

# افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نباشد تن من مباد  
بدین بوم و بر زنده یک تن مباد  
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم  
از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

[www.afgazad.com](http://www.afgazad.com)

[afgazad@gmail.com](mailto:afgazad@gmail.com)

European Languages

زبانهای اروپایی

ByMaddi Txintxurreta|

16.11.2022

Interview with Silvia Federici

***"The treatment of the elderly gives us an image of the inhuman logic of capitalism"***



**Sources:** Naiz [Photo: writer Silvia Federici (Jagoba MANTEROLA, FOKU)]

*She is a Marxist with many 'buts' and a feminist without a doubt. She says she likes to "explain" and there are many who listen to her. With 'Caliban and the witch' as her key work, Silvia Federici is a reference of feminism.*

Silvia Federici (Parma, Italy, 1942) arrives in Iruñea invited by Katakarak. The weight of a deviant prospective gaze hangs from his eyes of the ordinary – back to the commons – and leafs through the titles that bear his signature and that Katakarak has placed on a separate

table. "Can I take a copy of this?" asks the person in charge of the cultural space, and She responds with a "clear" so obvious that it seems that he thinks: "Yes! it's yours!"

Eighty years go through his words and his body and he can't stop Looking at history to read today's world: think about it, chew it and returns understandable to its readers. Resorts and returns often to the feminist struggles of the 1970s in the United States, as if I intuit that if fifty years ago I had not been there, I would not be there. in Iruñea one day in October 2022 presenting 'Going beyond the skin'.

**He comes to Katakarak to present 'Going beyond the skin'. In this work he lands his thought to the current world, to contemporary capitalism. Considering that we live in a time of constant change, do you, as a writer, find it difficult to think about and interpret the current era?**

On the contrary! All my books reach the experience contemporary, even though I always have a historical perspective, Because the past for me is not past, it is not something that has died: it lives in the present. I could never analyze the present by forgetting the past. The key is to understand social change, to understand how structures that are historical are still transformed. Capitalism has a history of more than five centuries and in each historical phase it is changed, It returns in response to struggles, to economic changes, to crisis... But current experience is fundamental.

**En sus trabajos sostiene que las mujeres son el principal motor para la producción capitalista; antes de los 70 porque se dedicaban de manera gratuita a los trabajos reproductivos y, después, con su entrada en el mercado laboral, porque son ellas las que soportan las peores condiciones laborales, además de que siguen con el trabajo reproductivo gratuito.**

Sí, cualquier tipo de trabajo, las mujeres lo hacen. Hacen el trabajo de reproducción, que incluye el trabajo del campo, de la agricultura o de la sanidad. También el trabajo extradoméstico, en las oficinas, en las fábricas, el trabajo industrial. En Bangladesh, en México a la frontera con Estados Unidos, en las llamadas zonas de libre comercio, hay formas de explotación del trabajo de la mujer similares a la esclavitud. Por eso, hoy las mujeres son las protagonistas del desarrollo. Y creo que siempre ha sido así.

**¿No le parece que esta situación de vulnerabilidad les ofrece al mismo tiempo un gran poder, en cuanto las necesita el capital?**

Claro, el trabajo de la mujer ha sido la fuerza que ha permitido relanzar una nueva fase del desarrollo. Por eso mismo las mujeres son las protagonistas de muchísimas luchas sociales, empezando por la lucha sobre la reproducción y la lucha contra la destrucción de

la naturaleza. En muchos lugares de África y América Latina vemos que las mujeres están en primera línea contra la deforestación, contra la política del extractivismo, la minería, la extracción petrolera... porque se dan cuenta de que la destrucción de la naturaleza es la destrucción de la vida, de la comunidad. Y saben que aunque estas empresas pueden traer salarios para los jóvenes, destruyen a la comunidad la posibilidad de reproducirse.

**Participó en la campaña ‘Salario para el trabajo doméstico’ en los años 70. La falta de salario convierte a las mujeres en dependientes y domésticas, sin embargo, el salario es uno de los mayores mecanismos de control del capital. ¿Cuál debe ser el punto de encuentro entre el trabajo de hogar y de cuidados y el salario para que no suponga una dependencia esclava de los hombres ni del capital?**

Sí, pero voy a agregar: solamente se dice que el salario es una medida de control cuando se habla de las mujeres y del trabajo de hogar. No se dice que es una medida de control cuando se habla de los salarios de los profesores o de los salarios de los obreros industriales. Si es verdad que luchar por un salario reproduce el capital, ¿porqué no creamos los mismos discursos en relación a todos los trabajadores asalariados? ¿Qué vamos a proponer? ¿Que todos trabajen sin salarios?

El discurso por el salario en el trabajo doméstico era una estrategia de un momento concreto para liberar las mujeres de la dependencia de los hombres, para visibilizar que lo doméstico es un trabajo, un trabajo que produce capital y sustenta cualquier actividad productiva. Porque aunque no produce coches, produce trabajadores para generaciones futuras. Por ello, pedir un salario era una forma de abrir una vía de contacto y negociación entre mujeres y capital. En los años 70, la relación mujeres-capital era mediada por los hombres. Entonces, el salario no era el fin, nunca lo propusimos como tal, sino una estrategia para cambiar la relación de poder entre mujeres-hombres, mujeres-estado y mujeres-capital. Y a partir de esta posición empezar un nuevo ciclo de lucha.

**En ‘Calibán y la bruja’ determinó que el capitalismo ha transformado los cuerpos en máquinas de trabajo y sostiene que las mujeres sufren una doble mecanización, productiva y reproductiva. ¿La implicación de los hombres en el trabajo de hogar y de los cuidados ayudaría a resolver esta situación?**

¡Claro! Pero dos cosas: lo primero, esto no cambiaría la condición de este trabajo. El problema sigue siendo que este trabajo está desvalorizado, no está remunerado y no da acceso a beneficios como pensiones o un seguro de salud. Compartir el trabajo con los hombres es un paso. Pero lo más importante de todo es responsabilizar al Estado. Hemos visto en las luchas en torno al trabajo doméstico que la dificultad de compartir el trabajo

con los hombres no es solamente la falta de voluntad de los varones, que es tanta, es también que la organización actual del trabajo y de los salarios provoque que sea mejor que el varón trabaje fuera de casa, porque su salario es mayor. Entonces, además de compartir, se necesita un cambio de la organización del trabajo asalariado.

**En Euskal Herria, algunos sindicatos y partidos llevan tiempo reivindicando un sistema público de cuidados. ¿Cree que esto podría ser efectivo contra la crisis de los cuidados?**

Claro que el Estado se debe responsabilizar. Aunque yo soy crítica con lo que dicen, porque el Estado debe responsabilizarse sin establecer un sistema de control y la comunidad debe decidir qué servicios nos va a dar el Estado. Soy contraria a que el Estado organice, debemos ser partícipes. Siempre he dicho que estos discursos de los comunes, los entramados comunitarios, las asambleas vecinales, son necesarios para cambiar nuestra relación con lo público. Porque hoy el Estado es neoliberal y no tiene ningún interés en reproducir nuestra vida. Nos ofrecen la sanidad para que volvamos a trabajar lo antes posible, nos ofrecen servicios, lo más baratos que pueden. Entonces, necesitamos una lucha desde abajo y esto significa que la comunidad debe organizarse y relacionarse con quienes trabajan en los servicios públicos. No es suficiente abrir las ventanas y aplaudir a las enfermeras, tenemos que encontrarnos con ellas y decidir qué necesitamos, qué podemos hacer.

«Cuando hablamos de trabajadores es necesario tener en cuenta la diversidad y saber que aún así podemos pensar en formas de lucha conjuntas. Se trata de pensar cómo juntarnos de manera que los que tienen más privilegios no sean los que dominen la lucha. Es una cuestión de organización»

**El cuerpo cambia, envejece, se vuelve inservible en la lógica capitalista y se deshecha. ¿Cómo debemos resignificar, recuperar, ‘reciclar’ estos cuerpos?**

When we think about the condition of the elderly today, we truly see the violence of this capitalist society and how it destroys people. In many pre-capitalist societies, and I am thinking especially of the indigenous communities of North America, the elders were the guides, also the older women. They had the wisdom and experience, the collective memory of the people. They made the decisions. Now the elders are the fools, they are not productive, they weigh, they give problems to families, they are a burden. We live a devaluation of the elderly and reproduction is devalued. And capitalism still privileges, in the context of this general devaluation, childhood, because that's where future workers come from. So the elderly can be discarded as garbage.

We have seen with covid-19 in the United States that many of the Older people who died were in public centers funded by the State. But the crisis of these centers preceded covid-19, Because in these centers the funds, the staff, have been cut, so They leave the elderly for hours in their beds. Treatment of Seniors gives us a picture of the inhuman logic of this society capitalist.

**Some voices that declare themselves feminists defend the more biological sense of the body and reproach both the queermovement and transfeminism for emptying the category of women of content, for "erasing" women. What do you think of this?**

I think there are problems on both sides. I come from a struggle that It emerged in the 70s, when feminism criticized the conception of capitalism over women. We have always stressed that a woman is not a biological concept. But women are important as political subjects. Because woman, in the history of capitalist society, has meant A whole particular organization of exploitation and labor. And everything a kind of fight against discrimination.

It is true that feminism has always been more aware of Diversities. But the same goes for workers, right? ¿We're going to discarding the status of the exploited worker because a worker does not is it the same in the Basque Country or in Spain, or in Africa? Of course, the The category of exploited worker is important for understanding the struggle in the history of capitalism. And yet, the category of the exploited worker includes a great variety. Why is it Do you blame diversity solely on the feminist movement? Why is the same not being asked of the workers' movement?

When we talk about workers it is necessary to take into account the diversity and knowing that we can still think of ways of struggle Joint. It's about thinking about how to come together so that those who They have more privileges than those who dominate the struggle. It's a question organization.

**But, as the intersectional theory defends, the relationship between oppressor and oppressed is circumstantial and this can generate tensions.**

You see, in the 70s, from the Black Power movement, there were A very interesting discussion. It dealt with the difference between autonomy and separatism, because there was a part of the black movement in favour of separatism, of a form of organization without targets. Autonomy, without However, it means being able to decide, having spaces without white people, But in spite of this we can come together in the struggles where we have common interests deciding when, where and how.

This discourse has also been addressed in the feminist movement. The Separatists said 'no work with men. Let's create women's communities, let's create a culture exclusively of women, because relationships with men are always domination'. On the other hand, and I position myself on this side, there are women who say no, because men are also exploited. In 'Caliban and the Witch' I talk about accumulation of differences, accumulation of hierarchies: capitalism, each time, in each phase of Development, does not deconstruct these divisions. It is so, dividing us, making us fight with each other, as it has been able to perpetuate. The It must not be that we can never meet men, but that we have our autonomy and ability to decide, that we We organize as women and do not include men in our organization. And we are going to decide in which spaces and how men will participate.

**He defends in 'Re-enchanting the World. Feminism and politics of the commons' communal life free of productive relations. ¿How Can we imagine the commons?**

I speak of the need for communal relations today, in a society where anywhere we are circumrounded, circumrounded, by the capitalist relation. So, the conception of the commons today does not It is a final conception. But we can think of the communal, be it in the framework of social relations, of sharing goods, but above all all as a principle of social organization that can and should be apply to any aspect of our lives. For example, sharing the natural wealth and the wealth that is produced or collaborating in the reproduction of life, and so on. Also in justice. Say no to prisons, not the police and thinking about justice communally. There are several examples within indigenous communities, because They have other systems, such as the restorative system, and we can assess whether they can inspire us.

This, therefore, is a principle of social organization to create a company which is not based on exploitation or competition, but in collaboration. And, above all, under the principle of hold ourselves accountable; of everything, not just our lives individuals, also of the life of the community. Taking responsibility also from the reproduction of the wealth we use.

The indigenous communities teach us a lesson, for they said: 'We must give to nature so that the next generations can use.' Thus, not only must we consume, seek and bring, It must also be reproduced. That's what makes you a member of a community. Because the member of a community is not the person who arrives and takes, is someone who takes responsibility for others, for others, and of the reproduction measure.

For me, the community is a way to create more resistance, to strengthen our resistance to the state and capital. It is also a ground for experimentation. We need to experiment, the society we want to build is not going to be built in a moment. It will be built through a

long process of struggle, which must also be a process of experimentation to achieve new forms of self-government. Now we are not able to govern ourselves without the State, because we have internalized this dependence. Therefore, we need a process of liberation and, for me, that is the common one.

Source:<https://www.naiz.eus/es/info/especial/20221114/el-tratamiento-a-los-mayores-nos-da-una-imagen-de-la-logica-deshumana-del-capitalismo>