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ABSTRACT

Nonmonogamy is undertheorised as site of anticapitalist resistance, despite monogamy’s intimate connectedness to Capitalism. The purpose of this study is advocating for conceptualising resistance at its broadest by including the personal realm as political. Nonmonogamy is mobilised as both sex-affectiveness and socio-political organisation to highlight the inseparability of sexuality and the political economy. The text lays down a theoretical background on the need to recover the 70s Feminist slogan *the personal is political* to challenge the liberal and sexist ontology of private vs public that brackets social life and political activity. The study is driven by the tendency to downsize aspects linked to the personal realm as not politically relevant within the wider framework of social movements, and by an apolitical, privatised and sexuality based approach to nonmonogamy in written production. The risk of neoliberal co-optation of antinormative sexualities’ political agendas is also a driving motivation. Using activist feminist ethnography, this study centres around the reflections of six anticapitalist activists identified with nonmonogamy and engaged politically in the Spanish state. It uses semi-structured interviews and thematic analysis to gain understanding on how nonmonogamy is articulated vis a vis the activists’ political engagement, and on to what extent the personal is given political significance and mobilised as an anticapitalist strategy.
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INTRODUCTION

First power relationships are forged in the private space, and get into the public through Patriarchy, compulsory heterosexuality, traditional notions of family and marriage, and imposed monogamy (...) It will not be possible to fight for equality and difference in the public if the imposed relational organisation is not discussed from the private¹

Questioning monogamy is not just about how you understand relationships, but how you understand life. It is about recognising that, even if you change the rest of the things, and you don’t change this, it’s like getting a blindfold, it’s like a headlong rush. You will have to deal with it at some point, and there is a lot of work to be done there, as it is not discussed publicly²

... and I wonder... polyamory, with all its diversity of the diversity of the diversity, how could it possibly make relationship’s hierarchies and power relationships disappear? What has polyamory to dismantle that? Besides this, polyamory is very related to consumerism... “take it! What do you want? Another person? All right, take it! Why would you settle for just one person? C’mon, take more! Enjoy life, you, the queen of consumerism!”³

What does politising the personal⁴ mean? Where are we when it comes to comply with the 70s-feminist slogan that the personal is political? Have anticapitalist social movements taken into consideration this feminist claim? Does Anticapitalism promote resistance in the personal area? Is the personal seen as politically mobilisable⁵? Or is it shut away as the non-political? What is a site of resistance? What does or does not constitute an issue worth politising? And also, who is engaged in the debate? Who is self-rewarded with the privilege to say what counts as political and what not? With neoliberalism advancing sharply as a totalising framework of life working subliminally on consensus and co-optation, it is crucial to make those questions if we are to conceive anticapitalist resistance broadly and exhaustively, without leaving loose ends.

Monogamy, despite claims that highlight its relationship to Capitalism through heterosexual marriage, the nuclear family and the sexual division of work, does not seem to be a topic worth discussing and mobilising within Anticapitalism. However, if we transcend the approach to monogamy as a mere private issue, and we understand it as sex-affective

¹ See Neri Arriaga (nd) El Poliamor como nueva posibilidad de accion y resistencia en los caminos de la diferencia.
² Quote from Luna, one of this participants’ study.
³ Quote extracted from Ana Alvarez de Miguel, LaTuerka (2016).
⁴ I use interchangeably the personal and the private as liberally demarcated concepts.
⁵ I use the work mobilisability and mobilisable to express the potential capacity to use politically.
structure and as socio-political organisation based on the privatisation of life, care and work, which is the purpose of this paper, then it follows that its questioning not only challenges capitalist principles, but also allows us to imagine new, sustainable and more collective worlds. Approaching nonmonogamy from this perspective, consequently, means approaching it as intrinsically political.

But to understand nonmonogamy in this political way does not mean to take it blindly, simplistically and intrinsically as anticapitalist and subversive. In fact, the large written production on polyamory that emerged recently has not been yet framed within a radical politics alternative. It seems, on the contrary, that this production endorses an apolitical and privatised reasoning portraying polyamory as a mere sexual option celebrating it as some kind of “does it all” panacea. Further to this, there is evidence showing that political agendas from social movements working around antinormative sexualities have been neoliberalised, falling often into an assimilationist agenda that ultimately reproduces monogamish principles, let alone the lack of questioning of Capitalism. Accordingly, from the perspective of political activism aimed at social change, it is realistic and honest to take the risk of mobilising nonmonogamy in apolitical, privatised, romantic and celebratory ways as a potential threat and take a cautious stand when debating about nonmonogamy.

In line with this, few scholars have written and conducted research from a more radical and politically engaged perspective that highlights the unexplored subversive potential that nonmonogamy has in visualising other ways to be in the world. I draw on this perspective as this might give insight into how nonmonogamy can be used for social change and for offering an anticapitalist alternative. It is in this vein that I frame my contention to explore nonmonogamy as site of resistance and critical thinking that offers positive and productive ways to organise anticapitalist activism. If, as Luna says, questioning monogamy is about how you understand life, then I wonder, what opportunities to resist might lie ahead when mobilising nonmonogamy as an anticapitalist resistance strategy?

**Situatedness**

Living in times of rampant neoliberalism gives body to this study. The resentment and anger
I feel for witnessing the impact of the economic crisis and the consequent economic adjustment, a benign and hypocritical way to call the present systemic global scam, are this research’s driving forces. The profoundly corrupted political elite we have in the Spanish state\(^6\) and the scandals showing its connivance with economic power hierarchies fuel the outrage and disgust I feel towards the current economic system. In parallel to this, thanks to a number of inspiring feminists I have met, to the experiences we have shared and the knowledge we have collectively gained, I have developed a feminist awareness that I take as a crucial and ever-lasting part of my identity and therefore of any political commitment. As a result of these lived experiences, I do not conceive any act of resistance disconnected from both an anticapitalist and feminist motivation.

In addition to this, the MA in Gender and Intersectionality has given me new perspectives to examine oppression, and it has made me aware of how it is exercised in subtle, multiple and interconnected ways. And if oppression is exercised this way, resistance and the construction of alternatives should follow the same reasoning. It is therefore with a broad perspective to resistance and political activity that I am concerned in this study, drawing on FeminismS and their alternative and subaltern readings of the world.

Throughout the years in which I have been involved in anticapitalist activism, I had different experiences as to what extent the so called private-personal matters were taken care of, and as to what extent it was Feminism the movement taking care of and advocating for those matters. While acknowledging the obvious reality that oppression and resistance are very complex and overwhelming just as the world is, and acknowledging consequently the obvious need to make this workable and concrete, my experiences have included, nonetheless, a dismiss of the personal and the accusation that Feminism was almost exclusively concerned about what occurs at the private sphere.

So, I asked myself: what is a personal-private issue? Why is the private vs public divide so pervasive as to be articulated as ontological basis to classify and judge what counts and what

---

\(^6\) I use the term Spanish state instead of Spain to highlight some of the participants’ disidentification with the idea of Spain as nation, where a national identity and a central political power are imposed from above.
not for political activity? Isn’t the personal and the public a continuum? Why some people equal focusing on the private realm to not politising and not considering anything else apart from what occurs at the private realm? Would we take such a critical stand when discussing about public affairs? As a political subject standing for both Anticapitalism and Feminism I cannot ignore these dynamics, and I feel I should react and do something to claim there is an urgent need to think resistance broadly, constructively, and in non-stigmatising and non-reductive ways.

In parallel to these experiences, I started to feel slightly disidentified with monogamy at a personal level, and increasingly worried about the slight uneasiness some anticapitalist and feminist co-activists and friends showed when discussing about it. I used to get comments like “you know, nonmonogamy is not for everyone”, or “it is difficult to do polyamory, I do not think it is realistic, I have never tried it to be honest, but it is difficult anyway” or “don’t you have enough with one person?”. Although at times these comments made me feel as some kind of “polyamory proselytizing sect member” convincing people to become nonmonogamous, viewing it now with the perspective that time allows, I realise how useful those comments were to realise why debating nonmonogamy is important to me. I am therefore thankful to all those who engaged in discussions with me as they all gave shape to this study and to a more grounded concern with the need to make of subversion a life approach.

They were also a driving force leading me to proactively search for people engaged in nonmonogamy to keep up a more hands-on discussion. I then found and joined a discussion-support group called Polyamory Belgium, based in Brussels (the city where I currently live) and there I met people who are critical of monogamy as a hegemonic and normative system, without condemning it as malicious, a priori. This seemed to me as a good approach, however, after a while, I had the impression this group fell short about conceiving nonmonogamy as an opportunity to think critically about the socio-political organisation. Indeed, its activities were more oriented towards learning how to manage jealousy, how to deal with the partner of our partner politely if we cannot stand them, how to communicate nonmonogamous thinking to the others or how to get out of the closet as poly… These issues are important and should be acknowledged, and in a monogamous world it is just essential to learn how to do nonmonogamy so as not to succumb to the normativity temptation, if we do
not agree with it. However, these discussions did not appeal to me as it seemed that the nonmonogamy question was floating in the air without connections to the social and political order, and to activism and other struggles.

**Research Questions and Context**

What I wanted to understand, nonetheless was: Is nonmonogamy understood as a site of resistance within the Anticapitalist Movement? That is, is nonmonogamy perceived as sex-affectiveness intermeshed with the socio-political organisation and the political economy? And if so, is it conceived as worth mobilising within activism?

The research is based on the Spanish state and on the experiences of Spanish anticapitalist activists identified with nonmonogamy. Regarding the political climate, the Spanish state is going through a social crisis that has been exacerbated since the so called 2008 financial crisis and, more importantly, the neoliberal turn that was put in place to react to it. As Alberto Garzón (2013) explains, for most of orthodox economists embracing neoliberal ideology, this crisis is just a temporary side effect intrinsic to the cyclical character of economy, that will get sorted by applying more of the same. Practically this has taken the form of institutional support on austerity measures from the EU which, together with a national context shaped by systemic corruption and a well-established regime of revolving doors, have paved the way to get what we have now: an antilife economic and political system. It is in this national context where I frame the need to make the most of anticapitalist resistance and political activity.

Talking about the recent political and activist climate in the Spanish state means talking about a major social uprising against austerity and lack of democracy that took place across the state from the 15th of May 2011, the so-called 15M. Millions of people participated in the events related to this uprising, and although this movement did not call itself anticapitalist, it is based on a clear systemic capitalist critic, with many of its proposals being profoundly socialist, as the advocacy for universal, public, free and quality healthcare, for the recuperation of privatised public companies, and for the need of a tax reform favourable to working class people. It is important to mention this movement as it built on previous
political activisms that were already active in the State which, together with the uprisings of 15M sowed the seed for a collective feeling that, yes, together we can. It is this positive, collective and towards-the-future spirit that lays the foundation of this research.

Lastly, to understand what the situation on nonmonogamy is in the Spanish state and in the absence of access to any empirical academic work that is not based in the USA or in Anglo-Saxon countries, I rely on what internet conveys. When doing a search, what I get is mostly feminist and non-conventional sex blogs entries that discuss polyamory from an antinormative and antipatriarchal approach⁷, and these are just an example of a prolific internet material on polyamory. I am not sure to what extent these entries are somehow related to google remembering my previous searches and getting record of my search preferences. Either way, in addition to this material, I discovered the video debate on “Poliamor: sexo y cuidados”⁸ (polyamory: sex and care) in the framework of the internet TV program En Clave de Tuerka, a platform founded by students’ and researchers’ associations with an anticapitalist orientation. Apart from this, I find the Policañas⁹, a network organising social events around some cañas (beers) to discuss nonmonogamy in a relaxed environment.

While these entries might show there is some debate on nonmonogamy in the Spanish state which is partly held from a political stand, it is difficult to understand if this transcends the theoretical to actually shape existing anticapitalist political groups, and if so, from which perspective. This is one of the gaps that motivate this research.

---

⁷ Pikara Magazine, a feminist blog, for example, has entries entitled: Romper la monogamia como apuesta política, (breaking with monogamy as political bet); La monogamia también es privilegio (monogamy is also privilege); Poliamor y redes afectivas: ¿reforma o revolución? (polyamory and affective networks, reform or revolution?). Golfxs con Principios, an antinormative sexualities blog, has entries such as Historias reales de non monogamia, poliamor y anarquía relacional (real stories on nonmonogamy, polyamory and relational anarchy).

⁸ See LaTuerka (2016).

⁹ See Poliamor Madrid (nd).
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The Personal as Political

What is this study’s approach to the personal and how is it portrayed within the social movements debate and with Anticapitalism? These are the questions explored in the present section.

The Approach to the Personal as Political

In the context of 60s and 70s USA political movement, Radical Second Wave Feminism popularised the slogan the personal is political as a call to give a political meaning and therefore to assign a collective responsibility to those questions that belonging to the private sphere and therefore to women were not politically addressed (Amorós & Alvarez 2007). As Carol Hanisch (1969) wrote:

…personal problems are political problems. There are no personal solutions at this time. There is only collective action for a collective solution. I went, and I continue to go to these (therapy) meetings because I have gotten a political understanding which all my reading, all my “political discussions,” all my “political action,” all my four-odd years in the movement never gave me. I’ve been forced to take off the rose-coloured glasses and face the awful truth about how grim my life really is as a woman (Hanisch 1969).

The key was understanding that personal matters had a structural base, claiming that the personal sphere, the micro, is politically conditioned and subject to power relations (Puleo 2005) and that by politics we should understand all those strategies aimed at maintaining a domination system (Millet 1970). Feminism made then a strategic use of the private vs public divide as means to broaden up the field of political struggle since, as Parrondo (2009) explains, the slogan gave attention to those aspects that were not included in the traditional notion of the political. The starting point was recognising that the distinction between the personal (what it is intrinsic to the personal realm and the own life) and the public (what it is intrinsic to the community) is a conventional and historical distinction (ibid).

Nonetheless, some Radical Feminists were criticised for engaging in a too rigid interpretation of the slogan that ultimately reduced the political as (only) the personal (Puleo 2005). This
rigidity, together with a universalising way of seeing the construction women, that is, to assume women share a universal sisterhood and status due to gender, could reinforce a narrow and essentialising interpretation, not only because the political is reduced to the personal, but because the personal is equalled to women and the feminine, in universalising ways. Acknowledging and sharing these criticisms, I still think it is useful to recover the slogan, provided this is done in non-essentialising and non-reductive ways. And this means differentiating between on the one hand, a strategic and temporary mobilisation of the private vs public, just as Feminism originally did back in the 70s, in which the personal-public boundaries are challenged and on the other hand, an ontological and fixed conception that reflects a cluster-based reality where we have the private disconnected from the public, the personal disconnected from the social, and a universalising female subject that in any case occupies the private space.

Following this, I recover the slogan in this study for a number of reasons. The first refers to the suggestion that as Liberal and Capitalist nation states main central notion, the divide private vs public has remained relatively consisting in a way that it does not merely describe the world, but that offers a perspective to see social life and the world (Duggan 2003). That is, the liberal divide (and disconnection between) private vs public seems to be the hegemonic cosmovision. It is important to highlight this insofar as an ontological divide private vs public might have consequences on how we, either consciously or unconsciously, keep explaining the world and in particular, political activity.

To understand how this would be the case it is important to take into consideration the “patriarchal adscription system of physical and symbolic spaces” as discussed by Molina (1994). That women were secluded to the private as this space was, according to Liberalism, excluded from the liberal promises of freedom, and that men gave a superior and more prestigious meaning and value to the spaces they kept for themselves, as the public space (ibid), is crucial to analyse how political activity in either the private or the public spaces are given value differently. It is this different allocation of value that I draw on to examine if the personal (made synonymous with the feminine) is given political significance, that is, if issues occurring at the personal sphere as sexuality are given political value.

To summarise what has been said so far about the personal as a space of political relevance, I
sustain that the realm of the personal should be given weight in a way that is strategic (temporal and political and not ontologically fixed), non-reductive (the political is the personal and beyond, highlighting the continuum private-public) and non-essentialising (it should not presuppose a feminine matter, but a different allocation of spaces and values where the private space has been feminised and deprive of relevance). Making the personal political this way and thinking our lives from a political dimension have obvious consequences for the mobilisability of personal matters within political activity, which is the concern of this research.

**Everyday Life and Identity as Personal Matters**

But is the personal realm actually seen as a site of resistance? Here I would like to add another level to the discussion, which is looking at the ways in which political activity that is based in the private realm is portrayed to understand if it is understood as political or not, by examining two existing debates on social movements.

The first debate is about the Everyday Politics. Some scholars have argued that there is a “conceptual wall between lifestyles and social movements that has created a theoretical blind spot at the intersection of private action and movement participation, personal and social change, and personal and collective identity” (Haenfler, Johnson & Jones 2012: 1). This has resulted in a debate on whether everyday life practices are political and whether they bring social change. This is the case of Everyday Feminism and Lifestyle Movements, for example.

Everyday Feminism is said to retrieve the strategy the personal is political from an individualist and not-collective, structural way (Fixmer & Wood 2005). To the question these scholars pose “can embodied politics really instigate substantial change?”, they rightly argue that neither the institutional or the embodied can promote change in isolation, but a combination of both. But this problematically suggests that by engaging in individual acts, or in any act altering an individual’s life, Everyday Feminists do not expect collective impact and change and that the private and public are approached as disconnected. A similar criticism has been raised about the Lifestyle Movement, which consciously and actively promotes a lifestyle, or way of life, as primary means to foster social change (Haenfler,
Johnson & Jones 2012). As with Everyday Feminism, the critic is on an alleged private action disconnected from public action and an apolitised (non-collectively organised) approach towards social change.

Against these backdrop, some scholars (Schuster 2017) have argued that although Everyday Feminism reflects micro activism and political aims, it is a political practice anyway and that there is no evidence supporting the claim that individual resistance has replaced collective mobilisation. In the same vein, others have provided evidence showing that the politics of everyday do not replace more conventional political behaviours (Baumann, Engman & Johnston 2015) and that activists do aim for social change by engaging in certain lifestyles (Dobernig & Stagl 2015, Kallus 2004). This would invalidate the criticism of engaging in a politics of the everyday as not political since, as these counter-arguments show, there is indeed a connection between making the personal politically relevant and seeking social change.

Another debate refers to the ongoing accusation from The Left towards certain movements for engaging in identity politics, that is in a mobilisation of categories on culture (as gender, sexuality, disability, etc) at the expense of more structural and more universal categories that very often are made synonyms with the class factor from the economism’s10 perspective. By doing this, movements on culture are accused for breaking with the necessary economic based synergy as this would allegedly be the only strategy capable to challenge Capitalism. While sharing that some identitarian based movements might be divorced from any critique of Global Capitalism (Duggan 2003), I suggest that these accusations are in reality an accusation of mobilising narrow and personal claims that are not seen as relevant, structural and universal such as the class factor, insofar as they draw attention to personal life aspects. Nonetheless, if we take on that the separation of economic/class politics from identity/cultural politics seriously disables political analysis and activism, as it overlooks that neoliberalism actually lives through culture, sexuality and everyday life aspects (ibid), these debates and their theoretical underpinnings are very problematic. They are also annoying, as

10 Economism “can be defined as the interpretation of Marxism which holds that political developments are the expression of economic developments; the line of causation proceeds from the economy to politics which tends to be deprived of any autonomy of its own” (see Simon 1991: 30).
they are sometimes raised in the absence of empirical work (Alcoff, Hames-García, Mohanty & Moya 2006, Brubaker & Cooper 2000), and from a pedagogical-moralising perspective that links mobilising identities politically with issues such as (badly managed and unresolved) resentment (Bickford 1997).

Needless to say, resentment is bloody power, but what it is more important is that the Everyday Politics and Identity Politics debates seem to indicate there is a hegemonic approach to resistance and political activity that downsizes personal acts (the everyday life and identitarian aspects) while reifying traditional (public and collectively organised) political acts as the acts. Contrary to this, I contend that political activity is better approached drawing on feminist perspectives that provide a new ontological perspective and new ways to see resistance that do not reduce it to traditional political acts or to a single strategy, or space for that matter. For example, Maria Lugones’ (2003) concept of resistant intentionality is inspiring since there is an implicit advocacy to value multiple sites and levels of struggle. As she explains, against according political intelligibility to only certain acts within a hegemonic “world of sense”, as marching in the streets, for example, any act that is part of an intentional interfering with, refusal of, or resistance to the reductive and unitary logic of the hegemonic common sense, should be given a political dimension (ibid).

Similarly, intersectional theory is useful here as not only does provide a way to juggle between various axes of oppression (Lykke 2010), but also new ways to conceptualise different levels of analysis and their ontological relationship, as Yuval-Davis (2006) argues, and I see this as very useful to advocate for different resistance strategies. As Yuval-Davis explains, social divisions have organisational, intersubjective, experiential and representational forms (ibid: 198), and the importance of this approach to this research is that it enables theorising about levels that connect, not only but importantly, to the personal sphere and everyday life. Therefore, it avoids both grand theories and the reification of certain aspects and spaces within political struggle by offering new ways to think resistance but also ontology.
Marxism, the Personal and Feminism

It is important to examine the place of the personal in social movement debates, but what this study is concerned about is Anticapitalism. Acknowledging that the personal realm has been politically taken care of by feminist women, as I previously discussed, and that most socialists have historically associated issues of sexuality and relations to women (Vogel 2013), it follows that to examine how Marxism, as Anticapitalism driving force, has considered the personal needs examining the women and feminist question.

If we take Vogel’s analysis on the historical synergy Feminism-Marxism, her conclusions suggest that in emancipation terms there is a theoretical reification of the public realm at the expense of downsizing the private one, by disregarding the domestic space. The tendency to see emancipation through paid work and therefore, as work carried out in the public space (2013), seems to suggest this. Engels’ writings where he labels domestic work as a women’s private aspect that they should get rid of to achieve emancipation through social productive work is given as evidence, among other examples:

Here we see already that the emancipation of women and their equality with men are impossible and must remain so as long as women are excluded from socially productive work and remain restricted to private domestic duties. The emancipation of women becomes possible only when women are enabled to take part in production on a large scale, and when domestic duties require their attention only to a minor degree (Engels 1968: 158).

In addition to this, Vogel examines the role of the family and the domestic space to conclude that, because Marx and Engels theorised about the family as a bourgeois institution due to historical circumstances, the domestic space was equated to capital and therefore subjected to abolition, not to emancipation (2013). According to this, Vogel’s analysis shows a slight tendency to disregard the personal space from the emancipation discourse by depriving the women’s space, that is the domestic space, of political relevance. However, that Marxism ignored women’s issues and women’s space as not politically relevant is not that clear. For example, Andrea D’Atri (2014) seems to suggest quite the opposite when she mentions that Marxism did problematise the women question, and as an example she mentions Engel’s discussion on monogamy from quite a political perspective, as women’s subjugation:

Thus, monogamy does not by any means make its appearance in history as the reconciliation of man and woman, still less as the highest form of such a reconciliation. On the contrary, it appears as the
subjection of one sex by the other, as the proclamation of a conflict between the sexes hitherto unknown throughout preceding history (Engels 1968: 167).

Women’s emancipation indeed appears in Marxist texts in various forms, as for example in Marx and Engels claim that “the degree of freedom of women gives the general measure of the freedom of a society” (Marx & Engels 1975: 230). In this line, D’Atri states that, despite of what has been widely thought (and misunderstood), Marxism did problematise women’s issues, and that the widespread belief that it did not is due to Radical Feminists overlooking that Marxist Movements are very heterogeneous with very different political agendas and that not all mobilise the same aspects in the same ways (2014).

What this disagreement suggest is that more than a theoretical issue it is perhaps a practical obliteration, and indeed, what it seems a more shared contention is that practically, Marxist Movements marginalised the women question by engaging in a prioritisation of class over gender (Arruzza 2015, Smith 2013, Maestro 2013). And in fact, what allowed the emergence of the Marxist Materialist Feminist perspective in the USA back in the 70s, was precisely the disregard form The Left towards feminist concerns, that included taken for granted topics as personal life and sexuality (Luxton 2014, Hennessy & Ingraham 1997, Avila Francés 2009).

Marxist Materialist Feminism emerged in an attempt to challenge the side-lining of feminist concerns and despite that there are too many different and elaborated approaches to discuss here, one of them is particularly relevant to further examine what counts and what not as political within Marxism. This perspective engages in a discussion on what the material means, to contend that hegemonic versions of Marxism gave it a reductionist significance that ultimately equated it with Capitalism, reinforcing the class factor over gender (Delphy 1980, Jackson 2001). What this suggests, besides reinforcing the contention that the obliteration of gender and women issues was a practical one, is that by engaging in a reductionist version of the material, certain aspects were simply not discussed. Against this, Jackson advocates for a version of the material that moves away from grand theory towards

---

11 The issue of materiality is placed at the center of both Marxist Feminism and Materialist Feminism, and although there are differences, as they both share a concern with the material from the Feminist perspective (Luxton 2014) I use it as a single perspective.
empirically grounded work that pays attention to the local material conditions, to the micro level and the everyday life (2001: 286).

In addition to the relevance to analyse what is meant by the material, the take home message is that it was not until Marxist Materialist Feminism arose as a new theoretical paradigm that Feminist concerns were placed in Marxism’s political debate. What it is appealing now is to examine to what extent these synergies between Marxism and Feminism are actually incorporated in current and existing movements. That is, to what extent anticapitalist movements have indeed moved from seeing Capitalism as intermeshed with and reflected upon personal matters and if this has meant a political consideration of those matters within activism.

**A Practical Example of the Personal within Anticapitalism**

Not long time ago I was given a draft position paper on Feminism from the Spanish political group Anticapitalistas\(^{12}\), in which there is a very interesting understanding on Feminism and the personal. In this paper, Anticapitalistas explain what the current situation in Spain is as regards new feminist trends and groups, and to the need to mobilise their energies within Anticapitalism. It is argued that the new generations of Feminists are locked in personal claims. Although this paper was just a draft when I came across it and it cannot be seen as representative of the Anticapitalistas’ perspective, not to mention of the Anticapitalist Movement in the Spanish state, it is interesting to examine how they portray the personal and its politicisation. I am therefore using this example as an illustration, and not as part of the analysis. To do so, I have taken some excerpts, underlining the juicy parts.

It reads, about these new generation feminists:

> It is important to understand that these women always start from their own experience, characterized by the inequality in their classrooms, their relationships and their houses, due to a recent rise of sexist violence. Therefore, their process of politicisation is determined by the predominance of the emotional-

\(^{12}\) Anticapitalistas is a political organisation that works as a confederation in the Spanish State. It is self-defined as revolutionary, anticapitalist, internationalist, feminist and socialist. It assumes Marxism in an open, plural and critical sense. Its stated objective is the rebuilding of the revolutionary project through the creation of a unitary, anticapitalist political expression sustained by the Anti-globalization movement, the labor movement and the social movements at large. From January 2015, Anticapitalistas became Podemos party’s political association.
personal. They seek to politicise spaces that previously had no room to be questioned, such as moments of leisure, parties, personal and sexual relationships.

According to this, sharing experiences of inequality exercised in private spaces, as the household or the school, means giving priority to the personal. The personal is, in turn, made synonymous with the emotional. In light of this, one can wonder: sharing an experience that occurred in a private space means giving predominance to the emotional-personal? Is it emotional to talk about inequality? What is, by the way, the emotional-personal? Why giving predominance to the emotional-personal would be an issue? Or perhaps the issue is that there is no understanding of the structural roots of those personal experiences of inequality? Or that those experiences are not accompanied by collective action? What is the issue, actually?

Then it states the problem that needs attention and work:

...as an organisation we have not had an active and central policy on it (feminist politisation process determined by the emotional-personal). Even so, there is still an evident difficulty in putting aside the purely personal and this is one of the key issues, as well as one of our tasks. Precisely, one of the main difficulties that we have found is that the debates are very much focused on the personal (many women come to the groups for personal reasons and find refuge in Feminism).

In this excerpt there is another important aspect. The organisation recognises that as an organisation they have not done much about making the personal politically relevant (whatever this means in their view), but that in any case, there is too much about the personal from women, too many difficulties for women (the problem-focus is on women and not on the organisation) to put the personal aside, as Feminism is used as refuge. But I wonder, is it even possible to focus too much on oppression and inequality experienced by oneself? Isn’t it what we should actually do, to speak aloud about it and to revolt? Let’s see now the solution that is suggested:

The solution is not to avoid this at all costs: After all, emotional assemblies also open up ways to get politicised, to generate union, mutual support, and a desire to act against the system, to get empowered and to fight. In any case, we have to do a great job to bring the personal to the political and therefore to fill with content those issues that they pose, to show them as structural and not isolated and that their solutions are also collective and systematic.

This excerpt is rightly suggesting that politicising the personal needs to acknowledge the structural basis of oppression, and that an individual sexist experience needs to be analysed as
a collective problem due to its nature and to the solution it requires. However, if they mean also that feminists have to engage in a particular political activity and what this would mean, is not that clear to me. It seems to say that despite acknowledging that they, as political group, somehow fail at giving a political response and framework to everyday sexism experienced by these women it is firstly up to these women to stop focusing on personal issues that much and to put them aside as this prevents them from focusing on the structure (as if both things were in contradiction), so only then, feminists would be able to act accordingly and give a political response (whether this means connecting it to the political economy or engaging in a collective, public and socially organised political act, is not clear).

In addition to this, the approach they take to talk about women’s consciousness process as some kind of primitive stage that needs “content filling” from… who? is extremely patronising and annoying. And what they call as “emotional assembly” is a powerful awareness process and, I maintain, what it is needed is not to fill these people and experiences with content, but to include them in a shared awareness process so, by discussing together, everybody understands it is a shared experience of oppression, and acts accordingly. These experiences held in private spaces affecting women’s personal lives need to be use as driving and ignition forces, they do not need, under no circumstances, to be put aside.

The State of Play of Nonmonogamy

But what has all this to do with nonmonogamy? If we see nonmonogamy as a sex-affective option, and therefore as belonging to the personal realm, the extent that personal matters are given political significance is crucial in determining the mobilisability of nonmonogamy as anticapitalist resistance. But let’s examine first the understanding of nonmonogamy in this research and its state of play.

The Approach to Nonmonogamy

Monogamy privatises life, care, work, and feelings through the maintenance of structures such as marriage, the nuclear family and the sexual division of work. While debating these
structures is not the purpose of the paper, it is important to mention that they maintain a particular socio-political organisation, and this conceptualisation marks the starting point of the study. The interest in studying nonmonogamy lays in the possibilities that nonmonogamy offers to imagine new political and social scenarios. Nonmonogamy, even if not organised yet as a proper political activity and not mobilised yet as a political act, could raise major issues that are intrinsically antisystem\textsuperscript{13}, not only as it challenges the conservative basis of monogamy but also as it provides new ways to look at social reproduction and life, as a whole.

For example, one can imagine the ways in which nonmonogamy could bring forward mechanisms to share resources, to collectivise care, to reduce consumerism or to promote values of solidarity. These political aspects are central to this research’s motivation, therefore it is not about compelling each and every person to become nonmonogamous, but about advocating for organising life in nonmonogamous ways. Besides this, as I hope to make clear in the following pages, I do not intend to respond to a naturalisation of monogamy with a naturalisation of nonmonogamy in which sexuality is regarded as the truth of the self and the main societal organising principle (Willey 2016b). What it is about, however, is to “scale up” (Wilkinson 2010) a nonmonogamous approach that considers individual and personal lives as sites of resistance in which to challenge wider hierarchies of power.

Accordingly, nonmonogamy, as it is theorised in this research, refers to a sex-affective socio-political organisation that is critical of compulsory monogamy. That is, although it includes sex-affectiveness, it is not reduced to it, since it is equally regarded as socio-political organisation, underlying aspects that are institutional, structural and relational. It also highlights the opening up component, therefore distancing from infidelity\textsuperscript{14}. Drawing on such formulation, and therefore on the political connotations that nonmonogamy has, it is argued that it has a potential to provide an alternative to monogamy’s privatisation of life and

\textsuperscript{13}I use the word antisystem as the capacity to challenge the status quo, generally speaking. I also use this word to re-signify it in positive and constructive way, as the term has been recurrently used by the Spanish Establishment to vilify 15M activists.

\textsuperscript{14} The critical approach to monogamy includes a differentiation with infidelity. That is, nonmonogamy is the possibility to keep more than one sexual and/or emotional relationships where everybody involved is aware of the situation.
normativity that it is yet unexplored. It is this understanding of nonmonogamy that I will mobilise to argue for the need to make it political and the need to use it within political activism.

Lastly, I use the term nonmonogamy instead of polyamory, as the way that polyamory is often used is not in line with this study's perspective. For example, polyamory often refers to "long-term, emotionally intimate relationships", excluding other nonmonogamous expressions (Taormino 2008: 71). In addition to this, this study reacts precisely to a particular articulation of polyamory in written production that I will discuss in the following section that does not highlight its political value, in the broad sense of the word. However, in spite of this disidentification with the term polyamory, I will sometimes use it interchangeably with nonmonogamy as it is the term that has been widely used in literature and media.

**Nonmonogamy in Written Production**

In the last decades, there has been a growing interest in the topic of polyamory (Barker & Langdridge 2010) that has resulted in a large written production, of which a significant proportion are self-help manuals on how to be a good polyamorous (Anapol 1997; Easton & Liszt 1998; Heinlein & Heinlein 2004). It has also been claimed that research on polyamory has been largely conducted on white and middle class people (Sheff 2011).

As an example of the nonmonogamy’s written production state of play, we could take Easton & Liszt (1998) manual, in which they explain aspects such as how to manage finance or how to deal with a mortgage within a more than two relationship. While these texts are valuable as they broaden up the debate on antinormative sexualities, and they importantly provide tools to dismantle monogamish intimate dynamics, as for example jealousy and possession feelings, its strategic potential has been called into question for taking a sexual preference based, apolitical and privatised (not private but privatised) approach on polyamory, that is, an approach that is not connected to the societal and political levels.

Critics of this approach have claimed that polyamory has been reduced to a mere private sexual preference, focusing on intimate and personal issues and therefore denying the rejection of monogamy as a political act (Wilkinson 2010). They have also criticised that the
lack of debate on power when discussing polyamory undermines its subversive potential and leaves the centrality of oppression-related issues unchallenged (Haritaworn, Klesse, & Lin 2006). Likewise, a pervasive focus on individual choice and agency has been criticised for hindering an analytical connection of polyamory to other political struggles, resulting in research focusing on how to develop successful polyamorous relationships rather than laying the foundations to create strategic alliances (Noel 2006). Prescriptive texts for polyamorous conduct are likewise criticised (Petrella 2007) for showing a liberal mentality of government that embeds regulation into the subjectivity of individuals through processes of normalisation. Lastly, it has also been underlined that a class-oriented analysis is of critical relevance to the study of polyamory and also to polyactivism (Kleese 2014).

As these examples suggest, nonmonogamy is not articulated as a tool to question and challenge normativity and oppression, there is no radicalism in the resistance sense of the word, as there is no engagement with nonmonogamy as social change tool. Having said this, it is important to clarify that the intention of this research is not to equate nonmonogamy to subversion and monogamy to conformity in an essentialist, simplistic and innocent ways, and it is neither to deny multiplicity in understanding affective human connections and socio-political organisation forms. More importantly, it is not to say that nonmonogamy is intrinsically and per se, subversive and anticapitalist. What it is suggested is that nonmonogamy is intrinsically political since it has a great potential in looking at life organisation differently, and it is this yet unexplored potential that could be subversive and anticapitalist.

Neoliberalisation of Antinormative Sexualities’ Agendas

Highlighting the subversive and anticapitalist potential of nonmonogamy is of fundamental importance not only in light of the state of play about the written production on polyamory, but also in light of recent work showing the role Neoliberalism plays on shaping the agenda of antinormative sexualities’ political activity. This line of work has focused on the cultural aspects of neoliberalism and their effects on everyday life, including sexuality and sex (Grzanka 2016). Although nonmonogamy in this study is not reduced to sexuality, it is relevant to mention this line of work as it might give us some impetus to mobilise
nonmonogamy in truly radical and anticapitalist ways.

But let’s examine first what Neoliberalism is to understand this line of work and also the research concern as a whole. Neoliberalism is understood here no longer as a political program, but as new understanding of human nature and social existence, as Read (2009) argues. Neoliberalism “operates on interests, desires, and aspirations rather than through rights and obligations and it acts on the conditions of the actions. This way, power becomes less corporeal and restrictive but more intense” (ibid: 29). From an anticapitalist perspective, this is extremely worrying in general terms, but also because it crafts political activity. As Wendy Brown (2015) reflects when discussing about the downsizing of democracy under Neoliberalism, the neoliberal market instrumental rationality that radically constrains choices and ambitions has an impact on how politics are conceived. Liberty is reduced to market conduct disengaged of any power to craft the conditions of life, and freedom is considered exclusively as self-management, therefore the homo economicus leaves behind the homo politicus and political power comes to be figured as an enemy (ibid).

It is this conceptualisation of Neoliberalism that should be taken on when analysing the line of work invested in showing how neoliberalism co-opts, assimilates and absorbs principles from political activity on antinormative sexualities that result not only in a de-radicalisation of the movements but also in a worrying alignment with neoliberal interests. Examples of this line of work are Ludwig’s (2016) analysis on sexuality’s flexibilisation as grounds for an antisocial neoliberal agenda in Berlin; Woltersdorff’s (2011) exploration on sexual subcultures and their ambivalent relation to Neoliberalism; and Duggan’s (2013) well known analysis on how mainstream gay rights politics foregrounds a neoliberal “equality” politics.

What these scholars show is that Neoliberalism acts on consensus, on non-tangible and non-visible ways to shape antinormative sexualities’ political agendas. It is this evidence that I underline to claim the need to be, firstly, very cautious about how nonmonogamy is mobilised and secondly, the need to do it from a truly anticapitalist vein, understanding by truly an ever present anticapitalist awareness knowledgeable of the sibylline ways in which Neoliberalism advances the interests of the Capital through aspects that might be overlooked. As it follows, the motivation of this research is to discuss nonmonogamy as an anticapitalist political tool further beyond the mere sexual preference and choice.
Feminism and Monogamy

Nonmonogamy, in general, does not seem an issue for feminists, in general. As Jackson & Scott (2004) have claimed, despite that the theory and practice of nonmonogamy were, back in the 70s in the USA, central to the politics of the personal, and despite traditional efforts to analyse nonmonogamy “not as an individual matter, but as part of a collective understanding forged through overlapping political, friendship and sexual networks”, the debate is today muted within Feminism. Other scholars as Szachowicz-Sempruch (2016) share this contention and link it to the overwhelming phenomenon of historical and contemporary polygamy, which with a few exceptions, was maintained through women’s subjugation and men’s privilege. That is, while the disidentification with patriarchal polygamy and a feminist desire to distance from it are understandable and might explain the dismiss of nonmonogamy’s political analysis, it is nevertheless surprising that it was not given more attention due to the many aspects linked to monogamy that are profoundly patriarchal.

But the dismiss of nonmonogamy from Feminism is not only understandable in light of a willingness to disidentify with patriarchal polygamy but also when taking into consideration the larger and historical unequal and differential tolerance given to men’s sexuality in comparison to women’s sexuality. This leads us to ask legitimate questions as: What does polyamory bring that is beneficial for women and for making women’s sexuality less scrutinised and instrumentalised? At the beginning of the document I included a quote from Spanish feminist Ana Alvarez de Miguel, who is one of those questioning in which sense nonmonogamy might advance the feminist agenda if we do not take into consideration the unequal nature of gender power relations in the first place, which is not sorted yet obviously. I share this concern and suggest that in order to do so, in order to make nonmonogamy politically useful not only for Anticapitalism but also for Feminism, there needs to be a recognition of how sexual exclusivity is framed in an extremely patriarchal context where women sexuality is manipulated according to the political and economic interests of a worldwide masculinist establishment.

In recognising that, the emphasis is placed not only in advocating for nonmonogamy as it allows a different social order organised through anticapitalist principles, but also in revolting
against Patriarchy and the many strategies it uses to keep subordinating women by controlling their sexuality. Placing emphasis on the political dimension of our lives, as Puleo (2005) affirms, is urgent if we consider that “consent Patriarchy and structural inertia” has replaced “coercion and repression Patriarchy”, meaning that Patriarchy works by reducing the visibility and explicitness of its sick mechanisms to get widen tolerance and pervasiveness. Slut-naming, phallocentrism, feminine sexual dysfunction, anorgasmia, feminine viagra, hideous romantic love, sexist violence, the Cosmopolitan Magazine, Trump, the hysteric, housewives’ internal exile, exhausting care work, the internalisation of inferiority… these are all aspects I keep in mind when advocating for nonmonogamy as contributing to a new order that is feminist. Nonmonogamy will be feminist or it will not be.

**METHODOLOGY AND ETHICS**

**Feminist Epistemology**

Feminist epistemology guides this research in each and every sense. Firstly, there is a critical approach to the god trick perspective and an alignment, instead, with a situated perspective. Rejecting objectivism, nonetheless does not mean embracing relativism, as Donna Haraway (1988) explains, but it means seeking for partial, locatable and critical knowledges that allow conversation and solidarity, and it also means doing a politics and epistemology that make claims on people’s lives.

Secondly, and in addition to the idea of situatedness, the research draws on a standpoint perspective. As Ramazanoglu & Holland (2002) explain, knowledge from a feminist standpoint is always partial knowledge in the sense of being “not-total” and in the sense of being “not-impartial”. What counts is, however, not how much universal the knowledge is, but the situated political implications it has (ibid). Following this, this research aims at accounting for the activists’ particular experiences on how they live nonmonogamy and how they live it within their anticapitalist groups to advance critical thinking, and not to claim representativity. It is therefore the relationship the people have with political mobilisation that this research intends to highlight, drawing on *their* experiences and accounts of the world.
Thirdly, while it would be me taking the decisions on what to focus on, the critical thinking and learning produced would be possible only through the encounter with the activists. And this idea of encounter and relation as essential in knowledge production reflects the influence of feminists as Karad Barad (2007), who conceives relations as the first epistemological units, and who claims we should think relationally, ethic-onto-epistemologically. If meaning construction is an ongoing process that changes not only meaning itself but all those involved in the construction process, as they all provide the conditions of possibility to the construction itself, I should see as participants in the research not only those who I interviewed, but all those with whom I engaged in conversations and activities that made meaning possible and that some way or another led me to write this thesis. That is, knowledge production is always collective, and any other way to view it not only does not make any favour to activism but contributes to separate theory and practice and to keep privileging the first over the latter.

Lastly, that I am making a therapeutic use of this research is also derived from thinking epistemology and knowledge production in feminist ways. Why do we research what we research? Echoing bell hooks when she claims that theory should be healing and liberatory to work for us (1997), I am engaged in theorising about nonmonogamy as I have an interest that goes beyond this research that is concerned with making antinormative sexualities socially intelligible. Therapy wise, I also draw on Sara Ahmed (2010) as she makes a very inspiring call for feminists to challenge whatever makes us unhappy, regardless of whether this unhappiness makes others uncomfortable and provides the conditions for their happiness. In this sense, I think it is important to discuss nonmonogamy because, despite the fact that there is a risk of naturalising it and romanticising it, monogamy is still a hegemonic and normative system, and discussing it allows people identified with nonmonogamy to make their stand intelligible.

**Feminist Activist Ethnography and Interviews**

The methodology of this research is feminist activist ethnography. This type of ethnography focuses on illuminating social problems and activating community groups (Davis & Craven 2016:147). This idea of activation reflects very well the purpose of this research, as the data gathered could be used to highlight useful guidelines to make the most of nonmonogamy as a
subversive mechanism. Besides this, ethnography places emphasis on how people see their world, and takes a holistic approach that stresses relationships and connections (Denscombe 1998:85). It also takes the researcher engagement and critical thinking as crucial for the research process and emphasises personal experience as a main motivation for the research (ibid: 81).

In line with this, I take this research as an opportunity to reflect creatively and productively on the kind of anticapitalist resistance and activism we could engage in. And following Catalonian philosopher Marina Garcés (2013), I argue that to make the most out of the synergy theory-activism, the embodiment of critical thinking and the making of the collective as ontological basis should be placed at the center of political activism. As I have explained, I am concerned about understanding a personal matter, that is nonmonogamy, in a political way, and embodying critical thinking in this case means, in my understanding, to think from nonmonogamous and anticapitalist people’s experience and to engage in those experiences as politically and collectively relevant. Therefore, it is not just about the fact that nonmonogamy implies a certain sex-affectiveness and a certain socio-political organisation, but it is about the process to think and share together, as a *we*, to use that knowledge in a way that advances political activity.

Moving on to research methods, when reflecting about ethnographic methods, Davies (2008) explains that there is not a simple choice and that while flexibility is allowed, researchers should “be aware of the theoretical perspective that underlies their approach and that their choice of topics and methods be informed by and answerable to their reflexive awareness of where they are situated both personally and theoretically” (ibid: 52). Researchers should ask themselves a series of questions as: “What methods will give us the data we need? What limitations exist for particular methods and will this undermine our research goals? What possibilities are there for combining methods?” (Davis & Craven 2016: 84).

In this regard, Brinkman (2013) explains that interviews have primacy over other methods when researchers are interested in accounting for individual life experiences, and this reflects well the motivation of this research. I have opted for semi-structured interviews as they provide a guide that help me focus on the specific issues of the research question, but are also flexible and open to new topics that participants might consider relevant. This reflects the
consideration of the interview as “a process in which interviewer and interviewee are both involved in developing understanding, that is, in constructing their knowledge of the social world” (Davies 2008: 109). Approaching the interview as mutual construction echoes the interviewing participatory model that Letherby (2003: 83) highlights, where the interviewer is prepared to invest their own personal identity in the research relationship, answering questions and sharing knowledge, to avoid objectifying the interviewees and to provide the grounds for a possible long term researcher-participants connection. I discuss this further in the ethical considerations.

**Participants**

When looking for participants for this research, I sent a few emails to anticapitalist activists I knew who had contacts with the political group Anticapitalistas, which is present in the Spanish state. Through these contacts, I got in touch with and interviewed six people between March and April 2017, who come from different places across the Spanish state. Out of the six participants, four were interviewed on skype, as they are based in the Spanish state, and two were interviewed face to face in Brussels.

Concerning their profiles, they all identify with nonmonogamy in various ways. Analysing the particular way they engage in nonmonogamy is not relevant to the research and it was not included in the call of participants, however, during the interviews they did explain this with some detail. All of the participants were in a couple at the moment of the interview, that some of them labelled as open relationship, while others did not put a name on it. I interviewed two couples, Rosa and Vandana, Emiliano and Simona, and two other people, Hugo and Teresa. Rosa and Vandana have been together for five years and although it was agreed from the beginning they could see other people, they “keep nonmonogamy in constant construction”, meaning that concerning how to do it practically is still in discussion. Emiliano and Alexandra have been together for about 17 years, and after some time “having an open relationship”, they decided a few years ago to allow themselves “to develop feelings for other people”. Hugo is in “monogamy at the moment” but has tried nonmonogamous options in the past and “keeps nonmonogamy in constant reflection”. Lastly, Teresa is also in a couple since the last four years and although at the beginning it was a tricky thing to juggle with her boyfriend as he would get upset when seeing her “making it out with another person”, now
they are both “perfectly ok with it”.

Regarding their experiences in Anticapitalism, they all have some years’ experience but their political trajectory varies in the sense that not all of them have a similar anticapitalist vision and engagement, and they also support other struggles at the same time. In particular, two of them are militants in Anticapitalistas, one is sympathiser of this political organisation, and the remaining three are engaged in other anticapitalist spaces. They are all engaged in other political movements as Feminism, the LGBTIQ\(^{15}\) Movement or Agroecology, in hybrid movements mixing different political agendas, such as Queer Anticapitalism or Agro-ecological Feminism and also in the new municipalismos, a way to call the new institutional politics at regional level that emerged from 15M. Half of them also mentioned the 15M as a fundamental part in their politisation process.

In general, they were eager to participate in the study and grateful to see somebody interested in conducting research about nonmonogamy.

**Ethical Considerations**

Davis & Craven (2016) explain that considering ethics in research means interrogating how one is situated in relation to the participants and their work. And this includes identifying oneself in the participants and making explicit the relationship to the project (ibid). From the beginning, I explained to the participants my personal interest in the topic and my motivation to conduct this research, giving them the chance to ask me questions about how I see nonmonogamy and Anticapitalism. I also explained my own process to become disidentified with monogamy. This was a great way to build trust and connection with interviewees and, in general, participants showed gratitude and excitement for being interviewed on this topic and for raising this important subject, as I just briefly mentioned.

By explaining them whatever they wanted to know, nonetheless, I worried that the consistency of the research would get affected, in the sense of orientating participants’ responses in a way that reflected more my position rather than theirs. I tried to solve this by being careful when phrasing the actual questions of the interview. I tried to formulate them as

\(^{15}\) I use LGBTIQ to include Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, Transsexuals, Intersex and Queer.
neutral as possible, following guides such as Tuner’s (2010) on *Qualitative Interview Design: A Practical Guide for Novice Investigators* in which he gives examples of useful and not so useful research questions. Following his advice, I tried to use the *how* and the *why* instead of the *what*, as well as to phrase the questions in both affirmative and negative ways at the same time to avoid making a statement with the question.

Ethical considerations were also important when explaining that the information was anonymous. This was an already set up step from the beginning, but I emphasised it throughout the research process as one of the potential interviewees decided not to participate at the last minute as he was worried about confidentiality issues, and was asked by her partner not to take part on the research. This was also another reason to take seriously the explanation on why I am doing this research and how I relate to the topic. Another ethical aspect I raised with the participants was to make sure this research was intended to create a space of reflection and a space to discuss safely about nonmonogamy, and not a way to get definitive and representative results.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

I conducted all interviews in Spanish, I transcribed them myself and also translated myself the quotes I included in the body of the text\(^{16}\).

To analyse the data I used thematic analysis, which is a method for “identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (Braun & Clarke 2006: 79). There are some steps suggested to improve the engagement with the data, and I tried to follow them as much as I could. For example, when still conducting interviews I started the transcription of the ones that were already done, to get a preliminary scan of the documents and themes (ibid). In addition to this, I also made a conscious effort to go back to the full interviews to avoid analysing a quote in a decontextualized way (ibid). Apart from this, I used NVIVO to code the transcripts and identify emergent themes.

After the transcription of the interviews, I wanted to share the input with the participants in order to comply with my theoretical approach to meaning making, but in the end I decided

\(^{16}\) See Annex 1
not to do it as I was running out of time. I acknowledge this as a limitation as my purpose with this thesis was to build critical thinking together. In any case, I hope I had made justice to the participants’ experiences and that I can re-use the findings somehow so I have the opportunity to cross check the data with them to make the results a real collective production.

ANALYTICAL THEMES

Breaking up With Monogamy

What are the issues arising when disengaging with monogamy? Are these connected somehow with the anticapitalist struggle?

Compulsory Monogamy vs Strategic and Political Nonmonogamy

As I briefly mentioned previously, the particular ways in which each participant engages in nonmonogamy is not necessarily relevant to this study, however, they do help explain how they live it, and despite the differences, all of them acknowledge that engaging in nonmonogamy implies a process that requires much thinking and much deconstruction in a context where monogamy is hegemonic and where alternative models are absent. As Vandana claims, “after a nine years’ relationship, I questioned it (monogamy) several times (…), I questioned it because I had no one around who had a different relationship to the ones people normally have. So I thought about it (nonmonogamy) as an ugly way to love somebody”. Besides this, words as “difficult”, “it is hard” and “it is an ongoing reflection” are expressions that participants use often in unfolding the process of breaking up with monogamy. Rosa, for example, describes this process as an ongoing back and forth negotiation with herself to dismantle love exclusivity:

I got in a relationship with a girl that had been with a guy for about five years. Then, to me, the kind of work to do there was to tell myself “she loves me for a number of reasons, and she loves him for other reasons… is not stronger, it is just different”. But when she stayed at night with me I told myself “Yes! She stayed with me because she likes me more!” And then when she left with him then I had to tell myself again (self-reassuring voice) “no… it is ok, she loves you, she is gone because… that’s it. It is ok”.
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Similarly, other participants raise the couple’s negotiation as an arduous process until the nonmonogamous situation was finally sealed and agreed, as Teresa, whose boyfriend “had a tough time and needed nearly two years to stop struggling” when he knew Teresa was with somebody else, and that meant “a lot of time spent in discussing and reaching agreements”. However, what is relevant from this deconstruction and hard process is the opportunity that opens up to reconstruct relationships and social models in ways that are more consistent with the participants’ worldviews. In this sense, this “finding oneself in a reference vacuum” is positive and propitious to get things done differently, as Simona so passionately expresses:

You face your deepest fears and insecurities. You are changing the power balance. And that, willing or not, makes you grow personally. You get to know yourself better, you learn, you get freer, you learn to communicate better, more assertively. But yes, I also mentioned the negative side. It’s bloody hard... But because it is a process and it will always be. From the moment you get into this mess, your social models are useless. But, it is precisely because you are left without them that you can build them again yourself, and that is an evolution, and it is positive.

The discussion on the “references’ vacuum” leads to a debate on the compulsory and hegemonic nature of monogamy in arguing that what it is ultimately challenged is the normative component and the lack of alternatives, more than the particular manifestation that has been historically linked to the monogamous norm, that is the engagement in sexual and emotional exclusivity. This echoes some scholars (Pieper & Bauer 2006) advocating for using the term mononormativity, instead of monogamy, as more appropriate to highlight the rejection of normality, correctness and moral superiority that is attached to monogamy.

Emiliano shows this the problem is the norm very clearly when explaining his perspective on nonmonogamy:

I like more the term consent monogamy rather than relational anarchy, polyamory or open relationship, but it is longer and more complex... At the end of the day, the key is just to be able to have sex-affective relationships with more than one person, and not to stick to traditional monogamy by default. But if you choose it (monogamy) afterwards, well, you choose it. But the key is having the possibility to choose.

Hugo takes a similar approach when he claims that for him “monogamy is not a bad thing, it gets bad and oppressive when it is imposed as compulsory”. And therefore, to him, “it (nonmonogamy) is not just about living nonmonogamy practically”. This is crucial as it shows that some participants regard nonmonogamy as more than a practical sex-affective engagement. And this is a conclusion that Emiliano shares, as evidenced in his discussion about networks and bonding, in which there is a fundamental antisystem component:
So, when you break that pattern (monogamy) you develop much stronger social bonds (...) And that is something that could challenge Capitalism or, on the contrary, it might be something beneficial to capitalism, it depends on the kind of bonds and networks you develop. It depends if the bonds are merely consumerists, like “I’m going to fuck with as many people as possible, so I can get as many medals as possible to place them in the shelf, over my bed” or if, on the contrary, we develop bonds and networks that are strong and enduring. And there lies the strength of nonmonogamy, in developing different networks.

What it is important is that this first debate about nonmonogamy seems to suggest that for most participants, engaging in an antinormative sex-affectiveness has a political connotation, as Teresa shares when claiming that “the way we develop relationships and love bonding has always a purpose (...) love in exclusivity, possessive love, love that regards the other person as an object… all that has always a purpose”. Secondly, it also shows that the engagement in nonmonogamy as mere sexual preference is not sufficient to make it politically relevant, but this needs a critical stand towards the status quo and the political economy as a whole. This is what Emiliano seems to suggest when he talks about nonmonogamy as developing consumerist bonds, as I just mentioned and it is confirmed by Hugo when he states that “if we establish a freer and more empowering way to forge relationships, if we end up with the monogamous norm, we don’t end up with capitalism”. This refusal to conceive nonmonogamy in simplistic and in any-case-subversive ways seems to be connected to a disidentification with an approach that centralises the sexual aspect of nonmonogamy and that side-lines the provision of social alternatives.

Nonmonogamy as consumption of bodies, as some participants put it, seems a very relevant topic that not only is significant when discussing Anticapitalism, but also when discussing about other participants’ political spaces. For example, when Hugo recalls his experience when working in a bar in the “consumerist gay ghetto”, there was a “competition about who fucks more people of the ghetto”, “the conversation was exclusively about “who I fucked””, showing that “to one say that they are nonmonogamous does not mean breaking up the norms”. However, the disidentification with nonmonogamy as consumption of bodies does not mean advocating that nonmonogamy does need to take a particular sexual form, and this is evident when for instance Hugo says that “relationships jump from loyalty as sacred to sexual promiscuity that, in itself I do not criticise”. It is therefore the disconnection with a critic on the social order what it is at stake and not “whether you have sex with one or with 20”, as Hugo affirms.
In this line, Teresa mentions that due to the recent polyamory “boom”, in anarchist-feminist environments, at first “It seemed that there was nothing else apart from that, and it seemed that nothing else apart from polyamory was ok”. This suggests polyamory was here understood as some sort of revolutionary induced moral obligation to engage in a politically superior sex-affectiveness in which the more sex-bodies an activist had, the more radical and subversive were they supposed to be. There seems to be a disengagement with this perspective, as it would paradoxically make nonmonogamy compulsory and ethically superior!

However, that there has been a “polyamory boom” that has received a lot of media attention not always from a politically engaged perspective precisely due to the apolitical connotation (as mere sexual option) that is given to it, does not mean that the “boom” is seen by participants as necessarily negative. Even if polyamory is approached uncritically in certain sectors, this could be seized as an opportunity to build momentum, to raise the subject, and to get it out of the closet to make people aware of the potential nonmonogamy has on advancing the political debate. Simona stands for this “building momentum approach”:

This about polyamory is starting to get a lot of media attention and, on the one hand, this is cool, as it makes the issue visible, you put it on the spotlight. On the other hand, I am not sure to what extent those of us who are on this are seen just as circus animals… however, even if this is the case, at least other people could start questioning and thinking!

Lastly, another issue that is worth considering when debating nonmonogamy is how to frame it. What nonmonogamy is? Is it a choice, a natural outcome, a sexual orientation? As I briefly discussed in the introduction, challenging monogamy by naturalising nonmonogamy is not the purpose of this study and I hope this was made clear by highlighting that nonmonogamy is not just conceived as sexual affectiveness but also as socio-political organisation. And I think so far participants have mobilised both monogamy and nonmonogamy as phenomenon that are more constructed than biologically determined. But then, if we do not advocate for the right to respect nonmonogamy as an intelligible option by saying some people have a natural orientation to it, how do we frame it? As sexual orientation?

The sexual orientation discourse does not seem the best approach either, especially when there is a political use at stake. According to Kleese (2014), the sexual orientation discourse implies seeing sexuality and desire as permanent clusters, (as the categories homosexuality vs
heterosexuality, monogamous vs nonmonogamous) and this does not seem the case according to some of the participants’ reflections. For example, as Hugo contends, he is “right now in a monogamous moment”, and nonmonogamy is not something he sees “as the opposite to traditional relationships”. That is, while not all participants state clearly how they define nonmonogamy, the fact that some of them as Hugo highlight that nonmonogamy is not about being necessarily and practically nonmonogamous at all times, but to have a critical stand on mononormativity that recognises different emotional arrangements and desires, suggests that the sexual orientation discourse is not the most accurate framework in this case.

In addition to this, and perhaps more importantly, advocating for nonmonogamy as sexual orientation is claimed to hinder its political potential by de-substantialising transformation (ibid). This would be allegedly caused as the sexual orientation discourse is said to reduce political activity to the advocacy of protection under the law and to foster a politics of recognition at the expense of a more transformative political agenda (ibid). Politically-wise, this is an aspect not to lose sight of, and in light of this, if we are to mobilise nonmonogamy in a political activity framework, perhaps it is more consistent to conceptualise nonmonogamy as a “strategic identity”, the way Robinson (2013) uses the term, in referring to a strategy of sexual expression that serves “a political, social or interpersonal function” that is “adopted by in-groups living under the surveillance of powerful out-groups” (2013: 23). This perspective seems to be more consistent with a concern to connect the sex-affective and the political economy realm.

Having said this, concerning the debate recognition vs real transformation, while mobilising nonmonogamy as sexual orientation might not be the best approach as it supposedly draws on a politics of integration and not on changing the actual normative and political framework, it seems participants’ articulation of nonmonogamy is not, in general, trapped under the ongoing and never-ending dilemma of claiming either recognition or global redistributive justice (Fraser 1995). This will be clearer in the following pages.

**Feminist, Non-Romantic and Non-Heterocentric Red Love**

To say that nonmonogamy has to be feminist or will not be means to acknowledge the different ways in which female sexuality has been politically manipulated to serve the
interests of the political economy. This makes the feminist awareness a must when discussing about how nonmonogamy is and could be mobilised politically to advance the anticapitalist struggle. In this sense, the fact that most of the participants consider Feminism as politically important as Anticapitalism is extremely beneficial as it raises aspects that otherwise might remain unchallenged. One of these aspects is the stigmatisation that women in particular endure when making explicit they engage in nonmonogamy, as Simona so explicitly contends. To illustrate this point, she describes situations such as that in which after deciding with her boyfriend Emiliano that they both wanted to be in nonmonogamy, the response from their social circle was very different to her in comparison to him. As Simona angrily recalls:

Then I see differences, things that they (men) do not face… The issue of judging is… fuck, we are not judged the same way as men, are we? A guy who says he is polyamorous, the first reaction is (celebratory tone) “uuuah! You are fucking a lot, man!” but for women, at first, it is not like (celebratory tone) “ole, great, you are fucking a lot!”, it would be more a (disgusted tone) “fuck, you are a whore, aren’t you?”. And that bugs me a lot. When Emiliano and I told some friends about our relationship, they said (surprised tone) “ah… ok… but is she also on this?” Fuck, it’s not that he (Emiliano) is the only one on this… So well, facing these things pisses me off a lot. There are huge differences.

Within this reflection on gender differences, she also raises the issue of shame when she regrets that in her personal experience, she endures self-censorship and self-shame that she tries to sort out step by step. She also claims that “it is quite common and quite shared… this thing about the shame…”. If there is an interest in advocating to mobilise nonmonogamy within a resistance and political context, slut naming and shame would have obvious negative consequences if just the mere open identification with it leads to sexist discrimination towards women.

On the other hand, in her study on polyamorous women, Sheff (2005) concludes that even if challenging, the stigmatisation and discrimination that polyamorous women undergo when rejecting traditional sexual norms gives rise to a new understanding of their sexuality that is empowering and liberating. And indeed, this seems to be the case for Simona since, despite regretting sexism and prejudice towards her, when contextualising her reflections on sexism within her entire interview it is clear that she has a defensive, zero tolerance to sexist discrimination, and that despite that it is difficult to engage in nonmonogamy as a woman, she sees it as an open door leading to new and healthier possibilities.

However, there is another aspect to keep in mind, and it is that this empowerment is more
likely to occur when polyamory is practised in an environment that is privileged in class and race, as Sheff (ibid) further refines and warns. This shows that, when celebrating the power nonmonogamy has in bringing in progressive agendas, it is a must not to do it in romantic and simplistic ways, losing sight of crucial axes of power, and this unfortunately has often been the case according to Haritaworn, Klesse, & Lin (2006). The need to be aware of how other axes of power interact with gender and sexuality is very well argued for by the scholar Angela Willey (2016a), who shows that in a femininity policing context, the “good” woman, the respectful and healthy woman is monogamous, but not only that, she is also white, middle class and clearly heterosexual.

A power analysis is decisive not only when assessing how empowering for women nonmonogamy is and how relevant could be to come out as a polyamorous woman to challenge sexism and prejudice, which it seems to be, but also when considering the previous discussion on connecting the sex-affective to the political economy so this, and only this, allows an articulation of nonmonogamy that is politically relevant that does not underestimate the subversive potential of nonmonogamy.

Another aspect that gets exposed when challenging monogamy is compulsory heterosexuality. Two participants explain that coming out of the closet as queer and bisexual respectively played an important role in deconstructing the monogamous norm. For example, Rosa explains that her criticism towards monogamy came together with a hard coming out process as bisexual, in which after deconstructing the heteronormative sexuality, her disidentification with monogamy came automatically and quickly. She gives a very detailed description of this process:

…when I was 13, I had a very good friend, and at some point, I did not understand my feelings for her. I did not know if it was friendship or another type of love or sexual attraction… I had no idea. Because when you face a situation like this with a boy, being a girl teenager, you don’t have to ask questions about anything. But as I felt this for a girl, it was a headache. So after, when people used to ask me “what do you like more, boys or girls?”, that was nonsense to me. I like the person and whatever it is between their legs, I don’t care. So, for me it was absurd. And then, once I understood love in this way, the next step came right after. I gave myself absolute liberty to like people. I asked myself: “if I have not repressed my sexuality why I should repress myself now about wanting to be with more than one?” Everything was really quick. Coming out as bisexual was a like a trampoline.

The discussion on gender differences and compulsory heterosexuality shows that nonmonogamy offers positive construction opportunities from the feminist point of view,
however, not all that glitters is gold. This is evidenced when the debate gets to talk about romantic love, showing that nonmonogamy is not just about opening up possibilities but also about norm compliance. This is evidenced by the reluctance and ambivalence some female participants show when it comes to reflect on sex and love, and to how differently they are problematized. While sex is questioned and participants do not hesitate in advocating for non-exclusivity in sex, with love they are in general more reluctant and cautious. One side of this ambivalence is shown by Rosa’s challenge towards the socially legitimated idea of sex that emerges when reflecting on her experiences with her partners:

For us (Rosa and her partner, Vandana) having sexual relationships is a broad term, because I don’t know where the limit between sex and love is. Being naked with somebody in bed, where bodies touch and orgasm, is sex. But why kissing and hugging is not? Isn’t that sex? It happened to me that I had a great sexual attraction for a person and after spending the day with that person, touching us, talking… what is that? Is that a relationship out of the couple? There are so many things to deconstruct, and one is sex. I do not feel identified with the idea of sex we have.

This critical position towards sex is not, generally speaking, shared within the debate on romantic love. That is, love is not questioned as much as sex, it is not included in the “breaking with” as much as sex, and when talking about love there are evident signs showing that there is much more at stake than with other issues. This evidences the deeply entrenched character of romantic love. It is shown in, for example, Teresa’s description about what non-exclusivity means. Her reflection shows that while it is easy to challenge sex exclusivity and therefore to manage this within the relationship, talking about loving more than one person is another story. In these two excerpts sex exclusivity and love exclusivity are discussed, respectively, very differently:

It (nonmonogamy) is a matter of demystifying sexuality, isn’t it? For me… for example, I always say that for me sex was never an issue, it was never dramatic… So, the way I feel it is that I have sex with a guy or a girl and I don’t think it is such a big deal, it is not dramatic.

I have always been quite sceptical about that (having an emotional relationship with more than one) haven’t I? It is not that I don’t think that you can have two emotional relationships at the same time, it is that I don’t think we have to force it. I have never had more than one emotional relationship at the same time, the truth is that I consider myself quite romantic, so I think it is difficult to be in that situation. But… the relationship I have with my partner is a relationship without sexual exclusivity and we have worked on that since the last four years that we are together.

While distancing from a pedagogical and moral approach that recommends how the sex-affective relationship should be to challenge mononormativity, the entrenchment of romantic love needs to be kept in mind. But what is problematic with romantic love, from the feminist
and anticapitalist point of view? It is that the amorous thought (Esteban 2011), as the hegemonic emotion model in the Western world, tends to highlight love over other human aspects and feelings such as solidarity, justice and freedom, and sexual and couple’s love over other kinds of love. Therefore, from the anticapitalist perspective, romantic love does not seem to be the best amorous organisation as it deepens up in the privatisation of affects and therefore life. It does not help either in promoting the values we so urgently need to tackle increasing individualism and shorttermism.

But there is more, and that is that from the feminist perspective, romantic love deepens up women’s subordination. From a general feminist perspective that is concerned with women’s wellbeing, it is a must to remember the intimate connection between romantic love and sexist violence (Bosch & Ferrer 2002, Flecha, Puivert & Redondo 2005, Valcarcel 2013). From a Marxist Materialist perspective we could affirm, following Silvia Federici (2012), that they call it love, and we call it unwaged work! Romantic love is not only unhealthy and toxic but it is one of the mechanisms sustaining the productive and reproductive capitalist divide, in which the bulk of (unpaid and unrecognised) care work is taken on by women, which gets invisibilised as a love act, as Federici claims (2012). If we take these concerns on, anticapitalist and feminist alternatives to toxic romantic love are needed to accompany political nonmonogamy. This can take the form of free and red love, as early socialist feminists as Alexandra Kollontai articulated it. This love would not be “about carnal promiscuity, carnivalesque temporality, or anarchy, although it can amount to such, but foremost about the conviction that social equality and love towards community cannot be achieved without eradication of the property-oriented oppression of female sexuality” (Kollontai 1972: 18).

Further to this, and while recalling again that nonmonogamy should not simplistically highlight some monogamous options as more radical than others, the entrenchment of romantic love should not be ignored as it might be connected to a slight tendency to set hierarchies within nonmonogamy that perpetuate monogamish principles and that are therefore counterproductive to make of nonmonogamy a subversive tool. Emiliano, who have been in a couple for over 15 years, explained that at some point he decided together with her girlfriend Simona, that they wanted to pass from an open relationship, where they just had
sex with other people, to a proper consent based nonmonogamous relationship, in which it was allowed to develop feelings for other people:

We got into it (nonmonogamy) step by step. We’ve been together for 17 years. We had been with other people but still together, and at some point we decided to keep opening up the couple. We did not consider ourselves as polyamorous, because it was still an open relationship, full stop. You could search for sex outside the couple and that was it. Not another partner. Not something like our relationship. We wanted to keep the couple, the sacredness of the couple. And step by step we evolved and now we accept and look for sex-affective relationships that include affect, friendship and more than just only sex.

This reflection gives much room for discussion. At first glance, it recalls Kleese (2006) when he contends that the discourse on responsible nonmonogamy usually goes hand in hand with a rejection of more sex-centred forms of nonmonogamy. Kleese suggests that love and intimacy, as relational ideologies, hamper the potential of polyamory as polyamory is understood as responsible and emotional based nonmonogamy, and then as superior to other forms of nonmonogamy that might emphasise the pursuit of sexual pleasure and that are less connected to the hegemonic ideal of the monogamous long-term couple (ibid).

While it may seem that Emiliano tends to formulate his current identification with nonmonogamy in these terms, a closer and deeper analysis of his reflections shows this is not that clear. When analysing this contention within the larger context of his interview, there are some examples showing this ambivalence. For example, when he affirms that “we (Emiliano and Simona, her partner) have always been aware, since the very first moment, of the fact that desire and relationships not always go together, unidirectionally, and that desire and relationships do not have to be reduced to the couple”. This suggests an awareness of the need to question the monogamous, romantic, dyad, and which reflects Kleese further contention that the discourses on intimacy, consent and love, are not per se and unproblematically connected to the normative ideal of monogamy. In a similar vein, when looking into detail on how Simona (Emiliano’s partner) accounts on nonmonogamy, it is evident that they both, as a couple invested in nonmonogamy, are concerned with challenging universalised and already set ways of being nonmonogamous. For example, when Simona explains her own perspective on monogamy she affirms that there is a need to discuss what we mean when we talk about it before engaging in a conversation, as there is a diversity of perspectives and that it does not mean the same to everybody:
Puah! For me the problem with labels is a big deal… Because the same word has different connotations to different people and for me this is one of the barriers to talk… so when you try to challenge somebody, the first thing is to clarify what it means to each and every person and take it from there.

While as Kleese (2006) positively and politically wise warns us about not making hierarchies within nonmonogamy according to monogamish principles that include romantic ideals, it is even more important to analyse how nonmonogamy is framed within the broader mind-set of people engaged with this sex-affective practice. Emiliano and Simona have their particular nonmonogamous way in which casual sex seems to be in a lower nonmonogamous hierarchy, but their stand is still respectful of diversity, critical of normativity and linked definitely to an anticapitalist and feminist vision of the world. Therefore, although there are some contradictions, ambivalences and go back and forth when it comes to talk about love, a more reluctant stand to question love as compared to sex, and a tendency to draw on romantic rather than non-romantic ideals, what it seems to be equally important is to take into consideration that this does not prevent participants from engaging in a progressive, open and constructive ongoing reflection on love and sex that is connected to their political engagement and interests.

In relation to keep up attention to unfolding participants’ ambivalences from a positive and perspective, Teresa, the participant who claimed to be “quite romantic”, when asked if nonmonogamy is connected to her anticapitalist activism, she vehemently shares her passion about Alexandra Kollontai and her book *Sexual Relations and the Class Struggle* (1921) where there is a clear questioning of love matters about possession and spiritual faithfulness, that Kollontai labels as cruel and as an “attack to the person we love”:

Kollontai has a great text where she theorises about love as historical question and I just love it as I am historian! She theorises it as an historic institution in the social sense. And then she sees how the various production systems have created different love systems that were useful for them. Love is nowadays possession love, an exclusive and monogamish love. Then Kollontai says “well, what kind of love system do we need to develop for the socialist transition?” She thinks the more love bonds the better, the sounder class unity would be. She thinks the question is to love each other more against a system that wants us alone (solas, in feminine), isolated (aisladas, in feminine) and without support.

Further to this, there is also a Rosa’s reflection that is worth analysing here as it implies the possibility to formulate love as subversive tool to be mobilised in political activity. That is, to see self-love as political agency. As she explains, since monogamy fuels the idea that an individual is complete and has a sense of belonging only when they are in an exclusive
couple, this shapes a limited idea of self-love that relies exclusively on receiving other people’s love. And this becomes politically important as this, in her opinion, builds us as individuals that lack political agency:

We live in a society in which we mirror ourselves externally. I think that… I don’t know how to explain it… for me, our self-love is based on how much people love us and accept us… our love… we face self-love shortages and one of the reasons is that we need a partner to love us, and to love as always. This is not logic. Then, to me, this (nonmonogamy) is linked to Anticapitalism because it breaks with the idea of both the individual we are told to be and the place we have to see ourselves. And not depending on other person’s love, that is, to be able to stand on our own feet, this is also part of Anticapitalism, to be able to see ourselves as capable people and not as servants of the system.

Talking about love from the building political activity perspective needs to start from considering that in the Western world love is conceived as a fundamental identitarian base since it replaced feudalism’s communitarian bonding after the emergence of the capitalist nation states (Esteban & Távora 2008). In absence of communitarian bonding, intimate love ended up accounting completely for people’s sense of belonging and sense of transcendence (ibid). Against this, working on to reverse an identity and agency completely determined by love from others can be used as power strategy in the form of self-love, as Luna suggests, showing another way in which questioning monogamy opens up resistance possibilities.

**Private Property and the Little Bubble vs New Forms of Bonding and Collective Care Work**

Another recurrent aspect that is raised by participants is the potential that nonmonogamy has in challenging capitalist main axes, as it is the case with private property. By equating emotional and material private property, they show the connection between the sex-affective and the political economy, and that changes made in the first would have an impact on the second and vice versa. Rosa exemplifies this perspective when she engages in a debate on jealousy in trying to identify where it comes from:

The concept of monogamous relationship is linked to private property in each and every sense. Jealousy, why am I jealous? It is because I somehow feel she (Vandana, her partner) is mine, because I am insecure about thinking that my partner would leave me for somebody else. This is a capitalist way of thinking that is insane, that is unreal, that does not define love. This about private property… I don’t want that, not in the economic system or in the emotional system.
Similarly, Vandana criticises how private property shapes people’s mindset by pushing for the “mine” in each and every life aspect, and how this mindset gets “inside” in people’s lives shaping society’s principles:

Private property is the most powerful capitalist control tool… Since the beginning of times, Capitalism found the doors open to get deep inside... So everything is now mine, or yours or theirs… My house, my property, my family… This turned us into individualistic beings that just take care of themselves without any links further the property. This hinders collective and collaborative thought, which is that makes us stronger and which can challenge the system.

The participants’ disidentification towards private property, as both a relational and material system is accompanied by a debate on the need for finding new forms of bonding. This need for new forms of bonding is expressed through a criticism on private property but also through a questioning on nuclear family and on the subsequent lack of bonding out of this circle. The “little bubble”, as Emiliano expressively names the nuclear family form, is in his view a way to isolate people and reinforce the capitalist agenda but shaping a society with limited attention and care to others outside this bubble. A nonmonogamous socio-political organisation would tackle that by expanding care and networks:

…capitalism, what it does quite ok is to place each and every of us in an individual bubble, in which it is only allowed to get two people. And you have to worry only for them, and just for them. So, when you break that pattern you develop much stronger social bonds. It is still a care and affection network, but it has nothing to do with that little bubble any more. You stop worrying only for what is yours, and you begin worrying about more people. And that is something that could challenge Capitalism (…) And there lies the strength of nonmonogamy, in developing different networks.

Similarly to Emiliano, Rosa gives the nuclear family a fundamental maintenance role in Capitalism by stating that monogamy is “an idea that is not beneficial, not at all” and that “if we stop that, the system would crash, because you dismantle the nuclear family and a lot of things that keep the system going, and that is anticapitalist”. It is very significant that most of the participants mention some way or another a more communitarian bonding as main component when they make the imaginary exercise to describe a post-capitalist society, as Teresa and Simona, respectively, so heartily show:

I see it as much more collective model, where care and basic tasks are socialised. A much more communitarian life, less isolated. I think one way would be to delimitate spaces and structures that facilitate the dismantling of nuclear family. Then we have care work much more shared between neighbourhoods. And love there will be treated as something much more collective.

How do I see it? As a free, without censorships world… I would like to get… A kind of housing with community spaces. Where care work is not taken on exclusively by women. And where relationships
will not be determined by shitty romantic love. It would be nicer, more honest, more… it a shared housing project where each person has their privacy.

Nonmonogamies’ potential to build new forms of socio-emotional sustainability that draw on community responsibility and care are urgent in light of growing inequality, increasing self-centrism, and the incompetence of existing nuclear family forms in tackling aspects such as the sexual division of work, among other issues (Szachowicz-Sempruch 2016). Together with advocating for new bonding forms, the issue of care, as mentioned in the previous quotes, is also a recurrent topic in the participants’ post-capitalist society description, in particular in female participants’ reflections. That women largely take care work under the hegemony of monogamy seems to be a main concern for the participants. And indeed, as some anticapitalist feminists as Amaia Perez Orozco (2014) claim, Capitalism ascribes care work to women as precisely Capitalist’s condition of possibility, that is, it is the privatisation and invisibilisation of women assuming care work what allows Capitalism to function (ibid: 90). This is hideous in itself, but it is even worse if we take into consideration that this adscription is made natural (as we discussed, is a love act) and that Capitalism attacks life. As Perez Orozco so inspiringly and illuminatingly affirms:

Sexual and gender diversity is constrained in order to guarantee the existence of invisible subjects who assume the responsibility of sustaining life in a system that attacks it. For all this, it is urgent to create a political movement that takes on the collective discussion on life, to redefine together, in a holistic way, through a radically democratic debate, what we mean by a liveable life (Perez Orozco 2014 : 79).

As participants suggest, monogamy reinforces a capitalist lifestyle by imposing a socio-political arrangement that is unequally and sexistly privatised. Participants seem to revolt against this, particularly female participants. And if we take into consideration that institutions as the sexual division of work are not only unresolved but exacerbated with the neoliberal turn, then it concludes that challenging monogamy as an organisational system is not only advisable but pressing if we really want a new conception of life that is both anticapitalist and feminist.
The Personal as Political

What is it understood by personal-private matters and by the slogan *the personal is political*? Does the articulation of nonmonogamy resonate with an articulation of personal matters at large?

A Space for the Individual and Strategy from Within

Among all the questions of the interview, the one that gets more silences, doubt and going back and forth, is the question to define what is actually understood by the personal and the private. There is some kind of uneasiness to discuss about this topic, and as some of the participants claim the question is too broad, I opt for asking them to say whatever comes to their minds, without worrying about phrasing it nicely and clearly. Besides the silences, in general, there is a going back and forth between two aspects. The first one is defining the personal as a space-emotional delimitation, as “that happening indoors”, “that where intimacy and intimate bonds take place”, “that which is shared with the closest circle” and “that linked to the individual”. The link between personal matters and the private space is clear here. Simona shows this first aspect:

The private would be what I decide to keep to myself, so it doesn’t go through… Well, I think I’m messing up things… For example, I am very jealous of my privacy, and one of the things that pisses me off from polyamory is that in reality we are just a few and in the end, everything gets very endogamic… and knowing who fucks who, that pisses me off. Because who the fuck cares about what I do or not do… So for me the private is… the less explanations the better. But your question is a bit broad…

Besides linking the private to the individual, in the case of Simona, there is also interestingly a connection to sexuality and to a preference to keep her nonmonogamous orientation out of sight. Recalling her previous discussion on slut-naming and on how differently she sees people’s reaction when finding out she is nonmonogamous in comparison to how it is seen on Emiliano, her boyfriend, it is relevant that she explicitly articulates the private as some kind of protected space that is free of prejudice. The private as sexuality-safe-space is significant as it might have consequences on whether nonmonogamy is *mobilisable* as a political tool, as I briefly explained. If coming out as nonmonogamous woman means enduring sexism and slut naming, it might be better not to come out and not to discuss it with anybody!
However, it is not only a matter of not coming out and therefore not using the potential nonmonogamy has in an open way, but the implications of taking a self-protective stand might affect women’s political participation. In her research engaged with women’s political spaces, Harris (2001) concludes that one of the reasons Third Wave Feminists might opt for engaging in a politics that is mainly held in the private space, and not in a collective organisation, is the growing social scrutiny affecting young women. Although this does not seem to be Simona’s case, as she is engaged in a number of anticapitalist collective spaces, the particular negative implications of coming out as nonmonogamous might hinder her capacity to make out of her sex-affectiveness a political tool, at least overtly. There is therefore another crucial aspect here, which is asking what political subjects are actually allowed to take political space and mobilise politically an aspect linked to sexuality.

The second aspect is the participants’ contention that, in general, we keep too much in the personal, and that we tend to see it as disconnected from the public and the social. Vandana and Teresa exemplify very well this back and forth between drawing on an emotional-individual space delimitation while at the same time claiming the need to open up the private space and to make its boundaries more permeable:

The private is for me…mmm…. what we find indoors, in our place, in our private property… this is what comes to my mind when we talk about the private sphere (…) For me the private sphere… I disagree with the private sphere. This is what comes to my mind but…. I think we should break much more with the division private and public. At the end of the day we make the mistake of keeping too many things in the private sphere.

I think that the emotional is private in the sense of personal, or linked to the individual. The problem is that the word private is understood as if it is not connected to the social, or influenced by the social… and that it is not the case.

It seems that the participants want to make the point that, regrettably, too much is kept on the private sphere disconnected from the social, while making sure their individuality and intimacy gets respected. That is, there is some kind of blurred boundary between their desire to have a right to privacy and individuality, to be seen as individuals, while on the one hand there is an uneasy desire to disengage with the liberal demarcation of the personal-private. This desire to keep the individuality and to keep own-self is important here as it is present in some of the participants’ accounts when explaining why they identify with nonmonogamy, as
in Rosa’s, with the notion of personal development and in Emiliano’s, with the “don’t lose part of ourselves”, respectively:

For me, having an open relationship includes so many aspects. It means that I am a person, she (Vandana, her girlfriend) is another person, and now our paths run together, we hold our hands, we don’t know if this will ever be like this, or if we will change in the future, or if we will look for different things… And in that freedom in which you should do whatever you want to develop personally, there, the sex-affective is also included. It is not just a matter of fucking whoever you want.

Step by step, we (Simona and him) got to nonmonogamy as the most effective relationship, so we don’t lose part of ourselves along the way. So we do not have to give up other relationships due to this nonsense we have learned…

Why is this interesting from the perspective to make the personal political so nonmonogamy is used as political tool? In my view, what it seems to be at stake is the need to explore other ontological ways that allow, firstly and as participants seem to argue, a blurring between the private and public space that recognises the political nature of the personal realm and therefore of the sex-affective, while secondly, not conflating this blurring with an invasion on one’s individuality. However, transcending the private vs public ontological vision seems to be tricky, as this divide is created and recreated constantly and made common-sense (Duggan 2003). And rethinking life through an alternative ontology might be even more difficult for people whose personal realm is not socially intelligible since it is sex-affectively disturbing.

Moving on to the discussion on the slogan the personal is political, as opposed to describing the personal-private, it is remarkable that there is not any more hesitation and uneasiness. Most of participants take an assertive attitude when confirming that they comply 100 per cent with the slogan. And when I ask them to reformulate it to understand what actually and specifically means to them, some of them highlight its strategic value from a feminist and anticapitalist perspective in exposing the “hidden” of the private realm. Simona, in particular, underlines the slogan’s use to make relationships matter politically as they are connected to both Capitalism and Patriarchy:

The personal is political. That’s it. Look, relationships in this capitalist system have bloody political implications. And if I change power relations as a woman and as a feminist, I would be challenging this capitalist and patriarchal system. That is why the personal is political, because in the personal there are also power relations that make us living in a certain way.
Similarly, Rosa makes a vehement criticism on how the private realm defined liberally warrants sexism at home, and that this is precisely why we should keep talking about the private space, insofar as it is made common sense deprived from political implications:

> The standard definition of the private would be something like what it is constrained by the limits of personal life and what is not related to the political realm. In that view, the mustiest but subtlest sexism shelters, as if what happens at home stays at home and it is no one’s business because it is a private issue. To me, that difference between private and public should not exist. It is political how the relationship is, and of course we have to intervene if we see nasty things going on. But the fact that I think that difference should not exist, does not mean it actually does not exist, and that is why we should speak about the *private*.

Sexism and relationships are two aspects raised by them as belonging to the “hidden” private space that needs to be exposed. This resonates Duggan’s (2003) contention on the power of liberal categories in obscuring and mystifying many aspects of life under Capitalism, hiding inequalities as they are assigned to "private" life, and therefore understood as "natural," and bracketed away from consideration in the "public". This seems to be a clear awareness in both Rosa and Simona, and this is of extreme importance if we are to advocate for making the personal political and for seeing the sex-affective (or relationships as Simona puts it) as much more than a mere sexual preference locked in the private realm.

Another aspect worth analysing is that, in general, the slogan is understood as a change strategy “from within to the outside”, as a social change tool that allows making an impact on the social order by altering the micro level. It is remarkable that participants mobilise the slogan in this sense, as it highlights the importance of engaging politically through their everyday life, including the sex-affective realm, in light of the disproportionate attention that is normally given to politics in the form of mass organised mobilisation (Yates 2015).

Emiliano states this “strategy from within” very inspiringly:

> Political changes do not come only from the political sphere. They should start at the personal and intimate level of the person. What a good activist of change should do first and foremost is to get awareness and knowledge and question themselves about the truths in which they believe, and eschew dogmas.

Emiliano’s articulation is representative from other participants’ reflections and is of extreme importance for this study. It evidences how pressing it is to understand resistance at its broadest. I previously mentioned Maria Lugones’ (2003) concept of resistant intentionality,
which is aimed at highlighting the multiple nature of resistance, making it essential not to see it in reductive ways reifying traditional political acts as marching in a street, organising a rally and so on. Lugones notion of resistance is very useful as it transcends the private vs public divide and its different value allocation that gives priority to public and visible political acts. Lugones approach focuses simply but crucially on what the intention of the political actor is. In this perspective, as Lugones sustains, a political act would include issues such as a low person calling attention to himself when he is expected to remain invisible, a person who is labelled mentally ill refusing to be “cured” or a young person’s inattention to the schooling she experiences inimical to her wellbeing (ibid). Although these acts do not benefit from institutional support and political intelligibility, they do face oppression and should be therefore given political value, as she contends. Lugones puts therefore attention to the fact that we live simultaneously on different words of sense, each one with a different sociality, recognising therefore a multiple ontology (ibid). This is vital as it seems we need new ways to think ontology.

According to this idea of “strategy from within”. Emiliano discusses the political implications of coming out as nonmonogamous in broadening up the scope of relationships and in challenging compulsory monogamy:

I take it (non-monogamy) 100 per cent as a political tool. In my opinion it is not just a matter of living differently and it is not a matter that my partner and I do things secretly. To me it is essential to get out of the closet and explain that there are other ways to have relationships and that compulsory monogamy is false, it is not worth it. The personal is political. I stand for it. So… like this we can open other people’s eyes.

In a similar vein, Hugo asserts that the political should be understood in the broadest sense possible. Slightly differently to Emiliano, he talks about micro political acts as being political due to the fact that they have an impact on others, regardless of the consciousness given to the act itself. Therefore, while Emiliano talks about the mobilisability of the personal, Hugo highlights the continuum between private and public, which is equally important to show the political relevance of nonmonogamy:

In all cases where the subject is not by himself, and even in these cases, the subject is a political one, because the reproduction of patterns are political acts, either to reject them or to embrace them. So, to me, any vital experience I have, as going to buy bread or going to work or developing a relationship with somebody, is political, as it has an impact in somebody else. Because politics is not just about big political events, like demonstrations… so for me, all these matters, even the ones more purely related to sex-affective relationships, are political acts, whether conscious or unconscious. When you choose a
certain sex-affective relationship, that is a political act.

In general, participants share the opinion that what the slogan *the personal is political* does is to underline the false division private vs public and personal vs social, and this coexists with a space-emotional demarcation of the personal-private in which the individuality, intimacy and closest circle have to be respected. There is also reference to what political activity means, as something that “starts from within” and something that is not reduced to big public events. It is important to highlight this “start from within” strategy since, as it was discussed previously, there is a reductionist tendency to conceive as political only the acts that connote mobilisation and organisational tactics, ignoring that daily practices are themselves politically meaningful (Yates 2013).

It is also important to underline that sex-affective relations are raised precisely as an example of the continuum between private vs public and as a way to promote change from within. As Simona says “relationships in this capitalist system have bloody political implications”. This, together with what has been discussed in the first section regarding the many aspects that have social and political significance that arise when participants explain their identification with nonmonogamy, show that for activists involved in this research, nonmonogamy is political insofar as the sex-affective is connected to the political economy and the structural realm but also because nonmonogamy, consequently, is seen as *mobilisable* as an anticapitalist tool.

**The Sex-affective as an Informal and Latent Topic**

Although participants articulate in various ways the political nature of the personal and the sex-affective, when it comes to analyse what the case is within their collective anticapitalist political groups, four out of six participants claim that the personal-private is a taboo, and that indoors matters are not analysed politically. However, there are nuances regarding this statement that are relevant for the research. Firstly, Teresa and Hugo do not share this opinion so blatantly. As I mentioned previously, Teresa and Hugo are the only ones militating in the political group *Anticapitalistas*. As they explain, *Anticapitalistas* organises workshops during the Summer University Camps to experiment, corporeally, alternativesexualities. These
workshops are mentioned by both of them to show that the topic of antinormative sexualities is debated, as Teresa affirms, not only discursively but also experientially:

In the Summer Camps, we deal with the topic (nonmonogamy) in a very natural way. I think it just a matter of setting up leisure spaces where people can experiment with certain sexual practices without anybody looking at them weirdly. So, it is a matter to create spaces to practice with the body.

Although there is not enough time during the interview to elaborate this further to understand what these workshops actually mean, and whether they can be seen as a sign showing that personal matters and nonmonogamy are considered as politically relevant, it is interesting that this perspective is not shared by the four participants who do not belong to the political group Anticapitalistas, who claim, instead, that there is a tendency to obliterate personal matters, as I just mentioned. When reflecting on the causes of this taboo, they contend that it is assumed that personal matters belong to the indoors space, and therefore they are untouchable, as Vandana clearly explains:

In the spaces where I worked, the private is still what happens indoors and it stays indoors, most of the time. It remains a discursive statement that we have to break up with the private and personal. My house is, in reality, my house, my space, my private space, my… and no one has the right to speak.

It is remarkable that, although there is a discrepancy on to what extent personal matters are treated between those who belong to Anticapitalistas and those who do not, most of them share the opinion that questions such as care work, the LGBTIQ sexualities (sexualities in plural, not sexuality), sex as commodification (that is, prostitution) and the heteropatriarchal family, that is, issues we could regard as pertaining to the personal realm, are indeed debated. For example, as Hugo explains, the topic of care work is at the core of the political debate:

This topic, care work in the personal space, is very important as it links to the economy. It is as fundamental as the pure class struggle. Because if capitalism had to assume the cost of the workforce reproduction, the cost of taking care of the elderly and the cost of daily life care, as housing, food… then capitalism will fall immediately.

It is surprising that despite of dealing with care work and the heteropatriarchal family, the debate does not include a questioning of its sex-affective base, monogamy, and this might be connected to what Vandana explains regarding sexuality and emotions as a tricky debate to discuss in political settings:

The topic of sexuality is one of the hardest topics to discuss. I mean I… I am very open and I like sharing… when we go for a beer, we sometimes end up talking about sex. I think there is a taboo there,
that is shit. At the end, you only discuss the topic with certain people that you know will not judge you, or people you know you get along well with, or people who want to understand you…

But n spite of this obliteration on sex matters, Rosa exemplifies the quite shared opinion from participants on the importance of discussing topics related to sex and emotions as political within their collective political spaces:

It is something that is still kept on the private sphere and that struggles to be placed in the political. And there are a lot of people in the organisations that do not see it as political. For me this is a lack, because we speak about the needs to live with dignity, and that includes a lot of material issues, as housing, food, etc… but we do not speak about emotional needs, or sex.

However, even if some participants claim that personal matters are a taboo within their political spaces, it is important to underline that as Vandana and Rosa contend, in informal spaces, like in small informal gatherings with like-minded co-activists or during the leisure activities organised in the framework of their political groups’ activities, the topic of nonmonogamy is indeed discussed politically:

We did not discuss it openly as we did for example with care work. There were no debates organised around that. But when we used to discuss it apart, we did consider it as a relevant topic. But we did not consider it as a topic that we needed to discuss, by itself, to keep up the work. However, people who I worked with and myself, every time we engaged in that conversation, we did it from a political perspective, as it is something with the potential to destabilise the system.

It was something we discussed with certain comrades when we used to go for beers, where we very often ended up talking about that… the conversation very often turned to that. I think this happened because there was a need to discuss it from a political perspective. As it was so recurrent, I guess the reason was that there was a need to frame it politically, to give it a political dimension.

This off-microphone way to debate nonmonogamy is, according to the participants, linked to a latent desire and need to discuss the topic politically, that, “sooner or later” will become an explicit and open topic. This, “sooner or later” shows the relevance given to pay attention to how the sex-affective is organised and, as Rosa puts it, not dealing with it is not an option if the objective is to change things for the better:

It is not just about how you understand relationships, but how you understand life. It is about recognising that, even if you change the rest, and this does not change, is like getting a blindfold, it’s like a headlong rush. You will have to deal with it at some point, and there is a lot of work to be done there, as it is not discussed publicly.

The importance given to the sex-affective from a political stand as part of a collective reformulation to make the world non-capitalist is apparent in some of the participants imagining work on a post-capitalist society. As Emiliano imagines: “I think the change on
sex-affective relationships will come before the change on capitalism (...) relationships will flow without anybody forcing anyone to have relationships in a particular way. Providing the possibility for affective relationships to develop regardless of the state of other relationships”.

Interestingly, it is remarkable that despite the relevance given by participants to changing the sex-affective and to a strong contention on the need to debate it collectively, this does not equal to a strong *advocacy* for debating it, for real, within their collective spaces. This is shown by the participants’ discursive choices when they state that, in general, while they consider it might be necessary to discuss nonmonogamy within the framework of Anticapitalism, this should be done “step by step” “without pushing”, “without stressing” and “through a culture of transition”. Emiliano exemplifies this perspective:

> I think these are topics worth debating, to explain what it is and disseminate information, as there will be people unaware. But I am not sure if the political groups should get the *polyamory label*, because the personal is political but the political is also personal… and people would reject that their organisation imposes how to live their life on them. I think this is complicated. I think they should give information without pushing it.

In this statement from Emiliano there is a crucial issue. What does politisising nonmonogamy actually mean? Is it about asking people to become nonmonogamous? While this is not the approach to make nonmonogamy politically relevant in this research, that some participants take it this way, as “imposing a certain sex-affective to their co-activists”, gives some insight on how crucial and relevant the sex-affective debate is and how tricky it is to discuss about it collectively. In other terms, the cautious approach from participants towards “imposing a certain label and lifestyle” within their groups and an alleged rejection this would cause on co-activists, together with the discussion evidencing the political connotation given to nonmonogamy, might paradoxically indicate that this “not wanting to impose” is in reality another way to acknowledge the profound political implications of engaging in nonmonogamy. Perhaps because, as Simona so bluntly contends “nonmonogamy touches everything”:

> It might be discussed in the future, but it will be difficult, as it questions your everyday life, your relationships, your well stablished and hypernormalised relationships… and when you start questioning them, well some people like questioning things, I do. But some others are very reluctant. It would be cool that polyamory would be in politics… I’d love that. The problem is that the label is cool, but when you have to question your everyday life, people are very reluctant.
Therefore, in light of a collective latent desire to discuss nonmonogamy as political, and a difficulty from participants to visualise how to practically make it important within their political collectivities so this is not conceived by their co-activists as an imposition to become nonmonogamous, what to do? Does the debate get collapsed? Does it finish here? What to do with the participants inspiring and compelling reflections showing that there is an unattended anticapitalist potential on nonmonogamy? Discussing in more detail how Anticapitalism works seem to offer a way out.

**Anticapitalism and Struggles Convergence**

What is it characteristic of Anticapitalism that, in general, does not allow a formal and explicit articulation of nonmonogamy as politically relevant?

**Reductionism, Tensions and Life Moments**

One of the questions that emerge when discussing why certain issues are neglected from the anticapitalist agenda is that, in certain anticapitalist sectors, the economic factor is understood in reductionist ways and given priority over other aspects as the “ideological” or “emotional”, as some participants criticise. In this sense, Rosa argues that emotions have always lacked within Marxism since they have not been included as material aspects and therefore as political and this, in her opinion, is problematic as it disdains crucial aspects of life that are, indeed, material:

> We talk about needs that allow people to live with dignity, and that includes so many things as housing, food, etc. But we do not talk about emotional needs, that is in fact the greatest Marxist deficit (…) That is all about material needs and there is little about the emotional, but it is fundamental.

Rosa’s reflection raises a very important question. What does the material actually mean? As it was briefly discussed previously, there is an ongoing debate on why certain aspects seem to be missing from Marxism, and what the role of Feminism convergence on this is. In this sense, Materialist Feminists such as Delphy (1980) have called into question the Marxist reductionist approach to the material in claiming that Marxists have conflated the capital with the material, while Materialism, as an analytical framework in which oppression is the fundamental reality, as Delphy argues, is not reduced to Capitalism. Although Delphy made this criticism quite some time ago, other feminists as Jackson (2001) have recovered it more
recently, arguing in the same line that the term “materialist” has been claimed from many competing theoretical perspectives but that one of the original strengths of Marx’s Materialism was that he did not conceive the economic as an abstract system with its own internal laws, but as a realm of social relations constructed through social activity. What Jackson and Delphy seem to suggest is that a reductionist approach to the material is not a theoretical shortcoming, but a practical question.

This, that what we are dealing with is a practical and not a theoretical issue, is what was suggested when discussing previously about how Marxism sees emancipation, the personal and the women question. This is what Rosa seems to suggest when claiming reductionism still exists in Marxist Movements as they limit the meaning of the material, while on the other hand recognising that, for her, Marxist Theory did help a lot in questioning relationships, and many other issues.

Marxism is to me not only how I understand the productive system but also how I understand human relationships. It always gave me answers to say “ok, what we know right now is not healthy”. And monogamy is one thing for me that… is like the ideal of the perfect woman, it does not exist, so don’t look for it. And if it does exist, it is imposed, and not real.

In a similar vein, Hugo criticises the reductionist perspective within Anticapitalism by phrasing it as an economy vs ideology limitation, claiming that certain organisations related to the Marxist experience and Stalinism dismiss the discourse on “ideology”, where issues such as sexuality are included, as opposed to the “economy”, where the “real struggle” takes place. Keeping up a separation on ideology-culture vs economy is problematic as it does not allow us to make links between identitarian aspects that are more linked to the personal realm with the macro-structural system, as I discussed previously. And this polarisation causes, in my understanding, a counterproductive debate accusing certain movements for engaging in identity politics. According to this, it is important to distinguish between two different motivations: one is to centralise an identitarian aspect and forgetting about how this is connected to the political economy, and another one is the legitimate move of politisising an identitarian aspect if the activist’s politics of location makes that identity particularly significant. Therefore, downsizing an identitarian aspects as not as a priority as it does not underline the political economy in first place, is problematic. And this is what Hugo seems to suggest:
these traditional organisations seem to establish that the economic revolution should go first, to come to terms with the factory contradiction and the dispossession of production means, to secondly, tackle oppression on the “ideological” and the “social”. (…) There is a mistake that most of the leftists make, even unconsciously. When somebody gets engaged in politics, it seems that they need to identify with certain groups, and then they choose only one. And that is when the Anticapitalist Movement feels the need to set up a priority list. It seems they say: “I am an anticapitalist worker. And then after comes the rest”.

While what Rosa and Hugo reflect upon are known criticisms towards The Left, it is interesting how their reflections are backed up by Emiliano when he claims that, according to his experience, there has been an unawareness within the anticapitalist spaces that has prevented anticapitalist activists from engaging in nonmonogamy from a political stand. More specifically, he affirms that there has been an unawareness of the potential that changing sex-affective patterns has in challenging Capitalism not as a result of a lack of interest or a conscious denial, but due to a lack of tools to deconstruct monogamy:

I think that not a single anticapitalist group… even those at the left of the very left… Not even they have realised the potential that changing the paradigm of relationships has. But I think this will change (…) people from Anticapitalistas that I know they are very close to polyamory. If they were given tools to dismantle the notions of coupledom and monogamy, I think most of them would dive into it head first, because they do believe in that kind of freedom. I think they agree with that freedom theoretically, but they have not articulated it yet.

The reductionism and limitation discussed from Rosa, Hugo and Emiliano is crucial if it prevents activists from seeing personal matters, including nonmonogamy, as Emiliano suggests, as emotional and ideological aspects that have material implications and that are therefore worth mobilising politically. And if we want to invest in making the personal political within Anticapitalism by claiming nonmonogamy is much more than an ideological and non-material issue, this reductionism should be questioned. However, there are two nuances worth examining before making conclusions as the problem is not as straightforward as it may seem.

The first one is related to the fact that not all political experiences can be read as reductionist in this way. Hugo, for example, contends that in the anticapitalist spaces where he has worked, there has been indeed an effort to keep both spheres, ideology and economy, in dialogue. This recalls D’Atri (2014) contention on considering the heterogeneity of Marxist Movements and perspectives before making general assumptions, but it should be noted that Hugo makes this claim when he reflects about the anticapitalist spaces where he works, that are, interestingly, queer anticapitalist spaces. Whether the cause of having a positive dialogue
ideology-economy is the synergy of Anticapitalism and the Queer Movement, is to be explored in the next section.

The second nuance to the critic on reductionism refers to Rosa and Hugo reflections on the life of social movements. Anticapitalism opens up or closes itself to politicise other questions that are not exclusively the economic, understood in the traditional and reductionist way, depending on its life cycle and the particular moment they are going through. Or to put it differently, how Anticapitalism accepts broad and inclusive versions of the economy and the material depends on the particular vital moment is undergoing. It is argued that when a political space is going through a political contraction or when it is just starting its activity, there is a tendency to centralise the class factor at the expense of other issues. As Hugo explains, in influx moments, when Anticapitalism is receding, it goes back to the “matrix”, as he calls it, as copying mechanism to recompose again and get on track:

> When the movement recedes, when its going backwards, it loses space, so it is more difficult to control because we anticapitalists go back to the matrix, to the essence, to the DNA, to control that reflux.

This is somehow shared by Rosa, who claims that when she began militating in a Marxist organisation, it only had about two years’ life, and she discusses this as a possibility explaining why it had a clear focus on “class” topics, understood in the more traditional and reductionist way. “The political topics we dealt with were more “book topics”. Debates were the various nationalist feelings, how to build an organisation, whether we would constitute a political party…”. So even though there is a criticism from some participants on a certain reductionism from Marxism that might have an impact on the lack of debate on matters such as nonmonogamy, there are nonetheless some nuances to this that compel us to take into consideration the particularity of each and every political space as well as their life moments before making general conclusions. And here I would like to raise Bevington & Dixon (2005) discussion on how movement related theory should re-conceptualise its role to make justice to the reality and actual needs of existing social movements.

These scholars contend that while drawing to some extent on old debates framing social movements (such as the economy versus culture dilemma), accurate movement related theory should distance itself from seeking to “privilege a particular variable or set of variables in the life-course of a movement”, a characteristic tendency in older ways to theorise movements (ibid). To put it clearly, new theorising should distance from debates that overemphasize
particular variables and pit them against one another in a devaluation of other movements, as this ultimately gives priority to these debates over existing and present movements and their needs. This does not mean we need to forget about these dilemmas, as they are still relevant, as it is evidenced by Hugo, Rosa and Emiliano. It means that while taking into consideration those “old” debates as they are still undoubtedly useful, we should make claims based on empirical evidence raised by people involved in those movements, and discuss what is relevant for them, not for the discussion itself (ibid).

This is, in my understanding, what the participants are suggesting when, on the one hand, criticising a problematic Marxist reductionism from certain sectors while, on the other, contending that firstly, it is not always so blatantly clear, and secondly, the movements evolve, have a life, and therefore it should be examined what is going on at the present moment before making general conclusions. So, in taking these insights in an attempt to make non-monogamy politically relevant, some questions we could pose regarding a particular anticapitalist space could be, for example: how do activists see the material? What is the place of ideology-culture? Is there dialogue about the in-betweens of economy and ideology? What is the movement going through in terms of its lifecycle? What are its present needs? Is the movement in a receding stage? What is it relevant to examine, in particular?

**The Role of Feminism the LGBTIQ Movement**

Another emerging theme is that both Feminism and the LGBTIQ Movement are two social movements raised by participants as examples of the movements that have developed substantial work on politisising the personal, and this discussion intermeshes on how, the presence of these two movements in anticapitalist spaces might be determining to make non-monogamy politically mobilisable. I will focus first on the role of Feminism, as it is more extensively mentioned by the participants, to analyse later the reflections on the LGBTIQ Movement.

Regarding the role of Feminism, Simona, Rosa and Vandana, are the participants who devote much more time to reflect on it. With some differences, they agree on attributing Feminism a leading role in politicising personal matters and to the lack of its transversalisation within Anticapitalism one of the causes explaining their non politisation, including the sex-affective
realm. In a first stage, Rosa makes a very clear statement on the absence of Feminism in Anticapitalism when claiming that:

Anticapitalist political groups have not known how to process Feminism. In my opinion, there has been and there is a huge lack within Anticapitalism regarding Feminism.

Simona confirms this by claiming that despite of an interest and a verbal commitment, in reality Feminism is hardly brought forward:

I think that more than punctual occasions as it is the 8th of March or occasions like that, well… a serious work is hardly done, is it? Sexual division of work, for example, everybody knows about it, but then the everyday life shows that it is not the case at all… I think these topics are not on the agenda. It’s a topic that is really green, green, green… In principle, the organisations champion the cause, but since the personal is political… It is really hard for them.

The side-lining of Feminism from Marxist Movements is a quite shared opinion from Feminists, as I discussed previously, and it seems half of the participants confirm it. And since they identify Feminism as The Movement which could succeed in making the personal matters, matter, this is of extreme relevance. However, there is much more to say about this. Concerning how natural the link between Feminism and the politisation of personal matters is conceptualised, there are different opinions. Simona makes a direct link between both, as Feminism is “the only movement able to do it” (politicising the personal) and the “only way to get topics as nonmonogamy on the table”. She also confirms the latent desire to discuss nonmonogamy from a political stand that was discussed previously:

The topic (nonmonogamy) is not on the table, but we will have to deal with it at some point. And to link it with Feminism, well, to me the two things go together, without a doubt. And they should be transversal. But one thing is theory and another one is practice. To me the ideal would be, at least for me, to participate actively in the feminist movement and moving from then putting these (personal) items on the table and bringing them into other precincts. And if we don’t do it ourselves (feminists), no one will.

Rosa, on the other hand, while sharing the opinion that it is Feminism the movement that has traditionally dealt with these topics, as exemplified when she asserts, for example, that “the emotional is not dealt with in any organisation that is not feminist”, does not phrase this link in such a direct way. That is, the fact that Feminism has politicised the personal so far does not mean that it has to be like this in any case, and does not mean that nonmonogamy is intrinsically a feminist issue:
Feminism tries to get the private and turn it into public, and this (nonmonogamy) is a private issue... So Feminism has been the only movement able to talk about this topic seriously. So I think it should not be a feminist issue, but it has been Feminism moving this topic forward.

Besides challenging the idea that nonmonogamy has not been a central theme within Feminism, as I discussed previously, what Rosa does here is to highlight the artificiality of the sexist and liberal spatial adscription that I previously raised as a mechanism that ascribes a different value to the private compared to the public space. In my view, when Rosa claims that “it should not be a feminist issue”, together with her previous reflection on the private and public as a difference that “should not exist” but that it does, so this is “why we should speak about the “private””, she is pointing out not only the artificiality of the liberal demarcation private vs public but also the risk of naturalising the adscription of that demarcation as it has consequences in reifying the private as a feminist and women’s issue. And Rosa’s reflection clashes others as Teresa’s, whose discussion suggests that debating sex-affective relationships in a non-feminist space would be somehow “weird” and out of place, suggesting that she (Teresa) sees it as a topic that is intrinsically feminist:

I think it is important to question the way we establish relationships with other people. But... Within my organisation, because Anticapitalistas is at the end of the day an organisation with hierarchies, so then, right... It would be weird to me if I am in the “education days” for example, and all of a sudden, they start talking about this. I think in spaces where it is appropriate, like feminist spaces that are ludic spaces, it is made visible in a very natural way

In “feminist spaces” that are “ludic spaces”, it is “appropriate” to discuss topics as nonmonogamy. This quote raises, precisely, the risk of fixing the personal and the sex-affective to feminism and therefore to women. If sexuality and emotional topics are considered, essentially and uncritically as a private and feminine (or feminist) issue, that could be counterproductive if we are advocating to make the personal politically mobilisable. That Teresa does not see as appropriate to discuss about nonmonogamy in a space that is not primarily feminist, perpetuates the distinction feminine-personal and masculine-public, and if this happens in a context ontologically determined in universal and masculinist ways, as it is the world we live in, this might lead to approach personal matters as not only specifically feminine but also as specifically particular, as that without universal implications. And if we see the feminine as not universal, this might reinforce the dismiss of personal matters as not a priority for the political struggle. That is, while it makes sense Feminism revolted against the dismiss of the personal as not politically relevant, it is necessary that this politisation
becomes effective without falling in a particular vs universal, feminine vs masculine, private vs public basis.

But looking at the larger picture, in spite of the differences on how natural and intrinsic the link *Feminism-politicisation of the personal* is visualised, what it is clearly shared by Rosa, Vandana and Simona is firstly, the fundamental role Feminism has if we are concerned with mobilising personal aspects as political and secondly, the problematic insufficient presence and relevance that has been given to this movement, in their experiences. As I discussed previously, this side-lining seems to be a shared opinion from Feminists that see the cause in a prioritisation of class over gender (*Arruzza* 2015, *Smith* 2013, *Maestro* 2013). I have briefly mentioned that Marxist Materialist Feminism provides a theoretical underpinning that attempts to challenge this.

For example, the Social Reproduction approach (*Arruzza* 2016), attempts to provide a non-reductionist account of the relation between gender oppression and Capitalism by providing a unitary theory about gender oppression and its relationship to Capitalism that does not fall into the impasse of dual and triple systems theories. It does so by looking at Social Reproduction as main theoretical paradigm, in which all those activities and processes that reproduce and maintain life are included as relevant, as for example the social construction of sexuality, among many other things (2016: 10). In a similar vein, others have argued for making sexuality central in the Social Reproduction framework since despite discourses celebrating sexual liberation and rights gained in this field, yet “sexual activity is silenced and made invisible” and while “we own our own bodies”, we “are dispossessed of control over them.” (*Sears* 2015). These are perspectives that might help to make Feminism, Gender, the personal and the sex-affective, important within Anticapitalism.

Intersectionality is also another framework that might contribute to analyse not only how different axes of power interact (*Lykke* 2010: 50), but also how different components of the social reality relate to each other. That is, intersectionality complexifies ontological matters, and it does so by exposing the different levels of analysis that exist in social reality while underlining the material and symbolic connotation each level has (*Yuval-Davis* 2006). Consequently, intersectionality is useful as it allows fluidity and interconnection as opposed to fixing and bracketing ontological cosmovisions that prevent us from firstly, seeing the
personal realm matters as related to other analytical levels, included those more structural (or public) and secondly from acknowledging that nonmonogamy, per se, has political relevance insofar as it has material and symbolic consequences.

Having said this, it is important to acknowledge that intersectionality has been criticised for not offering a clear methodology (Nash 2014, May 2014) and for being a bourgeois analytical framework (Mitchell 2013). While taking on these criticisms, I draw on Taylor’s (2010: 163) claim that intersection is not (or should not be) an “abstract concept or a benign listing, but something that lives, breathes and moves”. Therefore, we should move beyond intersectionality (or any other perspective) as a theoretical paradigm, towards understanding it as a lived experience that can be empirically researched and understood (ibid), which is what I am trying to do with this research, as it starts and ends with people’s political activity and commitment.

Therefore, to face Feminism’s marginalisation from Anticapitalism, it might be useful to draw on perspectives such as Social Reproduction or Intersectionality since they might offer useful theoretical insights that enable Feminism to get a more protagonist role. However, as Simona says “one thing is theory and another one is practice”, one thing is discussing about positive theoretical inputs, and another one is challenging the practical difficulties to move from the discursive to the actual realisation of having Feminism on the political agenda. And this gets particularly difficult since, as Vandana and Rosa claim, one of the reasons why Feminism is being dismissed is, simply but very problematically, sexism. Vandana is the participant that gives a more detailed explanation on examples showing how the work from women and Feminism gets invisibilised by co-activist men’s engagement in the perpetuation of conservative roles and in the monopolisation of the speech. She describes a few situations in which she faced the invisibilisation of her own work when she managed an anticapitalist-agroecologist-feminist project:

They (co-activist men) think they got it all about Feminism and that they have it super present, and no. They do not want to see it. When I tried to speak with them about it they get very defensive…. So, at first I used to shut up and feel hurt and say “hey, you are not realising about it but you are invisibilising me” And then they would go and say “I did not realise it… I did not mean it”, And then I said “I don’t care whether you are aware or not, whether you meant it or not, be aware of the fact that you are not aware, and work it out. It is not possible that you are all here at the frontline saying you are the greatest feminists”. And this way I shut a few up. Discourse remains in men, they re-occupy the space and with their Discursive Feminism they write you off again.
Rosa backs this up when describing some situations in which men dominated the discourse or when some activists engaged in gender conservative roles:

Feminism... it is difficult to bring it forward. It is a general lack within organisations because at the end of the day men talk more, louder, and they do not hesitate to repeat what has already been said. So in the end we are reproducing certain roles within organisations.

I mean, I have encountered people in organisations that talk about their partners and it is like, god… they say “I cannot come to the meeting, I need to prepare the children’s meal” And things like that, so you say… fuck, men! much ado about nothing!

While experiences of sexism are worrying in absolute terms, it is particularly worrying in the present case as they prevent Feminism from having a more fundamental role, and in turn, they prevent Feminists from bringing forward relevant aspects such as the sex-affective to the political agenda. Vandana and Rosa reflections raise critical problems since identifying sexism within leftist environments is particularly difficult as some Feminists engaged in social movements have evidenced. In this sense, Biglia & Gonzalez (2012) argue that, as social movements are minoritisised groups, they face a stronger social pressure to emphasise cohesion factors as group identity to keep a positive image of themselves and this, together with the “good militant ideal” shape the fake believe that within progressive activism there is never contradiction between theory and practice. As a result, discrimination and prejudices are hardly acknowledged and questioned (ibid).

Luckily, Spanish activists have looked at strategies to challenge sexism in social movements. Some examples are the guide *Tijeras para todas, violencia machista en movimientos sociales* (scissors for everybody, sexist violence in social movements) (2011) in which there is a compilation of texts discussing critically the phenomenon; the fanzine guide *Torres mas altas hemos visto caer* (we have seen highest towers falling down) (Several Authors, nd) that provides practical tools; and the analysis on sexism within the squad movement, by scholar-activist Pilar Alvarez Moles (2012). These are grassroots guides based on direct experience that should be a must read in any political group!

Moving on now to discuss what the rest of the participants have to say regarding the role of Feminism, it is worth examining that Teresa, Hugo and Emiliano (who are interestingly the three participants who work/have worked with the political group Anticapitalistas) do affirm
that Feminism is well represented within Anticapitalism, which suggests that this political group in particular does take Feminism seriously. As Emiliano affirms:

Feminism has taken a quite important place in the experiences I had within Anticapitalistas. But of course, as a man I cannot explain much because the feminist spaces were not mixed. And I would have probably not attended those spaces as there were others that appeal to me more…. But yes, I think Feminism has been quite alive, and from different feminist perspectives. I think it has been well represented.

This contention is curious if we take back the previous statements from both Teresa and Hugo on nonmonogamy as a topic that does receive political attention within Anticapitalistas. It is remarkable that in spite of the different opinions on whether Feminism is present in the participants’ anticapitalist spaces, there seems to be a connection between Feminism and debating personal matters, in either negative ways, as in the case of Simona, Rosa and Vandana, or in positive ways, as in the case of Hugo and Teresa.

Another remarkable aspect is the evidence Hugo and Teresa give to contend that Feminism is present. They mention the organisation of the “Summer Feminist Days” as proof showing that Feminism, in general, is present within Anticapitalistas. While organising some feminist days seems in any case a positive drive from the political group to take feminist concerns on, there is not time during the interview to discuss this further and to analyse closely what these days are, what the approach to Feminism is and, more importantly, what the political outcome is. While suggesting to take this as a “to be explored issue”, here I would like to bring back the analysis of the draft paper I was given by Anticapitalistas in which there was a slight downsizing of the personal-emotional, and a patronising attitude towards the new generation of Feminists, to further contend the relevance of examining closely how Feminism and personal matters are taken on in a given organisation, as it seems equally important as examining if Feminism, generally speaking, is present or not.

Another aspect worth mentioning is that not all contentions are as straightforward as they seem initially. For example, as the reflection goes on, Teresa makes some refinements to the statement she previously made on Feminism as being well represented, when she differentiates between having a feminist understanding and having members with a feminist background. As she explains, while there is a feminist understanding within Anticapitalistas, the participation of feminist cuadros, that is, people with organisational responsibilities with a solid feminist background, is not that high, suggesting therefore that there should be more:
I think that at the organic level there is that awareness of the importance (of Feminism). The question is that we do not have enough cuadros to make that importance tangible in real work. As all political spaces, the percentage of anticapitalist feminine presence is not too high, is it? It does not reach 30%.

This reflection from Teresa is very relevant to understand how to measure the role of Feminism in a given anticapitalist space. Is it a question of people’s number or a question of the quality of the awareness process? There seems to be an implicit conclusion that to make Feminism part of the organisation what is needed is actually more Feminists! So it is not just about having people with a mere feminist understanding. If this is the case, that is another aspect to work out within the broad objective of giving Feminism more relevance.

Before summarising the conclusions on the discussion on Feminism, I will first discuss how, although to a lesser extent, the LGBTIQ Movement is also mentioned as a movement that contributes to politicise sex-affective relationships. Although less frequently mentioned, very probably due to the profile of participants, I think it is important to include it here due to the vehemence in which both Rosa and Hugo discuss about it. The discussion on the LGBTIQ Movement underlines the fundamental role that it takes towards deconstructing gender and sexuality as a mechanism paving the way to talk about nonmonogamy from a political perspective. A wide range of literature on nonmonogamy conducted from the LGBTIQ perspective (Kleese 2005, Robinson 2013, Sheff 2005, Bonello, 2009) evidences this interest. In this sense, Rosa reflects about the strong relationship the LGBTIQ Movement has with Feminism on this regard:

The LGBTIQ Movement has been deeply connected to the feminist movement. Because it deconstructs…and this links to feminist theories, as they ask why gender exists, they question where it comes from. Then the LGBTIQ Movement has been much related to that, and it is from this movement where polyamorous relationships started to be debated. The LGBTIQ Movement was a trampoline for all the theories on polyamory as it has been very connected to Feminism.

However, despite acknowledging the positive role from LGBTIQ Movements in gender, sexuality and monogamy deconstruction, the convergence between the anticapitalist movement and the LGBTIQ Movement is, according to Hugo, an on-going process shaped by a back and forth that is not conflict free. He mentions the word “tensions” when he describes his experiences as anticapitalist queer militant, although the outcome is not entirely negative, as he contends:
I think there is some kind of rejection from Anticapitalism towards the LGBTIQ Movement, leading to homophobic attitudes, or better, LGBTIQ phobic attitudes. But even then, it is a discourse that is not marginalised, and it is kept at the centre of the political activity. There is a tension, and I think there will always be… but that tension needs to be studied in a critical and political way to minimise it as much as possible.

This tension that Hugo mentions is of extreme importance. If the LGBTIQ Movement has a leading role in politicising personal aspects and nonmonogamy, then keeping the synergies between both movements while respecting each movement’s main goals is essential. And this applies also to Feminism or to any other movement that might contribute to make the personal politically important with Anticapitalism. But this is a hard job, as Feminist Maria Matsuda (1991) reflects upon, since coalitions have limits of both utility and tolerance. As she argues, there needs to find a way to get a shared vision for social change while respecting the specificities of each movement, and the comfort we feel when avoiding difficult conversations is seducing (ibid). However, against this, Matsuda suggests “asking the other question”, forcing us to work on the obvious and non-obvious relationships of domination, since this discomfort that arises is essential and brings an opportunity for learning. This seems what Hugo has in mind when claiming the need to keep the tension and the dialogue, no matter how hard it is.

Besides to the “tension” aspect and to the need to learn how to make coalitions, there is another theme relevant to the research regarding the role of the LGBTIQ Movement, which is how, according to Hugo and Rosa experiences, certain sectors have lost radicalism as a result of being co-opted by an assimilationist tendency. As Hugo criticises, “capitalism mutates, 70 years ago capitalism was homophobic. But now it has seen a movement difficult to counteract against that could bring economic profit, which is the LGBTIQ Movement. So capitalism has capitalised it”. The neoliberal co-optation of political movements working around antinormative sexualities is one of the driving forces leading to the present research, as there are a number of studies showing the de-radicalisation of these movements in this regard, as I have discussed previously. One of the ways to de-radicalise a movement is indeed through pushing an assimilationist perspective towards a consumerist hetero-white-monogamish-middle class pattern, and this is precisely Rosa’s criticism:

(celebrating-ironic tone of voice) So let’s go! Gays and lesbians come out of the closet? So here we go! They will be everywhere and in all media but, of course in a white, bourgeois, and heteropatriarchal
way, with very clear man and woman roles… (go back to normal tone of voice) Their roles are exactly the same, as otherwise it would be very dangerous…

From a perspective concerned with mobilising nonmonogamy as anticapitalist resistance, this is a phenomenon to take extremely care of since it risks leaving behind the antisystem potential of nonmonogamy. This echoes a previous discussion from participants on how certain versions of nonmonogamy (the consumption of bodies) do not challenge capitalist principles necessarily as they do not engage in a critical reflection on the political economy. Therefore, it matters how nonmonogamy is mobilised, it is crucial the motivation that backs it up, and it is not just about how disconnected the sex-affective is in relation to the political economy, but also about an alignment with the neoliberal agenda. Although nonmonogamy does not seem to be worked out through political activity in itself (yet), and the risk of neoliberalisation is, in my understanding, just a potential risk, being attentive to how nonmonogamy should not be mobilised is a realistic and sensitive move according to participants’ experiences.

Lastly, there is another worry that is raised about the de-radicalism of the LGBTIQ Movement. As it seems, not only certain sectors within the Marxist Movement engage in a closed and reductionist grand narrative strategy, but certain LGBTIQ Movement sectors do it too, as Hugo suggests it is the case concerning the revolutionary homosexuals who, as Hugo affirms, “are more involved with the acronym LGBT, and they think that by themselves they can change society completely, including both the economic and relational side”. That kind of dogmatism is as useless from Anticapitalism as it is from the LGBTIQ Movement, and although it is not representative from the LGBTIQ Movement, as Hugo explains, it does reinforce the need to be critical about how the struggles’ axes are articulated and how reductionist these axes are considered. As I already mentioned, it should be analysed how the ideological and the economic are connected before making a priori conclusions, but if the revolutionary homosexuals engage in a politics that mobilises sexuality in essentialising ways disconnected from other struggles, that is not precisely the best strategy for making nonmonogamy matter.

What does stand out from the discussion on Feminism and the LGBTIQ Movement? As I understand it, Anticapitalism should take feminist and LGBTIQ concerns on to mobilise practically personal matters. Nonetheless, this needs careful attention to few aspects.
Regarding Feminism, if transversalising it within Anticapitalism is still an issue, then we are in trouble. If there is a problem with sexism, this needs urgent action, especially if the nature of social movements make it particularly difficult to identify, and the problem does exist as participants so vehemently expressed. Besides this, we have the issue of how to measure the transversalisation of Feminism in an anticapitalist space. Is it a matter of having a feminist understanding or of having feminists?

As for the LGBTIQ Movement, discriminations and tensions also shape how Anticapitalism deals with LGBTIQ concerns, therefore it needs to be worked out to find a balance between the different agendas. Besides this, certain LGBT sectors are shaped by assimilationism and reductionism, and it is important to keep this in mind if there is a concern about mobilising the LGBTIQ Movement to make personal matters political from an anticapitalist point of view.

In general, what it seems to be more important in these debates is that, to make personal matters as nonmonogamy politically relevant within Anticapitalism, this movement needs to take other struggles on. That is, the convergence of struggles is necessary.

**Convergence of Struggles and Post-Capitalist Society**

If we analyse the participants’ reflections in light of all the previous discussions and within the context of each interview, it is evident that a fundamental aspect is that more than engaging in a discussion on simply how Anticapitalism should embrace the personal as political, it is a matter to ensure those movements, struggles and interests more connected to the traditionally and liberally defined private space are given relevance and are given the attention they deserve. That is, instead of debating who has to take care of politicising the personal, it is a matter of understanding that the various struggles are complementary, and that this should be recognised and worked out to advocate for making nonmonogamy politically relevant.

The participants’ belief in the indispensability of this complementarity is clear. For example, some of them argue the need to advocate for the synergy between Feminism and Anticapitalism, as Emiliano so clearly expresses when saying that “the issue of polyamory and how to break up with monogamy is a brutal antipatriarchal tool, because Patriarchy is
what keeps Capitalism’s components together”. The importance of the synergy

Anticapitalism-Feminism is also evident in Rosa’s reflection about a post-capitalist society:

To me, the feminist movement is linked to Anticapitalism. To me when they say the revolution will be feminist or will not be, it is not a slogan, it is a truth. However, it has not been always like this. I think that in changing the social order this debate must be present, because otherwise the change will not be possible. I do not believe that women’s liberation will be accomplished when we change the society, or vice versa. All will be part of the same process.

And then she engages in a debate on how to put those synergies in place to make the change possible:

Firstly, we will have to set all society’s oppressed groups free, including women, who we are half of society, and we are the ones taking the bulk of care work. So material bases need to change. And once you get that, and once you are not tied up to a husband that maintains you, or to a shitty job to survive…then people would develop as people, they would feel free to relate sex-affectively with whoever they want.

Another way to contend the necessary convergence is advocating for the complementarity of economic and ideological struggles, as Hugo explains, where the struggles related to the sex-affective will need to be considered:

A conceptualisation that understands ideological relations as linked to economic ones, cannot side-line an ideological struggle while taking care of an economic one. The way we relate to others is linked to society’s economic structure. To me, it is not possible to be anticapitalist if we don’t develop other relationships because Capitalism is fed by particular relationships. To me, the utopia means being aware of and process our emotional needs, and from there, to assume those emotional and sex-affective needs, to share them with the environment, not only with our partners but with other people. From the moment in which relationships are defined as such, that would be the utopia… but that needs to come together with economic empowerment. There is not one thing without the other.

The complementarity of struggles is also explained as having a multi-identity, as Vandana vehemently argues when describing her own identity:

To me, everything is one. I speak about Feminism, and to me Feminism is a different way to construct the world, it is the more powerful tool to dismantle Capitalism and this system in which we are living in. I don’t see myself fully anticapitalist without considering myself feminist, and I don’t see myself fully anticapitalist without thinking in agroecology.

That to reach a utopian post-capitalist society needs a multi-struggle approach, in which the sex-affective, the emotional needs and sex are politically considered seem to be a general opinion from this study’s participants.
CONCLUSIONS

Nonmonogamy is given political significance and has an unexplored potential in broadening up the notion of resistance. The great number of aspects related to socio-political organisation from an anticapitalist and feminist perspective that arise when discussing about it evidences it. Nonmonogamy challenges many aspects as mononormativity, heteronormativity, female sexualities’ policing, privatised forms of bonding, privatised emotional arrangements and the sexual division of work. There are, nonetheless, issues that remain less questioned and that are not useful if we are to mobilise nonmonogamy as anticapitalist and feminist. There is subversion in nonmonogamy but also norm compliance (as with romantic love) and useless versions of nonmonogamy that centralise the sexual component disconnecting it from the political economy’s analysis. Instead of taking nonmonogamy as intrinsically anticapitalist and feminist, it is therefore more accurate to examine how activists mobilise it in a given political context, how it is connected to their visions of the world, what issues emerge when challenging nonmonogamy, how can we use those reflections for political activity and what aspects need more political attention. By doing this, we can assess if and how nonmonogamy offers alternative visions of the world.

Understanding what a personal matter is for activists is equally important. I have used nonmonogamy as an example of a personal matter, while contending that personal matters should be understood in way that are non-reductive (the political is the personal and beyond, highlighting the continuum private-public) and non-essentialising (it should not presuppose a feminine matter, but a different allocation of spaces and values where the private space has been feminised and deprived of relevance). Articulating the personal and nonmonogamy this way challenges the reductive approach to resistance that side-lines political acts held in the private realm as irrelevant for social change. It also challenges its sexist ontological basis, that is the liberal and patriarchal adscription system of physical and symbolic spaces.

However, this does not seem an easy task! While there is a desire to overcome the liberal separation between private-public by making its boundaries more permeable, (“too much is kept on the private”) and a reformulation of the personal is political as “strategy from within”, there is also reluctance to “expose too much of oneself”. This tension-uneasiness has not been thoroughly examined in this study, but suggests there is a pervasiveness of the
liberal thinking in which the personal is associated with the private space and the individual, as a space that needs to be protected from outsiders’ interference. Nonetheless, this makes even more relevant to work on a reformulation of the personal that while respecting each persons’ individuality and intimacy, manages to transcend the liberal approach that still conceives it as parallel to the social reality, in which certain aspects are seen as untouchable, or as irrelevant politically. That is, new ontological concepts are needed, and looking at Intersectionality and FeminismS might be of great help.

Interestingly, this “interfering in somebody’s lives” is also raised as a barrier when debating about how to make nonmonogamy politically relevant in the participants’ political collective spaces. Politicising nonmonogamy is understood here as imposing a certain sexual option to the co-activists and therefore as “too much, as it changes everything”, and while this is not this study’s approach to nonmonogamy as political, the fact that is sometimes understood this way shows that there is a lot at stake when dealing with nonmonogamy. And this is also evidenced by the fact that, even in those spaces where it is not explicitly and formally discussed (“we chat about it with the beers”), there is a latent desire to talk about it (“sooner or later we will have to discuss it”) from a political stand, and this is crucial! That is, the opportunity to politicise the sex-affective is there.

In light of this, how to make personal matters as nonmonogamy politically relevant in a given anticapitalist movement taking into consideration there is a latent desire to do so? There are two crucial aspects. One is to analyse how a given anticapitalist movement mobilises the material and ideology, to make sure this is not done in reductionist ways, so the emotional and sex are included as material and the economic is not opposed to the ideological. Marxist Materialist Feminists provide theoretical insight on how to approach this task. This should be done while being cautious about accusing anticapitalist movements of being essentialist without evidence and without taking into consideration what the vital moment of the political movement is. A bottom up, relevant based and empirically grounded approach needs to replace abstract accusations and old ways to think and discuss about social movements that give more relevance to the debate itself than to the actual movements’ needs and to what people involved in those movements have to say.
Secondly, converging is necessary. Transversalising feminism and the LGBTIQ Movement within Anticapitalism seems a major contributing factor to give relevance to personal matters from a political stand, as these are movements that have historically given priority to politicise the personal realm. In doing this, there are nonetheless many aspects to take into consideration. What does transversalising feminism (or any movement) mean? How to tackle sexism within anticapitalism? If transversalising feminism is a key move, these questions need to get attention, especially in light of a historical-practical divorce Marxism-Feminism. As for the LGBTIQ Movement, discrimination (LGBTIQ phobia) is also an aspect to tackle, together with the fact that some movements comprised under the umbrella term LGBTIQ Movement do not seem relevant for this study’s concern, as they mobilise a reductionist and assimilationist strategy.

In general, new conceptualisations of the material and the ideology and more relevance given to Feminism and the LGBTIQ Movement might help in offering a new framework to discuss about the sex-affective as site of resistance in itself. Considering sexuality, the emotional, the cultural and the ideological is necessary insofar as it blurs the boundaries between the private and public, overcomes the patriarchal adscription system of physical and symbolic spaces and avoids the prioritisation of public political acts. That is, it seizes each and every possible way to organise the anticapitalist struggle. As Hankins, affirms:

> scholars should look beyond the obvious moments of democratic political engagement, whether activism in the public square or in the occupied park, to pay attention to the quiet politics of the everyday, where everyday decision-making by individuals and communities can gradually, episodically, change dominant hegemonic norms and understandings, providing new understandings for social change (2017: 505).

A socially committed approach focused on what activists have to say about the connection between their everyday life and the structural system is necessary, as this is where the key of social change lies. We might need to put more attention to that, considering how apocalyptic the global situation is. But together, we can!
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### ANNEX

#### ANNEX 1 - QUOTES INCLUDED IN THE THESIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con conocimiento de causa, porque no tenía a nadie a mi alrededor que tuviera una relación diferente a la que conocemos... me lo planteaba como una manera muy fea de querer a alguien</td>
<td>So I questioned it because I had no one around who had a different relationship to the ones people normally have. So I thought about it as an ugly way to love somebody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me ha pasado estar en una relación en la que estaba con una chica que estaba con un chico desde hacía 5 años. Entonces para mi todo el trabajo que había ahí era de decirme “a mi me quiere por una serie de motivos, el amor que siente hacia mi es X, el amor que siente hacia la otra persona Y, y no es ni mas ni menos fuerte, sino simplemente es diferente...” pero cuando ella se quedaba conmigo yo me decia “toma! Se ha quedado conmigo y me prefiere a mi” Y luego cuando se iba con este chico yo tenia mucho trabajo de decirme “no no no... que a ti te quiere, que se ha ido porque ya esta, no pasa nada”</td>
<td>I got in a relationship with a girl that had been with a guy for about five years. Then, to me, the kind of work to do there was to tell myself “she loves me for a number of reasons, and she loves him for other reasons... is not stronger, it is just different”. But when she stayed at night with me I told myself “Yes! She stayed with me because she likes me more!” And then when she left with him then I had to tell myself again (self-reassuring voice) “no... it is ok, she loves you, she is gone because... that’s is. It is ok”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A el le costo cerca de dos años dejar de pasarlo mal cuando sabia que yo había</td>
<td>He had a thought time and needed nearly two years to stop struggling” when he knew Julia was with somebody else, and that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estado con alguien y eso fue un trabajo largo, de acuerdos, etc... meant “a lot of time spent in discussing and reaching agreements”.</td>
<td>Te enfrentas a tus miedos más profundos y a tus inseguridades. Estas cambiando la situación de poder. Y eso por narices te hace crecer como persona y te conoces más, aprendes más, a ser más libre… Aprendes a comunicarte mejor, mas asertivamente. Y sí, he hablado de cosas negativas. Te llevas guantazos también. Pero porque es un proceso y lo va a ser siempre. En el momento en que te metes en este fregao, tus referentes sociales y culturales ya no te sirven. Pero, justamente al no tener otros referentes te los tienes que ir construyendo tu misma y para mí es un proceso que va a ser una evolución, y eso ya es positivo. You face your deepest fears and insecurities. You are changing the power balance. And that makes you to grow personally. You get to know yourself better, you learn, you get freer, you learn to communicate better, more assertively. But yes, I also mentioned the negative side. But because it is a process and it will always be. From the moment you get into this mess, your social models are useless. But, this is precisely because you are left without them you can build them again yourself, and that is an evolution, and it is positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me gusta mas el termino monogamia consenuada pero es mas largo y farruco... Al final la clave es poder tener rel sexoaffectivas con mas de una persona, y no encasillarse en la monogamia tradicional como opcion por defecto. Que si llega la escojes pues la escojes. Pero tener abierta la posibilidad, de forma que no todos tengamos que hacer la familia nuclear y vivir en la burbuja de personas. El termino de no monogamia consensuada me gusta. I like more the term consent monogamy more than relational anarchy, polyamory or open relationship, but it is longer and more farruco... At the end of the day, the key is just to be able to have sex-affective relationships with more than one person, and not to stick to traditional monogamy by default. But if you choose it (monogamy) afterwards, well, you choose it. But the key is having the possibility to choose, so not all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mas que anarquía relacional, poliamor o pareja abierta</td>
<td>Of us have to identify with the nuclear family and with a little bubble life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…el capitalismo lo que ha hecho muy bien es ponernos a cada uno en esa burbuja individual en la que está permitido que entren dos personas y punto y si tienes descendencia entra también, pero ya está. Y tú te tienes que preocupar por eso y solo por eso. Y entonces al romper este esquema se hacen unos lazos sociales mucho más fuertes. No deja de ser una red de cuidados y de cariño que no tiene ya nada que ver con esa burbujita. Ya no solo te preocupas por lo tuyo, ya te preocupas por más gente. Y eso al capitalismo le puede joder mucho pero también le puede sentar muy bien, todo depende de si los lazos que creamos son meramente consumistas, de “voy a follar con mucha mucha gente y así voy a tener muchas crucecitas encima de la cama…” o de si, por el contrario, creamos unos lazos realmente fuertes que sean vínculos que perduren. Creo que ahí está la fuerza de la no monogamia, en hacer redes distintas…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…capitalism, what it does quite ok is to place each and every of us in an individual bubble, in which it is only allowed to get two people. And you have to worry only for them, and just for them. So, when you break that pattern you develop much stronger social bonds. It is still a care and affection network, but it has nothing to do with that little bubble any more. You stop worrying only for what is yours, and you begin worrying about more people. And that is something that could challenge capitalism or, on the contrary, it might be something beneficial to capitalism, it depends on the kind of bonds and networks you develop. It depends if the bonds are merely consumerists, like “I’m going to fuck with as many people as possible, so I can get as many as possible to place them in the shelf, over my bed” or if, on the contrary, we develop bonds and networks that are strong and enduring. And there lies the strength of nonmonogamy, in developing different networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pero para mí no significa que si acabamos con el patriarcado y establecemos una manera más libre y empoderada de las</td>
<td>If we establish a freer and more empowering way to forge relationships, if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaciones personales... si acabamos con la norma monógama no necesariamente acabamos con el capitalismo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parecía como que durante los últimos años ha habido el boom del poliamor, y parecía que nada que no fuera poliamor era correcto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esto del poliamor está empezando a tener bastante lado mediático, que por un lado es chulo, porque también lo pones a la vista y a la vez también... aunque por otro lado, no se hasta que punto somos un poco monos de circo, pero bueno, sí... A ver si así al menos otras personas se van cuestionando.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entonces sí que veo unas diferencias que ellos no tienen. Y el tema de juzgar es... ostia, no se nos juzga igual a hombres y mujeres, ¿no? Un tío que se declara poliamoroso, la primera reacción de entrada, va a ser... “ole, tú que folla un montón” pero, en cambio en una mujer, así, de entrada, no va a ser un “ole tú que folla un montón”, ¿no? Va a ser un, “joder que puta que eres, ¿no?” con las connotaciones negativas. Y, a mí eso me jode mil. Cuando se lo plantamos a unos amigos, a Reki le dijeron “ah... no... ¿pero ella también?”. No te jode, va a ser él solo el que... y bueno, tener que enfrentarte a estas cosas me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then I see differences, things that they (men) do not face... The issue of judging is... fuck, we are not judged the same way as men, aren’t we? A guy who says he is polyamorous, the first reaction is (celebratory tone) “uuuua! You are fucking a lot, men!” but for women, at first, it is not like (celebratory tone) “ole, great, you are fucking a lot!”, it would be more a (disgusted tone) “fuck, you are a whore, aren’t you?”. Y, a mí eso me jode mil. When Reki and I told some friends about our relationship, they said (surprised tone) “ah... ok... but is she also on this?” No te jode, va a ser él solo el que... so well,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cabrea un montón. Hay unas diferencias de género impresionantes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pero… en mi experiencia mas personal, yo tengo asociadas unas autocensuras y una culpabilidad que poco a poco trabajo. Y es bastante compartido el tema de la culpa.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>facing these things pisses me off a lot. There are huge differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>…cuando tenía 13 años, tenía una amiga muy amiga y llego un momento en que no sabía si lo que sentía era solo amistad o era otro tipo de amor o atracción física… no tenía ni idea. Porque cuando te pasa eso con un chico siendo una chica no te tienes que plantear preguntas, pero al ser una chica fue un quebradero de cabeza. Después cuando la gente me preguntaba “¿qué te gustan más los tíos o tías?” Para mí era una pregunta sin sentido… a mí me gusta una persona y lo que tenga entre las piernas me da igual. Para mí era un absurdo. Entonces una vez que yo entendí el amor así, el siguiente paso que</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…when I was 13, I had a very good friend, and at some point, I did not understand my feelings for her. I did not know if it was friendship or another type of love or sexual attraction… I had no idea. Because when you face a situation like this with a boy, being a girl teenager, you don’t have to ask questions about anything. But as I felt this for a girl, it was a quebradero de cabeza. So after, when people used to ask me “what do you like more, boys or girls?”, that was nonsense to me. I like the person and whatever it is between their legs, I don’t care. So, for me it was absurd. And then,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vino poquísimos después. Me di libertad absoluta para que me gustara alguien, yo me preguntaba ¿por qué si no he reprimido mi sexualidad tengo que reprimir ahora el querer estar con una persona? Todo vino muy rápido... Primero fue la salida del armario y luego se me plantearon estas cosas. Se te abre la visión, comprendes que no te tienen por qué gustar o los hombres o las mujeres luego te preguntas porque no te pueden gustar más personas a la vez. Para mí eso fue un trampolín

Para nosotras tener relaciones sexuales es un término amplio, porque yo no sé muy bien donde está el límite de que se considera sexo y que no. Estar desnuda con una persona y que los cuerpos estén en contacto y tener un orgasmo es sexo. ¿Pero porque besar a alguien y abrazar a alguien ¿no es sexo? Entonces a mi me ha pasado de tener un impulso sexual hacia una persona enorme y a veces he sentido que esas ganas se me han pasado después de haber pasado la tarde entera tocándonos, hablando... y eso entonces ¿que es? ¿Es eso una relación fuera de la pareja o no? Para mi hay un montón de cosas que se tienen que deconstruir, el sexo también, yo no me siento en absoluto identificada con la idea de sexo

Once I understood love in this way, the next step came right after. I gave myself absolute liberty to like people. I asked myself: “if I have not repressed my sexuality why I should repress myself now about wanting to be with a person?” Everything was really quick. Coming out as bisexual was a springboard.

For us (Luna and her partner, Alicia) having sexual relationships is a broad term, because I don’t know where the limit between sex and love is. Being naked with somebody in bed, where bodies touch and orgasm, is sex. But why kissing and hugging is not? Isn’t that sex? It happened to me that I had a great sexual attraction for a person and after spending the day with that person, touching us, talking… what is that? Is that a relationship out of the couple? There are so many things to deconstruct, and one is sex. I do not feel identified with the idea of sex we have
…yo respecto a eso siempre he sido bastante escéptica, ¿no? No es que no creo que se puedan mantener relaciones emocionales a la vez, es que no creo que tengamos que forzarlo, ¿no? yo nunca he mantenido varias relaciones emocionales al mismo tiempo… también es verdad que yo me considero bastante romántica ... entonces me parece difícil que se dé la situación. Pero ... la relación que yo tengo con mi compañero es una relación sin exclusividad sexual y hemos ido trabajando a lo largo de los 4 años que llevamos juntos...

| ...yo respecto a eso siempre he sido bastante escéptica, ¿no? No es que no creo que se puedan mantener relaciones emocionales a la vez, es que no creo que tengamos que forzarlo, ¿no? yo nunca he mantenido varias relaciones emocionales al mismo tiempo... también es verdad que yo me considero bastante romántica ... entonces me parece difícil que se dé la situación. Pero ... la relación que yo tengo con mi compañero es una relación sin exclusividad sexual y hemos ido trabajando a lo largo de los 4 años que llevamos juntos... |

| ...I have always been quite sceptical about that (having an emotional relationship with more than one) didn’t I? It is not that I don’t think that you can have two emotional relationships at the same time, it is that I don’t think we have to force it. I have never had more than one emotional relationship at the same time, the truth is that I consider myself quite romantic, so I think it is difficult to be in that situation. But... the relationship I have with my partner is a relationship without sexual exclusivity and we have worked on that since the last four years that we are together... |

| Ha sido un acercamiento poco a poco, llevamos 17 años juntos. Habiamos estado con otra gente pero juntos y en un momento decidimos abrir la pareja. No nos considerábamos poliamorosos, porque seguía siendo una pareja abierta y punto. Fuera podías buscar sexo y ya está y no una pareja paralela ni nada que se pareciera a lo nuestro no? Buscabamos mantener la pareja, el sagrado pareja. Y poco a poco hemos ido evolucionando y ahora aceptamos y buscamos rel sexoafectivas que incluyan |

<p>| We go into it step by step. We’ve been together for 17 years. We had been with other people but still together, and at some point we decided to keep opening up the couple. We did not consider ourselves as poliamorous, because it was still an open relationship, full stop. You could search for sex outside the couple and that was it, not another partner and nothing related to our relationship. We wanted to keep the couple, the sacred of the couple. And step by step we evolved and now we accept and look for sexaffective relationships that include |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>afecto, amistad y un grado de comprensión más allá del sexo y punto.</td>
<td>affect, friendship and more than just only sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenemos una relación desde hace 18 años, y siempre la hemos basado en</td>
<td>We have an 18 years’ relationship and we have always based it on mutual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la confianza mutua, por lo que hemos sido conscientes desde el primer</td>
<td>trust, this is why we have always been aware, since the very first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>momento que el deseo y las relaciones no son siempre en una sola</td>
<td>moment, of the fact that desire and relationships not always go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirección, ni tienen porque estar limitados a la pareja</td>
<td>together, unidirectional, and that desire and relationships do not have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to be reduced to the couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puah! para mí el tema de las etiquetas es ya un temazo. Porque la misma</td>
<td>Puah! For me the problem with labels is a big deal… Because the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palabra puede tener diferentes connotaciones para diferentes personas</td>
<td>word has different connotations to different people and for me this is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y para mí es una de las barreras… cuando intentas luchar con alguien,</td>
<td>one of the barriers to talk… so when you try to challenge somebody,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo primero que intento hacer es aclararnos primero qué significa para</td>
<td>the first thing is to firstly clarify what it means to each and every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cada persona esa palabra y empezar desde ahí</td>
<td>person and take it from there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kollontai tiene un texto muy bueno (..) donde teoriza sobre el amor</td>
<td>Kollontai has a great text (…) where she theorises about love as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>como una cuestión histórica y a mi esto me encanta porque soy historiadora.</td>
<td>historical question and I just love it as I am historian. She</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo teoriza como institución histórica en el sentido social y en el</td>
<td>theorises it as an historic institution in the social sense and in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentido de variable temporalmente. Y, entonces ve cómo los diferentes</td>
<td>sense temporally variable. And then she sees how the various production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sistemas de producción han creado modelos de amor que le han sido</td>
<td>systems have created different love systems that were useful for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>útiles… El amor actualmente aceptado es un amor de posesión, un amor</td>
<td>Love is nowadays is a possession’s love, an exclusive and monogamic love.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exclusivo y monogámico. Entonces</td>
<td>Then Kollontai says well, what kind of love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kollontaid dice, bueno, ¿qué modelo de amor necesitamos construir para una transición al socialismo? Ella cree que cuantos más lazos de amor haya entre individuos, más sólida será la unidad de la clase. Ella cree que la cuestión está en querer más y más colectivamente frente a un sistema que nos quiere solas, aisladas, sin apoyos.</td>
<td>System do we need to develop for the socialist transition? She thinks the more love bonds the better, sounder class unity would be. She thinks the question is to love each other more against a system that wants us alone (solas), isolated (aisladas) and without support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivimos en una sociedad en la nos identificamos con una imagen exterior al final. Creo que... No como... No se cómo explicártelo... Para mí, nuestro amor propio está muy basado en tanto en cuanto la gente nos quiere y nos acepta y eso nos fuerza muchas veces a definirnos como una serie de cosas... nuestro amor... tenemos muchas carencias en lo que al amor propio se refiere y una de esas cosas es porque necesitamos que la pareja nos quiera y nos quiera siempre, además. Entonces para mí eso no tiene lógica ninguna. Para mí tener este tipo de relación es romper con el formato de individuo que nos han vendido. Entonces para mí está ligado al anticapitalismo por romper con el rol del individuo que debemos ser, con que nos identificamos y relacionamos y desde donde nos vemos y no depender del amor de la otra persona sino de valerte por ti misma, y esto forma también parte del anticapitalismo, como</td>
<td>We live in a society in which we mirror ourselves externally. I think that… I don’t know how to explain it… For me, our self-love is based on how much people love us and accept us… our love... we face self-love shortages and one of the reasons is that we need a partner to love us, and to love as always. This is not logic to me. Then, to me, this (non-monogamy) is linked to anticapitalism because it breaks with the idea of both the individual we are told to be and the place we have to see ourselves. And not depending on other person’s love, that is, to be able to stand on our own feet, this is also part of anticapitalism, to be able to see ourselves as capable people and not as servants of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernos como personas capaces y no como siervos del sistema que no nos protege.</td>
<td>El concepto de relacion monogama esta ligado al concepto de propiedad privada en todos los sentidos. Los celos: ¿porque yo tengo celos? En el fondo es porque en algun sitio la siento como mia, porque siento inseguridad de pensar que mi compañera o compañero se pueda ir con otra persona. Esto es una forma de pensar super capitalista que es insana, que no existe, que no define el amor. …esto de la propiedad privada… yo no la quiero, ni en el sistema economico ni con el sistema emocional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concept of monogamous relationship is linked to private property in each and every sense. Jealousy, why am I jealous? It is because I somehow feel she (Alicia, her partner) is mine, because I am insecure about thinking that my partner would leave me for somebody else. This is a capitalist way of thinking that is insane, that does not exist, that does not define love. …this about private property… I don’t want that, not in the economic system or in the emotional system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La propiedad privada es la herramienta más potente de control del capitalismo. Desde que aparece, el capitalismo tiene las puertas abiertas para colarse bien dentro. Todo pasa a ser mio o suyo o tuyo… Mi casa, mis tierras, mi familia.. convirtiéndonos en seres individualistas que miran por lo suyo sin vínculos más allá de la propiedad, y minando el pensamiento colectivo y colaborativo, que es lo que nos hace fuertes y puede desestabilizar el sistema.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private property is the most powerful capitalist control tool… Since the beginning of times, capitalism found the doors open to get deep inside... So everything is now mine, or yours or theirs… My house, my property, my family… This turned us into individualistic beings that just take care of themselves without any links further the property. This hinders collective and collaborative thought, which is that makes us stronger and which can challenge the system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…el capitalismo lo que ha hecho muy bien es ponernos a cada uno en esa burbuja individual en la que está permitido que</td>
<td>…capitalism, what it does quite ok is to place each and every of us in an individual bubble, in which it is only allowed to get</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
entren dos personas y punto y si tienes descendencia entra también, pero ya está. Y tú te tienes que preocupar por eso y solo por eso. Y entonces al romper este esquema se hacen unos lazos sociales mucho más fuertes. No deja de ser una red de cuidados y de cariño que no tiene ya nada que ver con esa burbuja. Ya no solo te preocupas por lo tuyo, ya te preocupas por más gente. Y eso al capitalismo le puede joder mucho pero también le puede sentar muy bien, todo depende de si los lazos que creamos son meramente consumistas, de “voy a follar con mucha mucha gente y así voy a tener muchas crucecitas encima de la cama... “o de si, por el contrario, creamos unos lazos realmente fuertes que sean vínculos que perduren. Creo que ahí está la fuerza de la no monogamia, en hacer redes distintas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenemos una idea que no nos beneficia en absoluto. Y yo creo que, si se rompiera, el sistema peta, porque te cargas la familia y un montón de cosas que sustentan el sistema... Lenin decía que las ideas dominantes son las ideas de la clase dominante. Yo creo romper con esas ideas, y eso me parece una cosa anticapitalista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An idea that is not beneficial, not at all and that “if we stop that, the system would crash, because you dismantle the nuclear family and a lot of things that keep the system going, and that is anticapitalist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do I see it? As a free, without censorships world… I would like to get… A kind of housing with community spaces.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I see it as much more collective model, socialising care, and basic tasks. A much more communitarian life, less isolated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where care work is not taken on exclusively by women. And where relationships will not be determined by shitty romantic love. It would be nicer, more honest, more… it a shared housing project where each person has their privacy…

think one way would be to delimitate spaces and structures that facilitate dismantling of nucler family. Then we have care much more shared bewteen neighbourhoods. And love there will be treated as sometihing much more collective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo privado seria lo que yo pacto o lo que yo me quedo para mí y, por tanto no dejo que eso se traspuase. Bueno, creo que estoy mezclando cosas. Yo por ejemplo soy muy celosa de mi intimidad y una de las cosas que me raya un poquito del tema del poliamor es que en el fondo somos cuatro gatos y acaba siendo algo muy endogámico y… Acabar sabiendo quien folla con quién o quién esta con quién, a mí eso me molesta un montón, porque a quién coño le importa lo que yo hago o dejo de hacer… Para mí lo privado, es que yo... explicaciones las justas. Aunque la pregunta se hace un poquito muy amplia…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The private would be what I decide to keep to myself, so it doesn’t go through… Well, I think I’m messing up things… For example, I am very jealous of my privacy, and one of the things that pisses me off from polyamory is that in reality we are just a few and in the end, everything gets very endogamic… and knowing who fucks who, that pisses me off. Because who the fuck cares about what I do or not do… So for me the private is… the less explanations the better. But your question is a bit broad…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lo privado es para mí pues… lo que hay de puertas para adentro de tu casa y de tu propiedad privada... es lo que me viene a la cabeza cuando se habla del ámbito privado. Y es que para mí el ámbito privado… no estoy de acuerdo con el ámbito privado.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The private is for me…mmm…. what we find indoors, in our place, in our private property… this is what comes to my mind when we talk about the private sphere…(…) For me the private sphere… I disagree with the private sphere. This is what comes to my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para mi eso es lo que me viene, pero… creo que se debe romper más con el ámbito privado público. Al final creo que caemos en el error de mantener demasiadas cosas en el ámbito privado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para mi tener una relacion libre incluye muchisimos aspectos, significa que yo soy una persona, ella es otra, ahora mismo nuestros senderos van juntos, vamos de la mano, no sabemos si sera siempre asi, si alguna cambiara y buscaremos cosas diferentes y en esa libertad de que tu deberias hacer lo que quieras para desarrollarte como persona tambien esta dentro el campo afectivo sexual… no es simplemernte follar con quien quieres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step by step, we (Nuria and him) got to nonmonogamy as the most effective relationship, so we don’t lose part of ourselves along the way. So we do not have to give up other relationships due to this nonsense we have learned…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first thing that comes to my mind is the private vs public division of work… I don’t know… I think that the emotional is private in the sense of personal, or linked to the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individual. The problem is that the word private is understood as if it is not connected to the social, or influenced by the social… and that it is not the case.

The personal is political. That’s it. Look, relationships in this capitalist system have bloody political implications. And if I change power relations as a woman and as a feminist, I would be challenging this capitalist and patriarchal system. That is why the personal is political, because in the personal there are also power relations that make us living in a certain way.

The standard definition of the private would be something like what it is constrained by the limits of personal life and what is not related to the political realm. In that view, the mustiest but subtlest sexism shelters, as if what happens at home stays at home and it is no one’s business because it is a private issue. To me, that difference between private and public should not exist. It is political how the relationship is, and of course we have to intervene if we see nasty things going on. But the fact that I think that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>individual. The problem is that the word private is understood as if it is not connected to the social, or influenced by the social… and that it is not the case.</th>
<th>personal, o lo ligado al individuo. El problema es que la palabra privado parece que quiere decir que no esté influido por nada social... y eso no es así…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The personal is political. That’s it. Look, relationships in this capitalist system have bloody political implications. And if I change power relations as a woman and as a feminist, I would be challenging this capitalist and patriarchal system. That is why the personal is political, because in the personal there are also power relations that make us living in a certain way.</td>
<td>Lo personal es político. Es que es así. A ver, las relaciones en este sistema capitalista tienen una implicaciones políticas y estructurales de la ostia. Y si yo cambiara ese tipo de relaciones de poder como mujer o feminista, estoy luchando contra el sistema capitalista y patriarcal. Por eso lo personal es político, porque en lo personal también hay unas relaciones de poder que nos condicionan a vivir de una determinada manera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The standard definition of the private would be something like what it is constrained by the limits of personal life and what is not related to the political realm. In that view, the mustiest but subtlest sexism shelters, as if what happens at home stays at home and it is no one’s business because it is a private issue. To me, that difference between private and public should not exist. It is political how the relationship is, and of course we have to intervene if we see nasty things going on. But the fact that I think that</td>
<td>La definición estándar de lo privado podría ser algo así como lo que está constreñido a los límites de la vida personal y que no concierne al ámbito político. En ese paraguas el machismo más rancio, pero también el más sutil se escuda con cosas como que lo que pasa en la pareja se queda en casa y nadie debería meterse porque es privado. Para mí esta diferencia entre lo público y lo privado no debería existir, sí que es político cómo es la relación que tienes con tu pareja y por supuesto creo que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difference should not exist, does not mean it actually does not exist, and that is why we should speak about the “private””</td>
<td>hay que intervenir cuando ves relaciones chungas. Que para mí ese límite entre público y privado a ese respecto no debería existir no significa que no exista, es por ello que si hay que hablar de &quot;lo privado&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political changes do not come only from the political sphere. They should start at the personal and intimate level of the person. What a good activist of change should do first and foremost is to get awareness and knowledge and question themselves about the truths in which they believe, and eschew dogmas</td>
<td>Los cambios políticos no vienen solo de la esfera política. Deben empezar desde la esfera personal e íntima de la persona. Un buen activista del cambio, lo primero que debe hacer es formarse y cuestionarse a sí mismo, cuestionarse las verdades que cree, y huir de los dogmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take it (non-monogamy) 100 per cent as a political tool. In my opinion it is not just a matter of living differently and it is not a matter that my partner and I do things secretly. To me it is essential to get out of the closet and explain that there are other ways to have relationships and that compulsory monogamy is false, it is not worth it. The personal is political. I stand for it. So… like this we can open other people’s eyes.</td>
<td>Yo me lo tomo como herramienta política cien por cien (la nomanogamia). Para mi no es solo vivir de una manera distinta y que mi pareja y yo hagamos ciertas cosas a escondidas. Para mi es primordial salir del armario y explicar que hay otras maneras de tener relaciones y que la monogamia obligatoria es falsa, que no vale la pena. Lo personal es político. Yo me lo tomo muy así. Para intentar abrir los ojos de quien se pueda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the spaces where I worked, the private is still what happens indoors and it stays indoors, most of the time. It remains a discursive statement that we have to break up with the private and personal. My house is, in reality, my house, my space, my private space, my… and no one has the right to speak.</td>
<td>En el ámbito en el que yo me he movido, lo privado es lo que está de puertas adentro y se queda de puertas adentro la mayoría de las veces. Se queda en el discurso que hay que romper con lo privado, pero... mi casa es mi casa, mi espacio privado y aquí nadie habla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This topic, care work in the personal space, is very important as it links to the economy. It is as fundamental as the pure class struggle. Because if capitalism had to assume the cost of the workforce reproduction, the cost of taking care of the elderly and the cost of daily life care, as housing, food… then capitalism will fall immediately.</td>
<td>Ese tema precisamente, el de los cuidados en el espacio personal, es lo que vincula con la cuestión económica. Es un tema tan central como la cuestión puramente de lucha de clases. Porque si el capitalismo tuviese que asumir el coste de la reproducción de mano de obra, del cuidado de las personas mayores, del cuidado que necesitamos día a día... de la casa, de la alimentación... caería en cuestión de minutos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One thing is private property, and another very different thing is the private space. The topic of sexuality is one of the hardest topics to discuss. I mean I… I am very open and I like sharing… when we go for a beer, we sometimes end up talking about sex. I think there is a taboo there, that is shit. At the end, you only discuss the topic with certain people that you know will not judge you, or people you know you get along well with, or people who want to understand you…</td>
<td>La propiedad privada es una cosa, pero el espacio privado, es otra. Y el tema de la sexualidad es el tema más privado, el que mas le cuesta hablar a la gente.. O sea yo porque soy muy abierta, y compartimos, y vamos a tomar algo y acabamos hablando de sexo... Creo que ahí hay un tabú que... que es una mierda. Al final solo tratas el tema con ciertas personas que sabes que no te van a juzgar o con las que vas a tener entendimiento o un querer entender.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
…we did not discuss it openly as we did for example with care work. There were no debates organised around that. But when we used to discuss it apart, we did consider it as a relevant topic. But we did not consider it as a topic that we needed to discuss, by itself, to keep up the work. However, people who I worked with and myself, every time we engaged in that conversation, we did it from a political perspective, as it is something with the potential to destabilise the system.

| …no se ponía sobre la mesa como si lo hacíamos con el tema de los cuidados. No se generaban debates sobre el tema. Pero cuando lo hablabamos aparte, sí. Pero no lo considerábamos un aspecto a tratar como colectivo a la hora de llevar a cabo ese proyecto. Ahora, las personas que formábamos parte del proyecto, cada vez que hablamos de este tema lo hacemos desde un lugar político, porque vuelve a ser algo que desestabiliza el sistema, |

| It was something we discussed with certain comrades when we used to go for beers, where we very often ended up talking about that… the conversation very often turned to that. I think this happened because there was a need to discuss it from a political perspective. As it was so recurrent, I guess the reason was that there was a need to frame it politically, to give it a political dimension |

| Si era una cosa que con ciertos camaradas te ibas de cervezas en las que se acababa siempre hablando... muchas veces siempre la conversacion derivaba en todo esto. Yo creo que corresponfidia con la necesidad de abordarlo desde un punto de vista político. Si era tan recurentne era porque realmente había una necesidad de encuadrarlo y de darle una dimension politica |

| It is not just about how you understand relationships, but how you understand life. It is about recognising that, even if you change the rest, and this does not change, is like getting a blindfold, it’s like a headlong rush. You will have to deal with it at some |

<p>| No es solo como entender las relaciones sino como entiendes la vida. Porque si todo lo quieres cambiar, pero eso no lo cambias, es como ponerte una venda en los ojos, como una huida hacia delante. De esto en algún momento habrá que abordarlo, y ahí |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>point, and there is a lot of work to be done there, as it is not discussed publicly</td>
<td>hay un trabajo muy gordo porque no se habla de forma pública</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the change on sexafective relationships will come before the change on capitalism (...) relationships will flow without anybody forcing anyone do it in a particular way. Providing the possibility for affective relationhsips to develop regardless of the state of other relatinships.</td>
<td>Creo que se dara antes el cambio de relaciones sexoafectivas que el capitalismo, y cuando el capitalismo Lo ideal seria que las relaciones puedan fluir sin que nadie te oblige a tirar por ningun lado. Que una relacion afectiva se pueda desarrollar sea cual sea el estado de tus otras relaciones sexoafectivas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think these are topics worth debating, to explain what it is and disseminate information, as there will be people unaware. But I am not sure if the political groups should get the polyamory label, because the personal is political but the political is also personal… and people would reject that their organisation imposes how to live their life on them. I think this is complicated. I think they should give information without pushing it</td>
<td>Yo creo que son temas que mereceria la pena tratar para explicar y difundir el concepto para gente que no lo sepa... No se hasta que punto una organizacion politica tiene que ponerse la bandera del poliamor, porque lo personal es politico, pero lo politcio tambien es personal, y a la gente le causaria rechazo que una organizacion politica le sugiriera como vivir su vida. Lo veo complicado. Creo que se tendria que dar informacion sin presionar...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It might be discussed in the future, but it will be difficult, as it questions your everyday life, your relationships, your well established and hypernormalised relationships… and when you start questioning them, well some people like</td>
<td>Es posible, pero costará, porque el poliamor te cuestiona todo, te cuestiona tu dia a dia, tus relaciones establecidas y supernormalizadas y cuando te empiezas a cuestionar, hay gente a la que nos encanta preguntarnos pero otra gente es muy reacia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
questioning things, I do. But some others are very reluctant. It would be cool that polyamory would be in politics… I’d love that. The problem is that the label is cool, but when you have to question your everyday life, people are very reluctant.

Si estaría chulo que el poliamor estuviera en la política y… me encantaría, si. El problema es que la etiqueta mola un montón, pero cuando te tienes que cuestionar tu día a día, hay actitudes muy reacias.

When the movement recedes, when its going backwards, it loses space, so it is more difficult to control because we anticapitalists go back to the matrix, to the essence, to the DNA, to control that reflux.

The political topics we dealt with were more “book topics”. Debates were the various nationalist feelings, how to build an organisation, whether we would constitute a political party… so, they were deeper topics, since there were people with a very strong political background.

I think that more than punctual occasions as it is the 8th of March or occasions like that, well… a serious work is hardly done, is it? Sexual division of work, for example, everybody knows about it, but then the everyday life shows that it is not the case at all… I think these topics are not on the agenda Es un tema que esta verde, verde.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verde. En principio son organizaciones que abanderan esa lucha, pero como lo personal es político y…. pues a veces cuesta horrores.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los grupos políticos anticapitalistas no han sabido asumir el feminismo. Para mi hay y ha habido una carencia enorme en los movimientos anticapitalistas con el tema del feminismo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticapitalist political groups have not known how to process Feminism. In my opinion, there has been and there is a huge lack within anticapitalism regarding Feminism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El feminismo intenta sacar lo privado y convertirlo en público, y esto es una cosa privada... Entonces el feminismo ha sido el único movimiento capaz de hablar de esto de forma seria. Entonces yo creo que no debería ser algo del ambito feminista, pero ha sido este el que lo ha llevado adelante.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminism tries to get the private and turn it into public, and this (nonmonogamy) is a private issue… So Feminism has been the only movement able to talk about this topic seriously. So I think it should not be a feminist issue, but it has been Feminism moving this topic forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yo creo que plantearse el modo en que mantenemos relaciones con otras personas es importante. Pero... dentro de mi organización, porque anticapitalistas en una organización al fin al cabo como te decía, jerarquizada, entonces, claro, me resultaría raro si estoy en las jornadas de educación, por ejemplo, y de pronto me sacan este tema. Creo que en los espacios en los que viene a cuento, que son espacios feministas y que son espacios de ocio, si se visibiliza de una manera muy normalizada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is important to question the way we establish relationships with other people. But… Within my organisation, because Anticapitalistas is at the end of the day an organisation with hierarchies, so then, right.. It would be weird to me if I am in the “education days” for example, and all of a sudden they start talking about this. I think in spaces where it is appropriate, like feminist spaces that are ludic spaces, it is made visible in a very natural way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El feminismo ha tomado un lugar bastante importante en las experiencias que he tenido yo con anticapitalistas. Pero, claro, como hombre tampoco te puedo explicar mucho porque las formaciones feministas solían ser no mixtas. Y tampoco hubiese ido probablemente ya que hay otras formaciones que me tiran mas... Pero, si que ha habido vida en el movimiento feminista, bastante, y te diria que de todos los colores y de todo tipo de las luchas que hace el feminismo... Creo que si que ha estado bien representado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Yo creo que a nivel orgánico sí que hay esa comprensión de la importancia (del feminismo), lo que pasa es que no tenemos el número de cuadros necesario como para que se materialize en un trabajo real. Como todo espacio político, el porcentaje de militancia femenina anticapitalista no es excesivamente alto, no? No llega a un 30%. | |}
| Creen que están totalmente dentro del feminismo y que lo tienen super presente y no. No lo quieren ver. Cuando yo he intentado hablarlo con ellos te saltan a la defensiva... entonces cuando ya he pasado de callarme dolida a decir “oye, no te estás | They (co-activist men) think they got it all about feminism and that they have it super present, and no. They do not want to see it. When I tried to speak with them about it they get very defensive…. So at first I used to shut up and feel hurt and say “hey, you
dando cuenta de que nos estáis invisibilizando” Pues entonces te dicen “pues no me he dado cuenta, no lo he hecho con maldad”. Y yo digo “pues sí es que me da igual que lo hayas hecho con maldad o no. Date cuenta de que no te has dado cuenta y trabaja en ello. No puede ser que estés aquí a pie del cañón diciendo que sois los más feministas. Date cuenta de que no eres el feminista más grande del mundo...” Y así he callado a varios. El discurso vuelve a quedarse en los hombres y vuelven a ocupar el espacio y con su feminismo de discurso vuelven a anularte.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>El tema del feminismo, cuesta mucho ponerlo alante. Es una carencia de todas las organizaciones porque al final los hombres hablan mas, hablan mas fuerte, y no tienen problema en repetir las intervenciones... y al final acabamos reproduciendo unos ciertos roles en la organizaciones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminism, is difficult to bring it forward. It is a general lack of organisations because at the end of the day men talk more, louder, and they do not hesitate to repeat what has already been said. So in the end we are reproducing certain roles within organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O sea yo me he topado con gente de organizaciones que luego hablan de su pareja y es como no… “no puedo venir a la reunion, que tengo que hacer la comida para los niños...” y cosas así que dices joder, macho. Mucho lerele y poco larala...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I mean, I have encountered people in organisations that talk about their partners and it is like, god… they say “I cannot come to the meeting, I need to prepare the children’s meal” And things like that, so you say fuck, men! much ado about nothing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
El movimiento LGTBI ha estado políticamente muy ligado al movimiento feminista. Por el tema de que deconstruye... y eso va ligado a las teorías feministas, se preguntan porque existe el género, se cuestionan que no te viene dado... entonces el movimiento LGTBI ha ido muy relacionado con esto y es desde este movimiento desde donde se ha planteado un poco lo de las relaciones poliamorosas. El movimiento LGBTIQ ha sido un trampolín para todas las tesis del poliamor porque ha estado muy relacionado con el feminismo.

Yo creo que aunque si existe cierto rechazo en el movimiento anticapitalista al movimiento LGBT, que lleva a actitudes homofobas, o LGBT fobicas, mejor… Aun así, no se margina ese discurso y se mantienen en el centro de la actividad política. Hay una tension, que yo creo que va a existir siempre…pero que esa tension tienen que ser estudiada de una manera crítica y de una manera política para disolverla lo máximo

Piensan que el movimiento LGBT por si solo puede cambiar la sociedad por completo, incluido el nivel economico y relacional

| El movimiento LGTBI ha estado políticamente muy ligado al movimiento feminista. Por el tema de que deconstruye... y eso va ligado a las teorías feministas, se preguntan porque existe el género, se cuestionan que no te viene dado... entonces el movimiento LGTBI ha ido muy relacionado con esto y es desde este movimiento desde donde se ha planteado un poco lo de las relaciones poliamorosas. El movimiento LGBTIQ ha sido un trampolín para todas las tesis del poliamor porque ha estado muy relacionado con el feminismo. | The LGBTIQ movement has been deeply connected to the feminist movement. Because it deconstructs… and this links to feminist theories, as they ask why gender exists, they question where it comes from. Then the LGBTIQ movement has been much related to that, and it is from this movement where poliamorous relationships started to be debated. The LGBTIQ movement was a trampoline for all the theories on polyamory as it has been very connected to feminism. |
| Yo creo que aunque si existe cierto rechazo en el movimiento anticapitalista al movimiento LGBT, que lleva a actitudes homofobas, o LGBT fobicas, mejor… Aun así, no se margina ese discurso y se mantienen en el centro de la actividad política. Hay una tension, que yo creo que va a existir siempre…pero que esa tension tienen que ser estudiada de una manera crítica y de una manera política para disolverla lo máximo | I think there is some kind of rejection from anticapitalism towards the LGBTIQ movement, leading to homophobic attitudes, or better, LGBTIQ phobic attitudes. But even then, it is a discourse that is not marginalised, and it is kept at the centre of the political activity. There is a tension, and I think there will always be… but that tension needs to be studied in a critical and political way to minimise it as much as possible. |
| Piensan que el movimiento LGBT por si solo puede cambiar la sociedad por completo, incluido el nivel economico y relacional | Are more involved with the acronym LGBT, and they think that by themselves they can change society completely, |
So let’s go! Gays and lesbians come out of the closet? So here we go! They will be everywhere and in all media but, of course in a white, bourgeois, and heterosexual way, with very clear man and woman roles… Their roles are exactly the same, as otherwise it would be very dangerous…

Capitalism mutates, 70 years ago capitalism was homophobic. But now it has seen a movement difficult to counteract against, that could bring economic profit, which is the LGBTIQ movement. So capitalism has capitalised it”

(...) the issue of polyamory and how to break up with monogamy is a brutal antipatriarchal tool, because patriarchy is what keeps capitalism’ components together

(...) firstly we will have to set all society’s oppressed groups free, including women, who we are half of society and we are who take the bulk of care work. So material bases need to change. And once you got that, and once you are not tied up to a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>esto, y que no estas atada a un marido que te mantenga o a un trabajo de mierda para poder sobrevivir… hace que la gente pueda desarrollarse como persona, que se sienta libre de relacionarse sexoafectivamente con quien te de la gana…</td>
<td>husband that maintains you, or to a shitty job to survive…that would people develop as people, so they feel free to relate sexaffectively with whoever they want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para mí el mov feminista no va desligado del anticapitalismo. Para mí cuando se dice que la revolución sera feminista o no sera no es un eslogan, es una verdad. Aunque no siempre ha sido así. Yo sí que creo que en un cambio de sociedad tiene que haber todo este debate porque si no el cambio no será posible. Porque no me creo que la liberación de las mujeres se vaya a dar cuando cambíemos la sociedad, ni vicerversa. Todo será parte del mismo proceso</td>
<td>To me, the feminist movement is linked to anticapitalism. To me when they say the revolution will be feminist or will not be, it is not a slogan, it is a truth. However, it has not been always like this. I think that in changing the social order this debate must be present, because otherwise the change will not be possible. I do not believe that women’s liberation will be accomplished when we change the society, or vice versa. All will be part of the same process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una concepción que entiende que las relaciones ideológicas están ligadas a las económicas, no puede dejar de lado una lucha puramente ideológica mientras hace una lucha puramente económica (…) la forma como nos relacionamos está vinculada a la estructura económica de la sociedad. Para mi es imposible ser anticalpitalista si no hay otras formas de relaciones personales porque el</td>
<td>A conceptualisation that understands ideological relations as linked to economic ones, cannot side-line an ideological struggle while taking care of an economic one. The way we relate to others is linked to society’s economic structure. To me, it is not possible to be anticalpitalist if we don’t develop other relationships because capitalism is fed by particular relationships. To me, the utopia means being aware of our</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
anticapitalismo se nutre de esas determinadas formas (…) Para mí una sociedad utópica es ser conscientes de las necesidades emocionales, y a partir de ahí asumir esas necesidades emocionales sexoafectivas, compartirlas con el entorno, no solo con el entorno restringido de nuestras parejas sino con todas las relaciones. En el momento en que la sociedad defina las rel así, sería la sociedad utópica… para mí esto tienen que venir vinculado del empoderamiento económico. Una no viene sin la otra.

Para mí todo esto es uno… yo te hablo de feminismo y para mí el feminismo es una manera diferente de construir, por tanto es la herramienta más potente que hay para romper con el capitalismo o el sistema en que vivimos. No me creo una persona anticapitalista del todo sin ser feminista. No me creo una persona anticapitalista del todo sin ser pensar en la agroecología.

emotional needs, and from there, to assume those emotional and sexaffective needs, to share them with the environment, not only with our partners but other relationships. From the moment in which relationships are defined as such, that would be the utopia… but that needs to come together with economic empowerment. There is not one thing without the other.

To me, everything is one. I speak about feminism, and to me feminism is a different way to construct the world, it is the more powerful tool to dismantle capitalism and this system in which we are living in. I don’t see myself fully anticapitalist without considering myself feminist, and I don’t see myself fully anticapitalist without thinking in agroecology.
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