



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Social reproduction feminisms

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Bhattacharya, T., Farris, S.R., Ferguson, S. (2022). Social reproduction feminisms. London : Sage.

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/1050172> since: 2026-02-26

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

Social Reproduction Feminisms

Sue Ferguson, Tithi Bhattacharya and Sara R. Farris

Abstract

This chapter outlines the trajectory of social reproduction feminisms, particularly as it unfolded in Europe and North America, by focusing upon the main theoretical contributions. By critically engaging with Marx's critique of political economy, feminists engaged in debates over social reproduction extended his analysis to grapple with the ways in which the reproduction of labour power grounds processes of accumulation in relations of social oppression. The chapter outlines some of the main contributions to the debate on the nature and role of social reproduction within capitalism and in relation to women's oppression. From the early feminist communists' articulation of the place of women's unpaid or unrecognised reproductive labour within the household, to the domestic labour debate, and more recent re-appraisals and development of the Wages for Housework campaign and Social Reproduction Theory, we trace the unfinished project of foregrounding the centrality of life-making activities for capitalism.

This unfinished project has, as this chapter aims to show, a pointed political message: the fight against capitalist exploitation must be, at one and the same time, a fight against social oppression.

Keywords

Social reproduction; wages for housework; domestic labour; life-making activities.

Introduction.

As the coronavirus pandemic raged through the planet, devastating lives and livelihoods, capitalist governments, worldwide, had to make an important shift in their governing strategies.

Overnight nurses and janitors, agricultural workers and supermarket stockers temporarily assumed greater importance than the stockbroker and the banker. The work of producing commodities for profit, suddenly took a backseat while reproductive labour, the work that reproduces our capacity to labour and, ultimately life itself, was put centre stage.

Social Reproduction (SR) feminism is the name given to that set of conceptualisations from different strands of Marxist and socialist feminism trying to explain these processes of life-making, how such processes are part of capitalist accumulation, and what this means for how we as individuals and as a society produce and maintain our lives and human capacities. SR feminism is thus a loose but nonetheless broadly coherent school of thought – one that identified and developed the insight that the social labours involved in producing this and the next generation of workers plays an important role in the capitalist drive to produce and accumulate surplus value. The tradition picks up on, and aims to correct, the naturalization of the gendered division of labour seen in Marx's critique of capitalism, and in the socialist tradition more broadly. It does so by developing an insight at the heart of *Capital* Volume 1, where Marx identifies "labour power", or our capacity to labour, as the "special commodity" that the capitalist needs to set the system in motion and keep it running. Our labour power, Marx tells us, has the "peculiar property of being a

source of value" (Marx 1977: 270) because with that labour power, we create commodities and value for capitalism. The appropriation of our surplus labour by capitalists is the source of their dominance. Without our labour power, then, the system would collapse. But Marx is frustratingly silent on the rest of the story. If labour power produces value, how is labour power itself produced?

In the following sections we outline the trajectory of SR feminism, particularly as it unfolded in Europe and North America, by focusing upon the main theoretical contributions.ⁱ By critically engaging with Marx's critique of political economy, SR feminism extends his analysis to grapple with the ways in which the social reproduction of labour power ground processes of accumulation in relations of social oppression. This unfinished project has, as we show below, a pointed political message: the fight against capitalist exploitation must be, at one and the same time, a fight against social oppression.

Marx and social reproduction.

Marx discusses the idea of social reproduction in Volume I of *Capital*. In Chapter 23 on "Simple Reproduction," he urges us to consider that "viewed . . . as a connected whole, and as flowing on with incessant renewal, every social process of production is, at the same time, a process of reproduction" (Marx 1977: 711). More specifically, he tells us, capitalist production reproduces the wage-labourer, the essential condition of further capitalist production. A century later, both Louis Althusser and Pierre Bourdieu begin from this Marxian insight to theorise the ways in which 'ideological state apparatuses' (Althusser) and 'cultural capital' (Bourdieu) feature in the broader reproduction of capitalism. (See Cammack 2020)

Marxist and socialist feminists, however, introduced an important distinction between the reproduction of capitalist social relations as a whole, or 'societal' reproduction, and 'social reproduction' which refers more narrowly to the processes, institutions and work necessary to renew labour power and life itself. (Laslett and Brenner 1989: 383; Arruzza 2016; Luxton 2006: 28-30) Labour power, and the labour that produces it, thus became the key categories on which social reproduction feminism focused. Marx defines labour, 'in the physiological sense', as the 'expenditure of human labour-power' (Marx 1977: 137). Labour is the practical and conscious interaction of a subject with the world around them. While its social form varies historically, labour is the precondition of all (pre-capitalist and capitalist) societies. And in the chapter devoted to labour power, Marx presents it not so much as an abstract concept but as a material and even sensuous reality: 'We mean by labour-power, or labour-capacity, the aggregate of those mental and physical capabilities existing in the physical form (*Leiblichkeit*), the living personality, of a human being, capabilities which he sets in motion whenever he produces a use-value of any kind' (ibid.: 270). Shortly after, Marx argues that labour-power exists only in the 'living body (*lebendige Leiblichkeit*)' of the worker (ibid.: 272); it 'exists only as a capacity of the living individual' (ibid.: 274).

Labour power is also, in capitalist societies, a commodity. In order to survive, its bearers (workers) must sell their labour power to a capitalist in return for a wage.ⁱⁱ But, according to Marx, labour power is a "peculiar commodity". It is peculiar because it is one "whose use-value possesses the peculiar property of being a source of value, whose actual consumption, therefore, is itself an embodiment of labour, and, consequently, a creation of value" (ibid.: 270). It is this aspect of labour power—its exploitation by capital through relations of waged labour and its role in determining and producing capitalist value—that Marx explores in depth in *Capital*.ⁱⁱⁱ And it is this aspect of labour power that has tended to dominate discussions in Marxist theory and

revolutionary socialist politics ever since.

For social reproduction theorists, analyses of capitalism that focus solely on value-productive (waged) labour are flat, one-sided and overly abstract. They are capital-centric in that they understand labour and labour power in the same way capital understands them—exclusively as “resources” for making profits rather than also as elements of making life. But, as Tithi Bhattacharya writes in a seminal explanatory essay, “what we designated . . . as two separate spaces – (a) spaces of production of value (point of production) (b) spaces for reproduction of labor power – may be separate in a strictly spatial sense but they are actually united in both the theoretical and operational senses.” (Bhattacharya 2015)^{iv} Following this thread of analysis, SR feminists, particularly from the late 1960s onwards, proposed to look at labour more expansively, without losing sight of its concrete features. Labour, in their view, is first and foremost the practical human activity required to produce life in general and to produce workers for capital in particular. While the creation of capitalist value and profit requires labour power be abstracted from those concrete realities, critiques of capitalism can and should begin from the fact that labour power is an *embodied* capacity that is socially (and hierarchically) organized. The adoption of such an approach reveals just how complicated any process of regeneration of such embodied capacities must necessarily be.

From a social reproduction lens, then, Marx’s famous story in *Capital* Volume One about the owner of money and the owner of labour power (Marx 1977: 280)^v as the two dramatis personae encapsulating the secret of capitalist accumulation, is not in fact the full story. It requires an addendum. As Nancy Hartsock put it, if after descending with the capitalist and worker into the realm of waged work we were then to follow the worker home, into yet another hidden abode of production, we might observe another change in the dramatis personae:

He who before followed behind as the worker, timid and holding back, with nothing to expect but a hiding, now strides in front, while a third person, not specifically present in Marx's account of the transactions between capitalist and worker (both of whom are male) follows timidly behind, carrying groceries, baby, and diapers. (Hartsock 1983: 234)

That is, in completing the entire cycle of production (the production of value at the factory followed by the production of labour power at home), we see how economic class relations are grounded in gender hierarchies. “By descending into the even more hidden, even more fiercely privatized space of the household, we see men and women who may be formally equal under the law transformed through the gender division of labor into relatively privileged and penalized subjects” (Weeks 2011: 25).

SR feminism thus begins from the assumption that the renewal of our labour power—which involves life-making activities from eating, resting and gestating to learning, creating art and playing sports—is socially organized in ways that both *correspond* to and *contradict* the priorities of capitalist accumulation. In other words, the biological and cultural processes and institutions of social reproduction are neither natural nor neutral. Referring to a specific strand of SR feminism that is known as Social Reproduction Theory (SRT), Aaron Jaffe argues that this approach does not simply trace “our needs, how we try to satisfy them.” Rather, more significantly, it theorizes “how we are limited and constrained when other, better, freer possibilities are available” (Jaffe 2020: 4).^{vi} SR feminism is above all a theory that attempts to explain the link between labour power reproduction and capitalist accumulation on the one hand, and social oppressions on the other.

Early social reproduction feminists attended almost exclusively to the gender hierarchy

that mediates the relation between life-making and value-making, or the reproduction of labour power in the home. They argued that the activities that renew the labour power and life of workers under capitalism occur prevalently within the family and are performed predominantly by women. One of their most important insights is that capitalism depends upon the regulation of women to perform unwaged and/or low-paying social reproductive labour. That is, capitalism presumes and also helps to shape and perpetuate the subordination and domination of working-class women.

The early focus on theorizing gender relations to the exclusion of other forms of oppression has—in light of criticism—led some social reproduction feminists to develop and complexify their understanding of capitalist social reproduction in ways that account for its imbrication in racist, heterosexist, ableist, colonialist and other social hierarchies. Much of that work has been pursued within the SRT framework that Jaffe discusses—a framework that evolved out of engaging with Lise Vogel’s approach in her 1983 book, *Marxism and Women’s Oppression: Toward a Unitary Theory*. We explain below how Vogel’s specific theorization of the relation between social reproductive labour and capitalist processes of accumulation points beyond the limits of more binary (gender/class) conceptualizations of capitalism. And how, seen in this light, SR feminism is as much a theoretical framework as a political project for full-scale social transformation.

Mary Inman’s *In Woman’s Defense*.

The relation between production and reproduction has been at the centre of Marxist and socialist feminist theorising and activism from the early 20th century onwards. Even though they did not refer to it as social reproduction, several feminists influenced by the work of Marx analysed the household and women’s labour as a site which entertained a close relationship with the point of capitalist production.

One of the first sophisticated attempts at theorising the relationship between reproductive labour, women’s oppression and capitalist work can be found in Mary Inman’s 1940 book, *In Woman’s Defense*. A member of the CPUSA, Inman conceived of her book as a contribution to her party’s reflection on “the woman question” (as it was called by socialists and communists at the time). Women’s work in the home, she contends, contributes to the production of overall social wealth. Housewives are “the pivot of the system” who provide “indispensable social labour.” While its connection to the capitalist system is obscured by its private nature, housework is “knit into the productive process.” (Inman 1940: 136, 34, 133) Inman positions women’s unpaid labour as productive work—in both the conventional sense of that term, as well as in the more technical, Marxist, sense denoting labour that produces capitalist value. Her argument directly contradicted the dominant view within the Party and broader Left, which designated housework as a form of consumption, not production. Although a great number of women’s traditional domestic chores had been commodified (weaving, canning, and schooling, for instance), Inman pointed out, a woman still maintains her home and raises children. Housewives produce, she wrote, “the most valuable of all commodities ... Labor Power.” (Ibid.: 149)

Inman specifies that this is the lot of working-class women alone—women who are “without property and have been denied the use of the earth except on the terms of those who claim title to it.” The wealthy but dependent woman, she writes, “is a sort of glorified servant ... [who] does no work.” Similarly, only “subject women” whose labour produces the “subject children” become the workers and soldiers of tomorrow. (Ibid.: 59, 102, 138)^{vii} Inman goes on to bemoan the wastefulness of individualized household production. Under the current system, for example, 100 women are employed to feed 100 men, whereas under a collective or cooperative system, she

proposes, community kitchens would require far less labour time. She further argues that resources and day nurseries should be made available to diminish the drudgery of housework and allow women to more easily work for a wage.

Inman concludes that the struggle against capital need not be limited to the shop floor. It can and should also take place in communities. Whereas previous socialist feminists, such as Alexandra Kollontai in Russia and Clara Zetkin in Germany had also supported community struggles, they did not offer any analysis of how such actions might challenge capitalist forms of wealth production. Rather, they argued that working class support for feminist causes brings workers together into a larger, stronger political force against capital. Inman's originality lies in grasping that while capital has unified the working class across gender lines by involving all forms of labour (men's and women's, waged and unwaged) in the process of accumulation, in depending on the unpaid labour of reproducing workers, capital has also already divided the class along gender lines.

As provocative as Inman was about gender politics, she had little to say about race. She makes passing mention of it in both *In Woman's Defense* and in her 1964 pamphlet, *The Two Forms of Production under Capitalism*. The absence of any analysis of racism in *Two Forms* is all the more surprising considering that this text came out fifteen years after the seminal article by Claudia Jones. In "An End to the Neglect of the Problems of the Negro Woman" (1949), Jones outlined the complex interplay of race, gender and class in the lives of African American women. Its publication coincided with an ascendant Black and Latinx feminist movement drawing attention to the racial, gendered and class-based experiences of the US welfare system. Inman, however, merely notes that "Negro women are particularly victimized by the present system," while going on to reinforce racial stereotypes of black women as poor mothers. (Inman 1964: 35n5)

The interplay between gender and racial oppression under capitalism, or the ways in which race and racism necessarily change the terms in which we understand the link between production and social reproduction, were mostly overlooked by early social reproduction feminists. It is only from the 1970s onwards that Black theorists push feminists to integrate race into their reflections. But before we develop this point, we need to briefly discuss the work of Margaret Benston. As we shall see, her 1969 article helped to establish the main terms upon which Marxist feminists will debate (and ultimately develop distinct positions within) social reproduction theory.

Margaret Benston on paid and unpaid work.

Inman's work was not well received by the CPUSA leaders and did not reach a wide audience. Yet, five years later another Marxist-feminist analysis of the social wealth produced by housewives would help spark a vibrant international debate about the role of domestic labour in capitalism. Margaret Benston's article, "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation," published in a 1969 issue of *Monthly Review*, advanced the idea that women's unpaid work in the home constitutes production (not consumption) essential to the capitalist process of value creation. Unlike Inman, however, Benston stresses that housewives do not engage in capitalistically "productive" labour because, she reasons, they do not produce goods or services for sale on the market: housewives create use values, not exchange values. That is, their "products" are consumed immediately in the privacy of their homes by people with whom they share family ties. Such work, she then suggests, is not capitalist, but *pre-capitalist*:

[The] household ... constitutes an individual production unit, a pre-industrial entity, in the same way that peasant farmers or cottage weavers constitute pre-industrial production units. The main features are clear with the reduplicative, kin-based, private nature of the work being the most important. (Benston 1969: 17)^{viii}

Although not, strictly speaking, capitalist labour, housework, claims Benston, “is very profitable to those who own the means of production.” (Ibid.: 18) It and women’s oppression more generally keep production costs down. To begin, she notes, a single wage covers the cost of two people’s “socially necessary” labour and, moreover, the availability of housewives to serve as a reserve army of labour fuels competition among workers, allowing capitalists to pay lower wages. Capitalists also benefit from the fact that a wife and children are dependent upon a man’s wages, making wage-earners less likely to strike, change jobs, or forego work all together.

Benston’s argument is about the structural relationship of women’s unpaid work to paid work. This necessary relation, she insists, is the critical, socio-material lever of oppression. And it is also the critical lever of liberation. Equality in paid work, she agrees, is an important goal. But it will not liberate women: “As long as housework and childcare remain a matter of private production and the responsibility of women, wage-earning women will simply carry a double work-load.” (Ibid.: 21) She argues for the socialization of such work but cautions that only a socialist system will put human welfare above profit; in capitalist societies, the public provision of care work is likely to dehumanize women, not liberate them. For Benston then the promise of women’s liberation lies in women asserting control over the conditions in which they perform unpaid work. Like Inman, Benston calls on women to resist their “exploitation” as housewives. Such resistance cuts against capital’s reliance on the family for higher profits and social stability. Housewives, she insists, have a role to play in the transition to socialism because of (not despite) their unique position relative to capital.

Wages for housework and the domestic labour debate.

Benston’s article anticipates that current within social reproduction feminism that Susan Ferguson has called the “Marxian school of social reproduction” (Ferguson 2020). This refers to those feminists who accept Marx’s “value theory as authoritative” and conceive of unpaid and much paid (public sector) social reproductive labour as necessary to the production of surplus value but not, in itself, productive of surplus value. As we will see, the answer to the question on whether reproductive labour produces exchange or use values will divide social reproduction feminists for the decades to come. Meanwhile, Benston’s work helped set the grounds upon which the so-called Domestic Labour Debate^{ix} would subsequently build its main arguments (see Hensman on ‘Domestic Labour’ in this volume). The contributors to the Domestic Labour Debate aimed to solve above all the riddle of exactly how women’s unpaid labour in the home is part of the process of creating surplus value.

This question was also the focus of the international Wages for Housework campaign. In 1972, Mariarosa Dalla Costa, Silvia Federici, Brigitte Galtier, and Selma James—representing feminist organizations in Italy, the United States, France, and England, respectively—founded the International Feminist Collective, which then launched Wages for Housework (WfH) campaigns in Padua and London. Over the next five years, feminists in multiple North American and European cities, as well as in Trinidad & Tobago followed suit. They paid particular attention to

the significance of patriarchal oppression as an axis of power. As Federici explains in her 1975 pamphlet, *Wages Against Housework*, capital and men both benefit from women's oppression:

In the same way as god created Eve to give pleasure to Adam, so did capital create the housewife to service the male worker physically, emotionally and sexually, to raise his children, mend his socks, patch up his ego when it is crushed by the work and the social relations ... that capital has reserved for him. (Federici 2012: 17)

In insisting that men too have an interest in sustaining women's oppression, WfH feminists stressed that capitalism is not simply an economic system of "free" waged labour. More accurately, they argued, it is a political system of unfreedom: it relies on extra-economic (gender) oppression to produce the labour power upon which it thrives. The political upshot is that women must organize separately from men, while also making their demand on capital (through the state) for wages. WfH feminists did not, however, advance the wage demand as an end in itself. Rather, wages for housework was "only a basis, a perspective, from which to start," explained Dalla Costa and James. Its "merit is to link immediately female oppression, subordination and isolation to their material foundation: female exploitation." (Dalla Costa and James 1972; see also Weeks 2011) As such, the demand that housewives be given a wage reveals the power women have to withdraw from housework, to refuse it, in the same way that striking waged workers stand up to capital.

Lise Vogel and the unitary theory.

Together with Benston's 1969 article, Lise Vogel's 1983 book, *Marxism and the Oppression of Women: Toward a Unitary Theory* is now considered a critical point of reference for the contemporary renaissance of SR feminism, particularly for the "Marxian school of social reproduction feminism" or Social Reproduction Theory. Vogel broke with the tendency to search for an explanation of women's oppression within the (unpaid and invisible) nature of housework and the gender relations within the patriarchal household. Instead she examined and elaborated the analysis of what she stressed was a necessary but contradictory relation between social reproductive labour and the processes of capital accumulation. Others before her had noted that this relational dynamic existed. But, preoccupied with trying to explain the "cause" or "origin" of women's oppression, their analyses ultimately pivoted on the oppressive nature of housework itself. Vogel was not interested in identifying causes and origins, readily conceding that patriarchal power relations predate capitalism. Rather, she asked how we can understand the *systemic logic* that sets the conditions whereby people reproduce themselves, on the one hand, and capital produces value, on the other. She proposed that women's oppression was sustained and shaped in the working through of the dynamics of that relationship.

Therein Vogel identified and unpacked a deep and abiding contradiction. Capitalists do not directly control the (re)production of labour power (the processes of which involve, she insists, capitalistically "unproductive" labour).^x They do, however, pay the wages and some of the taxes through which workers gain the means of subsistence to reproduce themselves. Because competition compels capitalists to keep wages and taxes as low as possible, the social reproduction of labour presents them with a dilemma: they require human labour power but must constrain the conditions of life that generate it. As Vogel observed, "From the point of view of capital, the social reproduction of the workforce is simultaneously indispensable and an obstacle to accumulation." (Vogel 2013: 156) Capitalism thus exists only by consistently thwarting the flourishing of human life on which it nonetheless depends.

For the bulk of history, ruling classes have resolved this dilemma primarily by off-loading as much responsibility for the reproduction of labour power on private households as possible. Because women are biologically able to give birth and breastfeed, it is necessary for the ruling class to find ways to regulate women's bodies and the caretaking labour that has conventionally fallen to them, while also keeping the costs of so doing as low as possible. To that end, it relies on its state to ensure the privatization and regulation of social reproductive work through policies and policing that tend to reinforce existing gender and sexual hierarchies. Thus, for Vogel, "women's oppression in class societies is rooted in *their differential position* with respect to generational replacement processes." (Ibid.: 129, emphasis in original) It is not sustained and reproduced simply because they take on the bulk of domestic labour, however much that labour can be an *expression* of their oppression as well as a source of gendered conflict.

Earlier theorists from Inman to Benston to Dalla Costa analysed ways in which the relation between production and reproduction drew patriarchal relations into the very constitution of capitalist wealth. Vogel's contribution is in highlighting and unpacking the political-economic logic of that co-constitution. In this way, she reveals the ways in which women's oppression is *integral* to the capitalist relations of production themselves—the way, that is, that capitalist production requires and makes possible the on-going oppression of women. The specific expressions of that oppression will, she says, vary; they can only be known through historical (not theoretical) investigation.

In this way, Vogel avoids attributing undue determinative weight to unpaid domestic work. Although a common aspect of women's oppression, and the historically dominant means of reproducing labour power at little cost to capital, she contends, gendered labour and the patriarchal household do not explain why capitalism is a sexist system. Rather, that explanation lies in grasping the dynamics of the necessary but contradictory relation of the reproduction of labour power to capitalist accumulation. That is, women's oppression in capitalist society is grounded in a socio-material or structural logic of capitalist reproduction that limits the possibilities for women's freedom and equality.

Vogel's focus on the relation of social reproductive labour to capital needs to be stressed because it allows her to point beyond the household as a site for analysing labour power's reproduction. Vogel mentions, for example, that workers are also reproduced in "labor camps, barracks, orphanages, hospitals, prisons, and other such institutions." (Ibid.: 152) And as others have pointed out, there are many more such sites, not least among them the community-based organizations that Claudia Jones and other anti-racist feminists highlight as the core of much African American women's activism. Moreover, schools, hospitals, and the homes of middle-class white employers of Black and immigrant housekeepers and child-minders, are sites of *paid* social reproductive work. The labour in these spaces and times is—just like unpaid housework—organized in and through manifold social hierarchies, including gender, race, coloniality and heterosexuality. As some recent studies of social reproduction show, the full scope of labour power's reproduction is governed through local, national, and global regimes that draw on various forms of oppression in ways that tend to reinforce them. (See e.g. Farris 2017) In ensuring the social reproduction of certain communities is more precarious and under-resourced than others, they facilitate the reproduction of an unequal, internally divided, global workforce.

From Vogel then, we can grasp that *all* processes and institutions of social reproduction (including but well beyond individual households) come up against capital's hostility to life-making. Capital sets the terms of life-making precisely because capitalists and the capitalist state own and control the vast majority of the resources essential to reproducing life (the means of

subsistence). This has tremendous consequences for anti-capitalist politics because it means that any (anti-racist, feminist, etc.) struggle for expanding and controlling the conditions under which the working class socially reproduces life, is potentially a struggle against capitalism.

Vogel's book published in 1983 was an expanded version of an earlier article she wrote in response to Heidi Hartmann's controversial intervention "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union." (Hartmann 1979) While Hartmann had notoriously advocated for a 'divorce' between Marxism and feminism and initiated what would be later called a 'dual system' analysis (see Farris on 'Gender' in this volume), Vogel pointed in a different direction. Rather than abandoning Marxism, she proposed that socialist feminists try to explain women's oppression under capitalism in terms of a unitary, materialist framework, or theory, which takes the daily and generational production and reproduction of labour-power as its point of departure. The 'unitary theory' that Vogel's project aimed to build thus invited socialist feminists to search for a single, integrated theoretical account of both women's oppression and capitalist accumulation. She proposed this could be accomplished by expanding the conceptual reach of the historical materialist methodology Marx deploys in *Capital* so as to rigorously explain the roots of women's subordination to men under capitalism. But while her 'unitary theory' was above all an attempt at understanding economic (or class) exploitation and gender domination as a unified process, thereby rejecting the dual analyses that conceived of each as springing from different systems, a growing number of scholars today use her work as a basis from which to develop a unitary theory that takes into account the ways in which gender and class interlink with racial and other social oppressions.

The question of value.

As we briefly mentioned above, one of the main divisions between different currents of social reproduction feminism related to the question: Does the work that goes into producing labour power create the actual value that capitalists then appropriate when they sell the products of waged labour? Mary Inman, various contributors to the Domestic Labour Debate, and those involved in the international Wages for Housework (WfH) campaign all proposed that it does. Capitalist value is generated, they claimed, not simply through the waged labour that produces commodities for sale (as Marx insists) but also through unpaid domestic labour. That's because, women's unpaid work of cooking, cleaning and caring produces the commodity, human labour power, which they and/or their husbands (and in time their children) sell to capitalists who, in turn, exploit it to generate value and surplus value. The wage and the family obscure the value-making function of domestic labour: wages appear to be paid only for work done during the hours that a worker is "at work"; and the family appears to be a private, interpersonal institution outside of the labour/capital relation. Accordingly, capitalists don't only depend upon those whose labour reproduces this and the next generation of workers; they directly *exploit* them (in the Marxian sense of appropriating the value of their labour).

This perspective informed the WfH campaign strategy, which called on housewives to refuse work.^{xi} Because "every moment of our lives functions for the accumulation of capital," striking against housework and social reproductive labour more broadly conceived has the potential, Federici and others argued, to obstruct the creation of value. (Federici 2012: 35) Crucially, the campaign linked this strategy to the demand that women be paid a wage for housework. This was not intended as a typical campaign demand insofar as the WfH theorists did not believe it could be won. Indeed, that was their point: the demand for a wage was intended to

draw attention to the fact of domestic labour's economic value, and the *impossibility* of its full recompense under a capitalist system. The refusal of housework was also intended as a refusal of its commodification (through the hiring of nannies, for instance) and a demand for it to be organized by the state (through social services). While the campaign's revolutionary goals were regularly misinterpreted by both its critics and adherents, the WfH campaign has remained a highly influential strand within social reproduction feminism, with Federici's work in the last two decades reigniting and broadening the current's political conclusions.^{xii}

Other Marxist feminists—those who have expanded upon Vogel's work and developed a position that has come to be called social reproduction theory (SRT)—have a different take on the question of whether social reproductive labour produces value. Following from Marx, they argue that value is determined in a capitalist economy in the process of producing goods and services *for exchange* (that is, in *commodity* production). In other words, value is created only in those circumstances in which the product of labour is sold on the market and where it produces a profit.^{xiii} In the case of (unpaid and much paid, public sector) social reproductive labour, observe SRT feminists, the good or service produced never circulates on the market.^{xiv} The *unpaid work* of preparing breakfast at home, helping children with homework, comforting someone who is sick, along with the *paid work* of cleaning bedpans in public hospitals, or teaching students in public schools—these are all examples of social reproductive work that produces “products” whose consumption is not dependent upon their sale. Such work produces material, emotional, and/or intellectual goods and services necessary to life, including health, love, attention, discipline, knowledge and much more. Its producers may be waged or unwaged, “housewives,” paid domestic workers, community activists and public sector workers—anyone whose work is geared, in the first instance, to meeting specific life needs and desires. Such work is not undertaken *because* its product will realize value through its sale on the capitalist market. True, it contributes to creating a commodity, labour power, which will eventually be sold on the market (as those who subscribe to the WfH position argue).^{xv} But because the products of that labour are not produced for exchange on a capitalist market, insist SRT feminists, the labour is not, and cannot be, productive of value; nor, then, does it tend to be organized strictly in accordance with the capitalist logic of value creation.

Here, value creation is understood to require both forms of labour, those that are capitalistically “productive” and those that are not. Because capitalism is premised upon dispossessing the working class of their means of subsistence—which then requires people to sell their labour power for a wage—capital still tends to dominate “unproductive” work processes involved in creating life. But it can only do so indirectly. The logic and domination of capitalist value creation can and does affect the time, place, rhythm and pace of social reproductive work in public schools and hospitals, at home and in the community. But it does not subject that work to the calculations of value production in the way that it does, for instance, the labour processes at McDonald's or Amazon.

Labour in general resists total subsumption by capital precisely because there can be no labour without life—without a living human being, whose life needs can and will assert themselves against capital time and again. For both historical and systemic reasons, however, “unproductive” social reproductive labour tends to be less subordinated to capital than “productive” labour. The disagreements over social reproductive labour and value creation inform the way each approach conceptualizes the possibilities for resistance. While the WfH tradition tends to promote the importance of moving beyond or outside capitalist relations, through the creation of alternative

spaces to capitalism, the SRT tradition looks instead toward struggles to break the system from within.^{xvi}

Analyzing Race and Racism.

Social reproduction feminists in the 1970s made it possible to conceptualize and explore the logic behind capital's interaction with—and dependence upon—social power relations such as patriarchy. But these analyses also shared a key weakness: they focussed too narrowly on unpaid housework and childcare as the key to women's oppression. In so doing, they introduced theoretical oversights and ambiguities. Among other things, they tended to attribute the reproduction of patriarchy to men's power over women, a circular reasoning that easily defaults to an ahistorical biological reductionism. And to the extent that they situated patriarchal power as stemming from men's position as wage-earners, they ended up generalizing what are in fact particular relations within typically white middle-class households. Such a dehistoricized and universalizing conception of patriarchal power could not be sustained in the face of empirical evidence and mounting criticism.

The most developed criticisms at the time came from anti-racist feminists, such as those comprising the *Combahee River Collective* (CRC), who had long noted Black women's "triple" (class/race/gender) oppression (see Bandhar on 'Race' in this volume). By the end of the decade, many feminists were persuaded by the CRC's call for a radical socialist politics that addresses the multiple "interlocking" oppressions Black women experience within capitalism.^{xvii} And in her 1981 book, *Women, Race, and Class*, Communist Party USA member and Black Panther supporter Angela Davis directly reproached the tradition for its narrow focus on housework and the call from WfH feminists for a wage. The full-time housewife, Davis points out, has only ever "reflected a partial reality ... rooted in the social conditions of the bourgeoisie and middle classes." Not only have poorer, racialised women been excluded from that category, certain capitalist regimes (she cites South African mining capital as an example) actively undermined it for Black families. Moreover, she argued, wages are hardly a solution for immigrant and Black women in the United States who "have been receiving wages for housework for untold decades" as paid domestic servants in white women's homes. (Davis 1981: 229, 237)^{xviii} Picking up on a recurring theme of the 150 years of anti-racist feminism before her, Davis stresses that it is as low waged, low status workers that many Black women experience the harshest forms of oppression.

Davis's critique resonated widely. Michelle Barrett took it up in her seminal book, *Women's Oppression Today*, pointing out that the weight attached to the family as a primary site of oppression overlooks and underplays the role of the state. Black feminists have in fact argued that the violence and coercion of a racist state means "that it is the state rather than the family that is the oppressor as far as black women are concerned". (Barrett 2014: xxxvi) In her response to Heidi Hartmann's famous intervention in the late 1970s, Gloria Joseph makes a similar point and describes racial oppression as the "great equalizer". For these scholars, the family and the unpaid work of women therein do not explain the type of oppression and domination experienced by Black people in general or Black women in particular. Observing that white women have more power than Black men, Joseph writes, "Capitalism and patriarchy simply do not offer to share with Black males the seat of power in their regal solidarity" (Joseph 1981: 101).

Moreover, as both Claudia Jones and Angela Davis argue, in spite of its power imbalances,

the family can be a site of comfort and equality for Black life. That is, for many Black women who endured slavery and who continue to endure its legacy, housework can be the space in which they exercise a measure of control. (Davis 1981: 229, 237; Jones 1949: 3-4, 9)^{xix} Although many white socialist and Marxist feminists supported anti-racist struggles, they often failed to grasp the challenge that anti-racist feminists posed to the domestic labour theoretical paradigm. Many continued to position unpaid housework and the family as pivotal and universal categories of their analysis and, in so doing, either wrote Black women out of their feminism or treated racism as a secondary form of oppression, external to the workings of patriarchal capitalism. (See Bannerji 1991) Others abandoned materialist frameworks all together. (See Arruzza 2013) Meanwhile, Black feminists were elaborating upon the CRC's conception of interlocking oppressions, developing what Kimberlé Crenshaw famously labelled "intersectionality". (Crenshaw 1989) Some of the most compelling insights and commitments of intersectionality feminism have since been critically appropriated in the more recent renewal of social reproduction feminism. This engagement made it possible for social reproduction feminism to grapple with racial and other forms of oppression attending an increasingly globalized neoliberal capitalism and its authoritarian state. (See Blank 2011) For Meg Luxton, for instance, the integration of race into a unitary theory means:

put[ing] issues of imperialism, racialization and racism at the heart of gender and class analyses. Capitalist development depended on supplies of (reproduced) labour from people who originally lived outside regions where capitalist relations were dominant and on people in and from colonies; the transnational, trans-regional locus of social reproduction and capital's mobility mean that capitalism is foundationally racialized and dependent upon differences and divisions. (Luxton 2006: 38, cited in Blank 2011)

Isabella Bakker and Stephen Gill's *Power, Production and Social Reproduction*, an international political economy account of globalization published in 2003, made important advances in this area. Throughout the book, contributors analyzed the impact global capital and neo-liberal structures of governance have had on racial hierarchies in various times and places—an impact they assess mainly by examining notions of citizenship and capital's increasing reliance on exploitative regimes of migrant and marginalized labor. Social reproduction, they argued, is best conceived not so much as a set of intersecting structures, but as "a transformative process that not only entails the constitution and reconstitution of gender, race and class and ideas about gender, race and class . . . but also how a sense of identity and resistance can be actualized in this new context of intensified globalization" (Bakker and Gill 2003:18).^{xx}

Such a conception is rooted within a historical materialist approach to understanding social relations—one that is consistent with and builds upon the challenges offered by Himani Bannerji. Bannerji is a Bengali-Canadian anti-racist feminist and Marxist sociologist and philosopher who highlighted the Althusserian influences in critical feminist political economy that had developed social reproduction feminism in a structuralist direction.^{xxi} For Bannerji such Althusserian influences had been responsible for the tradition's systematic blindness to the experiential—and to experiences of race and racism in particular. (Bannerji 1991)

Bannerji thus argued for the need of anti-racist, socialist feminism to centre the experience, subjectivity and thus political agency of racialised subjects within the capitalist totality in order to avoid de-historicising their analyses. In the 2000s, Canadian Marxist feminist Susan Ferguson built on Bannerji's critique and used David Harvey's concept of spatialisation to argue that social

reproduction feminism must account for racism and racialisation if it wants to provide a solid account and political strategy of how the paid and unpaid socially reproductive work of women plays a key role in their oppression across cultures and racial divides. For Ferguson, bodies are racialized not because of some inherent bio-physical attribute (like the biological differentiation that is socially organized into gender differences). Rather, “people become racialized insofar as they are associated (by skin color, cultural identity, language or accent) with other socio-geographic spaces”—spaces that are hierarchically organized between and within national boundaries in ways that tend to conform with capitalist imperatives of dispossession and accumulation. “So while people are necessarily ‘territorialized’ by matter of their birth (we are all born and live somewhere),” writes Ferguson, “they are only racialized as a function of how their location figures in the broader socio-geo-political ordering of capitalism” (Ferguson 2008). And reproducing bodies through these socio-spatial capitalist relations is a significant means of ensuring both the on-going devaluation of social reproduction, and the availability of socially degraded bodies to perform that devalued social reproductive work. Ferguson’s overarching point is that social reproductive work is not free-floating, but is anchored in specific bodies *and* places. And attending to both of these concrete aspects within a capitalist totality is what allows us to analyze social reproductive labour as always racialized as well as gendered.

In many ways, that is precisely what several SR feminists have done by analysing the global care chain – a term introduced by Arlie Hochschild to capture the transnational transfer of care work that ensues when wealthy, often white, women in the global North employ (usually darker skinned) women migrating from poorer countries as nannies and domestic workers. (Hochschild 2000) One of the most striking phenomena of neoliberal capitalism has been the feminization of migration. Since the late 1970s more and more women have been migrating in order to respond to the growing demand for care and cleaning, or social reproductive labour. Sara Farris’s book *In the Name of Women’s Rights: The Rise of Femonationalism* (2017), updates and refocuses the Black feminist critique of paid social reproductive work. Farris illustrates the complex ways in which Muslim women’s migration to Europe and Britain is grounded in and fuels white supremacist and sexist dynamics reinforced through borders, immigration controls and settlement services. This ‘commodification’ of social reproduction filtered through the structures of nationhood and a naturalized, hegemonic, citizen culture takes us far beyond traditional social reproduction feminism concerns with the unpaid domestic labour of (white) women. It shows, among other things, the degree to which life-making under capitalism takes myriad forms, involving myriad social relations and forms of oppression. Other scholars inspired by these insights are exploring issues of settler colonialism, sexuality, forced labour and more.^{xxii} Social reproduction theory has become indeed more and more a key site for understanding the intersection between oppression in general and class exploitation.

Social reproduction feminist strategies.

Recent developments within SR feminism have been especially concerned with how Marxist and socialist feminists can draw on this theoretical approach to develop feminist, anti-racist and anti-capitalist organising and political strategies. (See Arruzza and Gawell 2020) Two related but distinct approaches can be identified. On the one hand there are those who are renewing and elaborating a form of Wages for Housework politics. This foregrounds the call for “a collective struggle over reproduction” through refusing to work for capital. Silvia Federici urges instead that workers take control over “the material conditions of our reproduction and creat[e] new forms of

cooperation around this work outside of the logic of capital and the market.” (Federici 2012: 111) Collective spaces, she reasons, can thereby be created wherein people learn new, collective ways of living and producing. These include, for example, communal kitchens, farms, and land occupations, as well as market-alternative trading systems for healthcare, childcare, and other social services. Such “commoning” initiatives, she stresses, can only be transformative if they are consciously revolutionary—that is, if they refuse the logic of capitalism and work toward the creation of a new, just, society.

For Kathi Weeks, one step in this direction is the campaign for a Universal Basic Income (UBI). A decent, unconditional guaranteed income, she suggests, would allow people to refuse waged work and force employers to increase wages and “pursue opportunities for pleasure and creativity that are outside the economic realm of production,” including opportunities to “recreate and reinvent relations of sociality, care and intimacy”. In the process, people come to realize how capitalism organizes all work, including through a gendered division of labour that naturalizes the family. Weeks’ call for UBI is, like the WfH campaign before it, intended as a “perspective and provocation” as much if not more than as a demand in its own right. (Weeks 2011: 103, 149)

Both Weeks and Federici are supporters of the “social reproductive strike”, or the withdrawal of socially reproductive labour as a way to single out its concealed importance under capitalism as well as a tool of political mobilisation and organisation. Since 2016, through feminist efforts in Poland, Spain, the UK, the Sudan, Iran, Argentina, the US and beyond, the social reproductive strike has become indeed one of the most visible forms of Marxist and socialist feminist organising as well as a powerful forum for and inspiration of SRT theorising. In *Feminism for the 99%: a Manifesto*, written to explain and advance the political perspective informing the strike, Cinzia Arruzza, Tithi Bhattacharya, and Nancy Fraser offer the following rationale: “By withholding housework, sex, smiles, and other forms of gendered, invisible work, [striking women] are disclosing the indispensable role of social reproductive activities in capitalist society.” The authors argue for a broad conceptualization of the working class, to include unpaid social reproductive workers as well as waged workers, underlining “the unity of ‘workplace’ and ‘social life.’” The strike is a time and place, they insist, in which everyday forces of creativity can take hold, and where “the impossible” can and must be demanded. (Arruzza, Bhattacharya, Fraser 2019: Thesis 1)

For both political perspectives, then, the social reproductive strike is a powerful weapon in the struggle against capital. The authors of the Manifesto depart from the WfH-informed strategy, however, in emphasizing the possibilities for striking within and against capitalist relations. That is, for Arruzza, Bhattacharya and Fraser, the strike is not only or even primarily about withdrawing from capitalist relations. However much revolutionary commoning must be supported, in their view, it is even more urgent to support and build anti-capitalist social movements that: (i) make direct demands on the state (without necessarily creating worker production or trading cooperatives) and (ii) that build unity across workplace- and community-based protests (for better schools, healthcare, housing, transportation, and environmental protections, as well as for higher wages, the end to sexual harassment at work and other workplace demands). While not work refusals in the sense discussed by Federici and Weeks, these social reproductive strikes make important claims for democratic and collective control of the conditions of (re)production. They demand that the resources for social reproduction be expanded and society prioritize meeting human need over making capitalist profit.

Following on the insights of the Manifesto, Tithi Bhattacharya has more recently emphasised the need to understand the role of the state and the differential impact of its withdrawal from social provisioning in the social lives of different sections of the working class. For Bhattacharya, being attentive to social reproduction and especially to the forces that inhibit the development of our capacities, trains our sight on what abolitionist feminist, Ruthie Gilmore has powerfully identified as “organized abandonment” by the state of communities, which has to necessarily pair with “organized violence” by that same state. (Gilmore 2008) In other words, when the state defunds social reproductive institutions such as healthcare and schools in communities of color neighborhoods, when they consciously refuse to investigate whether the drinking water supply of a community has been contaminated, (Feely 2018) this organized abandonment of the community must be kept in place by organized violence. Agents of the state such as the police or privately funded security then need to penetrate areas of social life like schools or hospitals, that as life making institutions should not have anything to do with the death making institution of law enforcement. Disciplining of poor and racialized communities thus gets woven into the fabric of social life and shapes the future of working-class lives.

It is not just racialized communities, of course, that are organized by violence. Queer people are also disproportionately targeted by the disciplinary arms of the state and suffer high unemployment and poverty levels. In grappling with these realities, some SRT scholars and activists have critically and productively engaged with gender theory to think through what it means to socially reproduce—and challenge—binary gender regimes (see Farris on ‘Gender’ in this volume; Arruzza 2015; Floyd 2009).^{xxiii} Families, policing, schooling, the healthcare system and more all structure (in different ways and to different degrees) the life-making work of gay, trans, intersex, two-spirited and other queer people. At the same time, as Kate Doyle Griffiths suggests, the project of “queer social reproduction”—that is, of organizing personal and collective spaces, practices and institutions that support and expand queer life-making—can and must be central to anti-capitalist resistance (Doyle Griffiths 2018). Writing specifically of past and current queer healthcare activism, Jules Joanne Gleeson notes: “As the material communities supporting trans people continue to strengthen, more and more trans women will be able to assert themselves openly as women.” (Gleeson 2017)^{xxiv}

From Life-making to World Making: SRT and the Climate Crisis

Nancy Fraser has argued that crises of capitalism identified by Marxism are not merely the result of contradictions between forces of production, but between such forces and the social reproduction upon which they depend.

on the one hand, social reproduction is a condition of possibility for sustained capital accumulation; on the other, capitalism’s orientation to unlimited accumulation tends to destabilize the very processes of social reproduction on which it relies (Fraser 2016: 100).x

In denuding social reproductive capacities, capitalism has disarticulated our collective life making, but the harm is no longer limited to the ‘social’. For it is only partially true that capitalism disarticulates the social; what is conjointly true is that it articulates social relations in very specific ways to reliably reproduce itself and its relentless productivist drive. It is this unique drive, peculiar only to capitalism, that has now triggered climate change, threatening all life as we know it. Differently put, the capitalist organizing of the ‘social’ has now “unhinged, disrupted,

destabilized” the climate to such an extent that any conversation about reorganizing the social must necessarily be about destabilizing capitalism. Any discussion of SR must then simultaneously be a discussion about forging a political project where the social reproduction of life is no longer subsumed under the social reproduction of the capitalist system. Where our priority is the growth and flourishing of *living beings*, human and non-human, rather than the growth and flourishing of *dead things* like the ‘economy’ and ‘commodity production’.

Capitalism as a system is future-blind, it can and will sabotage its own conditions of possibility in its drive to ‘accumulate for accumulation's sake’. Climate change, however, has put a timeline for how long this is possible. The system, and the planet with it, is experiencing time in radically transformed ways, or as Andreas Malm recently put it, “defeated time” is now “pouring down from the sky” (Malm 2020).

If capitalist production is concerned only with a constant, flattened present time, social reproduction, as theory and practice, directs attention to the future—to the ongoing reproduction of life of the species and the social world we create in and from the natural world. Capital's reproduction of itself is now threatening that chain of generational reproduction, which is why all politics, we maintain, must become a politics of social reproduction.

Such social reproduction politics in practice should be able to demonstrate that released from the imperatives of capitalist reproduction, we are capable of creating sustainable habitats where human lives be not just maintained but flourish. Where food, art and intimacies are pursued, or *made*, if you will, with the solemnity and playfulness they all deserve.

Bibliography

Armstrong, P. and Armstrong, H. (1978), *Double Ghetto*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Arruzza, C. (2013), *Dangerous Liaisons: The Marriages and Divorces of Marxism and Feminism*, Ponty Pool, Wales: Merlin Press.

Arruzza, C. (2016), “Functionalist, Determinist, Reductionist: Social Reproduction Feminism and its Critics,” *Science & Society* 80(1): 9-30.

Arruzza, C., Bhattacharya, T. and Fraser, N. (2019), *Feminism for the 99%: A Manifesto*, London: Verso.

Arruzza, C. and Gawell, K. (2020), "The Politics of Social Reproduction. An Introduction", *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 22 (2).

Bakker, I. and Gill, S. (2003), *Power, Production and Social Reproduction: Human In/security in the Global Political Economy*, London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bakker, I. and Gill, S. (2019), “Rethinking Power, Production and Social Reproduction: Toward Variegated Social Reproduction,” *Capital & Class* 43 (4): 503-23.

Bannerji, H. (1991), 'But who speaks for us? Experience and agency in conventional feminist paradigms' in: *Thinking Through: Essays on Feminism, Marxism and Anti-racism*, Toronto: Women's Press, pp. 67-108.

Barrett, M. (2014), *Women's Oppression Today: The Marxist/feminist Encounter*, London: Verso.

Benston, M. (1969), "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation," *Monthly Review* 21 (4): 13-27.

Bhattacharya, T. (2015), "How not to Skip Class: Social Reproduction of Labor and the Global Working Class," *Viewpoint Magazine*, <https://viewpointmag.com/2015/10/31/how-not-to-skip-class-social-reproduction-of-labor-and-the-global-working-class/> (last accessed 18/02/2021).

Bhattacharya, T. (ed.) (2017), *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression*, London: Pluto Press.

Blank, G. (2011), "Gender, Production, and 'the Transition to Capitalism': Assessing the Historical Basis for a Unitary Materialist Theory", *New Proposals: Journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry* 4 (2): 6-28.

Cammack, P. (2020), "Marx on Social Reproduction", *Historical Materialism*, 28 (2): 76-106.

Crenshaw, K. (1989), "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics," *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, Issue 1, Article 8: 139-67.

Dalla Costa, M. and James, S. (1972) 'Sex, Race and Class', Bristol: Falling Wall Press, <https://uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/01-sex-race-and-class> (last accessed 18/02/2021).

Davis, A. (1981), *Women, Race and Class*, New York: Vintage.

Dimitrakaki, A., Farris, S., Ferguson, S., and LeBaron, G. (eds.) (2016), Special Issue on Social Reproduction, *Historical Materialism* 24 (2).

Doyle Griffiths, K. (2018), "The Only Way Out is Through: A Reply to Melinda Cooper," *Verso Blog*, March 26, 2018, <https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/3709-the-only-way-out-is-through-a-reply-to-melinda-cooper> (last accessed 18/02/2021).

Farris, S. (2017), *In the Name of Women's Rights: the Rise of Femonationalism*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Federici, S. (2012), *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction and Feminist Struggle*, Oakland CA: PM Press.

Feely, D. (2018), 'The Poisoning of Flint', *International Viewpoint*, <https://internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article5855> (last accessed 18/02/2021).

Ferguson, S. (2008), "Canadian Contributions to Social Reproduction Feminism, Race and Embodied Labor", *Race, Gender & Class* 15 (1-2): 42-57.

Ferguson, S. (2020), *Women and Work: Feminism, Labour and Social Reproduction*, London: Pluto.

Fortunati, L. (1996), *The Arcane of Reproduction: Housework, Prostitution, Labor and Capital*, Brooklyn: Autonomedia.

Fraser, N. (2016), "Contradictions of Capital and Care," *New Left Review* 100: 99-117.

Gilmore, R. (2008), "Forgotten Places and the Seeds of Grassroots Planning", in *Engaging Contradictions Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship*, edited by Charles R. Hale, Berkeley et al.: University of California Press.

Gleeson, J. J. (2017), "Transition and Abolition: Notes on Marxism and Trans Politics," *Viewpoint Magazine*, July 19, 2017, <https://viewpointmag.com/2017/07/19/transition-and-abolition-notes-on-marxism-and-trans-politics/> (last accessed 18/02/2021).

Hartmann, H. (1979), "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union," *Capital & Class* 3 (2): 1-33.

Hartsock, N. (1983), *Money, Sex, and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism*, New York: Longman.

Hochschild, A. (2000), "Global Care Chains and Emotional Surplus Value", in Hutton, W. and Giddens, A. (eds), *On The Edge: Living with Global Capitalism*, London: Jonathan Cape.

Inman, M. (1940), *In Woman's Defense*, Los Angeles: The Committee to Organize the Advancement of Women.

Inman, M. (1964), *Two Forms of Production Under Capitalism*, Long Beach CA: Mary Inman.

Jaffe, A. (2020), *Social Reproduction Theory and the Socialist Horizon: Work, Power and Political Strategy*, London: Pluto.

Jones, C. (1949), "An End to the Neglect of the Problems of the Negro Woman!" *Political Affairs* (June 1949).

Joseph, G. (1981), 'The Incompatible Menage à trois: Marxism, Feminism, and Racism', in: Lydia Sargent (ed), *Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage between Marxism and Feminism*, Montreal: Black Rose Books, pp. 91-108.

Laslett, B. and Brenner, J. (1989), “Gender and Social Reproduction: Historical Perspectives,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 15: 381-404.

Luxton, M. (2006), “Feminist Political Economy and Social Reproduction” in: *Social Reproduction: Feminist Political Economy Challenges Neo-Liberalism*, ed. Kate Bezanson and Meg Luxton, Montréal & Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press.

Malm, A. (2020), *Corona, Climate, Chronic Emergency: : War Communism in the Twenty-First Century*, London: Verso Books.

Maroney, H. J. and Luxton, M. (eds.) (1987), *Feminism and Political Economy: Women’s Work, Women’s Struggles*, Toronto: Methuen.

Marx, K. (1977), *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. 1, introduction by Ernest Mandel, translated by Ben Fowkes, New York: Vintage Books.

McNally, D. (2010), “The Dual Form of Labor in Capitalist Society and the Struggle over Meaning: Comments on Postone,” *Historical Materialism* 12 (3): 189-208.

Mitchell, J. and Oakley, A. (eds.) (1986), *What is Feminism?*, New York: Pantheon.

Mohanty, C. T. (2003), “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited: Feminist Solidarity and Anticapitalist Struggles,” *Signs* 28 (2): 499-535.

Taylor, K.-Y. (ed.) (2017), *How We Get Free: Black Feminism and the Combahee River Collective*, Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Toupin, L. (2018), *Wages for Housework: A History of an International Feminist Movement, 1972-77*, trans. Kath Roth, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Vogel, L. (2013), *Marxism and the Oppression of Women: Toward a Unitary Theory*, 2nd edition, Chicago: Haymarket.

Weeks, K. (2011), *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Wright, S. (2002), *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism*, London: Pluto Press.

ⁱ Parts of this account are drawn from Susan Ferguson’s *Women and Work: Feminism, Labour and Social Reproduction* (2020).

ⁱⁱ And it is only when labour power has been sold to a capitalist that it transforms into a quantifiable, abstract determinant of capitalist value.

ⁱⁱⁱ His discussion, however, highlights how the commodity form of labour power also produces resistance and workers’ struggle to create and preserve life against the forces of capital—an aspect of *Capital* that is often overlooked.

^{iv} Bhattacharya qualifies that social reproductive work “may” be separated from work that produces value because it is not always so; life-making may also occur in for-profit enterprises (private daycares or hospitals, for example) and it may also be spatially integrated with productive work (as it is for people working from home or in labour camps).

^v The full quote reads: "the money-owner . . . strides out in front as a capitalist; the possessor of labour-power follows as his worker. The one smirks self-importantly and is intent on business; the other is timid and holds back, like someone who has brought his own hide to market and now has nothing else to expect but – a tanning." (Marx 1977: 280)

^{vi} For example, the United States leads the chart with 3800 kilo calories of average daily dietary intake, while people in Eritrea have available only 1590 kilo calories for their daily meals. Colonial legacies set an upper limit on what the acceptable ‘standard’ for food consumption can be, thus pushing African nations to the very bottom of this global chart. A similar story of striking national difference unfolds in educational attainments and life expectancy. Consequently, processes of regeneration of labour power in Eritrea or Haiti are nested in a very different set of expectations than in the US or the UK.

^{vii} In a later publication Inman retreats from this analysis, seeking to illustrate women’s common, cross-class, oppression.

^{viii} There is no evidence Benston, who was Canadian, had read Inman, but the ideas about domestic labour she advances in this article had been debated and discussed among Canadian socialist feminists throughout the 1960s.

^{ix} SRT or the Marxian school begins to cohere as a loose but definable “camp” in the 2000s, when Marxist feminists revisit Lise Vogel’s analysis and critique of the Domestic Labour Debate in her 1983 book, *Marxism and the Oppression of Women: Toward a Unitary Theory*.

^x Capital does directly control that social reproductive labour it has commodified (teachers in for-profit colleges or line chefs working in the hospitality industry, for example). But the bulk of social reproductive labour is not commodified.

^{xi} WfH campaign feminists critically engaged with the Autonomist tradition within Marxism. Developed in Italy in the 1960s, Autonomists coined the term “social factory” to capture the idea that society as a whole—not just the economic system—is directly constituted by capitalist relations of production. See Steve Wright, *Storming Heaven: Class Composition and Struggle in Italian Autonomist Marxism*.

^{xii} Critics of the WfH campaign argued that the focus on the wage was too narrow, reformist, or potentially damaging for women, and that it would turn the state into housewives’ employers, granting it the right to regulate women’s lives more closely while releasing governments (and capitalists) from the responsibility to provide essential social services in the community. See Louise Toupin, *Wages for Housework: A History of an International Feminist Movement, 1972-77*. For an excellent discussion of the WfH revolutionary campaign demands, Weeks (2011).

^{xiii} The reason has to do with the fact that, for Marx, the determination of value is bound up with the socially average labour time it takes to produce the product, something that is only evident because production occurs in the context of a mass, capitalist (and thus competitive) market.

^{xiv} The exception to this rule is paid social reproductive labour whose product is sold on a competitive open market, such as workers in private day care centres or restaurant waitresses and bartenders. Here social reproductive labour does generate capitalist value.

^{xv} Leopoldina Fortunati, author of *The Arcane of Reproduction: Housework, Prostitution, Labor and Capital*, agrees that reproductive labour, which she stresses includes both housework and sex work, produces use value, not exchange value. But, she argues, meals, clean clothes, sexual pleasure, and so on *transform into* exchange values because the ultimate product, labour power, is itself a commodity. Labour power, however, is not only, or necessarily, a commodity. Rather, it is a potential that inheres in human life, which can be commodified (that is, sold to a capitalist in return for a wage), but which can also be realized in non-waged, life-making activities.

^{xvi} See for example the Social Reproduction Dossier published in *Radical Philosophy* 2, no. 4, Spring, 2019, <https://www.radicalphilosophy.com/issues/204>.

^{xvii} See Keeanga-Yamahatta Taylor (ed.), *How We Get Free: Black Feminism and the Combahee River Collective* for the CRC Statement and interviews with its authors, Dimita Frazier, Barbara Smith and Beverly Smith.

^{xviii} Chandra Talpade Mohanty, meanwhile, objected to the universalization of white Western women’s experiences implied in these accounts of social reproduction. (See Mohanty 2003)

^{xix} Often understood as early theorists of intersectionality feminism, Davis and Jones both anticipate Vogel’s unitary analysis, arguing for the integral relation of race, class and gender within a capitalist framework. See David McNally (2010) and Ferguson (2020: 78-81, 109-10).

^{xx} See also Bakker and Gill (2019). This is the introductory essay to a Special Issue on Social Reproduction edited by Bakker and Gill that includes multiple essays deepening their initial contribution in *Power, Production and Social Reproduction* (2003).

^{xxi} See, for example, Heather Jon Maroney and Meg Luxton (1987), Juliet Mitchell and Ann Oakley (1986), Pat and Hugh Armstrong (1978).

^{xxii} For examples of recent work that showcases the breadth of discussions, see: Angela Dimitrakaki, Sara Farris, Susan Ferguson, and Genevieve LeBaron (2016), Tithi Bhattacharya (2017), and Bakker and Gill (2019).

^{xxiii} Arruzza, Cinzia (2015). "Gender as Social Temporality: Butler (and Marx)." *Historical Materialism* 23: 1, pp. 28-52. Floyd, Kevin. *The Reification of Desire: Toward a Queer Marxism*. University of Minnesota Press, 2009. Hennessey, Rosemary. *Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism*, New York: Routledge, 2000. See also Aaron Jaffe, *Social Reproduction Theory and the Socialist Horizon*, Pluto, 2021, pp. 111-120.

^{xxiv} See also the forum, "Beyond Binaries and Boundaries in 'Social Reproduction'", introduction by Max Andrucki, Caitlin Henry, Will McKeithen, and Sarah Stinard-Kiel, *Society + Space* 38 (6), <https://www.societyandspace.org/forums/beyond-binaries-and-boundaries-in-social-reproduction> (last accessed 18/03/2021).