incompatible positions are defended.

This shift from material claims to cultural ones, with its corresponding emphasis on identity, has the effect of continuously creating borders between the different groups that compete with each other for that recognition instead of fighting together for common goals. Which has a double effect: on the one hand, it ends up dividing LGBT groups into a multitude of particular identities; and secondly, it benefits the strongest, which in this case would be gay men, to the detriment of the rest. This produces discrimination against other groups within the collective and even the invisibility of some. This is the case of the transsexual group when using the prefix trans as an umbrella term, including transsexual and transgender people, when they have very different conditions and totally opposite objectives, values, and approaches, as discussed below.

Likewise, we see how the queer movement has abandoned any analysis of power relations and, therefore, of patriarchy, focusing its attacks against feminism. As Gimeno points out, in queer theory, “universal concepts are replaced by an anomie of meanings that prevent the articulation of any political subject that can confront power or oppression” [1].

The emphasis on identities, therefore, is making the LGBT collective political from which it is possible to carry out a critical analysis of the system of oppression, articulate resistances and claim substantial changes that directly affect the power structures that build that system of oppression.

2. What do we understand by identity?

Throughout history, the concept of identity has been understood in various ways:

In ancient times, identity was considered as an essential substance that was not subject to changes or transformations, without cracks or contradictions [2], so it consisted of something stable and permanent [3].

In Modernity, identity was considered as something that the individual develops in his relationship with the environment, especially with significant others. Consequently, identity is considered as the product of the socio-communicative processes that are established between the individual and his or her environment [2]. In this perspective, identity is something that is built through relationships with others.
and with the world around us. It is not something that belongs only to the individual, but is created by people in their interaction with the environment.

Postmodernity considers that identity is fluid, unstable, and fragmented, in which multiple unresolved contradictions are produced [2]. Therefore, it is something temporary and temporary. According to postmodernism, identity is not something fixed or stable, but something that is constantly changing and often contradictory. Postmodernists believe that there are multiple unresolved contradictions within identity. This means that identity is not something unitary, but something fragmentary. Furthermore, postmodernists believe that identity is temporary and can be changed.

These conceptions of identity should not be considered exclusive or contradictory, rather they can be understood as complementary since they all provide something essential to understand this difficult concept. It is necessary that there is an invariable, stable part that allows us to recognize ourselves and that others recognize us at different chronological moments and different situations. Obviously, people, as social beings that we are, we are built as individuals in relation to our environment and we are strongly influenced by the social categories established in the construction of our identity, therefore, identity is, at the same time, dynamic and varies throughout our life and in different situations. In addition, it must also be taken into account that there is a more or less important part in that construction, which depends on the individual’s will as being able to make decisions about his own life [4].

The first time this concept was used from a psycho-sociological perspective was in 1946 by Erik Erikson [5]. In its most basic form, identity is a set of principles, beliefs, and values that define who we are. These principles, beliefs, and values help determine our actions and procedures. We all have different identities, but we also have a set of shared identities. These shared identities are based on the general belief in the same set of principles, beliefs, and values.

Hall considers that identity is the “meeting point” between the discourses and social practices that place individuals in a place within society and the very subjectivities of individuals who have the ability to make decisions [5]. Álvarez-Muñáriz, meanwhile, understands that identity is “the awareness and assumption of ways of being, thinking and acting that give meaning and meaning to a person’s life” [6]. Personal identity is the concept that an individual has about himself, while social identity is definitions or categorizations made by the environment “the others” about the individual. That is, how others see us. Therefore, we can consider that identity has two dimensions: one individual and one social. Or, as Álvarez Munárriz points out, an interpersonal dimension and an extrapersonal dimension [6]. These two dimensions are inseparable, they form a unit.

For Giddens, identities are the product of a reflexive process that occurs throughout life and that connects the individual with himself and with social norms [7]. While Duggan considers that:

“Identities cross the space between the social world and subjective experience, constituting a central organizing principle that connects the ‘I’ and the world. Multiple and contradictory individual identities structure and give meaning to personal experience. Collective identities -of gender, class or nation- forge connections between individuals and provide links between past and present, constituting the basis of the cultural representation of political action” [8].

Therefore, individual identity is the way a person defines himself. It is what makes a person unique and different from everyone else. Social identity is the way a person is perceived by others. It is what makes a person identify with a social or cultural group. Individual and social identities are interconnected, so that a person's social identity is
conditioned by her personal identity and, to a large extent, it is built based on social identity.

In general, identity refers to the unique characteristics and attributes that make up an individual. This can include things such as ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and even personal preferences and interests. Everyone has their own unique identity that makes them who they are. However, these criteria on which that individual identity is based are usually socially defined. Therefore, we can say that it is created and recreated daily, through relationships with others and with the world [3]. Identity is not something that belongs only to the individual, but is created by the individual through relationships with others and with the world around him. It is said to be something social [3].

From these definitions, we can conclude that identity is something that concerns both the individual and the collective, that it implies, at the same time, inclusion and exclusion, and that its function is to endow a person’s life with meaning and connect individuals with the world. Environment.

3. How is identity constructed?

There is no single answer to this question, as identity is a complex and multi-layered concept. However, there is considerable agreement that identity is built through our interactions with others, as well as through the stories we tell and, we tell ourselves, about ourselves. Furthermore, our identities are shaped by the groups to which we belong, as well as the cultural and social norms to which we are exposed.

Identities are formed progressively throughout life, although the most critical stages are childhood and adolescence. They are built based on the interpersonal relationships that are established throughout life, and there are many factors that intervene in the formation of an identity: age, sex, religion, culture, family, social environment, etc. The family constitutes, however, a fundamental starting point in this process, since it is where the first values, norms, beliefs, behaviors, roles, and the first notions of how individuals think of themselves are assumed. In fact, the first relationship we have with identity stems from the identification that our closest environment makes of us. As Torregrosa points out:

“Even before we can identify ourselves with our name, or with our body, or with our parents, etc., we are identified by them and through them. Our identity is, prior to our personal identity, an identity for others. Only from the others can we have initial news of who we are” [9].

Therefore, any idea we have of ourselves arises through the capture of the self-image in the other [9].

Within the more or less wide range of possibilities that we have at our disposal, we can choose, to a certain extent, with what, and with what not to identify. Although, paradoxically, what we choose not to identify with can also be part of our identity in a conscious or unconscious way [5].

Later, as the relational environment expands, identity development will be subject to other influences [10]. Therefore, the construction of identity is a complex process that takes place throughout the life of the individual. As Marcús points out “...identities are built on the basis of previous significant experiences: they are based on historically constructed habits considering social and individual trajectories. So they are not established on a void even once and for all” [2].
In this way, identity determines the way in which we see and interpret the world and how we relate to the social context. That is, as we have mentioned before, the concept that an individual has of himself will be a reflection of what his environment. It has led him to believe about himself, although this does not mean that the subject is completely passive in the construction of his identity and simply limits himself to acting as a mirror of what his context transmits to him. Each subject has their own personal ways of interpreting this information and elaborates it based on many other elements. For example, a socially stigmatized person will reflect that stigma in his identity, but that stigma does not come from within, but is produced by the social context. In the case of sexual diversity, we can find internalized homophobia, caused by the stigma attached to non-heterosexual orientations. Internalized homophobia would consist of the personal assumption of social rejection of sexual diversity by people belonging to sexual minorities [10].

Each subject has several nodal identities from which the other elements are organized. These nodes are not definitive, but rather vary depending on various factors and take on relevance depending on the context [11]. The most common are: nationality, sex, religion, age, social class, profession, etc. These are socially defined differentiation criteria, which constitute a collective knowledge and, therefore, are internalized by the individuals of that society, so they are part of their own consciences [12].

Understanding that identity is a social construction does not mean that people’s ability to influence its creation is denied, but rather it underlines that this construction is carried out jointly with the environment “but whose rules of composition are derived from that context, and not of the organism that supports it” [9]. This link between the environment and the individual is what allows people to know their place in the world. As García-Martínez points out:

“The relationship with the world and with existence allows the individual to become aware of himself and thus define his identity. The question “who am I?” can only be understood accompanied by two other questions: “what are my relationships with others?” and “how do I position myself in the world?” [11].

4. Identity, difference, and power

Identity is built through difference [13], because it is what allows an individual or a group to distinguish themselves from others. This requires establishing a border between the “identical” and the “different.” That is, for there to be an identity, there must necessarily be an otherness or alterity. Only in this way can identities serve as elements of “identification and adhesion” [4]. This construction is not based on all the characteristics, nor on objective criteria, but is usually carried out through a selection of elements that are socially created as criteria of social differentiation, such as: class, sex, age, sexual orientation, etc. In this way, “identity difference is not the direct consequence of cultural difference; The particular culture does not by itself produce a differentiated identity; this can only result from the interactions between groups and from the modes of differentiation that they incorporate into their relationships” [11]. Following Butler, we can say that identities are constituted through exclusion, creating an outside where they would find constituted subjects as “abject and marginal” [14]. Bauman supports this idea arguing that “Identity means to stand out: to be different and unique by virtue of that difference, so that the search for identity can only divide and separate” [12].
The construction of an identity not only requires the constitution of borders that separate what is identical from what is different, but also supposes the creation of a hierarchy in which the “outside” is located at a lower level, while what is that remains inside acquires the quality of substantial, essential. This leads us to affirm that identities are constructed within “the game of power and exclusion” [13]. Expanding on this idea, Marcús affirms that, for the construction of identities, what is excluded acquires more importance than what is included, and that these differences are established through a series of power games [2]. Identity categories usually have a moral component and seek to establish a social hierarchy, with some groups being considered more worthy and valuable than others for possessing certain characteristics.

In these power relations, certain individuals and groups have the ability to impose the criteria through which limits and hierarchies are established and, therefore, to establish the definitions of themselves and others.

“The set of identity definitions works as a classification system that fixes the respective positions of each group. Legitimate authority has the symbolic power of making its categories of representation of social reality and its own principles of division of the social world be recognized as well-founded…” [11].

It is from these games of power that the lens of the gaze is established and through which the everyday becomes “just as it is.” This position is determined by the different power relations (economic, political, and cultural) that constitute the different fields [15]. These categories tend to create and “reproduce social reality” based on the interests of those who have the power to control the creation of identity categories [9] and the ability to include or exclude others from these categories and the benefits that come with them.

This situation creates inequalities of opportunity and power because some people are included in certain identity categories and are therefore considered full members of society and its institutions, while others are excluded and considered outsiders. In this way, one of the main functions of these categories is to reproduce a social hierarchy and the inclusion or exclusion of certain groups based on the evaluation of their value and social importance [9].

In conclusion, identity categories are created and used by people to establish social relationships and communicate their social position. These categories are created and used to constitute and reproduce a social hierarchy and establish a social order. As Butler indicates: “Identity is a culturally limited principle of order and hierarchy, a regulatory fiction” [14].

A person can be made up of a number of different identities [16]. For Bourdieu, one does not have an identity, but a series of identities that imply a certain number of oppositional relations, that is, one is really an inhabitant of a specific field, of a determined class, of a series of positions within the fields, and finally, of a system of power relations that define and determine the identity of the individual. In this way, the content of an identity is determined by a set of positions within a social structure [15].

In this way, at the end of the 19th century, the concept of homosexuality appears within medical and legal discourses, considering it as a “global identity that is imposed on the subject” [17]. That is, what until then were considered only as simple sexual practices that did not define the individual who carried them out, end up becoming “identities and political conditions that must be studied, reported, persecuted, punished, cured” [18]. Thus, the totality of an individual’s being is defined from a partial category such as sexuality, “taking the part for the whole” [16]. From that moment on, a progressive essentialization of sexuality, gender, and sexual
difference takes place, until it ends up being elevated to the category of natural and placing them beyond any historical or cultural context [19].

Therefore, homosexuality is an invented category, a category that exists only in the cultural and social struggle of a society, it is neither natural nor universal. Thus, the invented category of homosexuality is a reflection of the generalized discrimination against sexual and gender minorities, inherent to the heteropatriarchal structure of our societies. Likewise, Foucault defines the heteronorm as a “dominant system of representation and forms of practice that privileges and normalizes heterosexuality as universal and natural” [17].

Homosexual identity is constructed from a medical definition, and the exclusion that it causes, results in power relations. The individual can only be thought of within the sociocultural parameters in which he inserts himself. Building an identity around sexual orientation is something that only non-heterosexual people do. Therefore, sexuality forms an important part of the identity only of those who have non-heterosexual sexualities.

Identity can only be built based on social schemes that allow it. For example, homosexual identity is constructed from a context of know-how that creates homosexuality as a determining characteristic of individuals, not only as behaviors. That means that “excessive” homosexuality can only be done within the context and in the parameters that marks the “medication”. Consequently, the “homosexual identity” is created from outside individuals and assumed and claimed by the subjects who fall within that definition and, therefore, are excluded by it. In this way, we can affirm that, creating identities based on categories established by the same system that builds discrimination strategies, ends up being a way to submit to that system.

5. Redistribution recognition

In this context, Fraser argues that, since the end of the twentieth century, social and political struggles have gone from seeking economic redistribution to claiming cultural recognition, that is, group identities [18].

This author suggests that there are two types of injustice: economic and cultural or symbolic. The first is located in the economic structure of society, and its solution consists of the redistribution of wealth [18]. The second is located in the social patterns of “representation, interpretation and communication” [18], in it would be found, among others, sexuality. The solution to this type of injustice would have to do with the recognition of diversity [18].

Therefore, redistribution would deal with material issues such as income, property, and access to basic goods among which would be for example: housing, education and health. For its part, recognition demands the achievement of symbolic aspects such as the elimination of stereotypes, the representation of minorities and their social participation.

The possible solutions that Fraser poses to this type of claims vary according to their degree of depth or capacity for transformation. The “affirmative” solutions are limited to making superficial changes without going into the final cause of the inequalities, while what he calls “transformative solutions” seek to modify the situation by acting on the root of the problems. Transformative solutions are more effective, but require much more time and effort. The affirmative ones are quicker and easier to apply, but it is necessary to apply them repeatedly, which leads to the stigmatization of the groups they try to benefit [18].
The groups or groups that seek recognition seek the affirmation of their specificity; while those that raise redistributive demands, are aimed at disappearing as a group. For example, the proletariat, would not aspire to recognition, but to its disappearance as a class, as well as feminist claims about gender, its goal is that it disappears, not to multiply. On the other hand, the claims of the LGBT groups will aspire to affirm their specificity as a group, as well as those of the queer theory that intend to multiply the genres and that these are recognized. Affirmative recognition solutions increase the valuation of disadvantaged groups, but do not affect the basis of these differences; while the transforming solutions of recognition, transform the assessment structures, so the differences are destabilized and, consequently, the identities [18].

If the objective is to reach a more just society for all people, it is necessary they are also transformative. The type of demands that claim only recognition create division in the LGBT collective, and of these with the rest of society. In this fight for the recognition of identities, some groups will benefit to the detriment of others. Bauman it expresses it as follows: “The proclaimed redistribution demands in the name of equality are integration vehicles, while the recognition claims reduced to pure cultural distinction promote division, separation and, finally, the bankruptcy of the dialogue” [12]. Because identity policies end up obtaining exclusion, since others are seen as the different and, therefore, as the enemies. While, if a community is based on universal values, it means that all human beings have the same rights and the same duties, regardless of their differences.

6. Sexual and gender identities. Is there an LGBT community?

We usually talk about the LGBT community as if it were unitary and compact; as if all the groups that make up sexual and gender diversity had the same problems and interests. However, the truth is that it is not. Within this community there is great diversity and the interests of each of them not only do not coincide on many occasions, but also become incompatible with each other. Gays and lesbians start from very different positions in the social structure because, regardless of their sexual condition, they are still men and women in a patriarchal society. Bisexual people are almost completely invisible within the group, on many occasions, even discriminated against when it is considered that they are not capable of fully accepting their homosexuality. The “T” of the acronym LGBT, before referring to transsexual people, now also includes transgender people, two groups that have completely opposite approaches and problems.

In relation to trans laws that are being approved throughout the world, there is no agreement within the LGBT collective. In 2019, the “LGB Alliance” was created in London and, subsequently, other similar associations such as Canada, Iceland, Ireland, Australia and Spain have been created. These associations are the product of the split of LGBT+ groups of these different countries. They declare that they have separated from their organizations of origin due to the discrepancies they have with them and the lack of opportunity to have in them to expose and defend their views. That is, they accuse LGBT+ associations of creating an iron censorship that prevents debating everything that does not coincide with dominant political approaches, especially in relation to trans issues. The new groups propose that the defenders of the Trans Movement are protecting positions that go against the rights of lesbians, gays and bisexuals. From their point of view, the objective of these policies that deny the material reality of sex, is to end homosexuality in all their forms, so they consider
them homophobic and, especially, lesbophobes and misogynks. They accuse Queer theory of complying with the sexist prejudices of society, not admitting that there are women and men who do not adapt to these stereotypes. Likewise, they claim that, homosexual people are attracted to other people of the same sex, not of their same gender, so, accuse of transphobia to those who do not want to maintain relationships with people of the other sex, as the theory does queer, it’s homophobia.

This situation has been aggravated from the moment in which all the weight of the demands was transferred to the cultural or symbolic sphere. The emphasis on identities, in addition to highlighting differences and increasing borders and exclusions, leaves out of the analysis the structures of domination and the material conditions of life. In other words, there is a total depoliticization of the phenomenon of sexuality, turning it into a merely personal matter. As a consequence, they end up creating a multitude of groups, which find nothing in common between them and, therefore, cannot unite, that is, constitute themselves as a political subject, to carry out profound social transformations that allow the inclusion of these under equal conditions, only some very limited objectives are achieved that leave intact the structures that cause that discrimination. This condemns them to compete with each other to achieve their goals. The emphasis on identities from an individual and personal point of view has produced a simplification in the analysis and a loss of vision of the complexity of the phenomena. In addition, the emphasis on identities leads to organize politically around the interests of each group, without taking into account how these claims affect the rest of the groups.

The political model of explanation of sexuality, mostly developed by feminism and, more specifically, by feminism—the lesbian, considers sexuality as a political and social construction that aims to maintain the patriarchal system through the institution of heterosexuality mandatory. This means the exclusion of all kinds of sexualities that do not respond to this social organization scheme. Therefore, without the elimination of patriarchy and heterosexuality as a hegemonic model, it is not possible to end the discrimination suffered by sexual minorities. However, the dominant claim of the LGBT collective, based on queer theory, responds to a naturalistic model, not only of homosexuality, but of sexuality in general. That is, sexuality has a biological origin, so non-heterosexual people cannot be responsible for their sexual preferences. Sexuality has been considered as a political and social construction (lesbian feminism approach), to a biological interpretation represented by the “sexual orientation” model that gays defend. The objective, therefore, is not the transformation of the social system, but the modification of borders so that those people who previously considered system dissidents are included. This depoliticization responds to a strategy that implies the acceptance of certain types of sexualities in exchange for avoiding the transformation of the structures of power prevailing around the sex-gender system.

In the same way, lesbian feminism has always raised lesbianism as a political option, something that could be chosen by women to get out of patriarchal oppression; however, when women stop having their own spaces for debate and are integrated into the LGBT movement, these approaches have been censored, political explanations of sexuality have disappeared from the debate as a “space of resistance to heterosexuality and patriarchy” [1], assimilating, in this way, the gay approach that is biologic and, therefore, depoliticized [1].

This depoliticization affects the conception of what is trans in the same way. Transsexuality is considered something biological and never a cultural association between sexual organs and social roles. Similarly, gender is considered an essential characteristic in human beings, hence the interest shown by these currents in
so-called “trans childhoods,” coinciding with the most reactionary and traditional patriarchal discourses, with the only difference that now, sex separate from gender, or more specifically, instead of trying to adapt gender to sex, as has traditionally been done, what is intended is to adjust sex to the gender with which that person claims to identify. However, at the same time and in a contradictory way, it is affirmed that identities are fluid, malleable and that they depend on the will and desires of the subjects. This aims to question the political subject of feminism and the legitimacy of women in the fight against the conditions of oppression to which they are subjected because of their sex; as well as neutralize the advances in terms of equality achieved by the feminist movement. This is what has been called: homopatriarchy.

Gays are involved in a conflict of interest within the LGBT community, since, at the same time that they want to stop being discriminated against for their sexual preferences, they want to continue maintaining their privileges as men, so criticism of patriarchy is out of the question. However, in his analyses, it is not possible to transform the institution of compulsory heterosexuality or heterosexism, without eliminating the patriarchy that is at the base of that system.

Luisa Posada Kubissa comments on this that:

“The system of patriarchal domination is a system with social, sexual, political, symbolic and economic dimensions. The resistance to heteronormative sexuality and its deconstruction supposes a resistance to one of the dimensions of the patriarchal system, but not to patriarchy as a system of total domination -if, furthermore, it were even possible to transform some dimension of patriarchal domination without transforming the rest. In short, the eradication of gender subordination that feminism proposes can and should be allied with the transgender and queer movements, but we believe here that it has to continue to be a substantive, radical and critical struggle. A struggle with its own long history, its own signs of identity and its own interests, which cannot come to be dissolved in these movements, but rather have to be oriented towards a main objective: to eradicate inequality and patriarchal oppression of half of the humanity” [20].

The same thing happens with gender. Queer theory pretends that it is simply an identity. These movements consider that identity is something completely flexible, modifiable, selectable. Therefore, gender would be something that anyone can modify at will. However, feminism defends that gender is a patriarchal structure of domination of women. In no case would it be an identity, although, obviously, the gender in which we have been educated constitutes an essential part of our identity.

Overcoming gender so that it ceases to be important is not the same as multiplying genders to overcome the sexual binarism [21]. Because, as Posada Kubissa points out, the female “gender identity” is constructed in opposition to the male model that is dominant. We could add that the rest of the genders proposed by queer theory and transfeminism can only be created taking as a reference the hegemonic model of masculinity and the masculine-feminine binarism, so, ultimately, this approach is not it leaves the established paradigm [20].

“Queer theory makes a general critique of the gender system and heteronormativity, but confronts gender as if it oppressed men and women in the same way, as if it were inscribed neutrally on bodies, often forgetting that the what gender inscribes on the bodies is the hierarchy and also forgetting the material conditions of existence to which said gendered inscription on the feminine and masculine bodies gives rise. Queer theory presents us with a depoliticized gender that is unrelated to women's real lives, unrelated to economic inequality, violence, or freedom of movement or choice.
As Jeffreys denounces, power relations have disappeared from queer theory, as well as class privileges and unequal access to resources” [1]. Likewise, despite the fact that queer theory postulates that the intersectionality that occurs between all categories of oppression must be taken into account, at the same time issues such as the regularization of prostitution, pornography, and surrogacy are defended, using as I argue the right of people to freely use their bodies. These analyses never take into account the socioeconomic origin of the people who work in this field, nor the treatment that women receive in these areas. In other words, the material and economic aspects that condition the lives of these people are not considered, in a tacit defense of capitalist neoliberalism [22, 23].

7. Conclusions

As we have developed throughout this work, identities are not as malleable or as flexible as claimed, nor are they as strongly linked to the will of individuals. Identities have more to do with the differentiation criteria established by the social system. These criteria seek to create a hierarchy that serves to place individuals in different places in the social structure. It must also be taken into account that they are created and maintained by certain hegemonic groups that control power in societies. The sexual and gender categories themselves have been created by a patriarchal system that has established only heterosexuality as legitimate and has excluded those who did not fit into these categories through medical and legal discourses.

Obviously, building identities based on structures created from the heteropatriarchal power, is nothing more than submitting to its designs, unless, these identities are established as a strategy to dismantle the discourse itself from which it starts. Which means that identities should not be understood as an end in themselves, but as a means to create a political subject that seeks the elimination of the social categories that build discrimination.

But, for this, it is not enough to pretend to carry out superficial changes that eliminate the most serious forms of discrimination, it is necessary to dismantle these discourses from the foundations, questioning the bases on which they are based. In other words, it would not only be about ending heteronormativity, but also seeking the disappearance of the patriarchy that has created heteronormativity as a strategy of domination.

Obviously, cultural conflicts are very important, and there are groups deeply discriminated against for this. However, it is necessary to find a balance between the two dimensions of injustice if we want to carry out real transformations in society and thus eliminate the injustices suffered by multiple groups and collectives. Cultural claims must be complemented by struggles for redistribution or economic justice. We cannot forget that subjects are not neutral from the social point of view, but are marked by a series of characteristics that place them at a certain point on the social scale. Pretending to ignore this would only perpetuate inequalities.

Identities are necessary for the construction of political subjects, but as long as they are not considered essential identities but policies of resistance to heterosexuality as an oppressive institution of the rest of sexualities.

Likewise, we propose to avoid identity politics as much as possible to replace it with policies that seek the disappearance of collective identities, so that the objective is the equality of all people as individuals, not as members of groups.
This last proposal would need to be done gradually, since it is true that some groups and collectives are in a situation of social disadvantage, so they cannot achieve equality as simple members of the citizenry. But it would be necessary to establish objectives that seek the deconstruction of the symbolic and cultural structure of society, as well as economic transformation, rather than identity policies that reinforce the difference of these groups.

From our point of view, the emphasis on identities will end up causing a deep fragmentation in the LGBT community, creating a multitude of unconnected groups that will defend their immediate and particular interests, competing with the rest.
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