Rethinking Marx with(in) Latin American Societies. A Conversation with Verónica Gago

Edith Otero Quezada[1]

Rethinking Marx's *oeuvre* requires not only to look at the various interpretations that have emerged over time, but also to reinterpret it from historically specific local and global perspectives. The present interview with *Ni Una Menos* activist and intellectual Verónica Gago will do so for the Latin American context. In the region, there have been numerous attempts to address and recontextualise the philosopher's legacy, from José Carlos Mariátegui's work on issues of land and the indigenous as a political subject to José Aricó's complex labour of Marxian translation (and political reinterpretation). The endeavours of Lohana Berkins, a communist transvestite, in popular education and cooperatives have also been crucial for understanding the interconnections between transvestism, transfeminisms, and class struggle in Argentina. Lastly, reflections from feminist Marxism or feminist materialism are essential, with figures like Luisina Bolla, Natalia Romé, Luci Cavallero, and, in the specific context of this dialogue, the militant research of Verónica Gago.

How can we rediscover Marx without falling into reductions? How can we give space to diverse subjects and political bodies? Is there room for new internationalisms? How can we overcome the division between theory and political practice? These and other questions were the initial driving force of this conversation. I thank Verónica Gago for the opportunity for this enriching exchange. It challenges us and invites us to think about the dynamics of contemporary capitalism from Marx and beyond.

In her works *Neoliberalism from Below* (2017), *Feminist International* (2020), and, co-authored by Luci Cavallero, *A Feminist Reading of Debt* (2021), we find a complex and innovative framework of philosophical schools – post-structuralist, Marxist, Latin American, decolonial, feminist – which in turn intersects

1 Translation from Spanish by Edith Otero Quezada.

with her feminist militancy in *Ni Una Menos* in Argentina. In her analyses, we witness an Argentina criss-crossed by a multiple and expansive cartography of conflicts and resistances, with the feminist strike as a form of political practice that connects identity and class politics, manifesting itself against the financial violence of debt and building *feminist potencia* from diverse Body-Territories.

Throughout these pages, we discuss these issues and more with Verónica. Finally, I invite the reader to understand this exchange not as totalitarian analytical closures, but as entry points to begin other collective debates beyond the confines of academia and this book.

***

In your work, you have addressed a wide range of topics, including what you call "Expanded Extractivism," neoliberalism from below, and, more recently, new dynamics of debt. How do you apply a Marxist perspective in your work, especially in the context of Latin American societies? How does this perspective engage with others, such as decolonial and intersectional perspectives?

I read Marx, both at the public university and in different political education groups, the way he is often read: in fragments, repetitively, and generally through the lenses of different authors who interpret and discuss him, and, I believe, from whom we learn to read him. In this sense, it is a partial reading, always defined by our concerns at the times and the questions that arise in the struggles in which we are involved. A first landmark for me was reading him in relation to his "disencounter" with Latin America, to quote José Aricó, a great Argentine intellectual, translator, and editor whose work is fundamental. Through his writings, his biography as a militant activist, exile, and intellectual, I found a *thread* and a way of reading Marx that was very important. In his book *Marx y América Latina* (1982) [in English, *Marx and Latin America*], Aricó wonders how Marx's analysis of non-Western reality led him to his propositions and his contempt for Latin America. His "misreading" is interesting because Marx – as Aricó hypothesises – opens up a whole series of misreadings, to the point that in Latin America, Marxism came to be defined as "a grammatical expression of a very real historical challenge." A mistaken grammar, that of Marxism with Latin America, that attributed – to this continent – predicates that did not name it – whether due to the rigidity of nonexistent subjects, or the stubbornness of certain conditions that were never fulfilled. Rather than resorting to the familiar and readily available

label of Eurocentrism, Aricó attempts to reconstruct – from within Marx's own thought – the conditions under which he considered colonial realities, in particular from his "strategic shift" after analysing the Irish situation. Especially because Aricó wants to demonstrate – and this is another one of the originalities of his research – that the image of Marx's eurocentrism is the product of the "official" version of the "Marxist *intelligentsia*," which marginalised Marx's texts on Spain, Russia, or Ireland as merely "circumstantial" writings. But even with Marx removed from eurocentrism, Latin America does not seem to interest him. Aricó transforms this contempt into a political tension. He contends that it is the identification of Latin American processes with European Bonapartism, as embodied in Simón Bolívar, and the legacy of Hegel's notion of "peoples without history" that hinders Marx's ability to understand Latin America. Because if Marx was able to grasp and value independent national realities, it was only because he was able to verify that "the people in struggle is *vital*." And to Marx, Latin America, which was considered an *empty* territory, held no such significance. Latin America, a place without *depth* in Marx's eyes, does not seem to have the real *foundation* of social struggles in order to become a nation. For Aricó, Marx makes an unexpected retreat to Hegel to describe something he fails to understand, even when this understanding was utterly shaken by the emergence of other, peripheral, different realities. Marx was unable to understand the singularity of Latin America because he did not envision an active popular will there, but rather a ruling class seeking to identify the nation with the state. So, to Marx's Hegelian view of Latin America as a place that lacks the determinations that might bring about a national struggle, Aricó adds Marx's anti-Hegelianism: the refusal to recognise a state's "potential to 'produce' a civil society." Marx cannot possibly concede that the state has its own effectiveness, says Aricó, without breaking its system. Aricó's thesis, then, shifts the label of eurocentrism to conclude that it is the "essentially statist" or "top-down" construction of Latin American nations that politically obscured Marx's understanding of the continent's singularity. And this is his blind spot: He supplants the "real movement" of Latin American social forces with the figure of Bolívar, while not acknowledging any "autonomy of the political" in the essentially state-based character of its national formations, which from the Marxist perspective, appears as a regression. However, Aricó says, that privilege of strictly political situations appears in Marx's "vanishing point," or more precisely, outside of his system. It is with this genealogical reconstruction of Marx's thought that Aricó's philosophical research explains the *mutual repulsion* between Marxism

and Latin America that begins in Marx himself and permeates the twentieth century. This way of delving into Marx, for me, implied a method akin to the "materialism of the encounter," to use Althusser's words. A pure thought of deviation, which reveals the fortuitous combinations that inevitably weave a "sense of the situation," that is, a political thought that allows us to rediscover Marx under the influences of that undercurrent named by Epicurus. In the words of the French philosopher [Louis Althusser], the world appears as "a unique totality that is *not totalised, but experienced in its dispersion*." A strange dispersion, capable of creating something beyond the *system*. And here, Aricó doubles down and suggests thinking in terms of a deviation within the deviation: the construction of the Latin American nation and its relationship with the state from a perspective that does not simply discard Marxism. Of course, for Aricó, the misreading that begins with Marx and that connects with a whole series of subsequent disencounters (crystallised especially with Latin American communist parties) is resolved, or achieves a breaking point, with Gramsci, in a theoretical deviation of Marxism that thinks of the Bolshevik revolution as a revolution against *Capital*. A new deviation from that deviation required a Latin American Gramsci. It was the theories of Peruvian José Carlos Mariátegui that allowed Aricó to say – referring to the socialist movement in Latin America – that in these countries, the *Capital* became "the book of the bourgeoisie," for justifying the necessity and progressiveness of capitalism according to the European model. Aricó puts Marx through the wringer of Gramsci and Mariátegui, and that was the predominant mode of reading Marx in the debate in which I was formed.

Then it was crucial for me to read *Marx más allá de Marx* [in English, *Marx beyond Marx*], by Toni Negri. Here, I found the dispositive of *displacement* to be very productive. Surely *misencounter* and *displacement* share some of the same underlying thread. The readings of Italian *operaismo* on Marx, in particular the re-reading of the *Grundrisse*, have been a key that puts the materialist reflection on the question of "surplus," which leads us to a reading of living labour and its constituent force.

Then, the feminist reading has been fundamental for me: If Marx argues with neoclassical theories to de-fetishise the sphere of circulation, feminists dig deeper and de-fetishise the sphere of production. Thus, they reach the *subsoil* of reproduction. And from there, I was interested in researching the forms and experiences under which social reproduction develops in non-extractive or exploitative terms (which implies a fight against its *naturalisation*). I think I could say that the feminist reading of Marx emphasises, from my point of view,

the *differential* of exploitation. With this, we go beyond opposing reproduction and production (as if they were antithetical terms), to think about reorganising their relationship. I had not reflected on it in these terms before, but we can make a triad: *disencounter*, *displacement*, *differential*.

We know that several feminists have taken it upon themselves to read Marx in this way. They pursue a double movement and a double objective. On the one hand, to explore hidden places in Marx's work and, on the other hand, and simultaneously, to radicalise Marx's research method of looking into the "hidden abode" of how capitalist reality is produced. The first hidden (and concealed) dimension is reproduction: everything that is both invisible and constitutive of contemporary social production. This is the perspective of Silvia Federici, who describes the "gaps" in Marx that the feminists of the 1970s began to see in his work when they analysed his vision of gender, and then took it upon themselves to reconstruct his categories from their personal political experience of rejecting reproductive work. It is therefore *another origin* of critique. "The feminist movement had to begin with the critique of Marx," Federici always reminds us, and this beginning was driven by political practice. She writes: "I argue that *Wages for Housework* feminists found in Marx the foundation for a feminist theory centred on women's struggle against unpaid domestic labour because we read his analysis of capitalism politically, coming from a direct personal experience, looking for answers to our refusal of domestic relations." More recently, taking Marx's category of the "hidden abode," which is what he calls production in contrast to the "visible" sphere of circulation, Wendy Brown (2006) proposes that feminism must ally itself with critical theory (thinking of the most radical contributions of the Frankfurt School) because that is the way to include these invisible folds in the sphere of production. Here, the "hidden abodes" of production that she highlights are language, psyche, sexuality, aesthetics, reason, and thought itself. Nancy Fraser, in an article titled "Tras la morada oculta de Marx" (2014) [in English, *Behind Marx's Hidden Abode*,] writes that feminism, ecology, and postcolonialism are the three experiential perspectives that reconsider Marxist analysis precisely because they incorporate the "hidden abodes" of social conflict production in contemporary capitalism. In these approaches, the three authors assume – from different positions – a reading of Marx in relation to how the feminist perspective highlights the powers that *produce* the forms of capitalist power as subordination of labour to capital; but even more: how hierarchies function within what we understand as labour. Along this line, they place feminised labour as an example of what capital must subordinate and discredit (that is, *hide*). This symptomatic reading of Marx is a red thread

for feminist theory. First, because by taking up the Marxist thread of reproducing the workforce as a necessary activity for capital accumulation, it highlights *the class* dimension of feminism. Then, because it detects in its gaps, abodes, and recesses what Marx left *unthought* precisely because his reading of capital as a social relationship privileges the analysis of production, but not of the production of production (or reproduction). We speak of a *subsoil* of reproduction, from which we see all the layers that ultimately enable what we call the capitalist mode of production. Thus, feminist economics introduces a genuine perspective "from below."

In recent years, there has been a global trend to return to Marxist thought. How can we "return" to Marx considering the specific challenges of current capitalism, as well as the different social struggles and collective bodies?

I think it is a symptom that we have to confront and discuss again, the problem of *liberation* in conditions that need, once again, to be unravelled and elaborated. In other words, practice requires us to do it. As Sandro Mezzadra notes in his book "La cocina de Marx: el sujeto y su producción" [in English, *In the Marxian Workshops: Producing Subjects*] the so-called end of Marxism allowed the Marxist archive to be opened as a polyphony and to re-enter its "workshop." There are core aspects of the Marxian debate that are urgently summoned by our present. One of them is the issue of the so-called "primitive accumulation," with its direct violence and its mode of appropriating common goods. There is a whole body of debate about this, but above all, it seems to me that this has become *thinkable* because there is already a huge and persistent set of anti-extractive struggles that fight against the plundering of land, resources, and the racist and colonial displacement of people, which has created a need for conceptualisation. It is always beautiful to evoke Marx's lines in a letter to S. Mayer at the beginning of 1871, and which are also the spirit of his exchange with Vera Zasulich: "The intellectual movement now taking place in Russia testifies to the fact that fermentation is going on deep below the surface. Minds are always connected by invisible threads with the body of the people." That image of fermentation deep below the surface and invisible threads linked to a popular, subaltern body seems extremely suggestive to me for understanding how the conditions for thought come about. There is a group of Indigenous and Afro intellectuals who have been creating underlying genealogies of reflection for years, which are key for this moment and are also expressed in very powerful

political leadership, such as the figures of Berta Cáceres, Marielle Franco, and Francia Márquez, to name a few.

Continuing with the issue of Primitive Accumulation, I am very interested in the financial inflection of capitalism to rethink it in its *current context*. For example, the idea of *unpayable debt*, as framed by Brazilian philosopher Denise Ferreira Da Silva, shows how colonial forces partake in capitalist accumulation through violent expropriations that do not remain confined to the past, a "primitive" or "original" time (thus, she debates Marx's, and even Luxemburg's readings of value). Unpayable debt, Da Silva argues, is a "remembrance" of expropriation. In other words, non-payment becomes possible when the violence of debt is remembered. The dimension of time, as we see, is also central here: It invites the philosopher to introduce the *time* of colonial violence as *actuality* into the Marxian scene of value. She says that this explains the *temporality* that allowed the mortgage debt in 2018 in the United States to be a scam perpetrated against African American families, as their "inability to pay" became a financial asset. Da Silva connects this temporality of debt with two other concerns: the question of the "inheritance" of debt and the possibility of disobedience.

With Luci Cavallero, we wrote *Una lectura feminista de la deuda* [in English, *A Feminist Reading of Debt*]. An analysis of how so-called private debt and/or household debt is in fact a form of exploitation of the most precarious, usually feminised and migrant labour. In the light of the feminist mobilisation of recent years, we researched how women, lesbians, transvestites, and transsexuals do not fit in as a universal subject of debt, but how the precariousness of their jobs, the burden of obligatory unpaid work, and the macho violence that is often linked to the lack of economic autonomy are exploited in a *differential* way. A *differential* of "financial exploitation" is added to the sexual and racial division of labour, translating into sources of debt, interest rates, and different allocations of debt. This also allowed us to concretise the notion of domestic debt in relation to specific configurations of households, which are no longer predominantly organised under a heteropatriarchal family structure. In the domestic sphere, a "sexual division of debt" is *already* at work, which is obscured when households are only addressed in general terms. With this, I want to emphasise the collective struggles led by concrete subjects against forms of dispossession and exploitation that exceed, reconfigure, and update conflict dynamics.

The revolutionary subject is a central component within Marxism and the Left more broadly. However, as you mention in several of your texts, we cannot re-

duce this subject to an androcentric perspective centred on the factory. How can we think about revolutionary subjects today?

The current situation forces us to discuss the renewed forms of capitalist violence. One concrete way of charting them is to trace where the "civil war" between labour and capital is waged today. According to Marx, it occurred during the workday, but today, this battlefield is actually widening and expanding, in both territorial (beyond the factory) and temporal terms (beyond the usual work hours). What forms of violence does this civil war take today if we look at it from a social cooperation perspective that sees informalised, migrant, and popular economies, and domestic-community work as keys to new proletarian areas in neoliberalism? We do not have to abandon our reading of neoliberalism as the so-called workers' conflict (instead of a farewell to the proletariat), but we must do so outside its usual coordinates (a wage-earning, unionised, masculine framework), and think of the expansion of the financial system as a simultaneous response to a specific sequence of struggles and, on the other hand, a dynamic of containment that structures a certain experience of the current crisis.

In my book *la potencia feminista* [in English, *Feminist International*,] I addressed this by trying to connect four scenes of violence: 1) The implosion of violence in homes as an effect of the crisis of the figure of the male breadwinner, and his subsequent loss of authority and privileged role in relation to his position in the labour market; 2) the organisation of new forms of violence as a principle of authority in popular-sector neighbourhoods, rooted in the expansion of illegal economies that replace other modes of provisioning resources; 3) the dispossession and looting of common lands and resources by transnational corporations, and thus the deprivation of the material autonomy of other economies; and 4) the articulation of forms of exploitation and value extraction for which the financialisation of social life – particularly through the apparatus of debt – is a common code. I consider that from each concrete struggle against the forms of violence expressed in these situations, there are subjects who lead and sustain them. It is, therefore, about reading existing conflicts and from there, the subjects in struggle that inhabit and sustain them, rather than *first* thinking about the existence of a revolutionary subject that we should *then* seek. It is also a way of *not immobilising ourselves or waiting* for the emergence of some abstract notion of ideal subjects. This, of course, does not resolve the problem of political subjectivities.

We are seeing that the current ultra-Right mobilises anti-elitist feelings and meanings from which they seek to galvanise, especially those who have the experience of daily war, and especially among those who are also stripped of their role as providers and bearers of hierarchies guaranteed by a patriarchal system. This has been an important element in recent feminist debates to explain domestic violence and what we call the implosion of households.

If the hypothesis that we have been working on with Silvia Federici – which is formulated in our joint book *¿Quién le debe a quién?* – is that we are facing *a restructuring of class relations whose main scene is the sphere of reproduction*, then we have to read the neoliberal mutations there. This gives rise to a major problem that I consider an open question for feminisms: What are the political tools of protest and negotiation of a workforce that is at the crossroads between financial (and platforms) capitalism and unguaranteed social reproduction?

In the current context, it seems increasingly difficult to talk about internationalism given that many emancipatory political projects are confined to the local or national level, or articulate their demands around identities. Where do you see potentials of forging these struggles into a transnational movement?

I believe these are already transnational struggles, and yet, we still have to consider what it means to sustain them, translate them, articulate them. The cycle of feminist mobilisations and organisation that began internationally in 2016 has managed to consolidate a growing cycle of social mobilisations in the years 2017, 2018, and 2019. The strikes in Poland and Argentina that took place in 2016 are intertwined with mobilisations that had just begun, such as *Ni Una Menos* in Argentina in 2015, and have been gaining even more momentum. I even argue that strikes are a tool to change their political quality, surpassing an organisational threshold. By 2017, March 8 had become an international feminist strike with various forms of organisation in dozens of countries, including mobilisations that are true milestones in certain countries such as Chile, Mexico, Spain, and Italy, to name a few. In this three-year period from 2017 to 2019, a movement has been *scaling up* because: 1) the feminist strike of March 8 is organised and consolidated; 2) the internationalist character of the movement is expanding, with a clear impulse from the South; 3) it is linked to international campaigns for the right to abortion; 4) the feminist movement converges with popular and Indigenous protest dynamics in several Latin American countries.

I would like to insist on a point I also argue in my book: the transnational dynamics in which feminist struggles are rooted already exist. On the one hand, there are *domestic territories*, which are today spaces of practical transnationalism, where global chains of care are assembled, where we discuss modes of invisibilisation of reproductive work and the lack of public infrastructure that causes them to bear the cost of adjustment. Then, *Indigenous and community territories*, historically expropriated and considered to be closed, "backward" economies, are today spaces of borderless alliances, of community support, where extractive megaprojects and the new landowners in charge of agribusiness are denounced. From these territories, we can trace the global diagram of the extractive dynamics of capital, opposed by alliances, struggles, and networks to resist and expel these neocolonial advances. Finally, *territories of precarisation*. Historically considered "unorganised," they are today forms of experimentation of new trade union dynamics, of encampments and occupations in workshops and factories and on virtual platforms, of creative demands and denunciations that make explicit how sexual abuse, discrimination against migrants, and exploitation always go hand in hand.

We must acknowledge that they bear the brunt of the most aggressive dynamic of the conservative, patriarchal, and racist counter-offensive.

If we understand neo-fascism in relation to what it responds to, to how it fabricates enemies in order to legitimise its intervention and its proposal for subjectivation, we must underscore its capacity to deploy and mobilise what, together with Gabriel Giorgi, we call forms of *reactive transgression*. Thus, on the one hand, we see an ability to mobilise the cultural prestige and the seductive capacity of transgression, undoubtedly inherited from the twentieth century, to use it in specific directions, corresponding to the values and modelling of the public that these new Right-wing forces seek to consolidate and spread: hyper-individualism, so-called "antipolitics," the free market and its relentless grammars of racism, masculinism, and classism. Yet, on the other hand, we argue that it is a transgression that seeks to replicate and compete in the realm of the disruptive with the challenges that transfeminisms pose, not only in cultural terms, but also at the political, economic, and subjective levels. We could add that this politics, which likes to present itself as anti-establishment in its reaction, claims to offer a "realistic" balance of how recent democratic dynamics have combined with forms of inclusion, while the majorities require a subjectivation that is trained in the arenas of neoliberal competitiveness. Here, as we see, we are dealing with struggles that are simultaneously local and transnational.

In your book "Feminist International" (2020), you give great centrality to the strike, especially the feminist strike as a process, as a cartography of feminist practice. What new readings do you give to the strikes that have taken place in Argentina (for example, the one on January 24, 2024) in rejection of Javier Milei's ultra-Right government policies? What bodies, emotions, and demands are being articulated?

Through the strike, the feminist movement decisively politicises the crisis of reproduction in the neoliberal moment, making visible both the scale of unpaid feminised work and its convergence with processes of precarisation. It also makes explicit and confronts the gender orders that structure this precariousness. I, of course, was interested in how the notion of strike is displaced and reinvented, expanding the notion of labour, broadening the very notion of class from below. The strike has become a strategy to make visible and value the labour trajectories that remain unrecognised. The feminist strike is a collective exercise that questions the patriarchal concept of wage-labour. Moreover, such valorisation of social reproduction implies the recognition of other spatialities that are not confined to the household.

Milei's election was quickly followed by an attack on living conditions by way of a decree announced on December 20, the date of the popular revolt of 2001. Since then, there have been *cacerolazos* and protests. On January 24, just a month and a half after he took office, trade unions called for a general strike. To participate in that strike, we organised a huge feminist assembly, which was an important instance to discuss a diagnosis and a plan of action. It was also an anticipation of the assembly process towards March 8 that we initiated in February.

What happened on March 8 was impressive for several reasons. First, because we managed to recover a pre-pandemic level of attendance. Then, because we did it against an ultra-Right government, which constantly denigrates women in general and feminisms in particular. Thirdly, because we organised ourselves in the face of a severe and brand-new repressive protocol, against which we "flooded" the streets and decentralised in a fully coordinated way. Self-care worked perfectly among us and was part of the reflection and tasks undertaken during the whole assembly process. Finally, as I have already pointed out, because we are in the midst of an economic war against the population, which makes organising and mobilising a huge challenge. This is why the massive scale of 8M 2024 in Argentina is extremely valuable and powerful.

I would like to return to your experience as a feminist militant in *Ni Una Menos* and to the recent events of March 8, 2024. What challenges are being articulated within the movement in the current context in Argentina? How is the *Feminist Potencia* being remade?

I wrote a weekly chronicle of what was discussed in the assemblies, of the challenges that emerged, of the difficulties and proposals that were being woven.

In each of them, it was clear that the brutal advance against wages, rights, and possibilities of communal life do not go uncontested from below, from consolidated organisational forms of protest to jumping turnstiles in the subway in response to a hike in transit fares. Milei using electric appliances as metaphors for the virulence of his "anarcho-capitalist" government – the blender and the chainsaw – translates the shock of the country's accelerated impoverishment, including the lowest wage level in Argentine history. The assembly is also a forum for collective writing, where different concepts appear, others are reengaged, and we "cook" a new language for protest in a moment that is unprecedented and in which words often seem insufficient or escape us in the dizzying craze of everyday life.

I want to explore how the feminist assembly, as a political body, has a mode that is both continuous and discontinuous. We are now in the space that, despite all the difficulties of articulating heterogeneity, has been sustained since 2016. It functions as a coordinating instance of a movement that stands out for combining political structures, collectives of various types, and "independent" participants. The uniting factor is that shared platform to discuss the current situation and organise the streets. The assembly may have reiterative modes and performances, but it gives a different response each time; it deploys contextual intelligence to mix and enhance voices and experiences that would not otherwise meet in political conversation if it were purely virtual or segmented by pre-organised sectors.

The priority this year was to highlight the issue of hunger and to showcase the women who are sustaining the *ollas populares* (in English, collective kitchens or soup kitchens) that feed 10 million people today. The assembly expresses what the feminist movement has achieved in these years like no other: to speak simultaneously of waged and unwaged work, registered and unregistered, visible and invisible, domestic and communal. It is, in fact, what has allowed the feminist strikes of March 8 to include many of those realities that must strive to *invent* a way to strike and be recognised in this *absence* of tasks that are generally not considered work.

What is to be done? We are entering a stage in which popular feminisms in Argentina assume the challenge of changing the fabric of communal life, which the crisis has been attacking for a long time now, which has been infiltrated by this idea of sacrifice at the expense of leisure, where joy and pleasure are censured while cruelty is celebrated, where violence is imposed against solidarity and mutual support.

Finally, how have you overcome what has become an entrenched divide between theory and political practice? How have you built militant research?

I do not think it is something that can be "overcome" because there is a fixed system in which you have to divide your time and specialise, or dedicate yourself to either one thing or another. And, as we know, the more precarious our lives become, the more we are forced to "manage" our time. That is why I am interested in the experience of militant research as a practice that challenges boundaries; that does not confine thought exclusively to academic spaces, nor assumes that politics does not require thought because it is *already* known, and that increasingly requires a delicate production of availability, time, and commitment.

For me, it is a practice, as well, from where to combat anti-intellectual prejudice, which has a great impact on intellectuals and militants and has managed to sediment a series of commonplaces that are still operating. For example, the outdated division between thinking and doing; between elaborating and experimenting; between comfort and risk. These are undoubtedly poles that produce caricatures: the militant self-denial for practice, as if it were devoid of ideas, and the intellectuals' pristine adoration of the realm of concepts, as if it were a pure abstraction.

Despite the stereotypical nature of these figures, they continue to mark the boundaries of a map that, however, has changed a lot.

I am very interested in how in this cycle of massive and radical mobilisations of feminisms, that division into intellectual, conceptional, and political is changing. The question about anti-intellectual prejudice can also be posed the other way around: Every time this binary (in its most brutal formula: those who do and those who think) re-emerges, we see a disciplinary response to any shift in the relationship between thought and practice. Therefore, anti-intellectualism, instead of being a nod to the popular and its experiential richness (as it is often portrayed), is a call to order and a confirmation of classist, sexist, and racist hierarchies.

In a recent text published in a feminist compilation, I argued about the feminist movement's "desire for theory". It's something that interests me a lot. When I refer to the feminist movement's desire for theory, I mean our capacity to return to a magnificent era due to a collective capacity to raise problems, broach them, and address them in a way that does not involve linear solutions. But it does produce the experience of formulating them, of being part of their redefinition, all the way to the edges of the thinkable, and without resorting to the shortcuts of other formulas that seem more expeditious. Thus, a capacity for "reflective indocility" is redeployed, to use the Foucauldian term, as a diffuse sensitivity that makes conceptualisation a practice linked to disobedience.

Then, that desire for theory relates to the dynamic of creating names and narratives for what needs to be said differently. Undoubtedly, this versatility with this conceptual language expresses a capacity to make practice an interrogative form, with marches and countermarches, trial and errors. It is not by chance, as bell hooks said, that "feminist willingness to change direction when needed has been a major source of strength and vitality in feminist struggle," also in other historical moments. The intimacy with that ability to venture into speaking in a new language, criticising oneself, reopening past debates, is related to the vitality of a movement that thinks while it moves. Thus, thought is an attribute of movement. bell hooks adds that "our theory must remain fluid, open, responsive to new information" to be in tune with changes in our lives. That fluidity filled with theoretical substance enriches the movement. But also, I want to add that this cycle we are talking about, that conceptualisation is driven strongly from the South.

I believe that in that desire for theory, there is strategy and concern for mass-scale pedagogy. In this context, we also recognise the reactionary alarm, which makes language, content, and educational forms preferred targets for attacks and counteroffensives by the far Right when it seeks to combat so-called "gender ideology."