

ARTICLE

---

## Feminist lenses for the renewal of Marxism: exchange of views<sup>1</sup>

### Lentes feministas para la renovación del marxismo: intercambio de puntos de vista

Silvana Marinho<sup>2</sup>

Rio de Janeiro Federal University, Brazil

---

Received: 18/12/2022

Accepted: 18/01/2023

170

---

#### How to cite

---

Marinho, S. (2023). Feminist lenses for the renewal of Marxism: exchange of views. *Propuestas Críticas en Trabajo Social - Critical Proposals in Social Work* 3(5), 170-187.  
DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2023. 70126

#### Abstract

This article seeks to offer some theoretical-political bases for a necessary discussion: that Marxian categories have a history and a dynamism, and, because they are more complex in the present, they require being saturated with new historical and social determinations. In this effort, the Marxian ontology of social being is the analytical ground for this paper, which walks through feminist contributions that renew the reading of the relations of oppression-exploitation of class, race, and gender in the present time. This reflection intends, besides pointing out the renewal of Marxism by feminisms, to widen the lenses that allow for translating the structural elements of the historical and current social precariousness of Brazilian women, in the face of the de-democratization process imposed by the neoliberal and neoconservative project.

**Keywords:**  
Feminisms;  
Marxism; Oppres-  
sion-exploitation;  
Class-race-gen-  
der; Female social  
precarity

---

<sup>1</sup>Original article entitled "Lentes feministas à renovação del marxismo: intercambiando olhares", published in *Katalysis*, v.25, n. 2, p. 346-355, May-August, 2022. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/katalysis/article/view/82693>  
We thank the author, Silvana Marinho, and the *Katalysis* Journal for granting permission to translate and republish the manuscript.

## Resumen

Este artículo pretende ofrecer algunas bases teóricas y políticas para una discusión necesaria: las categorías marxianas tienen una historia y un dinamismo, y, por ser más complejas en el presente, requieren ser saturadas de nuevas determinaciones históricas y sociales. Para este esfuerzo, el escrito, teniendo como suelo de análisis la ontología marxiana del ser social, transita por aportes feministas que renuevan la lectura de las relaciones de opresión-explotación de clase, raza y género en la actualidad. El objetivo de esta reflexión, además de señalar la renovación del marxismo por los feminismos, es ampliar las lentes que permitan traducir los elementos estructurantes de la precariedad social histórica y actual de las mujeres brasileñas, frente al proceso de desdemocratización impuesto por el proyecto neoliberal y neoconservador.

**Palabras Clave:**  
Feminismos;  
Marxismo; opresión-explotación;  
clase-raza-género;  
precariedad social femenina.

## Introduction

Both the historical and dialectical materialist method and the Marxian categories have scientific validation, whose verification is produced through the historical process. Both are highly topical, since they continue to explain the immanent movement of bourgeois sociability. Marxian categories are ontological, they refer to dimensions of being, and, for this very reason, they have a historical and dynamic character, which, at present, in the face of other historical needs that must be studied, even from a class structure, deserves a theoretical and political analytical treatment that saturates them with new determinations, an exercise made possible by the Marxist method itself.

171

In this sense, it is worth recalling what the important Marxist feminist, Brazilian sociologist Heleieth Saffioti, said in “Quién teme a los esquemas patriarcales de pensamiento” about the knot between class, gender and race/ethnicity: “[...] it was, then, Marx himself who taught me to think the knot, although in his time it was not possible for him to do so. In fact, the most important thing about a scheme of thought consists in the power of being able to teach how to think” (SAFFIOTI, 2000, p. 73-74).

The functioning and legality of bourgeois sociability were duly unveiled by critical social theory. With Saffioti’s Marxist feminist perspective, it was possible to understand that patriarchy and racism also operate as social determination in reality together with capitalism, consubstantiating the system of domination-exploitation. In the sociological analysis of the knot, gender-race-ethnicity-class are constituted as three contradictions that structure the unequal social relations of Brazilian society.



Domination and exploitation for Saffioti (2004, p. 105) are faces of the same way of producing and reproducing social life, since “there is not, on the one hand, patriarchal domination and, on the other, capitalist exploitation”. To the extent that patriarchy is conceived as a political system and capitalism as an economic system, the system of domination-exploitation is fragmented, denounces the sociologist, splitting the political, social and economic dimensions.

Saffioti (1988), understanding that the capitalist mode of production presupposes social reproduction, as well as being the historical result of the capitalism-patriarchy-racism symbiosis, expressed his formulations in terms of the capitalist mode of production and not in terms of the logic of capital.

This theoretical and methodological prism is fundamental to refute the theses of the Marxist tradition that, in their argumentative constructions, separate the logical structure of capital from its historical dimensions, incurring a classic confusion between the two, as Cízia Arruzza (2015), American Marxist feminist, points out. Such a separation ultimately leads to reductionism and economism, autonomizing patriarchy from capitalism and underestimating the centrality of gender oppression (ARRUZZA, 2015).

Within the feminist-Marxist tradition we find studies that propose a unitary theory, in which patriarchy is not an autonomous system of capitalism.

*The defenders of the “unitary theory” disagree with the idea that patriarchy today is a system of norms and mechanisms that reproduce themselves autonomously. At the same time, they insist on the need to consider capitalism not as a set of purely economic laws, but as a complex and articulated social order, an order that has its core constituted by relations of exploitation, domination and alienation. (ARRUZZA, 2015, p. 38, emphasis added).*

Regarding the inextricability between production and reproduction, and between the determinations of gender and class for an analysis of the social totality, another relevant feminist, who produces intellectually from critical social theory, is the Italian historian Silvia Federici, for whom gender is a specification of class relations and the history of women is the history of classes (FEDERICI, 2017).

The Italian intellectual in *The Caliban and the Witch: Woman, Body and Capitalist Accumulation* (2017), by analyzing the processes of primitive accumulation from a femi-

nist and class approach, brought us a series of historical determinants hitherto unstudied that shaped the crisis of feudalism, allowing its transition to capitalism. In the study of the historical determinants of capitalist development, in addition to the expropriation of the peasantry, ending the communal societies, and the conquest of America with the slave system, Federici (2017) examined the witch hunts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, giving it historical and determining importance for primitive accumulation.

From this historical finding, Federici (2017) presents us with the thesis that the witch hunts of the Modern Age interacted in a structural way with slavery and enclosures for the constitution of capitalist accumulation, in which violence and expropriation, practiced by the ruling classes that were being formed at the time, occurred even more severely on women, configuring a historical, systematic and structural degradation of these in the course of the development of capitalism, whose scope still exists today.

Thus, the relevance and timeliness of her thesis for feminist and Marxist thought is precisely to elaborate the connections between past and present, for example the techniques of social control and extermination used in the present, which can still be seen as a witch hunt (MARINHO, 2020). However, it is not limited to this point. In the book *The Zero Point of the Revolution: Domestic Labor, Reproduction and Feminist Struggle* (2019) and in the article notes on gender in *Marx's Capital* (2018), Federici illuminates other important aspects of the transition from feudalism to capitalism by considering the primitive accumulation of capital as a permanent process, and by giving centrality to reproductive labor, historicizing domestic labor as labor for capital.

The Marxist feminist perspective has thus revealed itself as a significant analytical terrain for reading the current configuration of oppression-exploitation relations in the face of the dismantling of rights and public policies in times of de-democratization (BIROLI, 2020). When articulated with other feminist epistemologies, such as decolonial epistemologies - which situate the sociohistorical formations of modernity/coloniality and the violence of the intrusive colonial project (capitalist, racist and heteropatriarchal) - they enhance the lenses that allow us to translate the structural elements of the historical and current social precariousness of Brazilian women. It is worth noting that, in disagreement with what has been pointed out in some writings and studies in the field of decolonial production, it is not possible to consider that there is an antinomy between Marxism and the decolonial perspective in the development of intellectual and scientific production. This is because, in Marxist-inspired studies in dialogue with decolonial epistemologies, what must be taken as rigor to reach the structural and structuring foundations of social phenomena is the orthodoxy of the Marxist method, as learned from



Lukács, and its ontological (and not epistemological) nature, which, ultimately, means to unveil the essence of social being (LUKÁCS, 1979). In this sense, decolonial epistemologies contribute to the understanding that social relations are marked by gender, race, sexuality, nation and class.

With respect to the apprehension of oppression-exploitation relations as a unity, it is worth mentioning that in theoretical production, both within feminisms and the Marxist tradition, and in political debates, it does not yet occupy a central place, or is not yet theoretically and conceptually well developed. Although several feminist studies have established a theoretical-political understanding in terms of the articulation between gender, race, sexuality and the inequalities of neoliberal capitalism, the category of exploitation does not obtain a theoretical-conceptual framework, occupying a privileged place in the debate on oppression. On the other hand, most Marxist writings do not consider, or discuss laterally, the colonial dimension of the historical process of the inequalities of capitalism and the cleavages of gender, race and sexuality, maintaining the centrality of the analysis of bourgeois sociability in social class.

In view of the above, from Marx's rich categorical framework, we must emphasize social class, whose complexity and interconnectedness among its determinants needs to be better captured, which demands a new look at the political subjects of the transforming action of the existing order. After all, the factory proletariat, recognized as the universal subject of the emancipatory struggle (read as white, cis, heterosexual, male workers of the European and English-speaking world), had its historical time, and today this idea of the universal male subject no longer reaches the concrete reality; on the contrary, it reifies it.

This is how feminisms and the feminist struggle are situated in the framework of new protagonisms of emancipatory proposals. The different feminist formulations, as a unity of the diverse, encourage the articulation between anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist, anti-colonial, anti-racist, ecofeminist and anti(cis)heteropatriarchal struggles.

### **Feminist lenses and Marxist method: analytical legacies in perspective for the reading of oppression-exploitation relations today**

Given its theoretical nature (ideal reproduction of the real movement constitutive of social being in the bourgeois order), critical social theory allows us to understand the structure and dynamics of bourgeois society from a material and concrete



basis: the social relations of production and reproduction of social life, that is, class relations, based on labor, a founding category of social being - as vital activity, generic life of humanity, which gives light to the subject as historical being.

It is, therefore, a fundamental sociological concept, a fruitful analytical category for understanding history. In today's world, under globalization and the financialization of capital, contrary to the thesis that advocates the end of work, the category of work occupies a central place in human existence.

From Marx's ontology of social being, it is understood that work is configured as a source of satisfaction of the material needs of survival, as a development of human sociability and as a historical possibility. It is ontocreative. What differentiates human beings from other animals is precisely the teleological capacity to produce their own means of life. Marx (2004, p. 84) pointed out that "[...] man makes his vital activity itself an object of his will and consciousness. He has conscious vital activity".

In the wake of the historical materialist conception, men and women are sociohistorical subjects. History is the product and process of human action and, after all, has a material basis:

*[...] the first presupposition of all human existence and also, therefore, of all history, namely, the presupposition that men must be able to live in order to be able to "make history". [...] The first historical act is thus the production of the means to satisfy these needs, the production of material life itself, [...] the fundamental condition of all history [...] (MARX; ENGELS, 2007, p. 32-33).*

Pursuing ontology in Marxian thought and the methodological elements of his social theory leads to concrete thought. Marx starts from the concrete (unity of diversity, synthesis of multiple determinations), from his historical-social and materialist foundations, and captures the determinations of reality, turning them into abstract categories, which are not concepts that define themselves, they are determinations of being elaborated by knowledge as an abstract movement that abstractly reconstructs the determinations of reality.

*The concrete is concrete because it is the synthesis of multiple determinations, therefore, unity of diversity. For this reason, the concrete appears in thought as a process of synthesis, as a result, not as a starting point, although it is the effective starting point and, consequently, also the starting point of intuition and representation. In the first way, full representation has volatilized into an abstract determination; in the second, abstract determinations lead to the reproduction of the concrete through thought (MARX, 2011, pp. 76-78).*

When Marx elaborated his analysis to investigate the essence of the capitalist mode of production, he criticized the economists of the eighteenth century. In his Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts, Marx (2004) criticizes Political Economy, which treated economic mechanisms as given, natural facts, because it did not explain the historicity of these mechanisms, such as the origin of private property, the capital-labor and capital-land division.

According to José Paulo Netto (2011, p. 18, emphasis added), “[...] Marx did not make a tabula rasa of existing knowledge, but critically started from it”. Therefore, Marx advanced from accumulated knowledge. The meaning of criticism in Marx consists in: “bringing to rational examination, making them conscious, their foundations, their conditioning and their limits - at the same time that the contents of this knowledge are verified from real historical processes” (PAULO NETTO, 2011, p. 18, emphasis added).

Just as Marx elaborated his critique of political economy based on classical economists, feminist historian Silvia Federici elaborates her analysis of the historical determinants that contributed to the transition from feudalism to capitalism, based on Marxist theory and the critique of Marx’s limits and scope, particularly with regard to the theme of gender and the sphere of social reproduction in Capital.

In the analytical description of primitive accumulation, Federici (2017) includes a series of phenomena absent in Marx that are nevertheless extremely important for capitalist accumulation. Among these phenomena the author identifies the development of a new sexual division of labor; the construction of a new patriarchal order based on the exclusion of women from wage labor and their subordination to men; the mechanization of the proletarian body and its transformation, in the case of women, into a machine for the production of new workers; and, finally, the element that the author placed at the center of her analysis of primitive accumulation: the witch hunts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that occurred in Europe and in the so-called New World, arguing



that the persecution of witches was as important for the development of capitalism as the colonization and expropriation of the European peasantry from their lands.

Federici (2017, 2018) recognizes that critical social theory allows us to understand bourgeois society from wage labor, sustained by the so-called primitive accumulation, which, in the words of Marx (1980, p. 830) is “the historical process that dissociates the worker from the means of production. It is considered primitive because it constitutes the prehistory of capital and of the capitalist mode of production”.

However, as for the aspects of the transition to capitalism, in Federici’s (2017, p. 161) interpretation, they are not things of the past or as Marx stated, “historical preconditions of capitalist development that would be overcome by more mature forms of capitalism.” For Federici (2017, p. 161), we are still witnessing today with the new phase of globalization, impoverishment, rebellions and the scale of criminality, which are structural elements of capitalist accumulation to the same extent that capitalism must dispossess the labor force of its means of reproduction to impose its domination.

In the historical analysis of the development of capitalism elaborated by Marx, and also by later Marxists and socialists, as Federici (2017, 2018, 2019) points out, the primacy of attention was given to the formation of the proletariat, identifying factory labor as the normative form of labor, leaving in the background the conditions of everyday social reproduction and disregarding reproductive labor as labor.

The historian denounces that Marx does not historicize domestic labor by naturalizing it as something that has always existed. In dealing with the social division of labor, according to Federici (2018, p. 95), Marx identifies a division of labor in the family on a physiological basis: “within the family [...] a division of labor naturally arises, based on differences of age and sex, that is, on purely physiological causes” (Marx, 1990, p. 471, Federici, 2018, p. 95, emphasis added). Thus, and although Marx dealt with the outrageous conditions of female factory labor in the stage of industrial development, he did not deal with the subordination of women within the bourgeois family, which leads Federici (2018) to conclude that Marx dealt with gender issues descriptively and not analytically, which provokes us to go beyond Marx.

In this sense, filling Marx’s gap on reproductive work, the Italian feminist, in examining the determinations of domestic work in the formation of capitalist society, identifies that it is a historically determined work, a product of the separation between production and reproduction engendered by capitalism. This is one of his central the-





ses. And, contrary to the peripheral status of reproductive labor within the analyses of the Marxist tradition, Federici (2019) gives it centrality in capitalist society. According to her, reproductive labor is the pillar of the capitalist organization of labor.

The Italian historian has pulled back the curtains on the social processes that have constituted the hierarchization of labor and, consequently, the inferiorization of reproductive work, ultimately expressed by its unpaid condition. As Federici (2017) analyzes, gender differences were less marked in communal societies. Women performed activities related to their subsistence and that of their families, as well as domestic activities. However, with the hierarchization of these activities by capitalism, supported by biologicist conceptions of sex, women were confined to domestic work, producing the sign of a feminine vocation for this type of work.

*With the disappearance of the subsistence economy that had predominated in pre-capitalist Europe, the unity between production and reproduction, typical of all societies based on production for consumption, came to an end, as these activities became bearers of other social relations and became sexually differentiated. In the new monetary regime, only production-for-the-market was defined as a value-creating activity, while the reproduction of the worker began to be considered as economically valueless and even ceased to be considered work (FEDERICI, 2017, p. 145).*

178

In view of what has been explored so far, it is possible to infer that Federici brings historicity to the apprehension of primitive accumulation and of the dialectical articulation between production and reproduction, recomposing the history of capitalist development. She goes to the essence of the phenomena and brings to light the determinations of domestic labor in capitalist society. This is undoubtedly the great analytical legacy of Marx's method. His ability to help us read the movement of reality and arrive at concrete thought is already patented.

Another important aspect of Federici's (2017) thesis, which is that primitive capitalist accumulation is, in fact, structural and permanent, also reveals the permanence of the degradation of women. Historically, it was only possible by resorting to the violence of the dissociation of human beings from their means of survival, colonialism, racism and patriarchy, the latter having as its maximum expression the witch hunt. The



violence of the expropriation of primitive accumulation on women is exemplified, as Federici (2017; 2019) historicizes, given that women - stripped of their possibilities of sustenance and mobility by being expelled from their villages as a consequence of the practice of enclosures - were left with the impoverishment and violence of men.

This structural mark is still present. It is urgent to affirm that there is a permanent process of erasure, persecution and degradation of women in the present, which is combined to a contemporary process of dehumanization, a strategy of domination imported from colonial modernity (MARINHO, 2020).

In fact, the witch hunt of the present, as demonstrated by Marinho (2020), encompasses a complexity of violations of a structural nature with the neoliberal agenda, especially in the countries of the South, such as Brazil. There are several effects and impacts on women's lives with the commodification of social policies, the privatization of education and health, the global capitalist control over production and social reproduction and the dismantling of citizenship rights and the already fragile Brazilian democracy.

The structural elements that explain the social precariousness of women and violence against women are closely related to the processes of dehumanization that sustain the project of cisheteropatriarchal, racist, capitalist and colonial domination-exploitation, which ideologically has today, in neoconservative thought, in Christian religious morality and familism, its main mortar for anti-gender, anti-feminism and anti-LGBTI+ reactions, under the invented discourse of gender ideology, which in reality is a gender panic. This project gains materiality in social practices, either with direct violence, or with the violation of rights in the face of the ongoing Brazilian de-democratization (BIROLI, 2020), as an ultraneoliberal project of the imperialist global elites on countries of peripheral and dependent capitalism such as Brazil.

With the advance of the new right, an extreme right expressed in the Bolsonarista project, of an authoritarian and proto-fascist nature, we are faced today with many paradoxes regarding the issue of women, rights and Brazilian citizenship. If we take as a point of observation the violence against women, this is of a direct nature, as shown by the data in an upward curve in the cases of femicides, and of an institutional programmatic nature with the retraction of rights and the systematic defunding of public policies.

Brazil ranks 5th among the countries with the highest number of femicides, according to the Dossier on Femicide of the Patrícia Galvão Agency ([2015]). Regarding the sys-



tematic defunding of public policies for women, after so many historical conquests, the Ministry of Women, Family and Human Rights (MMFDH) - occupied by an evangelical pastor, whose personality brings together a series of positions, speeches and addresses frankly criticized by national and international human rights organizations - spent, in 2020, only 53% of its budget, which corresponds to a significant impact on the realization of actions for women's rights. Experts agree that, in the long term, this situation will empty the portfolio's budget, as pointed out by Lola Ferreira (2021), from *Gênero e Número*.

Therefore, there is no way to disagree with Federici's (2019) thesis that the globalization scenario, in all its capitalist forms (structural adjustment, trade liberalization, low-intensity wars) is, in essence, a war against women, particularly devastating for Third World women, although it also harms the lives of planetary women. To confront this war, the Italian historian argues that the feminist struggle must attack the underlying problems of women, moving away from the empty discourse of empowerment, which requires an anti-capitalist struggle, a struggle against capitalist globalization and its international bodies such as the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO.

It is a war already designed from the privatization of land and the commodification of social relations that, according to Federici (2017), must be taken as the sociohistorical contextuality in which to situate the history of women, since the arrival of capitalism introduced changes in the social position of women.

Thus, it is important to address colonial modernity and its dimensions: gender, race, metropolis/colony - north/south. According to Marinho (2021), the historicity of the capitalist mode of production is built on the patriarchal and racial structure of the colonizing project in the world-village, which transformed the references of life, culture and work of non-capitalist societies. It is no longer rare to find historical studies showing that imperialist and colonialist systems engendered hierarchies of race/ethnicity and gender in societies where gender and racial systems had no or insignificant hierarchical divisions. Argentine feminist Rita Segato (2014), addressing the existing interrelationship between coloniality and patriarchy, has historicized the existence of gender systems in the pre-imperial world and in colonial modernity, inferring that in the world-village there was a low-intensity patriarchal organization, which, historically transformed by Western gender with colonialism, was shaped into what she calls modern colonial patriarchy, a high-intensity patriarchal organization. Segato's thesis is relevant, in particular, for inserting the category of gender as a central category in the unveiling of the dimensions of social life totalized by the modern colonial order.



It is important to note that the decolonial proposal is different from “decolonization”. While the latter term, by putting an end to colonialism, refers to the historical processes that followed the end of the official colonial relationship, the former, on the contrary, is presented with a political use that aims to highlight what still remains in force in societies today considered postcolonial, although denied by the colonial structure (VERGÈS, 2020).

Thus, a decolonial view recognizes the permanence of the effects of colonization on current social relations and the intertwining of gender, race, sexuality, class and nation for the study of social phenomena related to women’s social precariousness. In other words, it implies situating such phenomena in the historical and concrete dynamics of global coloniality (CURIEL, 2015), whose central key of analysis is that of the inseparable trilogy between Eurocentric Western modernity, colonialism and the globalization of capitalism. A trilogy that structures racial, sexual, geopolitical, class and gender hierarchies - concretely expressed in the international division of labor that dynamizes between the center versus the periphery of capital -, thus hierarchizing who is human and who is not.

Such hierarchization is a debate that also gains importance in the studies of the important Italian Marxist Domenico Losurdo. Critically and historically, Losurdo (2006), by historicizing liberalism and racial slavery as a singular twin birth, reveals that liberal doctrine and slavery, which in theory are a paradox, a radical disjunction, were shaped as a necessary conjunction for the development of the English and American liberal capitalist bourgeoisie. A historical cycle broken only after the end of the Civil War due to the historical needs of consolidation of capitalism with the generalization of wage labor and the formation of a consumer market.

With the liberal revolution of the seventeenth century, racial slavery expanded and marked a period of dehumanization based on racial (black and white) and spatial (colony and metropolis) demarcation and discrimination, delimiting the community of the free and the enslaved, the boundaries of the human and the non-human. These frontiers, rationalized by natural/biological explanations, inferiorized blacks and indigenous natives of warm climate regions (the soil of the modern barbarian world), taking away their human condition and giving them the character of merchandise and property to be exploited (LOSURDO, 2006).

Against the historical backdrop of the American Civil War (the industrial North with wage and free labor and the agricultural and slaveholding South), Losurdo (2006) concludes that the liberal world was deeply divided on the issue of slavery. Ultimately,



these were intra-bourgeois dissensions: a liberal bourgeoisie on the one hand and a landed aristocracy on the other. This revealed antagonisms in the very condition of being liberal, as different political uses of the term liberal and its relation to the institute of slavery were forged, according to the imperative needs of economic domination, whether in liberal politics or in the liberal mode of feeling of the eighteenth century, the century of modernity, which was still nourished by conservative structures such as slavery.

The historical dynamics presented here express the consolidation of modern colonial capitalism. Today it can be situated with globalization: *on the one hand, the constitution of the capitalist periphery with a dependent economy*, the countries of the South, and, on the other, the central countries with a dominant economy, the countries of the North. A pattern of world capitalist power of a patriarchal and racist character, with control over labor and over the production and reproduction of life.

Thus, in the history of capitalist formation, the division between civilized and backward, between human and non-human, between the property-owning and the dispossessed, and between those who have rights and those who do not, is clear. The historical legacy of the modern conception of abstract formal law, by not considering the status inequalities of citizens such as women, the enslaved, the blacks, the indigenous, the illiterate, the non-property owners and the non-Catholics in asymmetry with the white, rich, property-owning, literate and Catholic man, reappears today reproducing the structural inequalities of modern colonial society. With regard to Brazilian society, whose social formation is marked by slavery and patriarchy and whose historical-political formation has the status of a former colony, the current neoconservative scenario sharpens the oppressive ideologies of gender, race/ethnicity, class and sexuality.

## Final considerations

The argumentative journey of this article, anchored in the Marxian ontology of social being and in feminist perspectives, was intended to contribute elements of analysis to a material basis of the present. The relations of oppression-exploitation of colonial modernity, read from the unity between theory, method and history, require a perspective of historicity, totality and dialectics, tripod of the Marxist method, to unveil the functioning of social relations through their historical-concrete and structural foundations.



This is how the historical and dialectical materialist method presents itself as an important analytical legacy to interpret the new realities in movement. This means that the Marxian categories have a history and dynamism and, being more complex in the present, demand to be saturated with new determinations.

This has been a theoretical-political exercise carried out by many feminist theorists, fruitful and encouraging of new syntheses and mediations, necessary, therefore, for us to read the historical root of daily violence against women and systematic violations of rights. They are structurally and conjuncturally linked to the current process of Brazilian de-democratization (BIROLI, 2020), imposed by the global imperialist elites in response to the structural crisis of capital.

The erosion of the already fragile Brazilian democratic conquests and the successive attacks on the social state are umbilically accompanied by anti-gender, anti-feminism and anti-LGBTI+ policies, which, despite having a transnational characteristic, gain in our country, of the societal project of the Bolsonarist extreme right, a symbiotic governance between the desecularization of politics, authoritarianism, necropolitics and corpocracy, the result of the fusion between neoconservatism and neoliberalism (PEREIRA, 2020; BIROLI, MACHADO, VAGGIONE, 2020), undermining our political sovereignty and the ballast of female citizenship. It is with this scenario in mind that the ability to broaden the lens of analysis on the relations of oppression-exploitation, as well as the design of strategies of struggle for their supplanting, merits an exercise of successive approximations to the real, as taught by the Marxist method, and especially in articulation with the contribution of different feminist formulations and theorizations, since no feminist theory will be able, on its own, to fulfill the task of translating the complexity of social phenomena and objectify the structural responses in the horizon of the feminist struggle.

Inspired by what Nancy Fraser (2018) already pointed out in the feminist debates of the 1990s, undertaking a theoretical, ethical and political exercise that accesses new emancipatory meanings requires confronting the complementarity of the substantive theoretical tools and methodological perspectives of feminisms.



## References

- Antunes, R. (2005). *Caracol e sua concha: ensaios sobre a nova morfologia do trabalho*. São Paulo: Boitempo.
- Arruzza, C. (2015). Considerações sobre gênero: reabrindo o debate sobre patriarcado e/ou capitalismo. *Outubro Revista, online*, N° 23, pp. 33-58.
- Biroli, F. (2020). Gênero, “valores familiares” e democracia. En: Biroli F., Machado, M. Vaggione, J. Gênero, neoconservadorismo e democracia: disputas e retrocessos na América Latina. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2020, p.135-187.
- Biroli, F., Machado M. & Vaggione J. (2020). *Gênero, neoconservadorismo e democracia: disputas e retrocessos na América Latina*. São Paulo: Boitempo,
- Curiel, O. (2015). Construyendo metodologías feministas desde el feminismo decolonial. En: Azkue, I. et al. (org.). *Otras formas de (re)conocer. Reflexiones, herramientas y aplicaciones desde la investigación feminista*. Donostia: Universidad del País Vasco/Hegoa, 2015. p. 45-60.
- Federici, S. (2017). *O Calibã e a Bruxa: mulheres, corpo e acumulação primitiva*. São Paulo: Elefante Editora.
- Federici, S. (2018). Notas sobre gênero em O Capital de Marx. *Cadernos Cemarx*, N°10, p. 83-111. Disponível em: <https://www.ifch.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/cemarx/article/view/2940>. Acesso em: 10 mar. 2019.
- Federici, S. (2019). *O ponto zero da revolução: trabalho doméstico, reprodução e luta feminista*. São Paulo: Elefante Editora.
- Ferreira, L. (2021). Pouco dinheiro gasto por ministério de Damares em 2020 impacta mulheres e LGBTQ+ e gera temor sobre futuro da pasta. Gênero e Número, Rio de Janeiro, N°14. Disponível em: <http://www.generonumero.media/orcamento-damares-2020-mulheres-lgbt/>. Acesso em: 18 jan. 2021.
- Fraser, N. (2018). Pragmatismo, feminismo e a virada linguística. In: BENHABIB, S. Et al. *Debates feministas: um intercâmbio filosófico*. São Paulo: Unesp, 2018. P. 233-253.
- Instituto Patrícia Galvão. Dossiê Femicídio. Plataforma eletrônica, [2015]. Disponível em: <https://dossies.agenciapatriciagalvao.org.br/femicidio/capitulos/qual-a-dimensao-do-problema-no-brasil/>. Acesso em: 20 jan. 2021.



Losurdo, D. (2006). *Liberalismo e escravidão racial: um singular parto gêmeo*. Contra-história do liberalismo. São Paulo: Ideias e Letras.

Lukács, G. (1979). *Ontologia do ser social. Os princípios ontológicos fundamentais de Marx*. São Paulo: Editora Ciências Humanas.

Marinho, S. (2020). Mulheres trans, violência de gênero e a permanente caça às bruxas. Dossiê Questão Social, violência e segurança pública. Argumentum. Vitória (ES), UFES, Vol.12, Nº3, pp.86–101. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufes.br/argumentum/article/view/31355/22394>. Acesso em: 04 fev. 2021.

Marinho, S. (2021). Relações de opressão-exploração da modernidade colonial: notas sobre cidadania trans e emancipação. Dossiê Movimento de mulheres, feminismos e estudos de gênero. Em Pauta. Revista da Faculdade de Serviço Social da UERJ. Rio de Janeiro: UERJ, Vol. 19, p. 248-264. Disponível em: <https://www.e-publicacoes.uerj.br/index.php/revistaempauta/article/view/56075/36725>. Acesso em: 12 jun. 2021.

Marx, K. (1980). *A chamada acumulação primitiva. O Capital. Livro 1. v. 2. Capítulo XXIV*. Ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

Marx, K. (2004). Trabalho estranhado e propriedade privada. Manuscritos econômico-filosóficos. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2004.

Marx, K. (2011). *Grundrisse. Manuscritos econômicos de 1857-1858. Esboços da crítica da economia política*. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2007). Feuerbach e história. Rascunhos e anotações. In: Marx, K. & Engels, F. A ideologia alemã. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, p. 29-51.

Netto, J. P. (2011). *Introdução ao estudo do método de Marx*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular.

Pereira, P. (2020). *Ascensão da nova direita e colapso da soberania política. Transfigurações da política social*. São Paulo: Cortez: Politizia.

Saffioti H. (1988). Movimentos sociais: a face feminina. In: CARVALHO, N. V. de (org.). A condição feminina. São Paulo: Vértice, 1988. p. 29-55.



Saffioti, H. (2000). *Quem tem medo dos esquemas patriarcais de pensamento?* São Paulo: Boitempo.

Saffioti, H. (2004). *Gênero, patriarcado, violência.* São Paulo: Perseu Abramo.

Segato, R. (2014). Colonialidad y patriarcado moderno: expansion del frente estatal, modernización, y la vida de las mujeres. In: MUNOZ, K.; CORREAL, D.; MIÑOSO, Y. *Tejiendo de outro modo: Feminismo, epistemología y apuestas descoloniales em Abya Yala.* Editorial Universidad del Cauca.

Segato, R. (2014). *Gênero e colonialidade: em busca de chaves de leitura e de um vocabulário estratégico descolonial.* E-cadernos CES, v. 18, 2012. Disponível em: <https://journals.openedition.org/eces/1533>. Acesso em: 12 jul. 2020. VERGÈS, F. *Um feminismo decolonial.* São Paulo: Ubu Editora, 2020.

Vergès, F. (2020). *Um feminismo decolonial.* São Paulo: Ubu Editora.

## Acknowledgments

I thank my fellow researchers and the coordinator of LIEIG/ NEPP-DH UFRJ, Lilia Pougy, for the debates held in the scope of the laboratory's activities, which contributed to the preparation of this article, as well as those that also took place during the meetings of the Thesis Seminar I Neoconservatism in Perspective, of the PPGSS/UFRJ, coordinated by Lilia Pougy, Ludmila Cavalcanti, and Rosana Morgado.



## Biography of the author

**Silvana Marinho**, is a researcher at the Interdisciplinary Laboratory of Studies and Intervention in Gender Public Policies (LIEIG/NEPP-DH UFRJ). Member of the Thematic Commission on Gender, Ethnicity and Sexual Diversity (GEDS-CRESS/RJ) and Alternate Member of the LGBTI Council of the State of Rio de Janeiro. Doctorate in Social Service from the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ). Master's Degree in Social Service from the State University of Rio de Janeiro (UERJ).

E-mail:: [marinho.silvana@gmail.com](mailto:marinho.silvana@gmail.com)

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3110-3902>

