

SOCIAL REPRODUCTION THEORY AND GLOBAL CARE CHAINS

SİMGE TAŞDEMİR

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2023

SOCIAL REPRODUCTION THEORY AND GLOBAL CARE CHAINS

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Philosophy

by

Simge Taşdemir

Boğaziçi University

202

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Simge Taşdemir, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date.....

ABSTRACT

SOCIAL REPRODUCTION THEORY AND GLOBAL CARE CHAINS

This thesis traces the evolution and complexity of global care chains and migrant domestic workers' contemporary experiences of oppression and exploitation in the domestic sphere. It compares the perspectives of social reproduction theories and reveals the scope and emancipatory potential of these theories. For example, an approach that equates the oppression and exploitation of migrant women with the workers' exploitation may ignore other categories of oppression. In this thesis, I first analyze domestic exploitation by examining Marxist economic reproduction theory. Second, I analyze affective labor by examining these relations from an intersectional feminist perspective. These two examinations reveal two different responses: wage labor in the workplace as exploitation and domestic labor, both paid and unpaid, as oppression. Finally, I attempt to bring these two paradigms into a dialectical relationship by focusing on the social reproduction theories.

ÖZET

SOSYAL YENİDEN ÜRETİM TEORİSİ VE GLOBAL BAKIM ZİNCİRLERİ

Bu tez, küresel bakım zincirlerinin evriminin ve karmaşıklığının ve göçmen ev işçilerinin ev içi alandaki güncel baskı ve sömürü deneyimlerinin izini sürmektedir. Toplumsal yeniden üretim teorilerinin bakış açılarını karşılaştırmakta ve bu teorilerin kapsamını ve özgürleştirici potansiyelini ortaya koymaktadır. Örneğin, göçmen kadınların ezilmesini ve sömürülmesini işçilerin sömürülmesiyle eşitleyen bir yaklaşım, diğer baskı kategorilerini göz ardı edebilir. Bu tezde, ilk olarak Marksist ekonomik yeniden üretim teorisini inceleyerek ev içi sömürüyü analiz ediyorum. İkinci olarak, bu ilişkileri kesişimsel feminist bir perspektiften inceleyerek duygusal emeği analiz ediyorum. Bu iki inceleme iki farklı yanıtı ortaya koyuyor: sömürü olarak işyerindeki ücretli emek ve baskı olarak hem ücretli hem de ücretsiz ev içi emek. Son olarak, toplumsal yeniden üretim teorilerine odaklanarak bu iki paradigmayı diyalektik bir ilişki içinde ortaya koymaya çalışıyorum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Words cannot express my gratitude to my advisor Yıldız Silier, whom I have been following closely since the moment I enrolled at Boğaziçi University and long before, and whose invaluable patience and feedback helped me overcome the problems that arose at every stage of my intellectual development throughout my undergraduate and graduate studies in philosophy. I am grateful to the committee members Feryal Saygılıgil, Berna Kılınç and Serap Sarıtaş, who generously provided knowledge and expertise during this process.

I thank my beloved mother Gönül Taşdemir, who paved the way for me to start this whole process, who worked hard in the Sümerbank kindergarten, who kept in touch with me throughout my undergraduate life, who never stopped supporting me even when I felt unsuccessful, and who reminded me of the value of my work every time I got tired; my father Muğdet Taşdemir for listening to me with curiosity every time and my brother İsmail Taşdemir — for keeping me alive and for being with me every step of the way in building my theory; my friends Rabia Ardıç, Burçe Gümüştü, Alper Cortoğlu for their sincere friendship, their participation in the long zoom meetings during the process and their endless support; my philosophy guides, Yüce Aydoğan and Şenay Çınar — for their feedbacks and endless support. Care is the most valuable source of our strength. We are interdependent beings and your presence, support and care made everything and my thesis possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: TURBULENT MARRIAGE OF MARXISM AND FEMINISM.....	5
2.1 Marxist Origins	8
2.2 Feminist Interventions	10
CHAPTER 3: SOCIAL REPRODUCTION THEORIES	22
3.1 Marxist Account of Social Reproduction	23
3.2 Intersectional Feminist Social Reproduction Theory	27
CHAPTER 4: GLOBAL CARE CHAINS.....	34
4.1 Affective Labor or Domestic Exploitation?	35
4.2 Experiences of Women Migrant Domestic Workers	38
4.3 Household as a Global Market for Women's Labor: Then and Now	40
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	51
REFERENCES.....	59

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, my aim is to analyze the mechanisms underlying contemporary forms of women's oppression and exploitation in the domestic sphere. I will be using the conceptual framework of Social Reproduction Theory to explore the phenomenon of global care chains. Global care chains are currently a major topic of public debate. They are often associated with care-intensive labor, healthcare, childcare and eldercare in the globalized labor market of women migrating from developing countries and refer to the many detrimental effects: the lack of care for sick, elderly, and children in migrant countries. If a society does not have this devalued labor of care, can there be political, economic, and cultural production? This is precisely why we face a global care crisis in the neoliberal era. As a result of austerity measures due to neoliberal policies, especially in social reproduction areas, care is burdened mostly on the shoulders of migrant women in developed societies. As Nancy Fraser argues, the crisis of social reproduction reflects the internal contradiction of capitalism. In other words, financialized capitalism is self-defeating because it undermines conditions of social reproduction.¹

Social Reproduction Theory has been developed in the last decade by Marxist feminist thinkers such as Nancy Fraser, Johanna Brenner, Silvia Federici, Lisa Vogel and Susan Ferguson. They emphasize that in order to fully grasp how capitalism reproduces itself, understanding the current forms of sexual division of labor at home is as crucial as the economic relation between the capitalist and the worker.

¹ Fraser, N., *Behind Marx's Hidden Abode: For an Expanded Conception of Capitalism*, 2014, <https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii86/articles/nancy-fraser-behind-marx-s-hidden-abode>, May 22, 2023.

According to this historical materialist approach, the realm of reproduction where patriarchy and capitalism interact forms the “hidden abode of capitalism” in Fraser’s terms. This theory also has affinities with intersectional feminism, which conceives class as always mediated by gender and race.

In this thesis, I will concentrate on migrant care workers to understand the relationship between the oppression and exploitation of women. But first, we need a historical perspective to reveal the specific form of women’s oppression and exploitation in late capitalism. Therefore, in the second chapter, I will examine the exploitation and oppression of women from two perspectives: the former prioritizes exploitation, and the latter prioritizes oppression. The second chapter extracts the following framework: 1) gives a brief overview of the rise of Marxist analyses of the evolution of the theory of social reproduction focusing on the oppression and exploitation of women, 2) analyses the Marxist origins of women’s oppression 3) defends Maria Mies’ view that capitalism divides classes by exploiting existing social inequalities and facilitates the transition to capitalism by creating racial and gender inequality through colonialism, 4) Lise Vogel applies women’s economic and political rights to the class struggle by focusing on the relations of reproduction.

In the third chapter, I will analyze social relations of reproduction by comparing the perspectives of Marxist and intersectional feminist social reproduction theories, by focusing on their different conceptualizations of the oppression and exploitation of migrant women domestic workers. Whereas Marx considers women’s oppression as a subset of class exploitation, the feminist approach refrains from this reductionism. To establish how relations of reproduction form the essential background of exploitation I will first use Marx’s labor theory of value, which will help us understand why economic reproduction is devalued. Secondly, I will explore

the specific relation between the realms of production and reproduction in capitalist societies and explain how this is essentially linked with the tendency of capitalism to create social crises. The kinds of social contradiction in capitalist societies have taken different forms in each regime. Thirdly, I will argue that Marx has a narrow notion of working class, which excludes unpaid domestic workers. Nevertheless, any social political movement that tends to challenge the power of capital can be interpreted as a part of the class struggle.

After defining exploitation as a complex phenomenon beyond the traditional Marxist understanding of class exploitation, in Chapter Four, I will examine the multiple, interconnected, and simultaneous exploitative systems in global care chains by using the feminist theory of social reproduction. I will deal with two key questions: How does social reproduction theory explain the specific exploitation of migrant domestic wage workers? What is the difference between the past and present regarding domestic work? In explaining global chains of care, I will explore how wage domestic workers fit into social reproduction paradigms by putting forward Federici's response to the Negrian theory of *Multitude*, which developed as another version of social reproduction theory. Negri argues that precarious working conditions are presented by capitalism in times of crisis as a solution to suppress the working class struggle and increase productivity. Nevertheless, Federici shows that Negri's theory ignores the gendered division of labor with this definition of precarious labor. Afterwards, I will highlight the strange situation of migrant educated domestic women workers in the EU who are both oppressed and exploited even if they often earn higher wages than in their own countries. I will explore whether there are any discontinuities in the oppression of domestic workers by briefly comparing their class position in precapitalism and capitalism. Finally, I will

argue that the only difference between domestic workers before and after capitalism is that today's domestics workers are educated.

In chapter 5, I will focus on the difference between Cuba and Philippines and the struggles of African, Latina and Caribbean immigrant care workers, nannies and elderly caregivers in New York City whose fight for fair labor standards led to the signing of the Bill of Rights.

CHAPTER 2

TURBULENT MARRIAGE OF MARXISM AND FEMINISM: A PRELIMINARY FRAMEWORK

“The marriage of Marxism and feminism has been like the marriage of husband and wife depicted in English common law: Marxism and feminism are one, and that one is Marxism. Recent attempts to integrate Marxism and feminism are unsatisfactory to us as feminists because they subsume the feminist struggle into the larger struggle against capital. To continue our simile further, either we need a healthier marriage, or we need a divorce.”²

In this chapter, I aim to establish a tentative framework to evaluate the similarities and differences between Marxist and feminist accounts of exploitation and oppression. Marx’s account of exploitation is focused on modes of production and in particular the relationship between capitalists and the proletariat. However, when it comes to the relationship between husband and wife in marriage, this is conceptualized as a realm of oppression, rather than exploitation. The main difference is that the wage-laborer produces surplus value for the capitalist, whereas the wife produces only use values for the family. However, if the wife reproduces a clean house and feeds the wage laborer, then her unpaid labor is preparing the background conditions for the husband to exist as a wage laborer. Why not call this unpaid labor as a form of exploitation? I will first examine Marxist account of origins of women’s exploitation and oppression. Second, I analyze how feminist

² Hartmann, H., “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union”, https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/4079326/mod_resource/content/1/Heidi%20Hartmann%20unhappy%20marriage%201979.pdf, Aug 22, 2023.

interventions show the materialist basis of patriarchy by focusing on Maria Mies, Heidi Hartmann, Lise Vogel, Christine Delphy, and Maxine Malyneux.

2.1 Marxist origins

The theory of social reproduction is a materialist theory of social life and is rooted in Marxism, which begins with a critique of society that capitalist society is driven by an impulse towards accumulation. However, this situation differentiates in the capitalist mode of production. The capitalist mode of production is driven by the urge for accumulation and causes inequalities in society. Social reproduction, which has its origins in Marx, has exposed the blind approaches and invisible inequalities in Marx's analysis from a Marxist feminist perspective. Especially in 1970s Marxist feminists focused on domestic labor and questioned how women reproduce proletariat, children, and elderly people. Today, modern social reproduction perspective examines the crises that arise in relation to care work and uses a dialectical method that analyses the interconnections between the production of human beings (realm of reproduction) and the production of commodities (realm of production).

Charles Fourier coined the term 'feminism' in 1837 and claimed that "The change in a historical epoch can always be determined by the progress of women toward freedom... The degree of emancipation of women is the natural measure of general emancipation."³ (Marx, 1975, p.258-59) Marx and Engels, who later quoted Fourier's statement in the "Holy Family", provided a theoretical basis to understand the exploitation and oppression of women. In the 18th Thesis on Feuerbach, Marx puts forward that all social life is essentially practical. However, there is no

³ Marx, 1975a, pp. 258-59.

comprehensive analysis of this early conception of ‘reproduction’ by Marx and Engels. In the chapter on *Simple Reproduction* and at the level of analysis of the capitalist mode of production, Marx states that “if production be capitalistic in form, so, too will be reproduction”. Then, Marx places reproduction in the conditions of production. Marx and Engels’ materialist account of history starts with the assumption that throughout history, people have been producing and reproducing themselves through their labor. Domestic labor as the producer and reproducer of the labor power is at the same time, a precondition for capital.

“The first premise of all human history is, of course, the existence of living human individuals... Men can be distinguished from animals by consciousness, by religion or anything else you like. They themselves begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence, a step which is conditioned by their physical organization. By producing their means of subsistence men are indirectly producing their actual material life. The way in which men produce their means of subsistence depends first of all on the nature of the actual means of subsistence they find in existence and have to reproduce. This mode of production must not be considered simply as being the production of the physical existence of the individuals. Rather it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production. This production only makes its appearance with the increase of population. In its turn this presupposes the intercourse [Verkehr] of individuals with one another. The form of this intercourse is again determined by production.”⁴

Hence, it is possible to analyze every society since the beginning of history in terms of these two basic activities: (i) the production of material life (ii) the increase of population. On the one hand, the relations of production related to the capitalist mode of production in which the daily needs and the means of labor are produced,

⁴ <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01a.htm>, 20.08.2023.

and on the other hand, the sphere of labor relations in which human beings are produced and reproduced, the relations between men and women, the family, and the household. In *German Ideology*, Marx does not limit the roots of women's oppression to capital, but rather problematizes the oppression of women throughout history and examines the relationship between men and women from a broad perspective. From this perspective, relations between men and women and relations of production pass through each other, grounding and influencing each other. That is to say, it is only through the intertwining, mutually underpinning and influencing social relations in both spheres that we will be able to grasp the contradictory and conflicting relationship between capitalism and patriarchy at its root and analyze gender in the totality of its social relations. On the one hand, capitalism excludes care work for profit and the market motives, and on the other hand, it undervalues care work, which ultimately puts pressure on communities, families, and public services. This also harms the interests of capital in the long run. For instance, educated migrant women are working as caregivers, even though they are doctors or nurses in their own country.

In the *German Ideology*, even though, Marx presents a dialectic perspective of production and reproduction, in *Capital*, he does not continue this approach and does not analyze the inequality in relations between men and women. Here, Marx and Engels argue that women's oppression and exploitation stem from society's class structure. According to them, capitalist societies are divided into two main classes regarding their access to the means of production: the bourgeoisie (those who own the means of production) and the proletariat (those who do not own the means of production). Since the main source of women's oppression is their being exploited as workers, for the emancipation of women, capitalism must be abolished, and the

means of production must be collectively owned. Marx and Engels claim that women's oppression and exploitation is of the same sort as the exploitation of workers, by describing the status of women as mere instruments of production. Accordingly, Marx and Engels in *Communist Manifesto* criticize the bourgeois family and the exploitation of women as follows: "The bourgeois has not even a suspicion that the real point aimed at is to do away with the status of women as mere instruments of production" (Marx, Engels, 1848).

Engels analyzed further sex, gender, and family in his book *The Origins of the Family, Private Property, and State*. Drawing on the work of the ethnographer Lewis Henry Morgan, Engels argued that there are significant historical changes in sexual and reproductive practices among primate and human groups. Here, Engels proposed a historical hypothesis linking the emergence of private property and slavery to the formation of paired couple families. Thereby he tried to give an account of the origins of women's oppression before capitalism. In his preface to *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Engels describes in general terms what should be understood by the "production and reproduction of everyday life" as follows: "The determining factor in history is, in the last resort, the production and reproduction of immediate life... On the one hand the production of the means of subsistence, of food, clothing and shelter and the tools required; therefore, on the other the production of human beings themselves, the propagation of the species. The social institutions under which men of a definite epoch and definite country live are conditioned by both kinds of production..." (Engels, 1884, p.6) Here, Engels labels the processes of production and reproduction as "production", as a starting point for the theory of gender relations. Even though Engels mentions the forms of domestic work, including feeding, housework, and

clothing, as 'production,' he describes the family not through labor relations but through kinship relations.

Engels mentions various forms of organization of gender relations and reproduction. However, his analysis in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* does not consider the history and causes of women's oppression as a distinct history of oppression. Engels places the oppression of women as class exploitation caused by private property and surplus value. His analysis is also based on now largely discredited anthropological evidence. And also, Engels mentions only the relationship between exploiting and exploited class without mentioning the men and women.

2.2 Feminist interventions

In *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*, Maria Mies analyses the historical trajectories of women's oppression. As a counter argument against Engels, Mies demonstrates that Engels mentions only the relationship between exploiting and exploited class without mentioning the relationship between men and women. However, according to Mies, when we look at the hidden foundation of civilized society, we see the relationship between men and women, the attitude of the colonial masters towards their colonies or of civilized man towards nature in general.⁵ The historical development of the division of labor in general, and of the sexual division of labor in particular, is not an evolutionary process based on the progressive development of technology and specialization, but an exploitative relationship established through a violent process first by certain groups of men between themselves and women, and then by certain peoples between themselves and other

⁵ Mies, M., *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*, 1986, p.76

peoples and classes.⁶ According to Mies, within such an essentially predatory patriarchal, mode of production, warfare and conquest are the most 'productive' modes of production and one does not acquire material wealth through regular subsistence work in one's own community, but through accumulation, conquest and and warfare. Moreover, in societies based on conquest and war, material wealth develops more rapidly. But here technology is not aimed at the subsistence needs of society, but at further accumulation, conquest, and war. Mies argues that the development of weapons and transportation technology was the driving force of technological innovation in all patriarchal societies, but especially in European society. From this point of view, Mies shows that the concept of 'progress' emerged in this patriarchal civilization and cannot be historically conceived without the technology of war and conquest. As such, subsistence needs - food, clothing, and shelter - seem to lag behind modern technologies of war and conquest.

Mies states that the predatory patriarchal division of labor is based on the structural separation and subordination of people from the very beginning: men are separated from the women they subordinate. While in ancient patriarchies this distinction was never complete, in modern 'western' patriarchy it is extended to the distinction between human beings and nature. And women, despite their exploitation and subordination, are extremely important to all patriarchal societies as mothers of sons. Mies calls these pre-modern patriarchal societies gynocentric and argues that no patriarchy can exist without the human mother and mother Earth. According to Mies, - Wallerstein states - with the rise of capitalism as a world system based on large-scale conquest and colonial plunder and the emergence of the world market, it became possible for the new patriarchs to externalize or de-territorialize those they

⁶ Mies, M., *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*, 1986, p.74

wanted to exploit.⁷ So, the colonies were thus no longer outside of civilized society and no longer part of the economy or society. To the extent that European conquerors and invaders 'penetrated' these 'virgin lands', these lands and their inhabitants were 'naturalized' and declared to be wild, untamed nature waiting to be exploited and tamed by male civilizers.⁸

Mies traces the “underground connections” that link the processes of male domination exploiting nature to the processes of women's subordination in Europe, and examines the ways in which these two processes are linked to the conquest and colonization of other lands and peoples. From this perspective, Mies links the persecution of European witches to the historical emergence of European science and technology. And Mies shows that both the persecution of witches and the rise of modern science are linked to the slave trade and the destruction of subsistence economies in the colonies.⁹

So, how the patriarchal nuclear family and housewifization process started? Mies demonstrates that dominant men took over the lands, natural resources and people of Africa, Asia, Central and South America for raw materials and new labor by destroying all the social relations created by the local population, while building the patriarchal nuclear family. After the gendered division of labor was established by the bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie declared the family private property, as opposed to the public sphere of economic and political activity, and the housewifization of

⁷ Mies, M., *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*, 1986, p.75

⁸ Mies, M., *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*, 1986, p.75

⁹ According to Mies, this cannot be a comprehensive history of this entire period, as desirable as that would be. She mainly highlights some important connections that are crucial for the construction of capitalist patriarchal relations of production. One of them is the connection between the persecution of witches in Europe and the rise of the new bourgeoisie and modern science and the subordination of nature. Here Mies notes that the following scholars have taken up this topic: Merchant, 1983; Heinsohn, Knieper, Steiger, 1979; Ehrenreich, English, 1979; Becker et al. 1977.

women was imposed on the working class by force, by police measures, by banning sex outside marriage, by banning abortion. In this way, the housewifization of women was forced upon the working class.¹⁰

Socialist feminists criticized Marx for naturalizing childbearing. These feminists aimed to provide a materialist analysis of women's subordination. They used Marxist concepts and combined a range of original formulations by considering Marxism and feminism. However, there was no consensus on feminist approaches regarding domestic labor. On the one hand, vulgar Marxist theorists continued to ignore domestic labor when they were assuming class exploitation, on the other hand, the discussions regarding domestic labor in the early period unfinished in feminist side.

Now, I will focus on the main debates in feminist interventions. I will then argue that neither Marx nor Engels provided a cohesive statement on socialist feminism because Social Reproduction Theory, firstly Lise Vogel shows that Marx and Engels overlooked the exploitation of unpaid domestic labor of women. Vogel discusses how women's labor, particularly their roles as caregivers and cleaners, has an important use value by contributing to the well-being and reproduction of the labor force, and argues that women's domestic work sustains families, trains future workers, and supports the overall functioning of society. However, according to Vogel, women's labor, despite its use value, is often excluded from the realm of exchange value under capitalism. Women's domestic labor is excluded from the economy.

Social reproduction approach is extremely helpful to analyze the historical fluidity of gender and racialized form of exploitation of capitalism because it's been

¹⁰ Mies, M., *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*, 1986, p.100-104

extremely good at mapping this historical fluidity of forms of exploitation.

Regarding this matter, in this period, In *Marxism and the Oppression of Women:*

Toward a Unitary Theory (1983), Lise Vogel defends that domestic work reproduces labor power daily and generationally. The important point here in my opinion is that Vogel show that the relation between production and reproduction is dialectical and includes both spatial as well as temporal dimensions which are ultimately a gender coding of production as men and production as women.

Vogel focuses more on domestic labor to show the reproduction of labor power and the contribution of domestic labor to capital accumulation to reveal the exploitation of women. She states that Marx's theory of reproduction does not encompass society as a whole because Marx's theory fails to explain the difference between use value and exchange value. Vogel defends that there is no difference between use value and exchange value in the capitalist mode of production by focusing on domestic labor. From this perspective, Vogel tries to explain the exploitation of women by emphasizing on the contribution of women's domestic labor which is reproducing labor power to capital accumulation. (She argues that on the one hand, women are producing labor power, on the other hand, they are providing social life, emotional needs of people, care for the elderly and children. Here, the roots of the oppression of women are not a natural and inevitable feature of human society but a product of historical and economic conditions. However, she does not take into account the historical materialist conditions of housewifization like Maria Mies. Some feminists defend that women's domestic labor produces surplus value in the capitalist mode of production. For instance, Mariarosa Dalla Costa argues that domestic workers are also creating surplus value. So, Costa proposes a solution for the undervalued housework which is non-waged, and she raises awareness about the

importance of housework and organizing housework collectively. (Hartmann, 1979, p.8). Regarding this matter, Hartmann says that

"Dalla Costa's emphasis on the centrality of women's reproductive labor as the foundation of capitalist production is an important contribution to Marxist feminist analysis, but it is overly deterministic and neglects the diversity of women's experiences. Dalla Costa's analysis treats women too much as a homogeneous group and does not address differences in race, class, and sexuality that shape women's identities and interests." (1979, p.8)

Hartmann's encompassing theory explains the material basis of race, class, and sexuality differences in terms of patriarchy and capitalism. Hartmann explains here the material basis of patriarchy as men's control over women's labor power: both by excluding women from higher paid work (thus ensuring their economic dependence on men) and by controlling women's sexuality through monogamous heterosexual marriage, domestic work, and the socialization of children by mothers who reproduce gender stereotypes (1979, p.15) It is precisely the analysis which is intersecting the feminist definition of oppression and Marxist definition of exploitation. There are two aspects of the social structure in which people and things are produced, she says: patriarchal feudalism and patriarchal capitalism. Therefore, she assumes that egalitarian hunter gatherer societies or socialist societies can remain patriarchal. (1979, p.17)

Hartmann claims that the Industrial Revolution drew women and children into the labor force and kept wages low for all. (1979, p.20) Forced participation to labor market and low wages negatively affected working class families. During this period, the women served two masters at once. According to Hartmann, the working man's home suffered when his wife must help him earn his daily income. That's why, she argues that men and capitalists have conflicting interests: low wage labor and housewives who serve them only at home. (1979, p.19) However, Hartmann's claim here is problematic because the two statements of Hartmann are not necessarily

contradictory. At the moment women are now facing double exploitation. That is, they could not get rid of this contradiction by reducing working hours to 8 hours. Instead of fighting for equal pay for women and men, male workers in trade unions tried to exclude women and children from wage labor, demanding, "family wages" and protective labor laws for women and children (1979, p.21). Thus, patriarchal social relations divided the working class, and women's right to work was sacrificed in favor of men. This is why Hartmann argues that women must become wage laborers for liberation.

According to Hartmann, the development of family wages secured the material basis of the patriarchy. In addition, by encouraging women to choose husbands as a career step, the gendered division of labor was based on women's economic dependence on their husbands or fathers and led to separate spheres for men and women. Hartmann argues that women's responsibilities at home also reinforced their inferior position in the labor market. (1979, p.22) There was a coalition between capitalists and men against women: capitalists were paid better wages, and it was in the interest of both capitalists and men to keep women at home during this period.

Contrary to Hartmann's thesis, women today continue to have household responsibilities, while women make massive entries into the labor market any they are double exploited. According to Hartmann, if women did not participate in the household labor process, would the value of labor power increase?

According to Christine Molyneux, in *Beyond the Domestic Labor Debate*, (1979), there are two important dimensions of the domestic debate: (i) the oppression or various forms of exploitation of women have a material basis, even if they are seen

as non-economic.¹¹ In this sense, the exploitation of women is also linked to the political economy of capitalist society. This approach demonstrates the economic contribution of domestic labor providing the labor needed for the reproduction of labor power. (ii) women's political position in feminist struggle, and feminist approaches have not considered the theoretical work on domestic labor, either through economic reductionism or a narrow focus on labor. According to Molyneux, Marxist approaches tend to be economic reductionist or broadening the definition of labor to include domestic labor, but the source of women's oppression cannot be limited to capitalism. The issue also extends to gender relations, masculine violence, and domination. Therefore, the scope of feminist struggle cannot be reduced to the struggle against capitalism but must also include the struggle against patriarchy.¹² As a non-Marxist approach of Christine Delphy, *Close To Home* (1999), discovered how huge quantity of goods change hands in hands through the family as gift or inheritance and she focuses on the patrimonial relationships in the transmission of family property to demystify market relations. From this point of view, she criticized caricatured version of Marxist theory for seeing women's oppression as secondary. Delphy claims that Marxists handle domestic labor as the reproduction of the proletariat and fail to consider the specific relations of women 'intrinsic to domestic (non-capitalist) production'. From this perspective, she argues that the only difference between unpaid domestic labor and working in a kindergarten or restaurant is that domestic labor is unpaid. In other words, the reason why women are exploited is not that domestic labor is less valuable than other reproductive activities, but that it is unpaid. Thus, women are exploited by their husbands.¹³ From this point

¹¹ Molyneux, M., *Beyond The Domestic Labor Debate*, 1979. p.3

¹² Molyneux, M., *Beyond The Domestic Labor Debate*, 1979. pp. 3-5

¹³ Delphy, in *Close to Home* (p.74) claims that patriarchal exploitation is the common, specific and main oppression of women. It is common because it affects all married women,

of view, Delphy argues that there are two modes of production in society: (i) industrial mode of production, (ii) patriarchal mode of production. As a result, she argues that women form a separate class as a patriarchal style.¹⁴ However, in *Beyond Domestic Work*, Molyneux explains why Delphy's approach is problematic because of two reasons:¹⁵ she demonstrates that women's entry into paid work did not significantly change their overall position for two reasons: First, after the entry of women to wage labor market, women's exploitation in household and wage labor market has doubled. Second, women's wages from paid work are likely to be controlled by their husbands and spent to pay for the kinds of services (e.g. childcare and laundry) that used to be performed by women themselves. Molyneux demonstrates that before entering paid work, the only difference was that women performed domestic labor for subsistence, whereas those who are now in paid work do so for free because they earn their livelihood in the paid sector. (3) What perpetuates this situation is the marriage contract. This marriage contract is the base of women's common class situation. Married women do not have right to 'control their own labor' because now they cannot sell their labor and they are not free. In this way, men exploit women's labor. Here, again, as I mentioned at the beginning it is important to remember how Maria Mies explains the history of housewifization and colonization.

Until now, I conclude that domestic labor contributes important discussions on two counts: (i) to identify the importance of the domestic labor process for capital accumulation (ii) to show how domestic labor mediates the oppression and

approximately 80 per cent of women. However, Delphy does not take different experiences in paid employment or unmarried women.

¹⁴ Delphy, C., *Close to Home*, p.20

¹⁵ Molyneux, M., *Beyond The Domestic Labor Debate*, 1979. P.6

exploitation of women. In the neoliberal period, as a result of the massive entry of women on the labor market itself, the historical trend would be marketization and a commercialization of reproductive domestic labor and we see the emergence of a transnational space, the real cause of the difference between the labor of women and men would be the big crisis. The most important point in my view is that not only the abstract class women are in but also the historical conditions would be important to analyze the real causes of the big crisis.

What is the relation between production and reproduction analytically and ontologically? What is the difference between the reproduction of capital and the reproduction of life and society? The answers to these questions can determine the scope and transformative potential of a social reproduction theory. The first social reproduction theory of Vogel explains domestic labor in accordance with the reproduction of labor power. As a result, she ignores other forms of subordination of women and family relations. Therefore, I will ask these questions: (i) how capitalism created housework and (ii) what is the actual and potential role of women within feminist struggle?

The ontological distinction between production and reproduction is as follows: the production of objects and the reproduction of people. However, where there is production, there is reproduction; where there is reproduction, there is production. These processes are relational and intertwined, and one is not the antecedent of the other. Here, the reason why feminists politicize the process of reproduction as a separate sphere of oppression is to change the conditions, to revolt. Political action aims to expose the systems that appear to be natural here, to change these social mechanisms. But once feminists have categorized the process of reproduction as separate from the process of production, for example by treating

domestic production as independent of capitalist production, they have tended to explain these relations in terms of some naturalized feminine oppression. But when patriarchal relations are explained in terms of an ideological continuation, this problem risks ceasing to be women's oppression and turning into feminine oppression. Therefore, the conflicting relations and contradictions between the systems of gender, race and class need to be analyzed for a materialist feminist strategy.

Marx's analysis of the reproduction of labor power in the production process points to the reproduction of the conditions of capital. This is at the same time the starting point for Social Reproduction Theory. Beyond the approaches to reproduction that reductionist approaches reduce to capital, Social Reproduction Theory aims to include the reproduction of human beings and society, but it analyzes the reproduction of human beings and society through the reproduction of the conditions of capital. Here, the problem of how to relate production and reproduction fundamentally and ontologically is the most difficult problem of the Social Reproduction Theory. But Social Reproduction Theory feminists, such as Gimenez, substitute Marx's theory for feminist theory and argue that Marx's methodology is indispensable for the following reasons: (i) to describe capitalist structural conditions and macro-level processes, as these form the basis of inequality between women and men in capitalist societies (ii) to limit political and legal change and end gender inequality.

Why is the domestic labor process women's duty? Why does the reproduction of labor power not take place entirely through commodity relations? While explaining the sources of women's oppression in the process of reproduction of the conditions of capital, an approach that recognizes gender relations in reproduction

relations reveals how the production of life is organized and how reproduction relations produce the means of life in the capitalist mode of production. Here, Ben Fine shows that in a capitalist society, labor power acquires the character of a commodity and exhibits different characteristics from other commodities while leaving the reproduction of labor power to the nature of the owner of labor power. Especially in the neoliberal policy environment, on the one hand, women's care burden in the household increases, while on the other, the reproduction of households becomes more difficult. Nowadays, where public expenditure is restricted and social services in the fields of health and education are reprivatized, the crisis in the field of reproduction is growing. Likewise, as home office work becomes more widespread, and ecological problems are not considered in the way that should be given the most importance, the burden of care increases and responsibility is left on the shoulders of women. Labor activities that produce life are the driving forces of society and the capitalist system. While Marx's theory does not encompass the reproduction of society, the theory of social reproduction based on Marx's methodology considers women's unpaid labor in the household and, more generally, labor activities in the process of social reproduction in institutions that reproduced capitalism.

In the next chapter, I will extend this discussion as follows: Bhattacharya will extend Vogel's positioning of family in social reproduction theory by arguing that social reproduction encompasses not only the unpaid labor performed within the nuclear family but also the broader social relations and institutions that reproduce and maintain capitalist social relations.

CHAPTER 3

SOCIAL REPRODUCTION THEORIES

In this chapter I will compare two kinds of social reproduction theories on the concrete example of women migrant domestic workers. On the one hand, Ben Fine develops his Marxist account of social reproduction by building on Marx's theory of value. On the other hand, Nancy Fraser and Tithi Bhattacharya defend an intersectionalist feminist theory of social reproduction and they explore the intimate connections between the economic and the noneconomic. Thereby, they reconceptualise capitalism as encompassing both production and reproduction in a nonhierarchical way. I will first present Marx's labor theory of value as a preparatory framework for general conceptual resources, and then, I will demonstrate why political economy does not take gender and political power into account. Afterward, I will explain how intersectional feminist theory includes boundary struggles by arguing that gender domination and the domination of nature can cooperate or merge against capitalism itself for the liberation of women, slaves and colonized peoples. Finally, I will show how social reproduction feminism centers the production and reproduction of labor power under capitalism to understand this power of labor is determined socially, individually, and in relation to the totality of capital. This would clarify the specific mechanisms by which free markets, privatization, deregulation, and individualism divide the proletariat in the neoliberal era.^{16 17}

¹⁶ Fine, B., *Marx's Capital*. London: Macmillan, 1984. See: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0308518X211049447?icid=int.sj-full-text.similar-articles.4>

3.1 Marxist account of social reproduction

Although the question of the value of care labor has been one of the main topics of debate at least since feminist discourse, Marx's conceptualization of the two faces of exploitation wages and labor power can help us to grasp why economic reproduction devalues domestic work such as elderly and child care, cooking, cleaning, etc..

According to Marx, on the one hand wage relations arise in the sphere of production, on the other hand labor power relations are part of the reproduction side of capitalism. Although wage workers are the source of the value contained in commodities, they must work more than the necessary labor time to reproduce themselves. That is, they perform surplus labor and produce surplus value, and then, the capitalists make profit.

The second mechanism, according to Marx, takes place in the sphere of economic circulation, where the exchange of equivalent values takes place, and wages are paid for labor power. That is, on the one hand, workers sell their commodities — their capacity to work — and receive wages in return, while on the other hand, these workers consume in historically defined ways of subsistence. So, production relations and social relations are historically determined by political and economic situations. Likewise, these workers' consumption is also historically determined. Marx's focus is here on the political and economic structures that organise relations of production, which then shape historical social relations.

More specifically, when migrant women workers receive payment for their care labor, they both produce a use value and also an exchange value, since capitalists increase their profits thanks to their care labor. For instance, workers can spend more time at work when they transfer their childcare and elder care responsibilities to their domestic workers, and therefore capitalists can increase their

profits thanks to their care labor. At first sight, this seems like a win win situation since both migrant domestic workers are paid more than they were in their home countries and also their hosts can satisfy their “care needs” in the cheapest way. However, in fact the distribution of benefits is asymmetrical and harms social justice. On the one hand, migrants who work in households or in other care institutions in the global North ensure benefits for these countries without having a residence permit, on the other hand their children or parents who are living in the global South without their mothers, wives or daughters need some care givers and they face the problems of care deficit. We should always keep in mind that these migrant women often do not have a residence permit and work illegally. We need to unravel the cunning of history because capitalist societies seem to provide migrant care workers with jobs and some social and financial opportunities, but in fact, back to the beginning, capitalism continues with precarity, informalization and dispossession, instead of progress.

Utilitarian and political economists claim that certain characteristics such as selfishness and greed are inherent in human behaviour. For instance, according to Ricardo, the existence of exchange, prices and commodities is natural and for him, the source of value is labor time. On the contrary, Marx explains this existence of exchange within not only the relations of production, but also its effects on the relations of human behaviour and social relations. Marx argues that all commodities are products of labor, and then, labor power is also a commodity in the capitalist mode of production. If labor power is also a commodity, labor power is also a product of labor. By following this Marxist methodology, I will focus on the value of migrant women care workers’ labor and firstly argue that these care workers have been accepted as natural for society since the beginning of history, but more

importantly, far from being a natural domestic process, with the division between production and reproduction emerging with capitalism, reproductive labor is separated and reduced to a separate private domestic sphere in which care work is hidden.

What distinguishes capitalism from previous periods? Not the exchange of the products of independent producers, but the buying and selling of the labor power of workers and their use in the production of commodities for profit. So, the most important distinguishing feature of capitalism is commodification of labor power. Marx defines "labor power" in two different ways:

(1) "The owner of money finds in the market such a special commodity: labor capacity [Arbeitsvermögen], in other words labor power [Arbeitskraft]. By labor power or labor capacity we mean the sum total of the mental and physical faculties existing in the physical form of a man, in his living personality, the faculties which he sets in motion when he produces the use value of anything." (Capital, Vol. 1).

(2): "Labor power, like all other commodities, is defined by the labor time necessary for the production of this particular article". It means the value of labor power is the sum of the use values that represent themselves in their labor time." (Marx, Capital, Vol.1)

The first definition asserts that the wage is the sum of the exchange values which are necessary for the reproduction of the labor power. The second definition defines the value of labor power as the sum of the use values. This double definition hints us why labor power is unique in Marx's notion of exploitation. In simplified terms, the capitalist buys the worker's mental and physical abilities in the market. Here, the price of the worker's labor power is the wage. And also, the capitalists determine how this labor power can be used to produce particular commodities. Labor power has a use value as a commodity, and this use value creates other use values. In the capitalist mode of production, use values are produced for selling. Therefore, they will in turn generate abstract labor time or value. In other words,

when labor power is spent as labor, it becomes a source of value. That's why labor power has a unique character and use value of the commodity.

If domestic workers do not produce exchange value for capitalists, are they not workers but slaves? Marx explains the reason why the worker differs from the slave through the causality between 'labor power and labor'. According to Marx, the worker is the owner and seller of his labor power and at the same time their labor power cannot be sold like other commodities in the market. And also, workers' contracts are also shorter than slaves. In many respects the worker is in fact like a slave. A slave has little or no control over the labor process or product but workers, unlike the slave, can refuse to sell their labor powers. Nevertheless, this is only partial freedom, because if a proletariat is unemployed, she may starve to death or become socially destitute. This is why workers in the capitalist mode of production are described as "wage slaves". Here, Marx puts forward a dualist definition of proletariat: 'workers produce surplus value for capitalists (exploitation), on the other hand, they produce to reproduce themselves. (worker's existence as 'virtual paupers').

According to Marx, the proletariat consists of both employed and the unemployed populations. However, in the proletarian condition, as a virtual pauper, the proletariat is stratified into different strategies of dealing with the problem of wage labor. This means that different parts of the proletariat populations live the proletarian condition differently.

Negri explains this notion of class as follows: political class composition is determined by how the objective conditions of exploitation are subjectively

appropriated by the class and how it is directed against these conditions.¹⁸

Nevertheless, Marx's political economy explanation of approach does not take gender and political power into account and is reductionist to explain the oppression and exploitation of migrant women care workers today because it cannot explain the background conditions of exploitation and the conditions of the possibility of production. At this point, I will demonstrate how intersectional theory explains the conflicts in the field of social reproduction.

3.2 Intersectional feminist social reproduction theory

Fraser begins to explain the background conditions of capitalist production relations by arguing that the tendency of capitalism to create social crises is a general tendency.¹⁹ Not only class struggles exist at the point of production, but there are also other boundary struggles over ecology, social reproduction, and political power. She argues that in addition to the class domination analysed by Marx, boundary struggles such as gender domination and the domination of nature can cooperate against capitalism for the liberation of women, slaves, and colonized peoples. In *The Contradictions of Capital and Care*, Fraser puts forward two theses about the conflicts of social reproduction. Firstly, the current tensions over care are not accidental but systematically rooted in capitalism. Secondly, the current crisis in the field of social reproduction is rooted not only in the current financialized form of capitalism, but in capitalism as a whole. Fraser thus argues that while the tendency of capitalism to create social crises is a general tendency, it is important to note that

¹⁸ Hansenref.Matteo Mandarini, "Translator's Introduction", In *Time for Revolution*, by Antonio Negri, p.36)

¹⁹ Fraser, N., *Behind Marx's Hidden Abode: For an Expanded Conception of Capitalism*, 2014, <https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii86/articles/nancy-fraser-behind-marx-s-hidden-abode>, May 22, 2023.

capitalist society does not exist in a universal sense. In other words, capitalism exists only in particular, historically specific forms or regimes of accumulation. In times of crisis various social actors struggle over the boundaries that separate economy from society, production from reproduction, and work from family. Sometimes they can even successfully redefine these boundaries. Fraser underlines that these border struggles are as important in capitalist societies as Marx's class struggles because these they lead to important historical transformations. From a perspective that foregrounds these changes, Fraser identifies three regimes of social reproduction economic production in the history of capitalism: (i) the nineteenth century regime of liberal competitive capitalism (ii) the state managed capitalism of the twentieth century (iii) globalized financialized capitalism.²⁰

The first one is the nineteenth century regime of liberal competitive capitalism. During this regime, which combines industrial exploitation in the European center with colonial expropriation in the periphery, monetized value circuits do not play a role in the reproduction of labor power. States also tend not to take responsibility. On the other hand, this regime creates a new bourgeois imaginary of domesticity. This regime, which sees social reproduction as the domain of women within the private family, has developed the ideal of "separate spheres" even while depriving most people of the conditions necessary to realize it.

The second regime is the state managed capitalism of the twentieth century. Based on large scale industrial production and domestic consumerism at the center, supported by ongoing colonial and postcolonial expropriation at the periphery, this regime internalized social reproduction through the provision of social welfare by the

²⁰ Fraser, N., The Contradictions of Capital and Care, *New Left Review*, <https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii100/articles/nancy-fraser-contradictions-of-capital-and-care>, May 12, 2023.

state and corporations. This regime replaced the Victorian model of separate spheres and promoted the ostensibly more modern ideal of the 'family wage' — although once again relatively few families were allowed to achieve it.

The third regime is the globalized financialized capitalism of the present era. This regime has shifted production to low-wage areas, incorporated women into the wage labor force and encouraged the state and corporations to withdraw from social welfare. It has placed the burden of care work on families and communities, while at the same time reducing their capacity to fulfill this work. Amidst growing inequality, the result is a bifurcated organization of social reproduction, commodified for those who can afford it and privatized for those who cannot, all of which is masked by the even more modern ideal of the "two earner family".

Fraser claims that the separation of family from that of economic production began after the industrial era. Then, this separation in the capitalist societies obscures the value of social reproduction by separating social reproduction from economic production. In capitalist societies, the separation of work from domestic labor devalues social reproductive activities with bonds of love and virtue generated two discrete spheres that complement each other by an obligatory relation. While women earn lower wages than men, their labor in domestic service is devalued at the same time. For Fraser, each regime of capitalism has had a unique normative order and institutional form for the conditions of social reproduction necessary for capitalist production, such as "separate spheres", "family wage" and "two earner family".²¹ In addition, the forms of the social contradiction of capitalist society varied and led to different crises in each regime. Moreover, the social struggle provoked by the

²¹ Fraser, N., *Crisis of Care? On the Social-Reproductive Contradictions of Contemporary Capitalism* Excerpt From: Tithi Bhattacharya. "Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentring Oppression, Apple Books, 2017.

contradiction of capitalism has also taken different forms, including class struggles and border struggles that intersect with other struggles for the liberation of women, slaves, and colonized peoples.²² While evaluating the crises in capitalism, Fraser focuses on the historical shifts which are realized with the struggles of social actors and changing social relations against the boundaries separating economy from society, work from family and production from reproduction. Finally, Fraser argues that capitalism's separate spheres solution that identifies production values with men and positions middle class women against 'fallen' sisters.

In *Social Reproduction Theory* (2017), Bhattacharya states that Social Reproduction Theory represents an effort to develop Marx's labor theory of value in a specific direction and tries to understand how categories of oppression (gender, race, ableism) are coproduced in simultaneity with the production of surplus value. For this purpose, SRT centers the production and reproduction of labor power under capitalism. According to Bhattacharya, the most important discussion here is that SRT is not an effort to understand the relationship between social relations through the market and extra market social relations. On the contrary, SRT does not accept the division between market and extra market. SRT tries to find a way to understand how the relations in production of surplus value produces the categories of oppression (such as gender, race, and ableism).

Therefore, within Marxist tradition, SRT tries to overcome the deterministic and reductionist interpretations of Marxism and emphasizes the totality of capitalism. According to Bhattacharya, some social theories describe the sphere of extramarket relations: "Moral economy, shadow economy, the social factory, and the unwaged

²² Fraser, N., The Contradictions of Capital and Care, *New Left Review*, <https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii100/articles/nancy-fraser-contradictions-of-capital-and-care>, May 12, 2023.

work sector are among some of the terms employed. SRT is unique in the sense that it theorizes the relationship between the market and extra market relations rather than simply gesturing toward their distinction.” (Bhattacharya, 2017, p.79) Bhattacharya criticizes Marx on the basis of the many defeats of the global working class and his misunderstanding of what the working class actually is. She argues that the theory of social reproduction extends this understanding of class by focusing on the framework of social reproduction. Bhattacharya says,

"I will argue that the key to developing a sufficiently dynamic understanding of the working class is the framework of social reproduction. In thinking about the working class, it is essential to recognize that workers have an existence beyond the workplace. The theoretical shift therefore lies in understanding the relationship between this existence and their productive life under the direct domination of the capitalist. The relationship between these spheres will help us to think about strategic orientations for the class struggle."

Based on this idea, Bhattacharya criticizes Marxist economics for excluding housewives from the capitalist market. Against the naturalization of social work by the capitalist system, SRT have focused on the relationship between the labor spent to produce commodities and the labor time spent for labor power as the systemic totality of capitalism. According to SRT as Bhattacharya argues, this framework aims to make visible the labor and work that is analytically obscured by classical economists and politically denied by policy makers.

I defend the Social Reproduction Theory by arguing that migrant women care workers are not only oppressed, but also exploited in capitalism by focusing on changing historical regimes in capitalism. In the property relations characteristic of capitalism, there are two sides: capitalists and the working class. Instead of these capitalist property relations, if workers owned the means of production or had the right to use the means of production independently under a wage contract, they would not have to sell their labor power. Moreover, if they did not have to sell their

labor power on the market, they would not be subject to exploitation by capitalists on the production and reproduction side of society. From this point of view, Marx argues that productive workers have the power to disrupt capitalism. Especially with the privatization of public spaces in the neoliberal era, the distinction between use value and exchange value is no longer functional and migrant care workers have the anticapitalist power to organize and fight against inequality, as I will discuss more in the last chapter. Sometimes it is not possible to fight for high wages. At such times different kinds of struggles of proletarians around the circle of social reproduction can break out. For example, struggles for clean water or the right to daycare centers, or struggles against the EU's immigration policies are also challenges to the power of capital as a whole. Like subsistence struggles for wages and benefits at the workplace, any social and political movement that tends to challenge the power of capital as a whole is part of the class struggle.^{23 24}

Bhattacharya criticizes approaches to capitalism that focus exclusively on the exploitation of labor in the workplace, such as those put forward by traditional Marxists. She argues that this narrow focus overlooks the importance of unpaid domestic labor, disproportionately performed by women, for the reproduction of capitalist systems. Bhattacharya emphasizes the importance of social reproduction in reproducing capitalism, but also draws attention to the gendered nature of this labor and the ways in which it is exploited. (Bhattacharya, 2017, p.28-104)

²³ Fraser, N., *Behind Marx's Hidden Abode: For an Expanded Conception of Capitalism*, 2014, <https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii86/articles/nancy-fraser-behind-marx-s-hidden-abode>, May 22, 2023.

²⁴ Bhattacharya, T., *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Gender, Remapping Class*, Pluto, 2017.

Bhattacharya thus defines exploitation as a complex phenomenon that goes beyond the traditional Marxist understanding of class struggle. Exploitation is not limited to the point of production, where the bourgeoisie extracts surplus value from the proletariat, but exists in a wider range of social relations, from workplaces to homes, schools, hospitals, and other institutions. By recognizing the multifaceted nature of exploitation and its relationship to oppression, Bhattacharya argues that we need to rethink our conceptual tools and develop a more nuanced understanding of power dynamics in society.

CHAPTER 4

GLOBAL CARE CHAINS

This chapter investigates the intricate relationship between global care chains and social reproduction theory, a theoretical framework that illuminates multiple, interconnected, and simultaneous exploitative systems. I aim to address two pivotal questions: (i) How do domestic workers fit into social reproduction paradigms? What are the main differences in domestic work between today and two centuries ago?

First, I will explore how these workers have been conceptualized by precarious labor theories and why Negrian precarious labor is sex blind. In contrast to Negri, I will defend Federici's thesis that builds upon to the struggles of radical feminists in the 1970s, such as Selma James and Mariarosa Dalla Costa, to demonstrate production relations as based on unpaid care labor. From this point of view, I will argue that precarious labor theory cannot adequately explain the exploitation of domestic workers by representing them as 'universal precariat plus emotions' and by classifying 'affective labor' as 'immaterial labor'. I will then demonstrate that the most significant difference in the situation of domestic workers in the last 200 years is that today's migrant workers are educated. In previous periods, services and education went hand in hand; people, mainly young, chose domestic work for education and money. In contrast, today's educated domestic workers migrate only to earn money.

Lastly, I will argue that social reproduction theory allows for a reconceptualization of the hidden dimension of daily life, including the relations

between men and women, sexuality, and homosexual relationships, as they pertain to capitalist exploitation and accumulation²⁵.

4.1 Affective labor or domestic exploitation?

Since the 1980s, new debates and concepts have emerged in the field of labor studies. Concomitant with the social reproduction theory was Negri's precarious labor theory. Two concepts that emerged in 2000s are emotional labor and affective labor. With these concepts, Hardt and Negri, in *Multitude*²⁶ argue that workers spend not only physical but also affective labor, especially in the service sector.

In *The Managed Heart* (1983)²⁷, Arlie Hochschild defines 'emotional labor' in these words: "The management of emotions to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display". So, Hochschild tries to reveal how capitalism exploits the human body and mentality emotionally especially in the service sector. Drawing conceptually on emotional labor, Hardt and Negri argue that capitalism produces and manipulates the emotions of workers in the service sector. Here, the feelings which are produced and manipulated by capitalism are defined as affective labor. For example, the smiling of a migrant domestic worker in addition to her kitchen and care work is affective labor because it is not her own emotion but her labor. Hardt argued that since the 1970s we have been moving towards an "informational economy" characterized "by the central role played by knowledge, information, communication, and affect" (Hardt, 1999, p. 91) Here, Hardt means that the

²⁵ Federici, S., *Precarious Labor and Reproductive Work* excerpt from Precarious labor: A feminist viewpoint lecture, 2006

²⁶ Hardt M, A, Negri, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, 2004

²⁷Hochschild, A. R., *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling* (1st ed.). University of California Press, 2012, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1pn9bk>, Apr 28, 2023.

distinction between manufacturing and services are blurring, and he assumes that immaterial work occupies a hegemonic position relative to other kinds of work. At that point, Silvia Federici argues that Negrian affective labor conceptualization ignores these feminist contributions by “suggesting that reproducing people is just a matter of producing emotions.”²⁸

According to Negri's precarious labor theory, capitalism sees precarious working conditions as a solution to its crisis by making work more flexible and increasing profits in order to suppress the working-class struggle and increase productivity. According to Hardt and Negri, capitalists have created precarious working conditions by fragmenting work in the workplace, making work more flexible and temporary, hence weakening unions. Hardt theorized the concept of affective labor as a subset of immaterial labor. Nevertheless, Hardt and Negri's theory of precarious labor presents a *Multitude* which, in Federici's words, is an illusion.

According to Federici, this Negrian theory defines domestic work as a personal service rather than work. In this respect, Federici argues that "Negrian theory of precarious labor ignores, bypasses, one of the most important contributions of feminist theory and struggle, which is the redefinition of work, and the recognition of women's unpaid reproductive labor as a critical source of capitalist accumulation.”²⁹ Negri's approach bypasses feminist analyses of the gendered division of labor, gender hierarchies, the ways in which capitalism uses wages to mobilize women's labor in the reproduction of the workforce, and furthermore by

²⁸ Federici, S., *Precarious Labor and Reproductive Work* excerpt from Precarious labor: A feminist viewpoint lecture, 2006

²⁹Federici, S., *Precarious Labor and Reproductive Work* excerpt from Precarious labor: A feminist viewpoint lecture, 2006

melting all these debates into the crucible of "affective labor" — makes it a subset of "immaterial labor".

Federici argues that feminists have tried to conceptualize domestic work as work, not personal service, because it produces and reproduces labor power. Moreover, Federici argues that feminists have uncovered a new and important ground of exploitation that Marx and Marxist theory completely ignored, defining domestic work as the producer and reproducer of labor power. Here, Federici argues that feminists have shown that unpaid domestic work is also work for capital. Although feminists in the 1970s focused on unpaid work, they demonstrated how domestic labor contributes to the accumulation of capital. According to Federici, capitalism is built on unpaid labor, not on contractual relations, and argues that the wage relationship conceals the unpaid, slave like nature of much of the work on which capital accumulation depends.

When I write that I use social reproduction theory to understand exploitation in *Global Care Chains*, I am already beginning to answer the first question of the chapter in a very particular way. This choice of words circumscribes both the theoretical and political focus. I interpret the social reproduction theory as a framework for exploitation that centers on the exploited. In a broad sense, social reproduction theory belongs to the same category as Marxism. The analysis of exploitation centers the perspective and needs of the exploited as a class formation (including class and boundary struggles). Feminism also can be considered as a form of class formation. When I consider social reproduction theory as a framework for understanding multiple, interconnected, mutually constitutive systems of exploitation, this also determines my focus on a particular strand of the search in which social reproduction theory is operationalized.

4.2 Experiences of women migrant domestic workers

What would you do if the only two alternatives were prostitution or domestic work? A significant proportion of educated migrant women in the European Union must choose between prostitution and domestic work, according to Anderson:

"Speak to any recently arrived, undocumented female migrant in European Union, and the likelihood is that she is working in domestic or sex work. Migrant organizations are clear that these are the principal opportunities open to newly arrived women, and when women are asked why domestic work? They answer that this is the only work available to them besides prostitution."³⁰

If we ask 'why,' we must look at the roots of this exploitation of women's labor in the history of prostitution, dispossession, and family relations. Moreover, even the answer to this question of 'why' lies in the social and economic links between maids, concubines, adopted daughters, and brides within the family, which opens a multidimensional and multilayer structure of exploitation.

The notion of a 'global care chain' was traced back to the number of international migrants worldwide in the 1990s, which analyzed the international labor market for care work, encompassing childcare, eldercare, and healthcare tasks. This discussion about the exploitation of the wage domestic work continues in the works of feminist sociologists Arlie Hochschild, Premila Nadasen, Helma Lutz, Yeates, Federici, and Fortunati.³¹ Given the significant increase in the number of migrants crossing international borders in the last three decades, research and policy analysis have deemed the movement of these workers a significant issue.

Women's migration to other countries for economic purposes does not transform paternal roles in their home countries and fathers do not automatically care

³⁰ Bridget Anderson, "Why Madam Has So Many Bathrobes: Demand for Migrant Workers in the EU"

³¹ Wojczewski, S., *African Female Physicians and Nurses in the Global Care Chain: Qualitative Explorations from Five Destination Countries*. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0129464. PMC 4466329. PMID 26068218, 2015.

for their children. Recent studies show that women who enter employment in rich countries generally hire the labor power of a migrant woman to perform "maternal duties" such as child and elderly care and cleaning and that the migrant woman also uses the labor of another woman in her own country for "maternal duties" in her own home. These women are mostly family members. Arlie Russell Hochschild called as global care chains. In *Global Care Chains*, Hochschild starts with *Vicky's story* from Rachel Parrenas' book *The Global Servants*:

Even now, my children are trying to convince me to go home. The children were not angry when I left because they were still very young when I left them. My husband could not get angry either because he knew that was the only way I could seriously help him raise our children so that they could be sent to school. I send them money every month.(130)

Then, Parrenas explains that "for Vicky and her family, living in this 'global care chain' is not easy" In Vicky's words:

Even though it's paid well, you are sinking in the amount of your work. Even while you are ironing the clothes, they can still call you to the kitchen to wash the plates. It was also very depressing. The only thing you can do is give all your love to the child [the two year old American child]. In my absence from my children, the most I could do with my situation is give all my love to that child. (130)

Here, there is a paradoxical thing, according to Hochschild, because Vicky got her job by telling her employer that she had experienced raising children.

"I found out about the job in a newspaper ad, and I called them, and they asked me to come in for an interview. I was accepted after that. They just asked me if I knew how to take care of a child, and I told them that I did because I had five children. However, come to think of it, I was not the one watching after them because I had a maid to do that." (131)

Hochschild writes that, like Vicky Diaz's story, "Global Care Chain " is "a series of personal links between people across the globe based on the paid or unpaid work of caring. Usually, women make up these chains, though some chains may be

made up of both women and men or, in rare cases, made up of just men. Such care chains may be local, national, or global. Global chains — like Vicky Diaz — usually start in a poor country and end in a rich one."

Yeates believes that we need more empirical data to demystify the chain formed here to answer two main questions: How can we address the risks, costs, and exploitation currently falling on migrants and developing countries? How can we regulate international trade in care migration in the interest of public health and welfare? (Yeates 2012, 144)

4.3 Households as a global market for women's labor: then and now

Helma Lutz, in *The New Maids* argue that Barbara Ehrenreich and Arlie Hochschild expressed women migrant domestic workers as "global woman", but this neologism "loses its luster when the underlying reality is described." Because of rising global demand for domestic workers, according to Ehrenreich and Hochschild, this state of affairs must be interpreted as the 'female flip side of globalization.' It has been touched upon in the previous chapter and bears repeating here that this phenomenon, which many characterize as something new, has historical antecedents; for example, the emigration of maidservants from Europe to North America and Australia in the late nineteenth century (Harzig 1997)."

From this point of view, Lutz questions whether the current situation differs from previous migration scenarios, and what factors have contributed to its emergence and persistence. Here, the intersectional method, according to Lutz, will help to analyse the trans nationalization of care.

In *Women, Work, and Family* (1978), Louise A. Tilly and Joan W Scott criticized the second wave feminists in 1970 for 'wage for domestic work' emphasis.

They argue that although these feminists claim wage for domestic work as a radical position against invisible domestic labor and women's role in the family, every form of value like wage, that we substitute for undervalued labor does not directly make that labor more valuable. Regarding domestic work, when we look at social and economic history, it is unavoidable to recognize that women faced double exploitation of women in the household and workplace. According to Tilly and Scott, what is being pitted against each other in these debates is family and work, modernity, and traditionalism. However, according to Tilly and Scott, there are fundamentally two political threads here: (i) feminist debates about the relationship between women and work, and (ii) social historians' debates about the relationship between social and economic change. At that point, Tilly and Scott questioned the effects of wage labor on women's roles in the family and the effects of changes through the industrial revolution, focusing on changes in women's roles in the household. They looked at France and England and realized that industrialization did not liberate women through wage work. Another consequence they revealed was that wage work did not improve women's social position. Although industrialization creates new possibilities, it does not automatically mean a "liberation" due to the gendered division of labor, and women's work has always been unpaid or low paid. According to Tilly and Scott, family relations have always been responsible for the asymmetry in the labor market and the arrangements that created this asymmetry. For this reason, they have focused on family relations.

Tilly and Scott's house depicts demonstrate the domestic economy during this period. In other words, describing the situation of houses' architectural structures was very helpful in understanding the social and economic life in England and France at that time. In short, the houses were the centers around which resources,

labor, and consumption surrounded. There were no separate spheres of work and home; needs for the reproduction of labor, material needs, and family relations constituted the family economy. In England and France at that time, the structure called home was a room that existed outside the workplace and private rooms resembling a parlor downstairs. There were looms, a kitchen, houses downstairs, and rooms upstairs. They fed themselves with their work, and family relations were not based on blood ties, and most importantly, on cooperation. They worked on looms, ate from the same plate at home, and slept upstairs. Many French family economies were typical peasant families. In the 18th century, rising taxes and rents impoverished many families and forced them to abandon their lands. The family life was organized around the property, no matter how small.

According to Tilly and Scott, consumption and production must always be balanced within these families. Since mothers, especially postpartum mothers, cannot work in remote areas, they would need servants. These servants worked for cash, and sometimes only for rooms and boards. In England, sixty per cent of children between the ages of 17 and 24 living in wealthy areas became servants. As the land was poor in northern European countries at this time, young people left their homes to look for work, and often worked as servants in other houses. In 1975, in England, landowners amalgamated their small farms to generate income and raised rents to the highest levels. As a result, those who lived independently on their farms gradually worked for cash in casual labor. During this period, the number of farming families decreased, whereas the number of wealthy families increased. At the same time, agricultural laborers started working in small enterprises and received salaries. They started to produce at home for wealthy business owners and received salaries when the family economy became a salaried family economy. The family is no longer

coproducing but a consuming structure. What is needed will be the salaries earned by family members rather than the family members themselves.³² (Scott, 2014)

In *Idealization of Domestic Services*, Rafaella Sarti argues that in the early modern period, some European people were forced to be servants or enslaved people. What has changed today? Sarti states that people are forced to serve as modern enslaved people, but with one difference: they can leave whenever they want. Here, Sarti gives the following example from today by making a striking comparison: the increasing number of "au pairs" who work in exchange for accommodation, food, and pocket money in many European countries. Nevertheless, "au pairs" can work only a certain number of hours per week, they are not covered by traditional social society, and they are often hidden and exploited domestic servants who primarily do housework and babysitting. At the same time, they must enter a foreign country to visit and study its language. (Anderson, 2000, p.24)

Sarti believes that the discussion between serving, and learning is the most important here. The first decades of the 20th century in Switzerland, says Sarti, were before the school system; domestic service was critical to transmitting knowledge and expertise, and the only way to learn a foreign language was through service. Here, she gives an example from Switzerland in the first decades of the 20th century as part of the tradition of educational exchanges after the 17th century. Young people stayed in the country's Swiss German speaking and French speaking areas to learn foreign languages. The only way to learn foreign languages was through service and domestic services were significant for transmitting knowledge during that period.

³² Scott, J. W., (2014) *Writing Women, Work, and Family: The Tilly-Scott Collaboration*, Social Science History.

With the development of the school, the picture was reversed, and domestic services lost their educational function. (Aries 1960,1980) And today, from the Philippines, Eastern Europe, etc., highly educated migrant people are employed as domestic workers, and their skills are wasted. This is a loss not only for sending countries, but also for European countries. (Sarti, p.202)

Is there a fundamental difference between today and the previous two centuries regarding maidservants? In the nineteenth century, manservants and a million women worked as maidservants in the German Empire. In the German Empire, the project of the bourgeois was to reinforce their cultural dominance; thus, they obligated maidservants to learn bourgeois lifestyles. At the same time, they assigned men to workplaces outside their homes. (Lutz, 2011) These maidservants who are obliged to learn and admire in their master's homes could barely realize these compulsions. However, this trend did not continue the current day. In contrast, women become more educated than their predecessors. According to Lutz, we can compare today with a century ago as follows.

- (i) Women were twenty four hour care givers; today, they work hourly or for certain parts of the day.
- (ii) Today 'unqualified' jobs are not undertaken by 'unqualified' employees, but by middle class women in their countries of origin.
- (iii) The average age of women domestic workers is higher now.
- (iv) These women had to leave their children and elderly parents in their homeland.
- (v) Migrant women live transnational lives to see their children or elderly parents.
- (vi) The difference between employers and employees is primarily due to the economic level of their country
- (vii) Professionalization left its place in the informal and illegal sectors. (Lutz, 2011)

In Germany, employers prefer the flexibility of domestic employees instead of legally offering person related services. This is how the woman participates in producing surplus value through her unpaid labor in the home. From this point of view, the explanation of 'housework as a surplus value' throws light on the distinction between exploitation and oppression prioritizing arguments and opens up new intersectional areas. In this way, we can recognize housework as a component of our domestic economy, which is related to three central regimes in our society:

(a) The gender regime: With the development of the school, the picture is reversed, and domestic service loses its educational function. (Aries 1960,1980). And today, from the Philippines, Eastern Europe, etc. highly educated migrant people are employed as domestic workers and their skills are simply wasted could not be successful. Therefore, other redistributive solutions are present. Eventually, the global market leads to the perpetuation of traditional gender responsibility. (Lutz, 2011)

(b) The World Bank's welfare regime states that remittances are better supporters of development and underscores the role of feminized migration in this context. (Lutz, 2011)

(c) Migration regime: German migrant restrictive policies that impede the recognition of migrant labor led to twilight zones in informal labor markets instead of preventing illegal immigration. Their inapplicable solution is penal law sanctions for the illegal employment of domestic helpers. However, 'criminalizing employers is unrealistic in a capitalist system. (Lutz, 2011)

Especially after the collapse of the Soviet Bloc, the transformation of the Welfare State, and the neoliberal period, with 'consent and coercion,' many women from Asian countries have gone to work abroad especially to provide better

educational opportunities for their children. For instance, Filipino migrant women who are teachers or nurses in the Philippines prefer to leave their children, husbands, and elderly parents in their country and migrate to work as nannies, maids, and care workers in Hong Kong, Italy, or Los Angeles. Even if this choice of Filipino migrant women is realized 'in the free labor markets of capitalism', the financial restrictions and the increased responsibilities of women in households are forcing women to make this choice. The most important results of these migration flows are the ageing of the population and the commodification of domestic services worldwide. As a result of the commodification of the care sector, the demand for migrant women also increased in rich countries in tandem. So, the globalization of care work is increasingly burdened on migrant women's shoulders from the Global South who migrate to richer countries to work as domestic workers, nurses, and care givers. These women are often paid low wages, work long hours, and face precarious working conditions.

The advocates of neoliberal economic reforms hold the position of the migrant domestic workers as being 'agents of change' to defend the transnationalization of consumption structures and lifestyles. On the other hand, the citizens living in developed countries that let in migrant workers complain of the situation because of the precariousness of migrant's life conditions and see them as 'victims'. In the face of this situation, some citizens emphasize human rights and stress that the rights of migrants are being violated without offering a radical solution. Here, Helma Lutz argues that although these positions may seem opposite, these two views are interrelated and intermingled, and both aspects are part of the same phenomenon. She emphasizes that instead of preventing illegal migration, German migration restrictionist policies create twilight zones of informal labor

markets by preventing the recognition of migrant labor. What governments offer as a solution here are penal law sanctions for the illegal employment of domestic helpers, which are not applicable, thus creating a twilight zone. However, it is politically and economically not possible to criminalize employers due to the law of capital accumulation and the decisive role of markets (Helma Lutz, 2011).

Especially in the 21st century, we witnessed a fundamental division between an increasingly global capitalist economy organized as a "world system" and a political world organized as an international system of territorial states. Starting from this division, to explain the current global crises, I will focus on the tension between Marxist and Feminist theories. The first one is related to Marx's conceptualization of three contradictions of capitalism, such as the ecological, social, and political correspondence to three "crisis tendencies". The second one is — Fraser submitted —not pertinent to the contradictions internal to capitalist society, but the contradictions between the economic system and its background conditions of possibility between economy and society, economy and nature, economy, and polity. In this way, we can categorize these two paradigms that place migrant women in the global care chain analysis discussion: Exploitation prioritizing paradigms and oppression prioritizing paradigms. First, exploitation prioritizing arguments try to find the essence of capitalism by looking beneath the sphere of exchange to the hidden abode of production. They focus on class issues and economics, i.e., they focus only on the class as a category putting surplus relations and wage labor at the forefront at the expense of other essential parameters of oppression such as gender and race. Second, according to Fraser, the division between commodity production and social reproduction in the neoliberal period is the reason for the gender inequality in terms of labor exploitation today because capital expands not via the

exchange of equivalents as the market perspective suggests, but precisely through its opposite: via the non-compensation of a portion of workers' labor time. (Fraser, 2014)

The paradigms that incorporate intersecting social divisions suggest that the contradictions in gender, class, age/generation, race, and ethnicity are determinant parameters when we analyze global care chains. Contrary to the exploitation prioritizing arguments that examine labor and care in the same framework, in some examples we can reveal an asymmetrical relationship between labor prioritizing and care prioritizing paradigms. For example, assume that a middle class woman doctor living in a developing country immigrates to a developed country and works a maid or a nurse. Her social status and welfare would increase because her salary will increase, even though her class position would decrease due to her job description. Is she more or less exploited when we compare her new job with her previous job?

Both continuities and changes in domestic/care work in the twenty first century demonstrate that the questions we need to ask are beyond the "exploitative relationship" between the global North and South to make a better analysis of shifts and reformations of care work.

As a result of the migrant women being expelled from the official economy to grey zones, paradigm shifts and reformations of care work occur in the 'male breadwinner model', which refers to an "ideal family" in which men earn a family wage and take care of their family. The fundamental reason for this paradigm shift is the flexibility of domestic employees. When women migrate to developed countries to work as care workers, the reasons of this change are as follows:

(i) (Double socialization): feminine work mentioned in the male breadwinner model is burdened by other female members of their family.

(ii) (The illusion of ideal women): the unspoken and unremunerated work of women in the household for 'labor of love' took the form of 'love as labor'.

(iii) (Wages for housework): Neoliberal capitalism has created new forms of inequality and exacerbates the burden of care work on women with family wage, as it often fails to recognize and value the unpaid care work performed predominantly by women.

(iv) (Twice exploitation): Women continue to work both at home and work

(v) (Nonmechanization of housework): Rationalization and technological mechanization did not reduce women's workload in the household. (Lutz, 2011)

Hence, the 'universalization' of labor market participation in the adult worker society is not sufficient to prevent women's oppression. This type of universalization of labor market participation can be regarded as a market that becomes 'individualized market subjects. This scenario is actualized in most EU countries, following the model of the Scandinavian countries. Furthermore, escaping from structured gender inequality with 'professionalization' in domestic work is also not adequate. Such a broad concept of 'care' obscures the difference between 'lay people' and professionals. Tracing the past, Hannah Arendt distinguishes 'productive' work from 'unproductive' work by emphasizing that household work is unproductive. Lutz argues that "the dialectical pairing of productivity and consumption has remained core to the analysis of the work society". In addition to the division between the private and household, there is also a distinction between 'lay people' and professionals which is especially pivotal to the discussion on domestic work. At that point, futurologists and planning commissions focus on "the need for a general development of care skills, even defining them as a basic requirement for the strengthening of civil society." (Beck, 2000) (Lutz, 2011). Although these

futurologists do not consider the relationship between care work and paid employment, the 'development of care skills' appears to be a necessary precondition for the disentanglement of personal services from their ongoing situation that posits a rigid gender dualism.

Regarding the redistribution of labor, we see that the female part of the arrangement remains in other female hands who are nonmembers of the family. 'The Seventh Report' in Socio Economic Panel 2005 states that "the private household is the sector of employment with the highest proportion of unprotected, illegal employment". (Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend, 2006) This is the result of the migrant women who are expelled from the official economy to grey zones. Put differently, in developed countries, the burden of care in families is left to migrant women, and thus, these families can step into the employer role. For a more detailed analysis, according to Lutz, we should look at migrant domestic work from – Turkey to Portugal, Greece, and Poland to Norway. This would be the visible face of the asymmetrical relationship between families living in developed countries and migrant women who need foreign aid.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

"The working class did not rise like the sun at an appointed time.

It was present at its own making."

E.P. Thompson

In the previous two chapters, I have tried to understand the relationship between the care and labor processes by studying domestic workers from the Marxist theory that treats care and labor together and from the point of the theory of Vogel's Social Reproduction Theory that highlights the asymmetrical relations between care and labor process. The two frameworks yielded two paradigms with a subtle but essential difference: the wage labor in the workplace as an exploitation and both paid and unpaid domestic labor as an exploitation. In the final part of the previous chapter, I tried to bring these two paradigms into a dialectical relationship by using Vogel's extended labor theory and demonstrate that women's unpaid domestic labor reproduces capitalism. The difference between the two theories can be characterized as one between a more historical materialist perspective, the exploitation of wage labor in the workplace and migrant care worker's exploitation. Then, I demonstrated that the labor of migrant care workers is not recognized as such and is systematically undervalued.

Contrary to the exploitation prioritizing arguments that seek to examine labor and care in the same framework, in some examples we have experienced, an asymmetrical relationship between labor prioritizing paradigms and care prioritizing paradigms. For example, a middle-class doctor woman who is living in a developing

country immigrates to a developed country as a maid then her social status and welfare increases because her salary will increase, even though her class position decreases due to her job description. The purpose of this thesis has been to bring these two perspectives, which are both crucial in understanding the exploitation of migrant domestic workers in the workplace and households, together to get a better understanding of the whole picture. If these two theories are the two sides of the same coin, I aim to grasp both sides simultaneously. At the end of the previous chapter, inspired by Federici's work on domestic work, I gestured towards a framework to further facilitate the theoretical work of bringing the two perspectives into a dialectical relationship by arguing that the wage relationship conceals the unpaid, slave like nature of much of the work on which capital accumulation depends. For this purpose, I will give concrete examples from women's struggles, especially by focusing on the struggles of migrant care workers in African, Latina and Caribbean housekeepers, nannies, and elderly caregivers in New York City, which led to the signing of the Bill of Rights due to their fight for fair labor standards.

The "care labor" of migrant domestic workers to feed, heal and clean the giant body called society and the invisible spaces in this sense are now in front of us with all their importance. The responsibility of caring for the sick, children and people with disabilities in developed societies has fallen on the shoulders of women in underdeveloped societies, and global care chains have become the phenomena of social reproduction.

According to the orthodox Marxist approach, the Social Reproduction Theory has bridged the boundaries between the reproduction process of labor and the labor process in favor of the former. For this reason, "social reproduction" has been

adopted instead of "reproduction of labor". Nevertheless, the sidelining of the labor process appears as a political choice. For example, the concept of "care labor", an approach that would be meaningful at different levels of abstraction ", extends" to areas where wage labor is essential, such as cleaning work, healthcare work, some of the food supply work, and sees these as parts of "social reproduction". However, the "labor process" in the Marxist sense includes all practices that fulfil or participate in the various functions of the mechanisms of surplus value distribution that produce commodities. In this respect, for example, the purchased "care labor" of a migrant domestic worker is part of the labor process, from the pharmaceutical industry to outsourcing.

In my view, the Marxist approach bypasses the crucial contributions of feminist theory and struggle and ignores the exploitation involved in women's paid and unpaid domestic work, which is critical for capitalist accumulation. Some Marxists argue that if the Commons perspective arbitrarily extends the reproduction process of labor, it becomes a vague field of subjects, a scale of "multiplicity" that cannot be unified and is politically undesirable to unify at first glance.

In this conclusion chapter, I will consider two concrete examples. Firstly I will compare two different ways of handling the global care crisis by focusing on the opposite policies adopted in capitalist Philippines and socialist Cuba. Secondly, I will explain the victories achieved by the domestic workers union in USA. Cuba and the Philippines are two island nations, with similar historical background conditions had very different relations with the capitalist world system and political economic developments regarding women's liberation. Retrospectively when we look at the last five decades of capitalism, we can see that billions of people have been expelled from the official economy into informal grey zones. Among them, Filipino

migrant women who are teachers or nurses in the Philippines prefer leaving their children, husbands, and elderly parents in their country and immigrating to work as nannies, maids, and care workers in Hong Kong, Italy, or Los Angeles to earn more money. On the other hand, although the US economic blockade starting in 1962 continues, the Cuban government has sent tens of thousands of doctors to other countries, mainly in Africa and Latin America, to help people affected by wars, disasters, and epidemics. During the coronavirus outbreak, the Cuban government sent hundreds of medical personnel to Italy. In this case Filipino migrant women and Cuba's medical internationalism offer two different paradigms in the global care chain and form the central axis in social and political philosophy debates.

As Wallerstein states, no nation functions completely independent of the capitalist world system; only some have achieved greater independence from the capitalist world system than others. Therefore, women's struggles for independence and decolonization must be 'anti-capitalist'. We can handle Cuba's primary health care system as the most significant solution for the social reproduction crises.

The domination of US economic and political interests over Cuba and the Philippines ended in Cuba after the 1959 revolution, although the Philippines remained dependent on the US. Since then, the market economy of social and health care provision in Cuba has been replaced by a primary health care approach, and people have achieved high level health status. Especially after the 1959 communist revolution, Cuba publicized all health services and its healthcare system. In short, three tiers of care are established in Cuba: consultors to provide primary care, polyclinics to provide specialized secondary care, and institutions to provide highly specialized tertiary care. The core of the Cuban health system is primary care services. Thereby, in Cuba, primary care is structured, and physicians can consider

the health needs of the whole community. Although Cuba lacks the medicines and equipment needed for high level tertiary health care due to international trade restrictions, Cuba has made significant progress thanks to a robust primary health care system. Today, Cuba has 6.7 physicians and 8.2 nurses per 1000 people, while the US has 2.8 physicians per 1000.

The Care Collective says that intersectionality theory reveals the oppression of care givers and although we accept Fraser's definition of the 'universal caregiver', we want to take this theory a little further because in our ideal world, care is at the center, and everyone is responsible for care. What does it mean for care to be at the center? It means developing social, institutional, and political tools that nurture and nourish the world instead of plundering it.³³

The word "care" in Old English means 'caru' or 'ċearu' means care, concern, anxiety, sorrow, grief, trouble. The etymological meaning of the word 'care' reflects the reality that caring fully for one's needs and vulnerabilities, and thus facing vulnerability, can be both challenging and consuming. On the one hand, caring satisfies us, but on the other hand, it can also be depressing and sometimes even seem the most repulsive and embarrassing. This is where the division of labour comes into play. Why is caring traditionally done by women, servants or others in inferior positions? Because by having these people, who are deemed suitable to do the care work, do the care work, the notion of inferiority is simultaneously reinforced.³⁴

³³ Federici, S., C., Barbagallo. Care work and the Commons, Vol 15, Edited by Camille Bar, 2012, https://www.academia.edu/4580791/Care_work_and_the_Commons__Vol_15_Edited_by_Camille_Barbagallo_and_Silvia_Federici, May 22, 2023

³⁴ Barbagallo, C., S., Federici, *Care work and the Commons*, The Commoner, Vol 15, pp.35-39, 2012.

We must recognize at the outset that we are all shaped by and through our interdependencies, albeit in unequal ways. Thus, in order to imagine a truly care oriented policy, we need to begin by recognising that our survival and flourishing depend on others in myriad ways, everywhere and at all times. In a care oriented politics we must recognise both this interdependence and the ambivalence and anxiety that it inevitably entails. It is only when we recognise our interdependence as well as our differences, and when we acknowledge that whatever our different needs as care givers and care receivers, these positions are often interdependent, that we can fully value the skills and resources necessary for the development of all our capabilities. Acknowledging both our care giving and care receiving needs not only enables us to recognise our common humanity, but also enables us to face our common fears rather than project them onto those we label as 'dependent'.³⁵

By now, we see that on one side, only class relations cannot discern the motivations and obligations of women who immigrate to the USA from a richer African country. On the other hand, when we only focus on motherly care, migrant women, and feminized meanings, we cannot discern that global care chains analysis reinforces care work as women's work. Apart from these two alternatives, there is a third alternative: We should focus on intersecting social divisions of gender, class, age/generation, 'race' and 'ethnicity'. For instance, a report pertinent to the racialized hierarchy of nurses has been published in Saudi Arabia. In this report, Filipina nurses tend to work as general nurses, while European nurses are more specialized and receive higher wages than Asian ones. Nevertheless, European nurses are less qualified than Asian ones. (Yeates, 2009a)

³⁵ Barbagallo, C., S., Federici, *Care work and the Commons*, The Commoner, Vol 15, pp.35-39, 2012

Even though the advocates of neoliberal economic reforms argue that there is common ground, and the interests of competing states are reconciled, global care chains research demonstrate that this common ground assumption needs to be more consistent regarding job descriptions of women. For instance, when nurses in developing countries migrate to developed countries as care workers to earn more money, the interests of developed countries would outweigh the women migrating from developing countries. Source countries unfairly load the double burden of training care workers for exporting and staffing local services in lower income countries. (Yeates, 2012) Now is the time for resistance!

For example, in NY State, domestic workers were excluded from many of the most basic protections afforded to other workers involving Title VII discrimination protection, Occupational Safety, Health protection and the National Labor Relations Act. Against this exclusion, a domestic workers' organization, namely Domestic Workers United (DWU) was founded in 2000 including Caribbean, Latino and African nannies, elderly caregivers, and housekeepers in New York. The aim of this organization was to build a movement addressing the causes of exploitation and injustice facing domestic workers. It is especially connected to working people, the poor, migrants, and peoples of the global south. The goals of this organization include educating the public about domestic work that is now generally considered unskilled, exposing gender inequality and racial inequality in LA. Nevertheless, DWU then recognized that this is not only the domestic workers' struggle but all workers, immigrants, migrants, poor people of the global South and all oppressed communities are parts of these struggles.

The objectives of this organization are:

- (i) “To break the isolation and to build the power of the estimated 200.000 domestic workers in the New York metropolitan area whose work literally keeps the city going
- (ii) To educate the public about the importance of domestic work, a work now generally devalued as “unskilled” and taken for granted
- (iii) To expose the racial and gender inequality in the labor market and,
- (iv) To fight for the recognition of domestic work as real and skilled work to obtain fair labor standards.” (Chatzidakis,2020).

On August 2010, the struggle ended in VICTORY! Governor signed the nation’s first Domestic Workers Bill of Rights into law! What are the New NYS Domestic Workers Bill of Rights? Now domestic workers in New York in four fundamental subsections: (a) it establishes 8 hours as a legal day’s work (b) one day of rest in each calendar week (c) protection against workplace discrimination based race, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, disability, marital status, and domestic violence victim status and also, protection against sexual harassment by employer. Additionally, it covers full time and part time domestic workers for temporary disability benefits. Surely these achievements is not a big victory yet, but it is still the beginning of an important struggle.

REFERENCES

- Andall, J. (2003). *Gender and Ethnicity in Contemporary Europe*.
- Barbagallo, C. S., & Federici, S. (2012). *Care work and the Commons*. *The Commoner*, 15, 35-39.
- Beauvoir, S. (1989). *The Second Sex*. Louis Braille Productions.
- Bebel, A. (1910). *Woman and Socialism*. *Socialist Literature Festival*. Retrieved from <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/47244/47244-h/47244-h.htm>
- Bhattacharya, T. (2017). *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Gender, Remapping Class*. Pluto.
- Bridget, A. (2002). *Why Madam Has So Many Bathrobes: Demand for Migrant Workers in the EU*.
- Bhattacharya, T. (2020). *Liberating Women from 'Political Economy'*. *Monthly Review*, 71. Retrieved from <https://monthlyreview.org/2020/01/01/liberating-women-from-political-economy>
- Cammack, P. (2020). *Marx on Social Reproduction*.
- Chatzidakis, A. J., Hakim, J., Littler, C., Rottenberg, L., & Segal, *Bakım Kolektifi*. (2020). *Bakım Manifestosu: Karşılıklı Bakım Politikaları*.
- Costa, M. D. S., & James, S. (1972). *The power of Women and the Subversion*. Retrieved from <https://libcom.org/library/power-women-subversion-community-della-costa-selma-james>
- Delphy, C. (1984). *Close to Home*.
- Gouges, O. (1791). *Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Citizen*. Retrieved from <https://revolution.chnm.org/d/293>
- Engels, F. (1844). *The Condition of the English Working Classes*. Retrieved from <https://marxistnkrumaistforum.wordpress.com/karl-marx-the-poverty-of-philosophy/friedrich-engels-the-condition-of-the-working-class-in-england-in-1844-2/>
- Engels, F. (1990). *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*.
- Federici, S. (2009). *Caliban and the Witch: Women, The Body and Primitive Accumulation*.
- Fine, B. (1984). *Marx's Capital*. London: Macmillan.

- Fraser, N. (2016). *The Contradictions of Capital and Care*. New Left Review. Retrieved from <https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii100/articles/nancy-fraser-contradictions-of-capital-and-care>
- Fraser, N. (2014). *Behind Marx's Hidden Abode: For an Expanded Conception of Capitalism*. New Left Review. Retrieved from <https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii86/articles/nancy-fraser-behind-marx-s-hidden-abode>
- Gill, S., & Bakker, I. (2004). *Power, Production and Social Reproduction*.
- Gimenez, M. (2018). *Marx, Women, and Capitalist Social Reproduction*.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2004). *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin.
- Hartmann, H. (1979). *The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union*. In L. Sargent (Ed.), *Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism* (pp. 1-41).
- Kofman, E. (2012). *Rethinking Care Through Social Reproduction: Articulating Circuits of Migration*.
- Lutz, H. (2011). *The New Maids*.
- Mackintosh, M. (1979). *The Welfare State and the Needs of the Dependent Family*.
- Marx, K. (2000). *Karl Marx: Selected writings* (D. McLellan, Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marx, K. (1867). *Capital*, Vol. 1. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/>
- Marx, K. (1848). *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/>
- Marx, K. (1975). *The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Criticism. Against Bruno Bauer and Company*. Retrieved from www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/holy-family/index.html
- Marx, K. (1996). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, volume 1*. Retrieved from www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-I.pdf
- Massey, D. (2013). *Space, Place and Gender*.
- Mill, J. S. (1869). *The Subjection of Women*.
- Mies, M. (1986). *Colonization and Housewifization, Patriarchy and Capital Accumulation on a World Scale*.

- Molyneux, M. (1979). *Beyond The Domestic Labor Debate*.
- Mitchell, J. (1966). *Women: The Longest Revolution*. In *Women, Class and the Feminist Imagination: A Socialist-Feminist Reader* (pp. 43-73).
- Mojab, S. (2021). *Marksizm ve Femizm*.
- Paletschek, S. B., & Pietrow-Ennker, B. (2004). *Women's Emancipation Movements in the Nineteenth Century: A European Perspective*.
- Nadasen, P. (2017). *Rethinking Care: Arlie Hochschild and Global Care Chain*.
- Pektaş, E. (2021). *Kadın Kurtuluş Hareketi*.
- Scott, J. W. (2014). *Writing Women, Work, and Family, The Tilly-Scott Collaboration*.
- Thompson, E. P. (1963). *The Making of the English Working Class*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Tristan, F. U. (1983). *The Workers Union*. Retrieved from <https://files.libcom.org/files/2023-02/Tristan,%20Flora%20-%20Workers'%20Union.pdf>
- Vogel, L. (2013). *Marxism and the Oppression of Women: Toward a Unitary Theory*.
- Walkowitz, J. R. (1999). *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Woman, Class and the State*.
- Wollstonecraft, M. (1792). *A vindication of the rights of woman: with strictures on political and moral subjects*. London: Printed for J. Johnson.
- Wojczewski, S. (2015). *African Female Physicians and Nurses in the Global Care Chain: Qualitative Explorations from Five Destination Countries*.
- Yeates, N. (2012). *Global care chains: a state-of-the-art review and future directions in care transnationalization research*.
- Zetkin, C. (1984). *Selected writings* (P. S. Foner, Ed.). New York.