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In the past four decades, radical subjects other than the 'working class have become visible in the global struggle against heteropatriarchal colonial capitalism. Seeking alternatives by gesturing towards social, cognitive, temporal, and environmental justice, these resistances are not only rejecting the present critical condition of the Planet and/or demanding the government to act with urgency: these grassroots collectives, movements, and community networks are experimenting with alternative practices and social relations created around issues of social reproduction of life, amidst a multifaceted planetary crisis of civilization. The GTA has aimed to weave these alternatives that are flourishing in many geographies of the world. The Global Tapestry of Alternatives' weavers -Crianza Mutua and Vikalp Sangam, have been dedicated to exploring, recognising, learning from, and mapping these alternatives. We are enthusiastic and hope to create different worlds on the Planet, with overwhelming evidence demonstrating that thousands are challenging 'development', 'growth', 'modernity' (Escobar) and all the concepts that sustain colonial rule heteropatriarchal capitalism. Today's struggles are 'epistemic struggles' demanding cognitive justice by challenging 'dominant ways of thinking and ordering of the real' (Icaza and Vázquez, 2013).

This draft paper aims to contribute to elaborate responses to some of the questions emerging from the recent VS-CM dialogue (Minutes, 11/2/22): 'What are the difficulties in connecting the vast diversities within these networks? Capitalism remains within and outside our networks; how can we truly remain autonomous? Even in alternative processes, when capitalist money comes in as a form of 'support', it always creates problems, bringing in constraints and impositions?'

The paper is organised into four parts.

• Part I: I present the capitalist system as a dynamic, violent system of indifference, homogenisation, and synchronisation (Marx/Tomba), which creates a specific form of social cohesion through money (Holloway, Trenkel).

• Part II: I advance the idea of 'the art of organising hope' as a complex articulation of different modes that intervene in the production of our 'alternatives', which can illuminate the process of weaving.

• Part III: I differentiate weaving from networking (both are used indistinctively in the GTA website and some documents), and attribute to the process of weaving the capacity to produce an alternative form of social cohesion to the capitalist one based on abstract labour/value) money. This weaving takes place within, against, despite and beyond Capital. Beyond signifies a different dimension, rather than elsewhere!

• Part IV: I present the notion of the multiversum (Ernst Bloch; also developed by Bloch's disciple Beat Dietscny and other Brazilian scholars) to bring not only a view of the world that accounts for difference and co-existence of difference (the co-existence of many worlds within the world, as pluriversal) but more importantly: it acknowledges and recognises that difference occurs in the non-synchronous juxtaposition of different temporalities emerging from various situations, oppressions, struggles and social relations.


² Will be published as an article at some point. Suggestions for publications also welcome.
The weaving of capitalism: Indifference, homogenisation, and synchronisation through money

Capitalism is a global system characterised by the exploitation and subordination of human activity and human and non-human life to the money form. This means that in capitalism, we need to work to live. But the process of subordination does not start in the 'market' selling our labour-power. To Marx, the worker belongs to Capital before entering the world of work. How? We are already compelled to work before becoming 'exploited': we are dispossessed of the entire means to (re)produce our own lives, which is why we go to work. Whether we work or not, we are subordinated to the money form. Money is not just the means of exchange but 'the supreme social power through which social reproduction is subordinated to the power of capital' (Clarke, 1988, p 1). Money represents the entirety of subordination. My perspective of capitalism differs from focusing on the production process, which is inadequate. The labour theory of value or embedded labour posits a direct relationship between value and expended labour-time 'embodied' in workers' products. (Dinerstein and Pitts 2021) This means that value is believed to be created by the labour time spent in the commodity.

Despite Marx abandoning this idea in *Capital*, many believe that we should focus on production. The perspective makes them hesitate when discussing the significance of social movements and community organising vis-a-vis the working class. Their view is that the subject of revolution is the working class (for they believe that exploitation only happens during the labour process). I/open Marxists advocate a more comprehensive (Marx's) view of capitalism that claims that the critical issue to understand capitalism is the subordination of the social reproduction of life to the value-form to the expansion, reproduction, and accumulation of Capital. Of course, we are exploited. But value is not realised in the factory. Money is the materialisation of this process and, at the same time, its most abstract power. This suggests capitalism's specificity pertains not to work alone but to the forms taken by its results: commodities, value, money.

Nonetheless, it remains the case that the world is a product of work (Dinerstein and Pitts 2021) and that there is a significant difference between the work of the spider and the bee, for example, and the work of the worker. David Harvey suggests that this is the capacity to imagine, plan and execute an idea that exists in her imagination only exists in the latter and by focusing on the task, she can transform her idea into a reality. It is only the human 'architect', David Harvey puts it, who can be an 'insurgent' who 'struggles to open spaces for new possibilities, for future forms of social life. (Harvey 2002, p. 20)

While humans produce in all societies, the specific feature of capitalism is the social relations that brace up the productive activity and the forms it subsequently takes. The question of form, argues Holloway, is a fundamental question. Work in capitalist society is specific. It has two forms: concrete and abstract, and both are connected. Work appears as unfreedom and shows the impossibility for people to control their lives as work is transformed into a measure of time directed to produce value and money. Whether we are at work or not, we all need money to survive. From this perspective, the 'working class is exploited, but the entire society is compromised and subordinated to Capital in the money form.

Those who continue defining capitalism as mainly an exploitative production system make another serious mistake: they think that the wage pays for the concrete, specific work that each worker has done when at work. Why is this mistake? Marx's revolutionary discovery was that the salary does not pay for the labour but for the labour-power. This means that we don't get paid for what we do concretely, but what is estimated will be needed to reproduce ourselves and our offspring. Our wage (with hierarchies, differences, etc.) does not pay for labour but for labour-power, our energy, life. Labour does not have a price because it is an activity. Labour-power has a price: we sell energy, skills, time. This idea took Adam Smith but mainly David Ricardo (political economists of
the time) out of their misery, for they had been erroneously trying to calculate the ‘price of labour’ in the same way as the price of the land. Only that the price of labour is the price of life! This is Marx’s most revolutionary discovery: the wage pays for the reproduction of the labourer and offspring because the labourer cannot sell labour but only labour-power. The wage pays for the energy spent rather than the time spent on the task.

Why is this important? Because no matter whether we love our jobs or not, or what we do for a living, what counts for Capital is not our ‘concrete’ labour, but what it is called ‘abstract’ labour. Abstract labour refers to a socially necessary labour time at a particular moment in technological development. It attains a non-empirical form of existence in the exchange of commodities, regardless of the form of expenditure of the concrete labour that created them (Dinerstein and Pitts, 2021, p. 9. This is to say, capitalism is a system based on the indifference ‘toward any specific kind of labour [which] presupposes a very developed totality of real kinds of labour, of which no single one is any longer predominant’ (Grundrisse, p. 103). While workers and individual capitalists have different preferences for workers, specialities, needs, Capital does not, and instead, it expands by transforming all specific forms of work into abstract labour (Cleaver, 2002). This means that the capitalist calculation indicates that 25 hours of abstract labour are required for a task. It is another matter if I am hating my job, earning well, working a 24-hour shift against the law, or making me sick. My experience, suffering, and substantial investment in the work are not recognised as social wealth. We get paid arbitrarily, not for what we do but for what is calculated we need to survive/live-well/there are variations, of course. The implication of this process is not just economic: it means that what is recognised by society in a system governed by abstract labour is not concrete labour or ‘doing’ (Holloway, 2010), i.e., the expenditure of human energy, but abstract labour – a social form abstracted from the concrete experience of work.

The key here is that abstract labour creates a capitalist ‘social synthesis’ (Holloway, 2010; Trenkel, 2014). In other words, abstract labour amounts to the ‘weaving of capitalism’, an ongoing process of abstracting from human activity the form through which capitalism weaves its web of social cohesion (Holloway, 2010, p. 157). The ‘weaving of capitalism’ through abstract labour is achieved through indifference and via a violent homogenisation process to make ‘abstract labour to constitute a totality’ (Holloway, 2010, p. 143) represented by the universal character of money. Abstract labour ‘encloses our minds’ (Holloway 2010) and dominates the world by shaping individual, collective and political lives involving society.

The expansion of indifference aims to homogenisation all concrete labour into one measure of time. Abstract labour is a calculation that does not consider me a single mother, a disabled child, indigenous person, high tech worker or an enslaved person in the twenty-first century. It homogenises. Homogenisation is a requirement for accumulation as calculating the number of hours required for work needs to be as accurate as possible. However, it is a bet to the future. Homogenisation does not allow difference, alterations, breaks, or interruptions. It expands until the end, in the hope to create value, expressed in money.

Complementary to indifference and homogenisation, there is a third element: the necessity to synchronise different activities at a planetary scale to produce and accumulate. I have googled "how to produce an iPhone", and I’ve found this graphic as an example:
The graphic shows the different geographical locations of production and hence of workers and livelihoods, but also different times, forms of exploitation, and temporalities in the experience of work. In capitalism, these differences require to be synchronised to create our iPhones. Being essential for the survival of capital, synchronisation means the combination of different temporalities (Tomba 2013a;2013b) so that slavery and free labour exist side by side and 'are always re-synchronised through the state's violence.' (Tomba, 2013a, p. 405). State violence is presented as 'regulation', 'policy' 'progress', 'investment' 'development', etc., and as slavery, terrible working conditions, humiliation, and hardship. The need to synchronise activities cannot permit delays and strikes (the first thing TNCs ask the government is the labour movement situation in the country before investing); above all, capital cannot accept diversity, pluriverses, or different temporalities.

Another essential feature of capitalism is governed by social forms that have emerged from human practice but have attained their own life (the law, the economy). Some of them have no empirical reality: abstract labour. Value does not really exist as such. All we can see is people working in factories. The process materialises in the money form. Capitalism sweeps away anything that interferes with the process of homogenisation and synchronisation, reinforced by the violent legal state, in the hope that the calculation will be realised at the end of the process. Nothing can get in the way, except that …it can! We should not naturalise it as a given…

The Art of Organising Hope: Understanding the struggle

I want now to characterise our search for alternatives with the art of organising hope (TAOH)(Dinerstein 2015) to problematise the process.

The idea of TAOH found inspiration from Latin American social movements and societies in movement. In my work, I established a strong connection between social activism and struggle around issues of social reproduction -land, water, food, work, care, education- and Ernst Bloch's Principle of Hope (1959.) Bloch lived and worked during two World Wars, through the Holocaust and Soviet politics, and suffered exile as a Jewish intellectual until returning to Eastern Europe. Today, his ideas can help us bring back hope as resistance and prefigurative force/ movement. Our context is marked by violent mediocrity, the advancement of neo-Fascism/neo-Nazism and the far right. And this is happening amidst a crisis of representative democracy, the dismantling of welfare systems, debt, and poverty, combined with the progressive authoritarianism of the nation-Stakes, and the poisonous mixture of homophobia, misogyny, xenophobia, racism, violence and loneliness in civil societies.

TAOH offers a characterisation of hope that is not fantasy or wish, but an emotion that gives us the energy to act, gather, learn, mobilise, organise, work politically. The redefinition of what is political is also a task for TAOH. Indeed, we do not know what we want precisely and how to get there yet. But for now, this gives us a sense of openness and possibility. Alternatives mobilising another reality, the reality of the not yet. The not-yet is an exciting term that designates something that has not become yet material, organised, articulate by people, but it is possible because it exists as a maturing possibility in the world. The power of TAOH is that it enables us to start thinking about how to occupy the reality of the not yet. In my book, I named what we are doing in a way that could be recognised, reflected upon, organised.

There are four ways in which autonomous organising is usually treated in the existing literature on autonomy: negation, (self)affirmation, contradiction/antagonism vis-a-vis the state or capital and
excess. But they are used separately. In my book, I put these four modes in the key of hope. Like a 'composer', I used 'hope' as the primary material, and all other concepts, notions and ideas were modified by the category of hope. In the key of hope, our varied and rich collective actions and resistances formed a complex process of the four intertwined and non-sequential modes of hope: the art of organising hope (TAOH). Hope is a force and category of praxis. With TAOH, we move from 'autonomy vs the state' to the prefigurative nature of the struggle for autonomy. Then we can overcome the fragmented understanding of autonomy and think about bridging the differences.

What are these four modes in which our struggles assert themselves?

* 'NO!' to domination, oppression, exploitation, or appropriation. NO! This is perhaps the moment of recognising the need to say no, mobilise, protest, occupy, cut the wire. We can say no because the real is the process, the world is open, the possibility is always present, unlike probability. We know that if we say No, we can do something different.
* YES! as in critical affirmation rather than positive acceptance. We have seen how people challenge dominant beliefs about human sociability and create concrete utopias. Rather than castles in the air or utopias in mind to implement in the future, concrete utopias keep the no alive and create alternatives via an everyday life praxis.
* WE DON'T KNOW is a third mode, which is always present because TAOH is not outside capitalism, patriarchy and coloniality but inside it. Since the latter are the guardians of capital, they also mediate and shape our struggles. Our concrete utopias are always at risk of being obliterated, integrated, distorted, or mistranslated by the state, the economy, the law. This happens because they are not outside capitalism and are fighting homogenisation and synchronisation of capital from within. Hope is not safe. Bloch talks about hope in danger created by the multiple internal and external contradictions in the process, individual, organisational, collective cultural and political. TAOH emerges from within capitalism and stands with, against, and beyond the state, the law, money, etc. The state is genetically designed to create order; managers endeavour to subordinate resistance to a historically specific form of order by either obliterating it by force or by translating our struggles into something else that befits the state order’s grammar via policy money legislation. In the process, the radical anticipatory and prefigurative elements of the alternative might get lost in translation, although some legislation passed emerging as a response to a method of mobilisation can create a better situation for people (e.g. the recent achievement of legal abortion in Argentina)
* WOW. Most analyses stop here at 'defeat'. GTA does not! We know it o well: binary thinking, i.e. victory or defeat, is the enemy on hope. Hope is rich, open, brave, cannot be seen in black and white. Beyond binary thinking, we can see that TAOH creates surplus possibilities. After translation, there is excess; after obliteration, there is resurgence; after oppression, there is innovation. The challenge is to grab and protect the excess, learn hope, navigate the contradictions, analyse problems and predicaments, and focus on the production of surplus possibilities. The latter are those experiences, relations, practices that cannot be integrated into capitalist, patriarchal or colonial rationalities, or at least not entirely, for they exist in the 'beyond zone' of movements' collective action. TAOH exists beyond the boundaries of what is politically acceptable and visible.
As I wrote in the GTA newsletter, as we navigate contradictions collectively, we engage with the NOT YET reality that exists materially in the world and produces a surplus possibility that we must cherish, nourish and expand by changing the ‘parameters of legibility’ of what is possible. The idea of ‘defeat’ prevents us from capturing this incredible dimension of the art of organising hope. We must find another way to process disappointment and identify the content of surplus possibilities (‘excess’).

Excess exists beyond the given in the ‘beyond zone’ where we can explore the not yet. Here, we stop worrying about what the state will do; we already know the answer to this, and shift focus onto the untranslatable possibilities that we are creating: the signs, ideas, experiences, horizons, practices and projects that are beyond the state reality, that exist in a ‘beyond zone’ of an alternative praxis and therefore cannot be recuperated and integrated by the state. This means that we will produce a different way of measuring ‘success considering how alternatives challenge the systems, ways of doing, classifying and naming, thinking, etc. As Icaza and Vazquez put it clearly, these struggles are ‘epistemic struggles’, so they ‘cannot be adequately understood through the rationality that underlies the processes they want to break’ and therefore, we must ‘read social struggles as open questions to the dominant ways of thinking and ordering the real below, from Dinerstein 2015)

Weaving an Alternative Form of Social Cohesion

The concept of networking has been used for decades to explain international solidarity and inter-connectedness in global struggles. The network connects dots on the map producing a graphic that looks like a spider net. We don't learn much about each dot in the network. The net-work is conceptually insufficient to contribute to the connection between territorial and concrete experiences. The GTA’s term 'weaving' designates an alternative form of contact and interaction between community and movement organisations. While networking connects individual points on a map, weaving interrelates practices, ideas, cultural/artistic action and knowledge into the production of fabrics, using 'interlacing threads' to enable an expression of each singularity and contribution to the tapestry' (See GTA website, see Minutes meeting 11/2/22). Remember some of the questions emerging from the recent VS-CM dialogue (Minutes, 11/2/22) that I brought at the start of this note: ‘What are the difficulties in connecting the vast diversities within these networks? Capitalism remains within and outside our networks; how can we truly remain autonomous? Even in alternative processes, when capitalist money comes in as a form of ‘support’, it always creates problems, bringing in constraints and impositions?’

Weaving is a process that follows the initial connection between dots on the map. Still, it is different from it. You have discussed this and explained that people share ideas at the gatherings, facilitating co-learning, creating non-racist, no patriarchal, non-sexist forms of relations, etc. (VS-CM meeting).

I want to contribute to the discussion with a conceptualisation of, and an interpretation of, the power of weaving.

- Our weaving is a concrete praxis that overlaps with the weaving of capitalism.
- Every area of ‘overlapping’ is a potential site of a struggle (weaving versus weaving)
- Weaving is TAOH and encompasses four different non-sequential moments:
  - getting together to say NO, protest and/or occupy
  - moments of the creation of alternative practices and sharing experiences; it has to AFFIRM and create our reality and truth, and make a solid net to protect itself from the weaving of capitalism but not close it to other weavers;
  - there are also moments of confusion and antagonisms (e.g. if money comes as support), and there can be a disappointment;
but weaving also creates EXCESS, SURPLUS POSSIBILITY because it works against what is wrong and embeds the alternative itself in the not yet reality that we can anticipate collectively and make it work.

**Non-synchronicity/non-contemporaneity and The Multiversum**

How do we do weave difference? Now, I want to bring Bloch’s concept of the ‘Multiversum’ to the picture to complete my argument. Why Bloch? Many reason (see my work elsewhere) but here I want to clarify that he was not a romantic, mystical, eschatological, or idealistic philosopher but a critic of orthodox Marxism and a philosopher of praxis who has a concept of collective) agency (Rehmann, 2020, p. 78). Still, above all, Bloch was a decolonial (Dietschy, 2017), intercultural (Hahn, 2007) and prefigurative (Dinerstein, 2015) philosopher.

The Multiversum enabled Bloch to create an ‘explanatory model of plural temporality’ to explain the formation of Nazism in Germany (Morfino, 2017, p. 137). I am using it here to explain differences and no synchronicity of time in the weaving process among participants within a weaver and among weavers. The Tapestry is a multiversum. Bloch writes: not everybody lives simultaneously even if they appear to do so. In *Heritage of our time*, Bloch analysed how different strata in Germany seems to share a present but not quite so. Today, not everybody lives simultaneously either, and this also means that not everybody is tuned with an imposed ‘modern’ time, linear progress and development, and escape homogeneity and synchronisation:

To explain non-contemporaneity, Bloch offered an alternative view of history which I believe is essential to understand the temporality of resistance and the GTA. Bloch writes:

‘Instead of the linearity, we need a broad, elastic, totally dynamic multiversum, a continuous and frequently linked counterpoint with historical voices. In this way, and to do justice to the gigantic extra-European material, it is no longer possible to work linearly, without sinuosity, in series (order), without a complex and new variety of time (...) Thus, we need a framework of a philosophy of the history of non-European cultures’ (Bloch, 1970a, p. 146-147 in Hahn 2007).

Italian Marxist Tomba deploys Bloch’s Multiversum to create an alternative historiographical paradigm enunciated by Bloch, to understand ‘the combination of a plurality of temporal strata in the violent synchronising dimension of modernity…[in the] ‘historical temporal Multiversum’, other historical times ‘interact within the contemporary of the present.’ (Tomba, 2013, p. 409-10)

This is tuned with late Marx. At the end of his life, Marx read Kovalevski’s discussion of land ownership, worked on his Ethnological Notebooks (1880-1881), and exchanged ideas with Russian populists. Under the influence of Chernyskevsky, Marx deconstructed ‘the idea of inescapable historicity and scientific inevitability tied to capitalism and industrial society.’ (Chakrabarti, 2016, p 71) Russian activist Vera Ivanovna Zasulich’s question about the Russian obshina (do we have to wait?) triggered Marx’s intense reflection on the Russian situation and the problem of the directionality of evolutionary change (see Hudis, 2018). In the 1882 Preface to the
Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels enquired about the obshina as a potential seed for revolutionary development in Russia:

'The Communist Manifesto had as its object the proclamation of the inevitable impending dissolution of modern bourgeois property. However, in Russia, we find...more than half of the peasants owned in common. Now the question is 'can the Russian obshchina, though greatly undermined, yet a form of the primaeval common ownership of land, pass directly to the higher form of communist common ownership?' (Marx and Engels, 56).

Marx realised that non-capitalist socio-economic forms were not residual to capitalist ones. They were contemporary forms of resistance with a specific temporality. They also contained the possibility of new forms of emancipation and liberation. Chakrabarti highlights: 'once we break away from the teleological theory of history, there is no need to be enslaved to capitalism in thinking about development paths. Rather, the path itself becomes open to thinking' (Chakrabarti, 2016, p. 71). The Multiversum opens the spectrum of radical revolutionary subjectivity, which cannot be limited to the working class. It also enables us to abandon the idea that emancipation can only spring from the direction in which capital takes us.

What does multiversum add to pluriversality? Pluriversality, the pluriversal, pluriverse, account for the impossibility of universality. Pluriversal -instead of universal, means that the world contains a variety of diverse forms of doing, being, knowing, becoming that either does not exist yet or have been obliterated, oppressed, and subsumed under one alleged universal form: modernity. The establishment of modern North-Western knowledge as universal took place in a long bloody process of domination and subjugation of alternative learning.

But I think (for the debate) that the notion of the Multiversum offers something additional: it enables to understand non-contemporaneity and non-synchronicity and facilitates the decolonisation of alternatives by freeing them from the subordination to universal, modern, colonial time, and at the same time maintains the connection among those different. In the 'politics of time' (Vazquez 2009), the Multiversum helps us to situate myriad of prefigurative struggles with their different temporalities in the real-abstract movement of capital.

The Multiversum corrects the shortcomings of pluriversality because it informs non-synchronous temporality. Not only does it account for a radical praxis that brings about diverse epistemic groundings and cosmologies (Kothari et al., 2019). It also explains how prefigurative politics can disrupt, fracture/fissure/crack and ventures beyond the process of capitalist indiffERENCE, homogenisation, and synchronisation towards an ever-expanding accumulation of capital. Like Bloch, Tomba explains history as a non-linear and non-synchronised Multiversum and capitalism as the 'juxtaposition of a plurality of historical times, where slavery is contiguous to high-tech production' (Tomba, 2013, p. 409-410) Prefigurative struggles are non-synchronous and juxtaposed, giving form to the Not-Yet realities against the objective reality of 'progress' (Bloch, 1970b), development, modernity, homogenisation, synchronisation. When multiple temporalities overlap, the prefigurative struggle becomes a multi-layered praxis. The TAOH weaving against the weaving of capitalism cannot connect this as it is a homogenising process. We can! Weaving moves beyond connection (network) to create an alternative form of social cohesion, the tapestry, that is not homogeneous and encompasses and connects multiple temporalities from within, again and beyond money. What provides the glue to find our feet in the multiversum? The defence of life in the age of destruction

The defence of life in the age of destruction: Zapatistas 2021

In June 2021, they 'invaded' Europe articulating one of the bravest and most intelligent political strategies ever seen. They aimed to revert the colonial process that started in 1492 with the Spanish conquest. The 'invasion' coincided with the 529th anniversary of the conquest, and the 211th anniversary of Mexico's independence from Spain proved that they were not conquered despite all the attempts to destroy them (Kolokotronis 2021). When the Zapatistas arrived in Vigo, renamed the continent Slumil K'ajxemk'op (Rebel Land), brought a message of solidarity with
those, who struggled and began listening and connecting. They also invited those who struggle to sign and adopt their 1st of January Declaration for Life (Zapatistas, 2021)

In the Declaration for Life, they highlight two interconnected elements of contemporary global resistance: a. the global quality of both humanity and the destructive system, and b. the value of defending diversity and difference to fight destruction:

’a certainty that the fight for humanity is global. Just as the ongoing destruction does not recognise borders, nationalities, flags, languages, cultures, races, the battle for humanity is everywhere, all the time [and] the conviction that many worlds live and fight within the world. And that any pretence of homogeneity and hegemony threatens the essence of the human being: freedom. The equality of humanity lies in the respect for difference. In its diversity resides its likeness' (Zapatistas, 2021)

But the EZLN/Zapatistas’ marvellous campaign for the defence of life has been inspired by the compañeras Zapatistas’ struggle against violence. In March 2018, the compañeras convened the 'First International Gathering of Women who Struggle' (Gies, 2018), which brought together 7,000 women of all ages, races, and beliefs from all over the planet to ‘meet, talk, and listen as women’. Zapatista women are feminists in a way, but they distance themselves from the usual ideological, strategic, and political divisions of Western feminism. To them, feminism is practical and comes from women's experiences. At this international gathering, women focused on the defence of life against the hetero-patriarchal obliteration of women: ‘We agree to live, and for us to live is to struggle...so we agree to each struggle in our own way, place, and time.' They discussed the necessity of fighting against capitalism as well as against patriarchal violence because the latter not only permits the abuse of women but even leads to murder and blame for their own deaths. In the Invitation to the Second International Encounter of Women who Struggle December 2019) they propose to focus on violence against women only. The 'Letter to Women in Struggle Around the World' (EZLN, 2019b) highlighted that the possibility of life on the planet depended on the absolute eradication of this violence (Dinerstein 2021).
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