

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

# Women's Studies International Forum

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/wsif](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/wsif)

## Introduction: Feminist geographies of social reproduction and race



Carmen Teeple Hopkins

University of Toronto, Department of Geography and Program in Planning, 100 St. George Street, Room 5047, Toronto, ON M5S 3G3, Canada

### ARTICLE INFO

Available online 11 November 2014

### SYNOPSIS

This is a special issue of *Women's Studies International Forum* that aims to bring a spatial analysis to social reproduction processes. The introduction outlines in broad brushstrokes the contours of recent feminist literature on social reproduction. It does so firstly in relation to the tradition of feminist political economy (FPE), secondly in relation to anti-racist feminisms, and thirdly in relation to feminist geography. We locate our own work on social reproduction at the junction of these three conceptual lineages, drawing particular insight from the important 2004 text edited by feminist geographers Katharyne Mitchell, Sallie A. Marston, and Cindi Katz, *Life's Work: Geographies of Social Reproduction*. Our central goal is to extend the debates initiated in *Life's Work* by drawing attention to relevant scholarship that preceded the publication of that text and specifically to research that originated outside of the U.S.

Crown Copyright © 2014 Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

This special issue of *Women's Studies International Forum* is the product of many discussions—both within and outside of the classroom—on feminist political economy (FPE), geographies of racialization, and the politics of positionality. The contributors of the articles in this collection are all feminist geographers, and as such, we aim to add a sustained focus on the *spatial* elements of social reproduction processes. I offer these introductory thoughts in my role as one of the organizers of our collective efforts, and as the author of one of the articles.

This introduction outlines in broad brushstrokes the contours of recent feminist literature on social reproduction. It does so firstly in relation to the tradition of FPE, secondly in relation to anti-racist feminisms, and thirdly in relation to feminist geography. We locate our own work on social reproduction at the junction of these three conceptual lineages, drawing particular insight from the important 2004 text edited by feminist geographers Katharyne Mitchell, Sallie A. Marston, and Cindi Katz, *Life's Work: Geographies of Social Reproduction*. Our central goal is to extend the debates initiated in *Life's Work* by drawing attention to relevant scholarship that preceded the

publication of that text and specifically to research that originated outside of the U.S.

While there is a vast social reproduction literature, one of the key arguments is that non-waged work is not only necessary for capitalist profit and waged work, but is indeed central to production processes (Dalla Costa & James, 1972; James, 2012; Federici, 1975; Federici, 2012; Hartmann, 1980; Delphy, 1984). Two main articles on social reproduction were published during the 1970s: Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James', "The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community" (1972), and Silvia Federici's "Wages Against Housework" (1975). Dalla Costa and James argued that the family was at the center of social reproduction (James, 2012, p. 50). While Marx focused on the wage relation as central to capitalism, one needed to discuss "women's work" to describe how wage labor is produced (emphasis in original, James, 2012, p. 51). This women's work was the unpaid caring labor necessary to reproduce the wage labor force.

Dalla Costa and James' article laid the foundation for the Wages for Housework Campaign (James, 2012, p. 44). This campaign challenged the societal expectations that women

perform unpaid labor in the home (Federici, 2012, pp. 18–19). At its core, the purpose was to “restructure social relations in terms more favorable to us [women]” (p. 19). By demanding wages for housework, the campaign aimed to create ways for women to ultimately refuse housework (p. 18). Dalla Costa, James and Federici were among important feminist theorists who were not only writing about women’s everyday work, but were also heavily involved in international feminist organizing to improve women’s daily lives and to recognize women’s unpaid work as work.<sup>1</sup> Since the 1970s, the definition of social reproduction has become generally accepted as: (1) biological reproduction; (2) the reproduction of the labor force, including subsistence and training; and (3) the provision of care by individuals and institutions (Bakker, 2007; Bezanson & Luxton, 2006; Brenner & Laslett, 1991; Eldholm, Harris, & Young, 1977; England & Folbre, 1999; Fortunati, 1995; Luxton, 2006; Picchio, 1992).<sup>2</sup>

There are important anti-racist feminists who have written on socially reproductive labor, some of who tend to be eclipsed from FPE literature. During U.S. slavery, there was a gendered division of enslaved labor where Black women performed field work with Black men but also domestic work that Black men would not do. Black women’s labor as field workers, i.e. harvesting crops in fields, and as domestic workers, was devalued by Black men because it was seen as feminine (Hooks, 1981, p. 23). Black women’s enslaved labor was thus devalued both within and outside of the home. During this time period enslaved labor was unwaged for both women and men, yet women’s labor often differed from that of men and was not considered as important. Black women’s enslaved labor was thus central to both production and socially productive processes. Furthermore, since Black women worked outside the home in unpaid labor during slavery, the traditional public/private sphere division has not applied to U.S. Black women (Hill Collins, 2002, p. 47). Yet for many decades post-slavery, research on Black women’s labor often focused on paid work instead of unpaid labor that was disproportionately gendered work within Black communities (Hill Collins, 2002, p. 46).

Black women and women of color have often done unpaid domestic work, paid caring work, or have been forced into workfare programs (Brewer, 1997, p. 245; see also Hill Collins, 2002, p. 47).<sup>3</sup> Black feminists have long understood the family and household as a form of oppression for women, but also as a site of resistance to racism (Carby, 1997, pp. 111–2).<sup>4</sup> Working class women of color and white women have also largely taken on commodified care, a term that refers to women’s *paid* reproductive work (Giles & Arat-Koc, 1994, p. 1; for analyses specifically on women of color, see Falquet, 2009; Nakano Glen, 1992; Silvera, 1989).

To some extent, Selma James’ work discussed Black women’s unpaid labor and political organizing during the 1980s on this issue. For instance, during a twelve-day church occupation by the English Collective of Prostitutes in London in 1982 (2012, p. 110), James mentions additional participating groups, one of which was Black Women for Wages for Housework (p. 120). In another article, James highlights that the social reproduction of Black women “remains largely invisible and unrecognized” (p. 178) through the organizing of meetings, committees, prison support work, etc., all after a full day of paid work (pp. 178–9).<sup>5</sup> Given that women of color have long performed socially reproductive labor that was

unpaid during transatlantic slavery and then waged in sectors of care and cleaning work, the scholarship of prominent feminists of color and white feminist theorists illustrates a *social reproduction of women of color*. This statement is not meant to homogenize women of color generally, but to methodologically center race in analyses of women’s unpaid labor.

Feminist geographers have developed a spatial lens to refine the definition of social reproduction (see, for instance, Atkinson, Lawson, & Wiles, 2011; England, 2010; Lawson, 2009; Marston, 2000; Massey, 1984; Peake, 1995; McDowell, 2004). Cindi Katz’s “fleshy, messy, and indeterminate stuff of everyday life” (2001, p. 711) is now commonly associated with social reproduction in feminist geography, and rightly so. Her definition concretizes and visualizes the tasks of caring labor that are often de-valued and seen as undesirable. Katz adds: “[a]part from the need to secure the means of existence, the production and reproduction of the labor force calls forth a range of cultural forms and practices that are also *geographically and historically specific*” (emphasis added, 2001, p. 711). Attention to the historical and geographic specificities of social reproduction expands FPE to allow for a combined theorization of gendered *social and spatial* dynamics.<sup>6</sup> Mitchell, Marston, and Katz (2004) emphasize that historically marginalized groups, such as women, enslaved peoples, their descendants, colonial and post-colonial subjects, and children have performed the majority of the world’s reproductive work (2004, p. 11). This journal collection addresses the historical and geographical specificity of women’s labor issues in a transnational context, particularly in the period of neoliberalization following 1989, and especially the reverberations after 9/11.

*Life’s Work* is one of only a few texts in feminist geography that deals with the question of social reproduction. It focuses on the level of everyday life, culture, and discourse. Importantly, it concentrates on how “we live in space” (Mitchell et al., 2004, p. 4). The spatial analyses of the authors in Mitchell, Marston and Katz’s collection take many forms, including but not limited to: “imagined geographies” in textbooks, port wine enclaves, hospitals, cities, households, suburbs, and the state. The introduction captures Marx’s capitalist/wage-labor dialectic, the role of class struggle, and the expropriation of labor-power in capitalist reproduction (2004, pp. 5–7). Like others in the antiracist feminist political economic tradition, the editors are centrally concerned with the ways that women, racialized and non-status people often perform highly exploitative socially reproductive labor (p. 6). The central argument of *Life’s Work* troubles the categories of work/non-work, or production/reproduction, which the editors see as a false separation that should be deconstructed or blurred (p. 2). They hold that many aspects of “life’s work” are considered non-work, and accordingly propose to examine life and work “in an entirely different register” (p. 14). Of course, many critical scholars would agree that numerous forms of labor remain unrecognized or undervalued as such. Nevertheless, the analytical contributions of *Life’s Work* can be enriched through further engagement with some core ideas in contemporary FPE and anti-racist feminist geography.

The goal of breaking down the work/non-work binary in *Life’s Work* represents a significant departure from some of the main social reproduction scholars. Antonella Picchio’s (1992)

now classic, *Social Reproduction: The Political Economy of The Labour Market*, argues that capital accumulation depends upon the socio-spatial separation of production from reproduction, but that the two are interconnected and interdependent in practice (1992, p. 9). For Picchio, the goal is to specify women's exploitation in the process of separating out social reproduction from production. To make her case, she examines England during the 19th and 20th centuries. She compares economic systems: pre-industrial agriculture societies versus industrialized capitalist England. In pre-capitalist England, production was organized *within* social reproduction (the family sphere). The separation of production from reproduction took a long time to achieve. Even in early 19th century England, production and reproduction were not totally separated: there were live-in domestic workers and work organized around the family/household, such as mining industry teams (p. 81). Put simply, labor was not entirely atomized at this point.

Picchio focuses on the specific capitalist formation that emerged in conjunction with England's urbanization and industrialization: the rigid separation between production and social reproduction (1992, p. 82). This separation was premised on the involvement of people in factory wage-labor work and the lessening of their participation in agricultural work. As people moved into proletariat work, women faced gender-specific intensifications of their socio-economic insecurity through two main forms: (1) women depended on the wages of men; (2) women received lower wages than men when they did carry out waged work (p. 84). While Picchio acknowledges the on-going interrelationship between production and reproduction, she accounts historically for the ways in which the *separation* of the two was systemically intertwined with the development of industrial capitalism. This point is a central premise of historical materialist theories of social reproduction.

Even though Picchio remains seminal for FPE, the impact of her work has not yet been felt in feminist geographical analyses of social reproduction. For instance, *Life's Work* does not refer to Antonella Picchio, and there is minimal discussion of key feminist political economists on social reproduction based in both Canada and Italy—two countries with long histories of scholars and activists working on questions of paid and unpaid domestic labor. While the editors of *Life's Work* focus on deconstructing the binary of productive/socially reproductive work, it is important to refer to previously established and recognized literature in the field in order to understand it and depart from it, if so desired. Elsewhere, Leah Vosko (2002) makes an important intervention for feminist inquiry. She argues that there has been minimal interaction between Canadian feminist political economists and feminist theorists, which has been a drawback for the feminist theory (2002, p. 55). Vosko focuses on the recognition–redistribution debates among major feminist theorists based in the U.S. and the U.K., specifically Judith Butler, Nancy Fraser, Iris Marion Young and Ann Phillips.<sup>7</sup> She highlights that the high-profile debates between these four scholars demonstrate a lack familiarity with (or perhaps disinterest in) contemporary questions in FPE. For instance, the debates between the four thinkers address neither the gendered and racialized character of social reproduction, nor various levels of analysis of social reproduction (2002, p. 76). For Vosko, these gaps illustrate the need for

feminist theorists—or perhaps more accurately put, feminist philosophers—to revisit FPE (2002, p. 78). Although Canadians have contributed significantly to FPE, their contributions are rarely discussed or recognized outside Canada (Luxton, 2006, p. 12). More recently, Joan Sangster and Meg Luxton respond to a 2009 article by Nancy Fraser where they underscore that we need to move beyond “American-centric understandings of feminism” and to develop an understanding of how gender and race interweave class relations (2013, p. 289).<sup>8</sup>

Granted, Joan Sangster and Meg Luxton's response to Nancy Fraser emerges several years after the publication of *Life's Work*. But their critique of US-centric feminisms expands on Leah Vosko's aforementioned 2002 intervention, written two years prior to *Life's Work*. Sangster and Luxton's argument illustrates the on-going neglect of FPE outside the US, an omission in *Life's Work* that perpetuates the relative dismissal of Canadian FPE outside of Canada. In this issue, we pay particular attention to Canadian social reproduction literature within feminist geography to discuss issues that are transnational in scope and deeply marked by racial hierarchies. In so doing, research on migrant and immigrant labor, race, and social reproduction in the Canadian context (see for instance, Bakan & Stasiulis, 1997; Giles & Arat-Koc, 1994) has influenced our research, and we seek to broaden Canadian FPE through a *spatial* approach. Our work thus falls in line with that of Kendra Strauss (2012) who, as a feminist geographer, draws extensively from FPE and demonstrates significant familiarity with Canadian and Italian social reproduction theorists.<sup>9</sup>

We argue that greater attention deserves to be paid to the literature that *does exist* at the intersections of feminist geography, FPE, and social reproduction, and that comes from both within and outside Canada. For instance, Eleanore Kofman (1998) contributes to the “global cities” literature, that class, gender, and immigration operate at a *household* level to understand the *urban* level. As well, the research by Stimpson, Dixler, Nelson, and Yatrakis (1981) and Mackenzie and Rose (1983; see also Rose, 2010) illustrates the cross-cutting relations that link social reproduction and urban planning. Silvey (2008) outlines the potential for a social reproduction of gendered transnational work. Her approach is a feminist political economic geography of migration (2008, p. 112), one that significantly influences the direction of the articles in this collection.

But a feminist focus on labor and space leaves many of us returning to a lineage of thought that places race and racism at the center of analysis. Sociologist Himani Bannerji's work inspires many of us. While Bannerji is also part of the FPE literature based in Canada, she draws on her own lived experiences as a woman of color scholar who moved to Canada later in life. She examines the violence and exclusion she faced from mainstream Canadian society, the “Left,” and white feminist movements. Bannerji (1995) thus argues that class is always constituted and mediated by gender and race (among other social forces) and that the labor of women of color is most exploited for profit. She uses a specifically *antiracist* feminist Marxist methodology that significantly contributes to FPE. In so doing, she shifts the methodological lens from a gender-focus to an intertwined gender and race analysis of labor. Similarly, Angela Davis (1981) focused on Black women in slavery and the ongoing exploitation of

Black women in the labor process. She, along with numerous other anti-racist and women of color feminists, have emphasized the need to centralize race with gender in capitalism, colonization and slavery (Gilmore, 2007; Kobayashi, 2003; Mahtani, 2006; McKittrick, 2000; McKittrick & Woods, 2007). We hope to contribute to analyses of the co-constitutive processes of race and neoliberalism (Roberts & Mahtani, 2010), as well as spatialization and racialization (Kobayashi, 2003; Peake, 2011; Peake & Schein, 2000).

Most of the contributors of this special issue are based in Toronto, Canada. We see our location as significant because perspectives based in Canada are frequently ignored in American and European scholarship on FPE, and our positions here enable us to see the politics of social reproduction, the role of the state, and racialization from a range of angles that we would not necessarily see from a different socio-spatial vantage point.<sup>10</sup> We are all either recent graduates or currently employed graduate students. Some contributors were born in Canada and some were not. Some have family members here, while others do not. Some contributors are more comfortable with situating their work in Canadian FPE traditions while some of us locate ourselves and our work within diaspora communities in Toronto and transnational studies. It is by pointing out these different social locations that the contributors insist on recognizing the crucial differences in terms of the ways we understand our relationships to Canada, racialization, and FPE.

We emphasize the location of our thinking and its genealogy not to reify a nationalist narrative about the origins of this work, nor to idealize an imagined group of scholars perhaps born and raised in Canada. Rather, we acknowledge the significance of our present geographic location in Canada for the scholars writing on pertinent gender and race-focused questions of labor, work, and capitalism. One of us was especially concerned that using the term “Canadian” was akin to supporting a deeply problematic nationalist project, “a project that both erases the fact that the symbol of Canada is also fundamentally a symbol of colonization of Indigenous peoples.”<sup>11</sup> This issue was of immediate importance to a contributor who has seen people from her own community experience different forms of violence by Canadian officials, a process she sees as a continuation of the violence carried out against Indigenous people. Far from pretending to have resolved these differences in our perspectives and experiences, we hope that our range of viewpoints speaks through the collected articles to show how our lived geographies matter for our work, our ideas, our political and intellectual commitments, and our solidarity projects.

Perhaps we can offer preliminary ideas as to why scholars and activists now based in Canada offer important contributions to feminist geography, antiracism, and social reproduction. Canadian-based feminist scholars have a long history of analyzing domestic labor, race, immigration, gender, and nationalism with FPE. If scholars outside Canada thus ignore these literatures, we lose critical *materialist* perspectives on how imperialism and empire operate, as well as how the legacies of slavery, colonization, industrial capitalism, racism, nationalism and patriarchy continue to impact working class women of color and white women. While we agree with the editors of *Life's Work* that racialized working class and non-status women, men and working class white women often do highly exploitative socially reproductive labor

(Mitchell et al., 2004, p. 6), if U.S.-based feminists engaged more fully with Canadian-based feminists, we would have much stronger historical material anti-racist analyses of social reproduction, and in turn, a more spatially-oriented direction for FPE.

While all of our projects draw on feminist and antiracist feminist political economic scholars now based in Canada, our empirical projects are not confined to processes taking place in Canada. We aim to recognize the lived experiences of the women of color and white women scholars who have shaped analyses of gender, race, and labor. Some of the pieces stem from everyday observations of family members' labor exploitation, while others draw more on a sense of solidarity with those struggles. Discussing various situations in Canada, France, the U.S. and the Mexican/U.S. border, and concluding with a theoretical reflection on social reproduction literature, these articles speak to the possibilities enabled by FPE in tandem with antiracist geography.

This issue begins with “Our Public Library: Social Reproduction and Urban Public Space in Toronto”, an examination of the recent struggle in Toronto to stop cuts to the public library system. Lia Frederiksen argues that public libraries have emerged as crucial sites for public and private provisioning as disinvestment from public services and public spaces have rolled out in neoliberalization. Because of this attempt to cutback on the library budget, struggles like these can best be understood as organizing against the further privatization of social reproduction.

In “Social Reproduction in France: Religious Dress Laws and *Laïcité*”, Carmen Teeple Hopkins examines the banning of religious symbols from public school spaces (2004) and the criminalization of face veils from public spaces (2011) in France from a social reproduction perspective. She argues that the anti-veiling laws increase the socially reproductive labor of religious-dress wearing Muslim women in France. This increase takes the form of unpaid and paid caring labor, spatial exclusions that push Muslim women into the home, and violence toward biological reproduction.

The devaluation of gendered and racialized labor is central to the next two articles. Drawing from interviews with fifteen nurses working in the U.S. and discourse analysis of online nursing discussion boards, in “Time and the Social Reproduction of American Health Care”, Caitlin Henry examines commodified socially reproductive labor. She argues that the lengthening of work shifts from eight-hour to twelve-hour days has been a feature of neoliberalism since the 1990s. These longer workdays increase nurses' physical and emotional exhaustion, meaning that many must “care less” for their patients to set boundaries between work and home. This means that there is less and less emotional labor in nursing. As well, since workers spend long days at work (exacerbated by commutes), they are distracted from dealing with other important labor issues, i.e. staffing, workload, overtime and resources.

In “Disrupting the Myth of *Maquila* Disposability”, Mary-Kay Bachour analyzes the *maquila* workers at the Mexican/U.S. border to deconstruct the way racialized women from the global south are often victimized in academic scholarship. She situates discourses of the *maquila* workers in relation to colonial narratives of the racialized other. By centering race in social reproduction, she analyzes the ways in which working class racialized women are utilized for capitalist profit. Part of what is



politically at stake in academic research, Bachour argues, is engaging with the research of women of color scholars, whose work is often marginalized within academic communities.

In “Interlocking migrant illegalization with other markers of social location: The experiences of Mexican migrants moving and working in Toronto”, Paloma E. Villegas links precarious immigration status with social reproduction based on interviews with Mexican migrants in Toronto. She shows us how the process of migrant illegalization—the identification of certain migrants as not welcome in a nation-state both through discursive and material processes—bridges with various factors of race, gender, class and sexual identity to restrict their access to social reproduction institutions. These various social locations matter greatly in relation to police profiling. The impact of illegal status and work among various social locations tell us that the body matters: some bodies can access decent work and wages while others are excluded from good living and working conditions.

Finally, “Embodied Contradictions, Capitalism, Social Reproduction and Body Formation” reflects on the question of social reproduction and historical materialist analyses of the body. Sébastien Rioux argues that Marxist feminism is crucial to analyzing the body. This article is particularly significant given that Marxists and materialists have tended to avoid studying the body (with some exceptions), and as the author highlights, postmodern theorists have often elevated the body to the level of discourse instead of materiality. Importantly, the body, as the author highlights, is central to production processes and the violence that is intrinsic to the exploitation of labor power in capitalist social relations.

Together, these pieces bring together key themes: socially reproductive work as gendered, racialized, and devalued, as well as the negative impact that this work has on the lives of women. Women's work has also increased both within and beyond the home through the intensification of neoliberalism. Spatial practices demarcate and undervalue women—women of color in particular.

We aim to theorize gender, race, and class as mutually constitutive processes that do not place gender or race as addenda to class. Similar to [Desbiens, Mountz, and Walton-Roberts's \(2004\)](#) introduction to the special issue of the journal *Political Geography* on feminist contributions to the subfield, these papers have been written in dialogue with many people who have also contributed to our intellectual and political development. These papers were edited and discussed collectively, a process that enriched the experience of writing and thinking through ideas by way of collaborative praxis. We thank the scholars that have come before us and hope that our research contributes to the literatures that have, in turn, inspired us.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Mary-Kay Bachour, Lia Frederiksen, Caitlin Henry, Adrie Naylor, and Katherine Perrott for their suggestions and feedback on various versions of the introduction, as well as an anonymous reviewer for suggesting key literatures and scholars. I would also like to extend a special thanks to Rachel Silvey for initiating this special issue project, reading drafts, and her support and encouragement throughout.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> While these feminists are some of the first to theorize women's unpaid labor, there are important differences between them. For instance, French feminist Christine Delphy differed from Dalla Costa in her definition of unpaid labor. According to Delphy, unpaid labor could only be done *for someone else*, but for Dalla Costa, unpaid labor also included labor *for one's self* (Delphy, 1984, p. 88). Delphy also identified as a materialist feminist whereas Heidi Hartmann was a Marxist feminist. Hartmann responded to both Marxist analyses void of gender reflection and feminists that did not consider class. She outlined the importance of Marxist feminists who studied the ways in which “housework produces surplus value and that houseworkers work directly for capitalists” (p. 2). Marxist feminists have thus been crucial to furthering our understanding of the role of socially reproductive labor in capitalism. Put differently, capitalist profit could not exist without women's unpaid caring work and thus *reproductive* labor is actually *productive* labor.

<sup>2</sup> In these essays, there is little attention to the biological dimensions of social reproduction, thus processes such as, pregnancy, childbirth, breastfeeding, are not our immediate concern.

<sup>3</sup> For more on the way that French feminists take up the racial and sexual international division of labor, see [Dorlin \(2009\)](#).

<sup>4</sup> I thank Adrie Naylor for drawing my attention to the articles by [Brewer \(1997\)](#) and [Carby \(1997\)](#).

<sup>5</sup> I hesitate to put Selma James in the same category as bell hooks and Patricia Hill Collins because James' earlier work with Mariarosa Dalla Costa, “The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community” compares women's work to slavery, a comparison that negates the history of Black women as enslaved workers and inaccurately compares the labor of white women in the home to Black women during slavery. For example, Dalla Costa and James write: “The challenge to the women's movement is to find modes of struggle which, while they liberate women from the home, at the same time avoid a double slavery and prevent another degree of capitalist control and regimentation” (James, 2012, p. 59). While I recognize that this article was one of her earlier works and her analysis progresses to consider race and immigration in more depth, I still think it necessary to outline how her initial analysis of race should not be considered homogenous to analyses of Black feminisms.

<sup>6</sup> It is worth noting that some Canadian feminist political economists have begun to incorporate spatiality into their analyses. See, for instance, [Bakker and Silvey \(2008\)](#), [Ferguson \(2008\)](#), and [Lebaron and Roberts \(2010\)](#). I would like to thank Lia Frederiksen for highlighting this point.

<sup>7</sup> While Vosko refers to Young, Butler, Fraser and Phillips as feminist theorists, it might be more apt to specify and call them feminist political theorists or feminist philosophers.

<sup>8</sup> Canadian feminist political economist scholars Meg Luxton and Joan Sangster (2013) respond to Nancy Fraser (2009) who argues that there is an affinity between second wave feminism and neoliberalism (Fraser, 2009, p. 108). Fraser suggests that the roots of second wave feminism responded to an economic determinism through addressing gender, race, sexuality, and ability with class but then shifted to a neglect of the economy and focus on culture. This shift away from the economy means that second wave feminism provided “a key ingredient of the new spirit of neoliberalism” (p. 108). I agree with Luxton and Sangster's argument that Fraser largely generalizes second wave feminism and needs to historicize the political trajectory of second wave feminism (Sangster & Luxton, 2013, p. 294).

<sup>9</sup> There may be some differences, however, between [Strauss's \(2013, p. 182–3\)](#) interpretation of *Life's Work*, from the argument put forth here.

<sup>10</sup> Daiva Stasilius highlights a similar point in an article that seeks “to address the specificity of the Canadian context within analyses of Native women, immigrant women and women of color. Many of the writings by Black women and women of color who have challenged white feminist theory and practice are based on the experiences of racial minority women in the United States and Britain” (1991, p. 99).

<sup>11</sup> This statement comes from e-mail correspondence with one of the contributors of this special issue who chose to remain anonymous. The contributor consented that I include it in the introduction and gave feedback on the introduction before publication.

## References

Atkinson, Sarah, Lawson, V., & Wiles, J. (2011). Care of the body: Spaces of practice. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 12(6), 563–572.

- Bakan, Abigail B., & Stasiulis, D. K. (Eds.). (1997). *Not one of the family: Foreign domestic workers in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bakker, Isabella (2007, December). Social reproduction and the constitution of a gendered political economy. *New Political Economy*, 12(4), 541–556.
- Bakker, Isabella, & Silvey, R. (Eds.). (2008). *Beyond states and markets: The challenges of social reproduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Bannerji, Himani (1995). *Thinking through: Essays in Marxism, feminism, and anti-racism*. Toronto: Women's Press.
- Bezanson, Kate, & Luxton, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Social reproduction: Feminist political economy challenges Neo-liberalism*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Brenner, Johanna, & Laslett, B. (1991, September). Gender, social reproduction, and women's self-organization: Considering the U.S. welfare state. *Gender & Society*, 5(3), 311–333.
- Brewer, Rose M. (1997). Theorizing race, class, and gender: The new scholarship of black feminist intellectuals and black women's labor. In Rosemary Hennessy, & C. Ingraham (Eds.), *Materialist feminism. A reader in class, difference, and women's lives* (pp. 236–247). New York, NY: Routledge ([originally published in S.M. James & A. Busia (Eds.). *Theorizing Black Feminisms* (1993)]).
- Carby, Hazel V. (1997). White women listen! Black feminism and the boundaries of sisterhood. In Rosemary Hennessy, & C. Ingraham (Eds.), *Materialist feminism. A reader in class, difference, and women's lives* (pp. 110–128). New York, NY: Routledge ([originally published in CCCS Race and Politics Group (Ed.). *The Empire Strikes Back*. (1982)]).
- Dalla Costa, Mariarosa, & James, S. (1972). *The power of women and the subversion of the community*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.
- Davis, Angela Y. (1981). *Women, race, and class*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Delphy, Christine (1984). In Diana Leonard (Ed.), *Close to Home: A materialist analysis of women's oppression*. London: Hutchinson.
- Desbiens, Caroline, Mountz, A., & Walton-Roberts, M. (2004). Introduction: Reconceptualizing the state from the margins of political geography. *Political Geography*, 23, (pp. 241–243).
- Dorlin, Elsa (Ed.). (2009). *Sexe, race, classe, pour une épistémologie de la domination*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Eldholm, Felicity, Harris, O., & Young, K. (1977). Conceptualising women. *Critique of Anthropology*, 3(9 and 10), 101–130.
- England, Kim (2010). Home, paid care work and geographies of responsibilities. *Ethics, Place and Environment*, 13(2), 131–150.
- England, Paula, & Folbre, N. (1999). The cost of caring. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 561, 39–51.
- Falquet, Jules (2009). La règle du jeu. Repenser la co-formation des rapports sociaux desexes, de classe et de "race" dans la mondialisation néolibérale. In E. Dorlin (Ed.), *Sexe, race, classe, pour une épistémologie de la domination* (pp. 91–110). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Federici, Silvia (1975). *Wages Against Housework*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.
- Federici, Silvia (2012). *Revolution at point zero: Housework, reproduction, and feminist struggle*. Oakland: PM Press.
- Ferguson, Sue (2008). Canadian contributions to social reproduction feminism, race and embodied labor. *Race, Gender & Class*, 15(1/2), 42–57.
- Fortunati, Leopoldina (1995). *The arcane of reproduction*. London: Autonomedia.
- Fraser, Nancy (2009, March–April). Feminism, capitalism and the cunning of history. *New Left Review*, 56, 97–117.
- Giles, Winona, & Arat-Koc, S. (Eds.). (1994). *Maid in the market: Women's paid domestic labour*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson (2007). *Golden gulag: Prisons, surplus, crisis, and opposition in globalizing California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hartmann, Heidi (1980). The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union. In Linda Sargent (Ed.), *Women and Revolution: A Discussion on the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Hill Collins, Patricia (2002). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Hooks, Bell (1981). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. Cambridge: South End Press.
- James, Selma (2012). *Sex, race, and class: The perspective of winning, a selection of writings 1952–2011*. Oakland: PM Press.
- Katz, Cindi (2001). Vagabond capitalism and the necessity of social reproduction. *Antipode*, 33(4), 709–728.
- Kobayashi, Audrey (2003). The construction — Racialization, spatialization. In K. Anderson, M. Domosh, S. Pile, & N. Thrift (Eds.), *The handbook of cultural geography* (pp. 544–556). London: Sage.
- Kofman, Eleonore (1998). Whose city? Gender, class and immigration in globalizing European cities. In Ruth Fincher, & Jane M. Jacobs (Eds.), *Cities of difference* (pp. 279–300). New York: Guilford.
- Lawson, Victoria (2009). Instead of radical geography, how about caring geography? *Antipode*, 41(1), 210–213.
- Lebaron, Genevieve, & Roberts, A. (2010). Toward a feminist political economy of capitalism and carcerality. *Signs*, 36(1), 19–44.
- Luxton, Meg (2006). Feminist political economy in Canada and the politics of social-reproduction. In Kate Bezanson, & Meg Luxton (Eds.), *Social reproduction: Feminist political economy challenges Neo-liberalism* (pp. 11–44). Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Mackenzie, Suzanne, & Rose, D. (1983). Industrial change, the domestic economy, and home life. In James Anderson, S. Duncan, & Raymond Hudson (Eds.), *Redundant spaces in cities and regions* (pp. 155–200). London: Academic Press.
- Mahtani, Minelle (2006). Challenging the Ivory Tower: Proposing anti-racist geographies within the academy. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 13(1), 21–25.
- Massey, Dorreen (1984). *Spatial Divisions of Labour: social structures and the geographies of production*. London: MacMillan.
- Marston, Sallie (2000). The social construction of scale. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(2), 219–242.
- McDowell, Linda (2004). Work, workfare, work/life balance and an ethics of care. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(2), 145–163.
- McKittrick, Katherine (2000). Who do you talk to, when a body's in trouble?: M. Nourbese-Philip's (un)silencing of black bodies in the diaspora. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 1(2), 223–236.
- McKittrick, Katherine, & Woods, C. (Eds.). (2007). *Black geographies and politics of place*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Mitchell, Katharyne, Marston, S., & Katz, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Life's work: Geographies of social reproduction*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Nakano Glen, Evelyn (1992). From servitude to service work: Historical continuities in the racial division of paid reproductive labor. *Signs*, 18(1), 1–43.
- Peake, Linda (2011). In, out and unspeakably about: Taking social geography beyond an Anglo-American positionality. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 12(7), 757–773.
- Peake, Linda, & Schein, R. H. (2000). Racing geography into the new millennium: Studies of 'race' and north american geographies. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 1(2), 133–142.
- Peake, Linda (1995). Toward an Understanding of the Interconnectedness of Women's Lives: The 'Racial' Reproduction of Labor in Low-Income Urban Areas. *Urban Geography*, 16(5), 414–439.
- Picchio, Antonell (1992). *Social reproduction: The political economy of the labour market*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- Roberts, David J., & Mahtani, M. (2010). Neoliberalizing race, racing neoliberalism: Placing race in neoliberal discourses. *Antipode*, 42(2), 248–257.
- Rose, Damaris (2010). Refractions and recombinations of the 'economic' and the 'social': A personal reflection on—and challenge to—feminist urban geographies. *The Canadian Geographer*, 54(4), 391–409.
- Sangster, Joan, & Luxton, M. (2013). Feminism, co-optation and the problems of amnesia: A response to Nancy Fraser. In L. Panitch, G. Albo, & V. Chibber (Eds.), *The question of strategy: Socialist register 2013* (pp. 288–309). Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Silvera, Makeda (1989). *Silenced: Caribbean domestic workers talk with Makeda Silvera*. Toronto, ON: Sister Vision.
- Silvey, Rachel (2008). Managing migration: Reproducing gendered insecurity at the Indonesian border. In I. Bakker, & R. Silvey (Eds.), *Beyond states and markets: The challenges of social reproduction* (pp. 108–121). New York: Routledge.
- Stasiulis, Daiva (1991). Rainbow feminism: The complex nexus of gender, race, ethnicity and class in Canada. *International Review of Sociology*, 2(2), 97–111.
- Stimpson, Catharine R., Dixler, E., Nelson, M. J., & Yatrakis, K. B. (Eds.). (1981). *Women and the American city*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Strauss, Kendra (2013). Unfree again: Social reproduction, flexible labour markets and the resurgence of gang labour in the UK. *Antipode*, 45(1), 180–197.
- Vosko, Leah (2002). The pasts (and futures) of feminist political economy in Canada: Reviving the debate. *Studies in Political Economy*, 68, 55–83.