
Silvia Niccolai. Professor of Constitutional Law at the University of Cagliari, Department for the Studies on Society and Institutions, where she also teaches Anti-Discrimination Law. Former Jean Monnet Professor of European Law (2009-2011). Most of her studies focus on equality and nondiscrimination from a feminist perspective and with attention to rhetoric and legal argumentation. With Ilenia Ruggiu she edited, in 2010, *Dignity in Change, Exploring the Constitutional Potential of EU Gender and Anti-Discrimination Law*, where she authored the chapter “Changing Images of Normal and Worthy Life” (Epap, Fiesole, 2010). Among her recent articles, in English: “Disability Discrimination by Association. A Case of the Double Yes?” (with C. Hoskyns and A. Stewart, in *Social and Legal Studies*, 2011); “Law and Community” (with F. J. Mootz III et al., in *Federalismi.it*, 2013); “When Minorities are 99%”, in *Costituzionalismo.it*, 2015); “The Third Movement: Family Life for a Fee?”, in E. Olivito (ed.), *Gender and Migration in Italy. A Multilayered Perspective* (Ashgate, London, 2016).

Contact: niccolai@unica.it

IF WOMAN BECOMES A METAPHOR FOR DEATH

Silvia Niccolai

Università degli Studi di Cagliari (Dissi)

DOI: 10.17450/170208

Reception date 1st June 2017; acceptance date 1st September 2017. This article is the result of research activities held at the Department for the Studies on Society and Institutions, Università degli Studi di Cagliari.

Abstract

‘Domestication’ is the turning of feminism into a discourse which, rather than challenging and transforming the existing status quo, and particularly the capitalistic mode of production and the whole of practices and ideologies connected to this latter, serves as its support. Why and with what results, such a turning towards Domestication has taken place? This article contributes to this largely debated issue by proposing to think that the domestication of feminism is linked to the domination of ‘Gender’ as an analytical and political tool.

Keywords

Domestication, feminism, gender, capitalism.

Resumen

La domesticación es el giro del feminismo en un discurso que, en lugar de desafiar y transformar el *statu quo* existente, y particularmente el modo de producción capitalista y el conjunto de las prácticas e ideologías conectadas a este último, sirve como su apoyo. ¿Por qué y con qué resultados ha tenido lugar un giro hacia la domesticación?

Este artículo contribuye a este tema ampliamente debatido al proponer pensar que la domesticación del feminismo está vinculada a la dominación del “género” como una herramienta analítica y política.

Palabras clave

Domesticación, feminismo, género, capitalismo.

1. 'Domesticated' feminism: roots and outcomes

Domestic is the dog: not only a friendly inhabitant but the fiercest defender of the master's house, very aggressive in case of need. Accordingly, 'domestication' is the turning of feminism into a discourse which, instead of challenging and transforming the existing status quo, and particularly the capitalistic mode of production and the whole of practices and ideologies connected to this latter, serves as its support.

However, nor the whole of feminism is 'domesticated', neither is 'domestication' its destiny or fate. In its history, however, feminism has borne as well the creative mark of un-domestication, which means a profound and constant critique of the status quo. Why then, and with what results, such a turning towards domestication has taken place? To this largely debated issue, these pages modestly contribute by proposing to think that the domestication of feminism is linked to the domination of gender as an analytical and political tool. Thinking like so implies that the bifurcation between domesticated and 'un-domesticable' feminism(s) corresponds to two conflicting ways of interpreting the relationship between the 'Female' and the 'Natural'. And explains why domestication results in a violent attack against the idea that being a woman is a valuable and positive chance for humans.

Due to the link between the female body –maternal, fertile– and reproduction, the relationship between Women and Nature is constitutively inherent to the capitalist structuring of our social world. Furthermore, it is –I contend– at the core of the fork between unpolitical, domesticated feminism, on the one hand, and undomesticable political feminism(s), on the other hand. The former, raising the shield of gender neutrality against the idea itself that humans are differently sexed beings, have aimed to hinder, conceal and extinguish the subversive force of the discourse about nature.¹ 'Gender' is indeed nothing but the stipulation –typically postmodern in its theoretical premises– according to which anything which has to do with the 'female nature' is nothing but a 'social construct' that, being by definition stigmatizing, stereotyping and conservative, must be destroyed in the name of a progress called 'gender neutrality'.

1. As a jurist, I am interested in the parallel between the trajectory of feminism as discourse against Nature and the disappearance of the references to Nature in the juridical discourse. As the Italian philosopher of law Giuseppe Capograssi once wrote "if 'Nature' is the victim of modernity, and of the correspondent rational and formalistic understandings of law, it is because that word has historically played as the argumentative and imaginative tool bridging the ideas of personal liberty and societal autonomy" (G. Capograssi, "Incertezze sull'individuo", 1951, reprinted in G. Capograssi, *La vita etica*, Bompiani, Milano, 2008, p. 508).

The constitutive/divisive question between political and un-political feminism(s) is indeed: does sexual difference exist? Is it worth speaking of it, defending it, using as an analytical, political tool? Is it a question that implies another one: does human nature exist? Is it worth speaking of it, defending it, using it as analytical, political, philosophical tool? Here resides the difference between the two feminisms. Whereas the focus on gender has reduced feminism into an unpolitical, neutralizing, consent-building discourse of women on women only, political feminism(s) have contested the notion of gender in name of the awareness that speaking about women, and from a female perspective, is speaking about the whole humanity, and that the ban on 'the female nature' was the forerunner for a complete ban against the idea of human nature itself.

The concept of gender, which consists into refusing the idea of a 'female' nature, is a complex device that produces two connected effects: on the one hand, it operates as a transliteration for refusing the idea of 'human' nature; on the other hand, it operates as a barrier against the possibility of reading what happens to women in universal terms, as something linked to what happens on a general scale and useful to explain this latter. On the one hand, indeed, assuming that the female nature has nothing good, must be fought against, means saying that human nature has nothing good, must be canceled (in the name of progress). On the other hand, if such a horrible message has gone unnoticed, it is thanks the fact that no one values the female nature, nor is capable to think that what happens to women happens to everyone. That is a result of the triumph of the lesson of gender.

Domesticated feminism is not humble. It is brutal and wild. Under the polite appearance of a politically correct, academically recognized, socially useful, rational and meaningful doctrine, it has meant –and realized– the most violent assault against women that history has ever known. It is an assault, I repeat, that targets human nature itself, paradoxically demonstrating the exactness of political feminism(s)'s assumptions: that what happens to, or it is said about, women, has universal implications.

2. Women, the human, and the turbine of capitalism

These are of course gigantic themes that I cannot approach with completeness, neither I will try to. I will confine my discourse to some quick notes from the feminist debate of the years spanning the late decades of the last century and to a couple of conclusive remarks, which I hope could be useful for further debate.

Given that the time on which my notes refer is one when ‘capitalism’ was still the word used to describe a determined system of production and correspondent ideologies and practices, I will make often use, in the following, of the word ‘capitalism’. Nonetheless, I feel the need to say expressly that I am using that word as referring to a regime of exploitation, violence, and abuse that, becoming today’s ‘technocratic-neoliberalism’, has demonstrated the truthfulness of Marcuse’s famous assimilation of capitalism to any form of totalitarianism and the topicality either of the analysis and discourses developed forty years ago by the Feminist Marxist thinkers to whose work I will refer.²

In other words, I assume ‘capitalism’ as label for violence and abuse on humans, on their nature, on nature; as synonymous for a system of government that aspires to the control of human nature and which finds its most veritable synthesis not in big factories, industrialization or stock markets, but in the concentration camp. Such a deadly reality was made possible by the destructive alliance between technological development and a form of reason which only valuing ‘rationality’ brings straight to the ‘rational management’ of the human being and its forms of life, which is, to the reduction of the human to an object, or a number.

With the communicative force which is unique to poetry, the Russian-Juif writer Vasilij Grossman has shown at the very core of the extermination camp there was nothing but the last breakthrough, for the times, of technological progress: the industrial hydraulic turbine.

Its apparent simplicity and modest dimensions notwithstanding, [the Responsible explained] the industrial hydraulic turbine is an unprecedented concentrate of strength, mass and speed: in its whirlpools the geologic potency of water transforms into labour. That complex was built on the principle of the turbine. It transformed life and all the forms of energies connected to it into inorganic substance. The new turbine was appointed to defeat the power of mental and nervous strengths, of breath, of earth, of muscles and of blood. The new unit pooled within itself the principle of the turbine, of the slaughterhouse and of the incinerator. The whole into the plainest architectural forms³.

2. On violence as constitutive of capitalism see widely S. Federici, *Calibano e la strega*, Mimesis, Milano-Udine, 2015, p. 14.
3. V. Grossman, *Vita e destino*, Adelphi, Milano, 2008, p. 450. (English versions of textes published in Italian provided in this chapter are mine) (Author’s Note).

It is within this constellation that the question has to be posed, on how and why, and with what effects, it has become customary, and since a long time now, to represent women's emancipation, and freedom, as coincidental with overcoming the 'natural destiny' that –so it is often said– binds women to maternity and care, excluding them from (or disadvantaging them in) the workplace and the public sphere. Under the 'plain forms' of a progressive narrative that invites women to abandon their nature and join the market, it is the principle of the turbine that operates, which incessantly turns life to profit.

The whole of narratives and disciplines which concerns women and their body are exemplary and strategical to the triumph of the deepest aspiration of capitalism, the 'rational management' of the human being. Through women, natural things, acts, and relations (such as, for women, to have children and to care), are pictured as things that can be and that must be controlled, managed and dominated –either transformed into profit-making activities or exploited by these latter– if one does not want to be overwhelmed, if one aims to succeed in life, and behave responsibly.⁴ Women, and particularly the women's body, have been, and are, the terrain for an uninterrupted, huge plea for the need to control, direct, plan and subdue the Nature, the Natural, and the human nature.

This exemplary, pedagogic and disciplining character of the themes concerning women has emerged since the dawn of capitalism and it has never ceased to be strategic to its survival.

3. Constructing women's natural destiny. Capitalism at hunt on women for the appropriation of nature (and of the human nature)

The rhetoric according to which women must be freed from a 'natural destiny', that anchors them to maternity and care, conceals an intriguing circumstance: such a 'natural destiny' has been a 'construct' built by capitalism since its nascent phase, that of the 'original accumulation' of sixteenth-century Europe.

4. See recently what Barbara Duden, with reference to contemporary medicine transforming into a global management of human life, observes about the pivotal role, in this process, of the relation of women with their bodies, real "emblem of a de-personification of the lived experience in the whole society". "Feminist categories relating to the body (self-determination, choice, control, decision, personal responsibility) encourage, support and confirm, *in the name of an alleged emancipation from the biological destiny*, the modifications, oriented to the control of their body (contraception, fertilization, aging, etc.) that women undergo in the attempt of being consistent with the system" (Italics mine). (B. Duden, "L'epoca della schizo-percezione", in A. Buttarelli, F. Giardini, *Il pensiero dell'esperienza*, Baldini Castoldi Dalai editore, Milano, 2008, p. 133).

On this point focused Federici and Fortunati's *The Great Caliban*⁵, an example of feminist thought –which has from then on become rare– which has not feared to link women and nature, being conscious that this association is the fundamental dialectical and critical leverage against capitalism and its material and symbolic implications.

Federici and Fortunati see in the 'Witch Hunt' the founding moment of modern capitalism. Due to the enormous surplus that reproduction produces (the work-force), the appropriation of reproduction is the fundamental requirement for the establishment of the capitalist model in Europe. The reduction of reproduction at the level of one 'natural' activity and therefore freely exploitable is, in their analysis, the key to the 'original accumulation'.

With eloquence, Federici and Fortunati say that it is inherent to capitalism "try to break the barriers of nature", and primarily "the barriers of the body." The systematic "struggle of capitalism against the status naturalis" is the direct expression of its "rationalistic logic and of the infinite will of power that nourishes it."

The persecution against witchcraft becomes hunt on women by the identification, still prevalent in the '500, between women and Mother Nature. For a long tradition, women, by virtue of their reproductive powers, were considered to be the largest depositories of the secrets of Nature, which in its turn was often represented in the Renaissance with the image of a woman. The woman is attacked as a witch because it is nature in her, her own generating force, that has to become object of control and exploitation⁶.

If capitalism began with restructuring reproduction, which was characterized as an "organized and strictly defined production process",⁷ it was because, since its very beginning, it has known that "control over human nature is the indispensable premise of control over Nature."

In order to "stream them both in productivity channels", the conquest of the feminine body was decisive: "the woman's body is taken on as a natural machine for the production of workforce."

5. S. Federici, L. Fortunati, *Il Grande Calibano*, Franco Angeli, Milano, 1984.

6. S. Federici, "La Caccia alle Streghe", in S. Federici, L. Fortunati, *Il Grande Calibano*, pp. 62 and ff., p. 71. From Federici's chapter are taken the quotations that precede and follow if not differently marked.

7. C. Fortunati, "Sesso come valore d'uso per il valore", in S. Federici, L. Fortunati, *Il Grande Calibano*, pp. 102 and ff., pp. 180-186. In this sense, think also to the establishment of marriage as an exclusive domain of admitted sexual practices (marriage as "production chain of reproduction"); or to the criminalization of non-procreative sexuality such as homosexuality. Federici and Fortunati help us to understand that capitalism begins by killing the idea that relations between men and women can exist, without having a productive purpose (children) (*ibid.*, p. 121). Step by step, this will mean killing the idea itself of human relations which are and end in themselves, and the idea that the human life is an end in itself.

Important to say, Federici and Fortunati are fully aware that capitalism is not only a mode of production: it is a form of reason tending to transform every component of life in a merely quantitative fact, subject to a logic of management.

This point is crucial to understand the symbolical functioning of modern and contemporary relation with nature and its connections with the feminine: a relation made of material exploitation and symbolical devaluation.

4. Capitalism as a sexually neuter mechanism

Federici and Fortunati's point is that the link between women and reproduction is undeniably natural in the sense of incontrovertible and existing by nature, or spontaneously.

It is with capitalism, through and in force of it, that this bond transforms, becoming the symbol and the essence of what we mean by nature: everything which is un-rational and subject to exploitation; everything which is inferior, worthless (devalued) and, therefore, can and must be rationally managed in order to make value.

From the early capitalism onwards, the relationship with Nature is thereby constructed in dualistic terms: a) as a relation of power, which is the relation with the Nature of those who exploit it (the winners, the superiors); or b) as a relation of identification, which is the condition of those who are exploited as if they were Nature (the inferiors, the losers).

Federici and Fortunati, however, stress that, even if it is true that nascent capitalism placed women on the side of exploited 'Natural' activities and subjects, capitalism is not interested in whether are men or women who fill the position (a) or (b).

What is the key to capitalism is instead a sexually neuter mechanism made of two elements? Firstly, continuously constructing and reconstructing a series of activities and experiences as belonging to the sphere of the nature and of the natural, which are doomed by definition to the expropriation (naturalization). Secondly, continuously constructing and reconstructing the 'worker', independently from her/his sex. The worker is neither male nor female, it is whoever freely owns his/her work-force and can sell it on the market.

This double mechanism is what is perpetual in capitalism, and perpetual is also the method through which it functions. Of this method the story of the original accumulation and the Witch Hunt are exemplary.

At that time, actually, the naturalization of reproduction was realized by expropriating women from the knowledge and skills they previously possessed and practiced because of their relationship with nature and with their nature (with their reproductive body). Anti-contraceptive and abortive practices; sex for non-procreative purposes; knowledge of medicinal remedies; participation in public life as healers, midwives, alchemists, all these things were banned, together with the plurality and diversity inherent to femininity (and to humanity).⁸

In other terms, capitalism originates and perpetuates by excluding the idea itself that the Nature, intended as 'Environment' as well as 'human nature', and the relation with it are sources of competence and of personal and societal autonomy. Women are attacked as the expression of a "relation with nature" that capitalism considers dysfunctional and dangerous to its purposes.

The labor that women put into the production of life is not interpreted as a mindful interaction of a human being with Nature; it is depicted as an act of Nature itself, which produces plants and animals without having the control on these processes. The definition of women's interaction with Nature as an act of the Nature itself has wide consequences, between what is hidden in the concept of Nature distorted in a biological sense is a relation of power: the dominion of the human (male) on nature (Female).⁹

Then, it is true that capitalism creates the difference between the sexes, made up of the power of man (who, waged, can pay for the consumption of sex) and woman's subordination (who, without wages, sells sex / reproductive work). But it is not true that the difference between the sexes (as the difference between societal and economic roles) is inherent to capitalism. Capitalism is only interested that the dualistic relation of

8. Federici stresses that "the Witch" has to be understood (and was fought against) as the material and symbolic embodiment of an entire world of female subjectivities, that capitalism has intended to destroy (because it targets plurality and diversity in themselves): the heretical, the healer, the disobedient wife, the woman who dared to live alone, the woman head of the family, the priestess who poisoned the food of the master and spurred the slaves to revolt (see S. Federici, "La Caccia alle Streghe"). Whilst the gender discourse wielded by domesticated feminism indulges in accusing of 'essentialism' all those feminist discourses that claim in favor of sexual difference, it was capitalism to construct the one-dimensional-woman (whose nature is subordination). It was capitalism to build the idea that to be women (to be human) means to be a determined something. Political feminism(s) that denounce gender as a companion of capitalistic oppression, do aspire to the re-emerging of the female (of the human) as plural and diverse (thereby alive). Accuses of essentialism instrumentally directed against every discourse pointing at defending and valuing the sexual difference want to conceal that reducing the human into standardized types is a capitalistic aim, certainly not a feminist one.

9. Von Werlohf et al., *Freuen, die Letzte Kolonie*, Reinbeck b. H., 1983, p. 165, quoted, with the Italics, by I. Praetorius, *L'economia è cura. La riscoperta dell'ovvio*, IOD Edizioni, Casalnuovo di Napoli, 2016, p. 41.

exploitation of Nature is not only preserved, but also continuously expanded, because its survival depends on the perpetuation of that relation.

5. Is (my) Nature the cause of my Subordination?

The concealment of this point is at the basis of those ideologies and practices of women's 'emancipation', which, adopting Gender as an analytical key, have interpreted the dichotomy between production and reproduction as a 'sexed' one, where women are doomed to the lower level and men to the superior. According to these ideologies and practices, thereby, 'getting freedom' has, for women, only one meaning: rising from the inferior level to the superior, abandoning activities labelled as 'female' and thus 'inferior.' In this attitude, which has confirmed the 'hierarchical' relation between production and reproduction, or between 'culture' and 'nature', as one necessary and ineluctable, consists the alliance between liberal and emancipatory feminism, committed to gender neutrality, and the aspirations of neoliberal contemporary capitalism, that speaking about women tells everyone its lesson: your nature is worthless, let us abandon it and join those who know how to make value of it.

As Carole Pateman puts it:

Feminists who plead for the elimination of Nature, of biology and of sex in favour of the 'individual' play the game of modern Patriarchy and join themselves to a far much larger and furious attack against Nature which comes from the inside and the outside either of civil societies. Nature is not only women, but also, for example, the earth, the indigenous people, the descendants of Slaves. To suppose that the patriarchal recall to nature and natural sexual difference implies that theories and institution of Patriarchy derive from what is given by Nature (by physiology, biology, sex) means to remain within the patriarchal boundaries.¹⁰

Capitalism is patriarchy, Pateman argues, and patriarchy is capitalism: thereby, to pretend that women are oppressed by patriarchy (by male power) is useful to capitalism, because it distracts women and men from the awareness of their common subordination to capitalism.

10. C. Pateman, *The Sexual Contract*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1988, p. 226.

The ideology of parity conceals that capitalism presupposes an idea of freedom well distinct from sexual relationships and with no connection with sexual identity, with femininity and masculinity.¹¹ The same idea of freedom, Pateman stresses, which has been adopted by Marxist socialism and by (gender neutrality oriented) feminism as well.

On this basis, Pateman criticizes the idea of gender, which, when used to assert that women position in society is not dictated by Nature, biology or sex, but is a societal and political invention supports capitalism, because it ends up in telling women that, if they want to be free, they must abandon the relation of identification with the exploited nature and to undertake the relation of exploitation of the nature.

Pateman's criticism against gender stems from the consciousness that it is not the relation of women with Nature (and motherhood in particular), which originates the subordination of women, but the political interpretation that they receive by patriarchal-capitalism (and that women accept). Or, to put it differently, that neither motherhood nor the connected caring activities as such do subordinate women, but the historical changing constructions and reconstructions that these activities and relations receive as a consequence of the capitalistic aim to exploit them.

Of course, Pateman does not deny that it exists a continuous construction (societal, political, even psychic, which is to say interiorized) of sexes and of their relationships, a construction which functionalizes them to the needs of the status quo. Where is then the difference between Pateman's point of view and the idea of gender, which would seem to say the same thing?

The difference is here: the idea of gender thinks that the sexual difference in itself is a construct, and that in a really free and just society, the sexual difference should be irrelevant. (It is 'Just' only the society that constructs the sexual difference as void).

Pateman (and Federici and Fortunati as well)¹² invites us to think the contrary: only by recognizing the sexual difference as politically relevant and full of sense a more Just and Free society could arise, because it is only by giving value to what is devalued by the patriarchal-capitalism (the sexual difference) that capitalism and patriarchy can be subverted. (It can be just only the Society that recognizes the sexual difference as a value).

11. Ibid.

12. One could not find in Federici and Fortunati's work a critique to Gender so explicitly exposed as Pateman's. There is actually more: a wide criticism towards the Foucault's reflection on power, accused to be at the origin of the disentanglement of the studies on sexuality from the critique to capitalism (S. Federici, C. Fortunati, *Il Grande Calibano*, pp. 139, 149, 171-2, 193). The influence of Foucault's thought on the gender discourse, the turn to queer included, is unequivocal (see exemplarily G. Rubin, "The Traffic on Women", in R. Reiter (ed.), *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1975) but of course impossible to analysed in these short pages.

‘Gender’ –the concept that says: ‘sexual difference is constructed’– is for this reason the dividing line between political un-domesticable feminism and un-political feminism(s): gender militates against any political re-interpretation of the female experience. Not surprisingly, the critique against gender is the common denominator of different feminisms –from the materialistic, Marxist feminism of authors like Federici to those Feminist movements which have pointed on the ‘symbolical’, as the Italian feminist wave known as ‘The Difference Thought’; all have in common the assumption that is by not denying, but only re-signifying their nature, by taking it on with love and making of it a resource, that women can find freedom, and thereby putting freedom in the entire world. Political feminisms of all kind oppose to gender because they perceive that at the very end, gender means that, all the human experience being a societal construct, freedom simply does not exist and human life is a void case in the hands of the Rulers that manipulate it through their policies and in view of their purpose.

If it is true that all political feminism(s) opposes to gender, it is worth remembering today, when the injustice and violence of the modes of production manifest themselves openly, Federici-Fortunati and Pateman’s position, which recommend us never to forget that the construction of the sexual difference is a specific product of capitalism, interested in ‘devaluing’ reproduction and care –the ‘female’ spheres– in order to exploit them even better and even more. Only this understanding makes it possible to oppose to the capitalistic aspiration towards making the sexual difference invisible, and to perceive the political, subversive significance of this latter. Or, to using Silvia Federici’s words, one should never forget that ‘woman’ is not a construct which designates a certain natural being or her ‘essence’, but a construct that designates a particular form of exploitation. Assuming a ‘feminist’ point of view in this frame means “to make visible the hidden structure of domination and exploitation”¹³: they consist in conceiving as ‘natural’ everything is doomed to be freely exploited.

Unpolitical, neutered domesticated usage of gender has the purpose of talking about the condition of women, their subalternity to men, without criticizing the context and particularly the mode of production. Gender thereby creates and re-creates its own targets (from sexism to heteronormativity) which are as many ‘imaginary enemies’ whose function is to hide and protect the substantial causes of inequality and injustice, which are represented by capitalism which labels as natural everything it wants to live off it.

13. S. Federici, *Calibano e la Strega*, p. 21.

This is reflected by gender policies and parity programs, which, as the German theologian and feminist Ina Praetorius observes, propose the idea that integrating women (and others formerly excluded or discriminated groups) into the superior level (exploitation) is the answer to injustice and inequality, while, and just by doing so, they reproduce and strengthen the condition, which is the origin of injustice and inequality consists, the exploitation of the nature and of the human nature.¹⁴

6. If woman becomes a metaphor for death

Jumping from a forty years old debate to nowadays, one can recognize that the triumph of gender analysis has had at least two momentous effects, which resolve into one: women being let alone and devalued today, as they have never been before.

Let us think, to start with, to this: telling the history that women are subordinated in that they are the victims of a gendered role that segregate them in the reproductive sphere, too near to nature, Gender has fed the illusion that it is sufficient not to recognize oneself within the sexual binarism, or within ‘heteronomy’, in order to make oneself immune from exploitation or alienation. Spreading the mantra that the enemy of human freedom is sexism, not capitalism, gender has performed as the best ideology in support of the status quo, also by generating the queer subject, which sermonizes against the sexed body and experience as a resource of liberty, autonomy and self-empowerment, thus matching the needs of today’s capitalism. Only the anti-historical, crystallized lesson of gender cannot see that today the reproductive activity of women as such, is no longer in the first line among the things that capitalism aims to appropriate of; neither it is the essence of what capitalism today expropriate. Neoliberalism today strives to take possession “of the ‘life’ itself, of ‘vital activities’ and lifetime. Reproduction is no longer the merely heterosexual, biological regeneration of the species, but rather the entire cycle of activities generating the human for the market and the social world.”¹⁵ By re-telling the history that it is a matter of women if they are subordinated, that it is a fault of sexual binarism is there is injustice in the world, the Queer subject is a useful tool to make everybody forget, firstly, that the original divide between reproduction and production today identifies “the human in its cycle of vital activities which becomes the

14. I. Praetorius, *L'economia è cura. La riscoperta dell'ovvio*, p. 66.

15. F. Giardini, A. Simone, “The Reproductive Paradigm”, online paper, 2015, available at <https://www.viewpointmag.com/2015/10/31/reproduction-as-paradigm-elements-for-a-feminist-political-economy/>.

object of 'rational' management of social problems" in view of pure calculation of maximization of profit and reduction of losses; and, secondly, that the dynamics of exploitation "concern all the subjects." We experience in our everyday life that the 'reproductive paradigm' goes far beyond the heterosexual framework and menaces "as all of us, lives depending on the relations and necessities of material conditions and on the means for affirming a dignified life." The queer subject is there to deny this and to repeat that it is only a matter of women if they are oppressed and that oppression, in itself, has nothing to do with the system of production, as if subordination was inscribed in bodies, instead than in the activities they perform and that are bled white by capitalism.¹⁶

A second momentous achievement of Gender is to have reduced Femininity to one only field: that of violence against women. The sole case in which one is today allowed (and actually: encouraged) to speak of a female specificity without being accused of essentialism is death. In a world where it is prohibited to speak of Motherhood as female experience, women cannot be associated with anything good, positive, vital (like generation, life); they can be nominated only in association with the deadly paradigm of violence, and even a sexed word has been coined for the purpose, femicide.

In a seminal study of 1992, Martha A. Fineman affirmed that the true discrimination that women undergo consists in the systematic exclusion of female experience from the legal, political, and public discourse in the name of the ideal of gender neutrality, the preferred companion of market oriented liberalism.¹⁷ The disappearance of the Mother and Motherhood substituted with the neutral expressions of parents and parental, was felt by Fineman as the erection of a desert of loneliness all around what women do experience in their concrete life. As a matter of fact, the only ones, amongst human beings, that not only were born from a female body, but can reproduce the same opera of the Mother are also the only ones to whose specificity are denied respect and recognition. Motherhood can never be depicted as a field of freedom, or, if it is, it is only in the terms of the freedom of entering the market. With the advent of surrogacy, motherhood has become an experience cut into two pieces: on the one front, there is the 'valued' motherhood, which is making children for some who want them. This is a 'valued' activity. People pay for it, or the reward is moral (when surrogate motherhood is praised as a love gift).

16. Google making colossal profits on the data that people exchange by sending each other's emails or sharing the socials (which is to say by doing what humans do by definition: communicating each with the other) shows explicitly enough that in no way the issue of subordination/exploitation can today, less than ever, be attached to sexual orientation or sexual difference as such.

17. M. A. Fineman, "The Neutered Mother", in *University of Miami Law Review*, 46, 1992, pp. 653 and ff.

On the other front there is the ‘naturalized’, devalued and depreciated experience of giving birth ‘spontaneously’.

Whilst a ‘surrogate mother’ is to be praised, because provides profitable ‘maternity value’, a ‘natural mother’ is on her way to get hunted. Modern witches –who does not understand that?– are all those who provoke expenditures on public budgets and do nothing ‘productive.’

The woman is a dead metaphor; to associate women with nature, justice, or knowledge, or care is now ‘stigmatizing.’ Being a woman does not denote anything, that, at the most, a high statistical risk of violent death. Then, one understands why queer theories fascinate many young women: they offer them the illusion of being rescued from the saddest destiny than a human being can imagine, that of being a woman.

Domesticated feminism, with rationality and perseverance, has defused the only bomb, which could break the chains that enslave humanity: the fondness of women for their nature.

Is not that Violence?