

Is Politics Possible Today?

Verónica Gago

Abstract: This text is an attempt to bring together some scattered notes to think about social reproduction as a general perspective and not as a set of sectors or tasks. This becomes possible based on understanding recent feminist struggles also as a challenge to their sectoral confinement and epistemic marginalization.

The perspective of social reproduction has been generalized in recent years thanks to a political comprehension of its centrality, similar to what happened in the 1970s. The pandemic was, in turn, the confirmation and an attempt to deny that centrality.

The political centrality that social reproduction has achieved, the re-emergence of this “idea-force,” is not only an academic debate, and even less a technical one: it refers to characteristics that contemporary feminist struggles have addressed and confronted, with the capacity to make the accurate diagnoses of forms of exploitation, domination, and violence of contemporary capitalism.

Keywords: Feminism – Social Reproduction – Strike – Neoliberalism

The question that brings us together in this dossier, “Is politics possible today?” already includes an answer folded within it. It starts from the suspicion that no. Its formulation once again calls into question the affirmation that there is always politics, in one form or another. The question does not speak of what politics, it just asks about politics in general, but that absence of an adjective is full of meaning. We understand it as transformative politics, revolutionary politics. Today, however, it is easier to accumulate arguments and find an empirical basis for that argument that no, there is no politics, or that politics has become impossible today. That is why concepts such as “capitalist realism” popularized by Mark Fisher (2009) are so effective, prolonging that famous phrase by Jameson from the 1990s that it is easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism. Indeed, it is increasingly possible to better describe everything that capital *can do*, all the ways in which it *is able to appropriate* from what we do, how it even conquers moods, resources, and legitimacy. From this analytical lens, an arsenal emerges that ranges from deception to exhaustion, crossed by the complexity of contemporary impotence that Paolo Virno (2021) accounts for, as always, with exquisite precision. Nothing, I insist, seems to have more force of reality than that total reality of capital: which can be verified in the exhaustion of bodies, unlivable mandates of happiness in the midst of precarity, and the ironic skill in accounting for the inefficiency of everything that attempts to oppose the existing order. There seem to be no lack of arguments for so-called “militant depression” (to use Eric Fassin’s (2020) formulation), nor awareness of the long-held inconsistency of alternatives.

Undoubtedly, there is a saga of defeats that explain and tie together the preponderance of this type of analysis, as well as the attraction of these discourses. Those words would not take place, would not take on flesh, if there were not an experience of political defeat capable of hosting them, of endowing them with explanatory force. Are we still referring to the defeat of the 1970s, with its different variants around the world? Is that the temporal reference for those who make that analysis? Everything seems to indicate that yes, it is. Is that defeat – that, in Latin America, took place at the hands of state terrorism – projected onto other closer and smaller defeats? The introjection of defeat undoubtedly provides a type of lucidity, a way of qualifying words with history.

The term coined by Étienne Balibar (2019) on characterizing the current moment as “absolute capitalism” capable of combining instability and violence, manages to take to the extreme and, at the same time, place in tension, this triumph of capital that is shown to be on the brink of crisis and with increasingly predatory dynamics. Arguments about the ecological devastation wrought by contemporary capitalism multiply. As Jason Moore (2015) argues, based on a world-ecology perspective, that devastation is a condition of possibility for the extreme cheapening and devaluation of nature and labor as global imperial policy, capillarized – following Ulrich Brand and Markus Wissen’s argument (2021) – as an “imperial mode of life.” That level of advance – toward the absolute, toward the complete destruction of the planet, seems to make the question about the limit, which would make capital finite, obsolete. Michael Lebowitz (2005) differentiates the barriers that capital installs to overcome in respect to the *limit*, following Marx’s argument: the only limit is the working class, he said. The lack of a limit would then be an indication that there is not a working class that would make finitude a principle. There is already a history to this argument: several “goodbyes” to the proletariat and diverse ways of analyzing the processes of “deproletarianization” as a key element of the neoliberal offensive.

Deproletarianization, however, can be thought of in two ways: the desalarization of large sectors of the population and the modification of the subjective attitude workers hold toward their activity, which no longer seen as simple subordination, but rather as the realization of a certain autonomy of the self. Here the problem arises of how capital has tried to translate, neutralize, and metabolize those active principles of insubordination and refusal practiced by the struggles of the 1970s. It is not only defeat, but, as Boltansky and Chiappello (2006) argue, assimilation.

I want to counterpoise recent feminist struggles as another place from which to *simultaneously* characterize contemporary capitalist violence and to uncover the deployment of a capacity for political action. I emphasize this double meaning: on the one hand, the astuteness of feminist struggles to become a majority without abandoning

minoritarian vectors and to establish a *limit* under new forms. On the other hand, re-establishing terms that put the notion of war in the center of political analysis and, from there, conceptualizing violence in a systemic way. Here I find two political novelties that are worth highlighting. In passing, I want to insist on the question of why, when it comes to asking about politics, the most recent feminist struggles are, in certain great leagues of thought, given a marginal character, as if they were only added to provide a note of color. The epistemic violence of this gesture is endless and is not sufficiently recognized in its dimension of laziness and deliberate ignorance.

To elaborate both arguments (about the capacity of political action and the characterization of violence), I would like to focus on elements of the feminist perspective that inquires into *social reproduction* and shifts that field to the center of analysis and political intervention. It is as if reproduction were a new form of Third Worldism, since it is linked to a reconceptualization of exploitation and it does so at the global level, while multiplying the notion of territory to which it refers. Undoubtedly, this is connected to what Maria Mies (1986) theorized as realities of “super-exploitation”: when capital not only appropriates surplus time and labor in respect to “necessary” labor (that is, surplus value), but also advances over the appropriation of the time and labor necessary for the production of subsistence. Threading together the forms of exploitation of “women, nature, and the colonies” in a simultaneous sequence, as the German theorist did, articulates the intersections of gender, race, imperialism, and class on which the systemic reproduction of capital depends. It posits other interpretative keys for thinking about the dynamics of proletarianization not recognized as such. But, above all, it reveals the strictly *political* character of its visibilization and valorization, as well as its decline in organizational dynamics.

I add, as a thesis, in the heat of today's feminist struggles, that the conjunction of realities of popular economies on our continent, as ways of organizing the reproduction of the majorities outside of the forms of waged integration and in conditions of urgency, creates a new zone of convergence between the dynamics of precarious labor and the work of social reproduction. In this way, popular feminisms disputing remuneration and the gender mandates of social reproduction become mutually implicated with popular economies that render visible the conditions of unpaid work beyond the household. One can be read in light of the other and, at the same time, they put each other in tension. The conjunction of feminism with dynamics of the popular economy pushes toward a popular feminism and feminist dynamics related to the precarization and informalization of labor operate as an antidote, as an open struggle, against the reactionary forms in which the end of the “patriarchy of the wage” seems to be dealt with, including within subaltern spaces. This concretely expands the contents of social

reproduction, situating conflicts around housing, the neighborhood, and land as key, although not the only, axes of struggle. In this way, it replenishes the politicized and capacity of leadership that emerges from reproductive economies, as Angela Davis (1983) has indicated regarding the racialized genealogy of labor.

From these conjunctions, we can locate reproduction as a contentious field, even if the word itself seems to be the opposite of discontinuity and *novelty*. Immediate and social reproduction, as well as interdependence are also managed and that is where the dispute takes place. It is from here that debates about social reproduction from decades ago, especially those launched by the Wages for Housework Campaign in the 1970s, are revitalized and updated today (Federici and Arlen, 2018). Similarly, these debates displace thinking about reproduction fundamentally dedicated to capital, which, for a long time, was more discussed than the concept of social reproduction established by Marxist feminists as a perspective that was critical of the reproduction of capital. I will not go into a systematic outline of the debate here, but what I am interested in looking at is its current emergence as an effect of a particular state of forces.

It is notable that the feminist perspectives that, for some time, have placed reproduction in the center of the political question, have proposed it as a way to *re-enchant the world*. This is precisely Silvia Federici's formulation (2018): to re-enchant, she says, is to "discover logics and reasons distinct from those of capitalist development." As if changing the world would require, first, a politics of enchantment. I do not want to suggest a linear distribution of re-enchantment against the capitalist realism mentioned at the beginning. Rather, the maneuver is more complex: that feminist proposal of re-enchantment involves, in turn, the most precise readings of the contemporary forms of patriarchal-racist-capitalist violence. By this, I mean that is not a matter of posing reproduction as a sphere that is exempt from violence, or of the common as an uncontaminated space, but rather almost the opposite: it is there where predatory machines swarm that experiment with virulent extractive operations of capital because that is also where there are concrete politics of confrontation, of the demarcation of *limits*, and of new dynamics of organization of workers and of the forms in which exploitation is confronted when it is understood not only as tasks mediated by the wage.

It is on this plane where we can glimpse the constellations of reproductive fabrics, as Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar (2018) calls them, that capable of articulating struggles over resources and other affective, subjective, and organizational economies for the defense of what is considered essential for life. The notion of defense, in fact, can be thought of as a political declension of the word *limit* to capital that seems, time and again, to vanish. The notion of fabric elaborated by

the Mexican philosopher allows us to glimpse a generalizable concrete totalization capable of unfolding toward the entire tapestry of life, in which multilateral and vital links of connection develop. These fabrics are not exempt from disputes: there are constant attempts to drain their vital energies and resources to increase valorization by assembling them with forms of exploitation.

Now, where could that ethics, or better, that desire be lodged if it does not work in a subjectivity capable of being open to the possibility of having a concrete place of action, of orienting in a material and everyday sense that mundane and existential re-enchantment? Putting it another way: could we hypothesize that the terrain of reproduction is a preferred terrain for current forms of (new and old) proletarianization and that, not by chance, the dynamic of extraction and exploitation has been especially merciless with reproductive labor and the forms that are assimilated to it? Thus we concretely see the reorientations of neoliberal capital toward the reproductive, reinforcing its conservative alliance (see Melinda Cooper 2017). Formulas regarding an “extractive” type of capital, as the contemporary pattern of valorization, can be read in a similar light.

Then, how does the notion of social reproduction allow us to confront the idea of the *end of the working class* that leads to discourses of capital as *infinite*, ratifying its natural or divine presupposition? How does the notion of social reproduction allow us to *expand* the reading of labor under processes of informalization and, therefore, understand other logics of conflict with capital? Is it possible to locate an “absolute limit” (J. Fujita Hirose 2021) there?

These questions aim to maintain that politics is possible from a plane that has been—and continues being—characterized as non-political and, on the other hand, signal it as a plane that is majoritarian (it is impossible to escape reproduction), that has been minoritized in the sense of subalternized. Today feminist struggles that value social reproduction have made it possible to project those minoritarian vectors toward modes of re-comprehension of the general, connecting productive and reproductive circuits. Therefore it is also from there that we can think strategically about social reproduction as a laboratory of neoliberal, patriarchal, and colonial violence. Identifying social reproduction as a surface of dispute over value also allows for relaunching forms of unionism, union tools capable of incorporating, in organizational terms, other experiences of labor. It is the sequence of feminist strikes (2017-2022) that has served as a *dress rehearsal* for this process.

On Reproduction

Rosa Luxemburg (1951 [1913]), in a pioneering way, identified the expansionist issue of capital as its inherent and unstoppable tendency toward appropriation. Reading Luxemburg, the question arises again and

again of “how far?” What else can be absorbed and metabolized by that dynamic that raises barriers only to overcome them, to continue running forward? Her concern with reproduction is for the expanded reproduction of capital. Luxemburg starts with Quesnay, she continues with Smith and then Marx, to point to their gaps and think about “the specifically capitalist method of colonization.” Hence she uses the figure of an “incessant *ritornello*” to locate the logic of the accumulation process. In this way, she investigates capital as a global territorial assemblage whose characters do not only include capitalists and waged workers, but rather is precisely “expanded” based on non-capitalist territories and populations. In this way, the issue of the “expanded” reproduction of capital is directly linked with the problem of capitalist expansion, with its delimitation of what is produced as an “outside”, as Luxemburg noted. At the same time, the expansion of reproduction allows us to have a point of view from the outside, a way out of capital's perspective and, simultaneously, a way of reading its imperial voracity. The notion of reproduction is at play in that ambivalence.

But, additionally, she opens up the question over how workers are produced as consumers, as a key issue for reproduction. Capital can by force, she says, appropriate the means of production and also force workers to become the object of capitalist exploitation. What it cannot do through violence is “force them to buy its commodities,” that is “it cannot force them to realize its surplus value” (353). We could say it as: it cannot force them to become consumers who realize the surplus value of those commodities that they have produced and that they must re-encounter in the market.

However, there are ways. Luxemburg provides historical examples: the destruction of the “formations of the natural economy” and, in particular, the dispossession of lands to put an end to the self-sufficiency of peasant economies, along with mortgage debts on farmers in the United State, and Dutch and British imperialist policy in South Africa against Black and Indigenous populations. These are concrete forms of political violence, tax pressure, and the introduction of cheap goods: a key trident for the *expansion* of reproduction from the point of view of capital, but also in the determination of the labor force, its needs and desires. A sort of moebius strip – to use a figure beautifully elaborated by Suely Rolnik to speak about the colonial unconscious – connects and at the same time allows for imagining discontinuities in those logics of reproduction, production, and consumption to the extent that the reproduction of capital supposes the reproduction of that which is not capital: life force, the very power of the body of labor.

Marx and Engels raised the problem of the reproduction of the working class to think about the very production of “free” workers. We can recall those paragraphs where Marx, for example, references the opiates with which women drugged children to be able to go to work or, later, the

impact of the introduction of children into factory working days. Silvia Federici has systematized the need to read Marx and take him beyond his blind spots regarding the exploitation that takes place in the sphere of reproduction (not only when women and children enter the factory). She critiques him for excluding reproductive labor in the process of value creation, limiting reproduction to the consumption of goods included in the wage. Or rather, within the notion of the reproduction of the working class, she argues, it seems that only the consumption of goods (those recognized as necessities) counts, but not the labor involved.

Without a doubt, that displacement of the very notion of reproduction toward social reproduction that allows for reading Marx beyond Marx is a political displacement. That concept has acquired a critical status thanks to the insistence of feminist struggles of the 1970s. Federici explains it clearly: “What made the discussion of social reproduction by wages for housework theorists and activists in the 1970s ‘revolutionary’ (in my view) was not the field that they examined, but what they discovered, which is the existence of a large area of exploitation until then unrecognised by all revolutionary theorists, Marxist and anarchist alike. It was discovering that unpaid labour is not extracted by the capitalist class only from the waged workday, but that it is also extracted from the workday of millions of unwaged house-workers as well as many other unpaid and un-free labourers. It was redefining the capitalist function of the wage as a creator of labour hierarchies, and an instrument serving to naturalise exploitative social relations and to delegate to wage-workers power over the unwaged. It was unmasking the socio-economic function of the creation of a fictional private sphere, and thereby re-politicising family life, sexuality, procreation” (2019).

Two forms of “expanded” reproduction converge to widen the perspective that only locates the reproduction of capital as a problem between waged workers and capital: the imperial dimension signaled by Luxemburg and the reproductive dimension systematized by Federici. In other words, we can *directly* read an international order in the conditions of social reproduction. The “smallest” aspect of daily life also responds to the structural. The fact that these two zones – the domestic and the global – are so strategically connected also brings us read the gender dimension (intertwined in social reproduction) and the colonial dimension (structural in the imperial mode) as key points that seem to have been temporarily sutured by the patriarchy of the wage and its national-state regimes. However, today, they can clearly be seen in a newly imbricated way.

In that sense, I want to hypothesize that the current cycle of feminist struggles contributes elements for the re-emergence of this “idea-force” of social reproduction, understood as a political concept: that is, it illuminates and signifies disputes led by thousands and thousands of women and feminized bodies on that terrain. We can return

to Luxemburg because she provides extremely prescient clues on the function of credit and the dynamic of consumption in relation to the map of colonial expansionism. These two points – credit and colonization – must be emphasized as fundamental elements for the *expansion* of the reproduction of capital, on the one hand, but also to understand, in Federici's words, current attempts to "colonize social reproduction." Here, again, I think that contemporary feminist struggles, particularly through the politicization of public debt and households as devices of governance point to social reproduction as the place from which to make intelligible *and* to confront both financial exploitation (structural adjustment policies and usurious credit) and the domain of possible futures they involve.

It is fair to call this process *financial colonization* of social reproduction since it positions the most impoverished and precarious populations as the territory of conquest and makes the dependent on debt for their everyday economy. When the debt relation spills over toward below, the effects of the debt taken by states come cascading down. That is, the dispossession and privatizations that are preconditions of state indebtedness are translated into compulsory debt for subaltern sectors, that now access goods and services through the mediation of debt. This has the effect of modifying the relation between income and debt, as well as between debt and access to rights. The purpose is to turn life into an accumulation of debts: that which we pay for our countries and that which we pay personally.

A whole variation of the concept of reproduction thus opens up when it is not a matter of only thinking about it from the point of view of capital and the world split between workers and capitalists. It presents complex folds when we comprehend it from the present, in the heat of the massification of feminism, in popular and feminized economies on our continent: the proliferation of communal and neighborhood bonds, of organizational forms and cooperatives that assemble, in changing ways, with the dynamics of struggle, but also with popular entrepreneurship and initiatives that create infrastructure or maintain certain ancestral practices in new contexts. In turn, social reproduction exceeds the limits of the household, even of communities, to be able to be understood as the articulation of forms of doing, of obtaining incomes, of disputing recognition, and organizing the supply of essential services. This is also due to a fundamental feature of contemporary neoliberalism: the deepening of the crisis of social reproduction that it produces is cushioned by an increase in feminized labor, unpaid and subjected to the blackmail of family and individual responsabilization. The privatization of public services or the restriction of their scope means that those tasks (health care, feeding, child care, etc.) must be supplied by women, lesbians, travestis, and trans persons as unpaid or badly paid and obligatory work.

On Immanence

Similar to Luxemburg's displacement of the characters of workers and capitalists, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) propose another displacement in *Anti-Oedipus*: "As Marx observes, *in the beginning* capitalists are necessarily conscious of the opposition between capital and labor, and of the use of capital as a means of extorting surplus labor. But a perverted, bewitched world quickly comes into being, as capital increasingly plays the role of a recording surface that falls back on (se *rabat sur*) all of production" (11). How does capitalism itself – in the language of the French philosophers – propose itself as the quasi-cause of everything that exists? It is a matter of a specific mode: functioning as an "enchanted surface of inscription." Capital thus manages to convert its unproductiveness into productivity through modes of appropriation and exploitation, demonstrating a fundamental vector: velocity, embodied by money. Another vector, undoubtedly, is the violence capable of appropriating unpaid labor and of usurping territories.

Here the "axiomatic" question of capital as a logic of incorporation of everything that opposes it and rises up against it, as a permanent machine of translation and codification of struggles, seems, at times, to better explain the dynamics of neutralization than those of violence. Can immanence be non-capitalist? Zeynep Gambetti (2022), pointing out the weight that falls on this concept, distinguishes three aspects that come together in Deleuze and Guattari's work talking about immanence: (i) the self-perpetuating movement of capitalist accumulation processes, (ii) the most treacherous feature of micro-fascisms, and (iii) paradoxically, one of the conditions of resistance and revolution.

Is it possible to wrest control of the use of that term from capital and think about the terrain of social reproduction as an "enchanted surface of inscription"? It is a matter of enchantment in the sense proposed by Federici: that is, competing against the fetishist enchantment of capital (of its full, yet empty, body). Reproduction as an enchanted surface of inscription can be visualized, almost metaphorically, as the world's skin. It has a *general* character to the extent that it involves everyone because, precisely, the desire to live, the persistence of existence, is at stake in its *production*.

Judith Butler (2019) has recently read the *1844 Manuscripts* in this key to bring together arguments against only interpreting Marx in anthropocentric terms. Another way of reading Marx beyond Marx. Her question revolves around the concept of Nature as the "inorganic body" of the human body. The human body participates in and, at the same time, is differentiated from that inorganic body: nature becomes a means of human life. Butler writes, "when Marx then claims that 'Nature is the inorganic body of the human', he is claiming that only as inorganic can nature keep the human alive" (13). The human is not the other of Nature, but rather exists to the extent that it maintains "a continuous interchange

with nature” and, therefore, “no way of conceptualising life outside the framework of this interchange” (13). If there cannot be a human body without the body of nature, their interdependence becomes evident in a key that Butler emphasizes: in this text by Marx, human’s relation with nature is not that of pure domination of nature, but of an *extension* of it. Nature as an extensive body includes the human. The inorganic is an effect of a sort of perspectivism from the human body (because Nature, in itself, is organic): “it starts to become inorganic once it starts to sustain the human at which point it is the human life that is sustained and animated by nature” (14). But to the extent that the human is sustained by nature, it “becomes nature in a distinctly non-anthropocentric sense that was always a potentiality of its living version”. The conclusion is radical: there are not two natures nor two bodies, but rather “a perpetual oscillation of perspectives (organic/inorganic)” (14). There are not two separated substances but rather a variable relation between organic body and inorganic body that enable ways for life to persist. Why is this argument fundamental? Because the reproduction of life is inseparable from a fabric that is expressed as the permanent interchange between the living body and the body of an inorganic nature. An interchange that, Butler says, is constantly threatened or destroyed by the mode of economic and social organization. Her reasoning leaves us in the field of reproductive labor, in the possibility of the reproduction of life as a surface of inscription of an interchange of bodies.

The dispute with capital is a dispute on the very plane of immanence. If the immanence of capital is the logic of indefinite expansion and *simultaneously* that of its emptiness that is filled with acts of appropriation, we can rethink that surface of inscription in relation to reproduction, in which it would be another type of inscription, also of enchantment. I bring up these different theoretical perspectives to show how the concept of reproduction thus allows us to read: 1) a plane of immanence, 2) a potencia of generalization; and 3) a field of violences.

Going back to Violence

The dynamic of social reproduction as a terrain of unpaid, obligatory work associated with gender mandates becomes a prism for understanding the generalization of conditions of precarity and subalternization in which hierarchies of race, class, and gender intersect. More than a secondary or subsidiary form of exploitation, the forms of reproduction labor have become a direct terrain of super-exploitation.

In turn, it is in the practical negation of certain dynamics of reproduction linked to sex-gender mandates that opens the possibility of the de-domestication of reproductive labor (the de-domestication of the household), as well as of the reappropriation of public-common resources. We see it practically in how dynamics of care, work,

cleaning, and health care are organized in different territories, in the tapestry of networks distributing agro-ecological food, but also in the *accompaniment* of processes of denunciation, demands, and self-defense. These are not isolated experiences, they are made invisible because they invent and provide architectures, platforms, and infrastructure of goods and services in territories that have been dismantled.

Additionally, in many cases, they experiences are fundamental for the articulation of state resources, which cannot be made effective if they are not assembled with these prior dynamics. However, at the same time, they are financially exploited (Cavallero and Gago, 2019). But it is also on the terrain of reproduction where certain anti-extractive dynamics take place: both to demand to put a stop to the dispossession of territory and to detain the extraction of multiple forms of rent (household debt and real estate speculation, for example).

At the same time, levels of violence increase especially in areas of reproduction. If, at one time, a set of institutions had managed a certain degree of pacification (patriarchy of the wage, the maternal mandate, etc.), today, to the contrary, we can identify them as arenas of everyday war. I want to return to one of the threads that I posed above: I maintain that the notion of war has been placed in the center of political analysis again by the feminist perspective, enabling a characterization of contemporary violence in a way that is systematic without being demobilizing. It has also been posed again as an analytical lens for thinking about how it can be disarmed, to cease being in the middle of its repositioning as a binary device of symmetrical groups.

Much has been written about the ways in which neoliberalism has successfully been able to modulate subjectivities. After the defeats of the 1970s, the neoliberal triumph seems to have been based on the annulment of conflict, on the sparkle of consensus and agreement. Foucauldian notions such as biopolitics became key to explain this internalization of government of the self to adapt to the mandates of valorization. A first counterpoint emerged from Achille Mbembe's theorization of *necropolitics*, providing an account of how that biopolitical rule is not universal.

However, I want to propose that it has been the feminist thought of authors such as Silvia Federici, Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar, and Rita Segato, who have brought back the interpretative key of war for thinking about contemporary violence. They have done so by conceptualizing a war against women and, from there, building a framework for analyze new types of war, thus also making it possible to read *other wars*. Reviving the term of war for talking about the "state of permanent warfare" against certain bodies and certain territories has allowed for popularizing Federici's thesis regarding the extent to which the devaluation of life and of labor driven by the phase of contemporary globalization shapes a neoliberal violence that has not been subsumed in devices of subjective

pacification nor is it only understood in the register of societies of control. The concept of “new forms of war,” capable of comprehending the violence against the body of women and dissident bodies and its connection with the economies of violence of illegal capital, as Segato proposes, renews the lexicon, as well as strategic thinking about a war that is no longer that of two clearly identifiable groups in a single arena of contention. Raquel Gutiérrez Aguilar has characterized it in relation to the systematic repression against the fabrics of communitarian and communal reproduction and its analogy with cruelty toward women. In this sense, anti-extractivist struggles have identified wars of conquest of territories, displacements of populations, assassinations of leaders of conflicts, and connection of control of territories with the body of women, lesbians, travestis, and trans people. Accumulating the narrative in this way adds another dimension to the perspective of war (see Mina Navarro’s work among others).

With this I want to emphasize, that it has been the feminist debates, hosted and escalated in mass mobilizations, that have posed neoliberal violence as part of that conceptualization of war. Those debates consider gender-based violence as a structural key of an ongoing war, and an update of the variations that have occurred in the very dynamic of what we understand by war. Thus, as I have been investigating with Luci Cavallero (2020), the financial war that is unleashed under the capillarization of debt in households in order to manage impoverishment is articulated with the narco-world and its logics of territorial and patriarchal violence. The terrain of deployment of war is the same that appears as the space of re-enchantment: that of social reproduction.

This diagnosis of violence generates a line of demarcation of (*self-*) *defense*, a radical question about practices of justice. However, what I am especially interested in thinking about are the political forms of struggle that arise from identifying and disputing that violence. Recognizing that diagnosis of the forms of violence allows feminist struggles to mobilize an understanding of patriarchal-colonial-extractivist capitalism starting from everyday life. Uniting scales, weaving together dimensions, and, in this way, innovating in the articulation of minoritarian vectors with a becoming mass-scale. I mentioned this point at the beginning because it seems fundamental for understanding how feminist struggles have achieved a transborder massiveness, of multiple temporalities and spatialities – capable of intervening in the local, national, regional, and global conjuncture – and have also been able to become a component of other mobilizations, protests, and uprisings.

Thus we see that massiveness, on the one hand, is not homogeneous, at the same time as it has allowed for escaping from fragmentation. This is achieved by integrating a multiplicity of conflicts from practices and struggles that historically have been categorized as “minoritarian.” With this, the opposition between minoritarian and

majoritarian is displaced: the minoritarian takes on a mass scale as a vector of radicalization within a composition that does not stop expanding. But, at the same time, feminism becomes a vector of radicality within broader movements: today, for example, we see it in the popular and Indigenous revolts in different countries on our continent.

The feminisms of the South have carried out a sustained exercise of transversal alliances that were able to expand in practice both the strength of statements and the capacity for action. In fact, I think it can be argued that if we can see reactionary action somewhere it is in the decomposition of those alliances.

Contemporary fascism advances against alliances with politics of segmentation of identities, creating divisions among channels for resources and recognition in the midst of an economic crisis. The transnational capacity forged by a common understanding of what sexist violence means in articulation with labor, financial, and institutional violence, among others, is achieved in conjunction with slogans about precarity. In this way, there is a dynamic of connection between a class condition that is not restricted to national borders nor folded onto groups already recognized as workers. In recent years, the feminist movement has built a new type of internationalism, that overturns scales, scopes, and forms of coordination of a movement that expands without ceasing to be situated. An *internationalism* that projects the current feminist movement onto the masses, positing the attack against the social reproduction of certain bodies and territories as a fundamental key. An *internationalism* that becomes transnationalism because it is made up of alliances that do not strictly adhere to the borders of nation-state geometry, but also because they are dissidents in respect to the frames of an abstract notion of class (in which it is supposed that there are shared objective interests) or of the people (in which it supposed that there is a homogeneous amalgam of national affection).

That internationalism enables a movement that is both unitary and plural: capable of finding, for moments, common vectors of meaning, effectively bringing together the movement's action and, at the same time, understanding that this terrain on which we fight consists of the multiplication of dissimilar situations, of diverse landings. In any case the *slogans that make movement* (here I am reformulating the idea of the Chilean feminist Julieta Kirkwood (2022) who speaks of questions that made a movement) is a decisive point. Slogans have a spatial and temporal validity, but their force lies precisely in connecting bodies and statements. When we read slogans that make sense across borders, they indicate dates (in which those words express a moment) and bring together theses that organize a way of understanding what happens and even orienting it. This has happened with "Ni Una Menos," "Nos queremos vivas," "El violador eres tu," "No son 30 pesos, son 30 años," "Tocan a una, tocan a todas", "EleNao," as well as with the popularization

of slogans such as “It’s not love. It’s unpaid work.” In all of them we find a set of unique elements that express very specific conjunctures that, at the same time, are able to be almost immediately translated into others. They express, without a doubt, incorporeal transformations that are translated into ways of experiencing violence, self-defense, insecurity, collective force, the dispute over everything that makes up the perseverance of living in increasingly urgent contexts. These slogans imply transformations in bodies, they materialize thresholds in links, they propose a collective horizon. And they do not lose their relationship with that common plane of the reproduction of life.

By Way of Conclusion

This text is an attempt to bring together some scattered notes to think about social reproduction as a general perspective and not as a set of sectors or tasks. This becomes possible based on understanding recent feminist struggles also as a challenge to their sectoral confinement and epistemic marginalization.

The feminist strike provides us with a specific point of view about social reproduction. What does that mean? That the feminist strike functions as a practical experience but also as an analytical lens to produce understanding and political valorization of reproductive labor. As in the 1970s the Wages for Housework campaign enabled a novel political capacity to point out the existence of a large area of non recognized exploitation, just as the Third World struggles made visible whole areas of unpaid labour and un-free laboring populations, I believe that the current feminist movement succeeds in showing the scale of neoliberal precarisation in terms of the crisis of social reproduction, while also embodying the political commitment to confront it. And, it is not a coincidence that this movement emerged from the global South.

The perspective of social reproduction has been *generalized* in recent years thanks to a political comprehension of its centrality, similar to what happened in the 1970s. The pandemic was, in turn, the confirmation and an attempt to deny that centrality (Malo, 2021; d’Alisa, 2022).

The activities of social reproduction, exacerbated in the pandemic moment as a state of global alarm, endow feminist struggles an inevitably present dimension, as a strategic plane of confrontation with capital. It is what is necessary here and now to sustain life, to guarantee the everyday flow of doing. In that sense, they provide a concrete dimension of action that does not delegate the possibility of change to the future. To be able to take these questions seriously, it is once and again necessary to dismantle the perception that *feminist and antiracist politicization* is a sectoral and minoritarian politics. I will also add that is on the plane of reproduction where battles over property take place, particularly

to discuss, as feminist struggles in Latin America have indicated, ownership of the means of reproduction.

The concrete struggle for common and public use of goods and services and the super-exploitation of labor that social reproduction requires today have rendered reproduction visible as a strategic sphere over which capital's systematic dispossession takes place. It is also social reproduction that allows for reading a dynamic of neoliberalism that no longer only adjusts to the logics of entrepreneurship of the self and its subjective modulation in adaptive terms, but rather new tendencies of direct violence, formulating logics of war in specific territories. And it is the feminist movement that has been denouncing these new logics of war.

Capital – and the offensive led by finance and employers – has used the global pandemic to reconfigure forms of labor, modes of consumption, the parameters of income, and sex-gender relations. With this text I sought to bring together some elements for a hypothesis that we have been developing collectively: that we are facing a restructuring of class relations, which takes the sphere of social reproduction as its main stage. This includes households but also reproductive work that is carried out beyond the walls of the house, in impoverished and financialized territories, self-managed economies that, at the same time, demand public resources and seek to sustain infrastructure of care and support against precarity.

The political centrality that social reproduction has achieved, the re-emergence of this “idea-force,” is not only an academic debate, and even less a technical one: it refers to characteristics that contemporary feminist struggles have addressed and confronted, with the capacity to make the accurate diagnoses of forms of exploitation, domination, and violence of contemporary capitalism.

Translated by Liz Mason-Deese

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Balibar, Étienne 2019, 'Absolute Capitalism', in William Callison, and Zachary Manfredi (eds), *Mutant Neoliberalism: Market Rule and Political Rupture*, New York: Fordham University Press.
- Boltanski, Luc and Chiapello, Eve 2006, *The New Spirit of Capitalism*, New York/London: Verso.
- Brand, Ulrich and Wissen, Markus 2021, *The Imperial Mode of Living. Everyday Life and the Ecological Crisis of Capitalism*, New York/London: Verso.
- Butler, Judith 2019, "The inorganic body in the early Marx: A limit-concept of anthropocentrism", *Radical Philosophy* 206, Winter, pp. 3–17.
- Cavallero, Luci and Gago, Verónica 2020, "Feminism, the Pandemic, and What Comes Next", *Critical Times blog*.
- Cavallero, Luci and Gago, Verónica 2021, *A Feminist Reading of Debt*, Trans. Liz Mason Deese. London: Pluto Press.
- Cooper, Melinda 2017, *Family Values: Between Neoliberalism and the New Social Conservatism*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Davis, Angela 1983, *Women, Race & Class*, New York: Vintage Books.
- D'Alisa, Giacomo 2022, "Reddito di Cura. La vita al centro durante e dopo la pandemia da Covid19", Available online at: <https://comune-info.net/reddito-di-cura/>
- Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Félix 1987, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Brian Massumi, trans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fassin, Éric 2020, *On vit mieux en luttant qu'en se résignant*, Paris: Mediapart, Available online at: <https://academia.hypotheses.org/28016>
- Federici, Silvia 2018, *Re-enchanting the World: Feminis, and the Politics of the Commons*, Oakland: PM Press.
- Federici, Silvia and Arlen, Austin 2018, *The New York Wages for Housework Committee 1972-1977: History Theory and Documents*, Brooklyn, New York: Autonomedia.
- Fisher, Mark 2009, *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?*, London: Zero Books.
- Fujita Hirose, Jun 2021, *¿Cómo imponer un límite absoluto al capitalismo?*, Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón.
- Gambetti, Zeynep 2022, "Immanence, neoliberalism, microfascism: will we die in silence?" in *Rosi Braidotti and Rick Dolphijn (eds.)*, Deleuze, Guattari and Fascism, *Edinburgh University Press (forthcoming)*.
- Gutiérrez Aguilar, Raquel 2018, *Comunalidad, tramas comunitarias y producción de lo común. Debates contemporáneos desde América Latina*, Oaxaca, México: Colectivo Editorial Pez en el Árbol, Editorial Casa de las Preguntas.
- Kirkwood, Julieta 2022, *Preguntas que hicieron movimiento*, Santiago de Chile: Banda Propia.
- Lebowitz, Michael 2005, *Beyond Capital: Marx'S Political Economy of the Working Class*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Luxemburg, Rosa 1951, *The Accumulation of Capital*, Agnes Schwarzschild, trans. New York: Routledge [1913]
- Malo, Marta 2021, *Estamos para nosotras. Siete tesis por una práctica radical de los cuidados*. Barcelona: Synusia.
- Mies, Maria 1986, *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*, London: Zed Books.
- Moore, Jason 2015, *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*, New York/London: Verso.
- Rolnik, Suely 2019, *Esferas de la insurrección. Apuntes para descolonizar el inconsciente*, Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón.
- Segato, Rita 2014 *Las nuevas formas de la guerra y el cuerpo de las mujeres*, Puebla: Pez en el árbol.
- Virno, Paolo 2021, *Sobre la impotencia*, Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón, Tercero Incluido & Traficantes de Sueños.