



ALTERNAUTAS

(Re)Searching Development: The Abya Yala Chapter
Vol.12 - Issue 2 [December 2025]

Critical reflections on the super-exploitation of labour power, reproductive labour and the theory of value

Mariano Féliz  ^α

^α *Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina*

Accepted: 18 July 2025 / Published online: 31st December 2025

Alternautas is a peer reviewed academic journal that publishes content related to Latin American Critical Development Thinking.

It intends to serve as a platform for testing, circulating, and debating new ideas and reflections on these topics, expanding beyond the geographical, cultural and linguistic boundaries of Latin America - Abya Yala. We hope to contribute to connecting ideas, and to provide a space for intellectual exchange and discussion for a nascent academic community of scholars, devoted to counter-balancing mainstream understandings of development.

How to cite:

Féliz, M. (2025), Critical reflections on the super-exploitation of labour power, reproductive labour and the theory of value. *Alternautas*, 12(2), 125-144. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31273/dtss2405>

University of Warwick Press
<http://www.alternautas.net>



ISSN - 2057-4924

Mariano Féliz¹

Critical Reflections on The Super-Exploitation of Labour Power, Reproductive Labour And The Theory Of Value

Abstract. Marxist dependency theory puts the category of super-exploitation of labour power as the “essence of dependency”. However, this category is presented in most debates as fundamentally linked to so-called productive labour, carried out by a working class that appears to be male and white. The work of reproduction and care, essential in the (re)production of the labour force, carried out essentially by women and feminised and racialised bodies, is hidden in the analysis. In this article we propose to develop a critical reflection on this relevant category, recovering the debates coming from the field of feminism and in particular from Marxist feminism. We seek to explore this debate in the light of key discussions in the theory of value that allow us to fruitfully articulate productive labour with the so-called reproductive and care work.

Keywords: superexploitation, dependency, Marini, labour, social reproduction

Resumen. La teoría marxista de la dependencia sitúa la categoría de la superexplotación de la fuerza de trabajo como la “esencia de la dependencia”. Sin embargo, esta categoría se presenta en la mayoría de los debates como

¹ Mariano Féliz, Adjoint Professor in the Department of Sociology of the FaHCE in the Universidad Nacional de La Plata (UNLP) and Principal Researcher of CONICET in the IdIHCS/CONICET-UNLP in Argentina. Fellow of IRGAC (International Research Group on Authoritarianism and Counter-Strategies) in Germany. Email: marianfeliz@gmail.com. ORCID: 0000-0002-3000-3873

fundamentalmente vinculada al llamado trabajo productivo, realizado por una clase trabajadora que aparece como masculina y blanca. El trabajo de reproducción y de cuidados, esencial en la (re)producción de la fuerza de trabajo y llevado a cabo principalmente por mujeres y cuerpos feminizados y racializados, queda oculto en el análisis. En este artículo proponemos desarrollar una reflexión crítica sobre esta categoría relevante, recuperando los debates provenientes del campo del feminismo y, en particular, del feminismo marxista. Buscamos explorar este debate a la luz de discusiones clave en la teoría del valor que nos permitan articular de manera fructífera el trabajo productivo con el llamado trabajo reproductivo y de cuidados.

Palabras clave: superexplotación, dependencia, Marini, trabajo, reproducción social

Introduction

Ruy Mauro Marini's work produced several significant contributions to understanding the dynamic nature of dependency (Marini, 2015). In particular, he placed the super-exploitation of the labour force at the centre of the production and reproduction of capital in these territories. This extended and intensified exploitation of the labour force is the key to understanding the limitations of capitalist development in the dependency, its impact on the reproduction of life in these territories and the urgent need to overcome it (Osorio, 2013).

That said, it is true that the theoretical project initiated by Marini has been truncated to the extent that the debate around the centrality of labour super-exploitation has not incorporated in a systematic and integrated way contemporary reflections on the nature of value (Féliz, 2023; Féliz and Haro, 2019), women's work within the labour force (Costantino, 2023), and the role of reproductive and care work (Antunes de Oliveira, 2021) in the organisation of and struggle against exploitation. Costantino and Antunes de Oliveira stress the role of women, or their invisibilization, in the development of Marxian dependency theory; both recover, particularly the works of Vania Bambirra, in this endeavour. However, in our opinion, they do not attempt to articulate the analytic connection between super-exploitation in dependency settings and the valorisation of capital through the exploitation of women and feminised bodies. Furthermore, the discussions contributed by feminist Marxism in its different strands (Arruzza and Bhattacharya, 2020; Dalla Costa, 2009; Federici, 2013; Ferguson, 2020; Mezzadri, 2019; Varela,

2020; Vogel, 2013) and the register of the traditions of open and autonomist Marxism around value (Caffentzis, 2013; Clarke, 1991b; Cleaver, 2000; De Angelis, 1995) were generally left out of dependency reflections. With a frozen concept of value that does not include these proposals, the super-exploitation of labour power as a theoretical category loses some of its most significant analytical, theoretical and political insights.

In this article, we will seek to recover these debates and integrate them into the discussion on the nature of dependent capitalism by complexifying the very category of super-exploitation of labour power. We provide a discussion to explore the connections between the super-exploitation of labour in dependent territories and the specific nature of the super-exploitation of women and feminised bodies. First, we will present the core elements of the link between super-exploitation of labour and dependency. Then we analyse how precarisation of labour is a prerequisite for the super-exploitation of labour. Afterwards, we connect super-exploitation of labour to the constitution of value, trying to extend it beyond the factory. Finally, we present the logical links between the super-exploitation of labour and reproductive and care labour.

Super-exploitation of the labour force: the essence of dependency

One of Marini's main contributions to the characterisation of dependent capitalism was grasping that at the heart of its reproduction was the relation of super-exploitation of labour power. The conditions of super-exploitation of the labour force became the foundation for the reproduction of dependent capital (Marini, 2015, p. 163), constituting a law of motion proper to dependent capitalism (Bambirra, 1978). This pattern is associated with the persistence of conditions of reproduction of the labour force that do not guarantee the payment of its value (Dias Carcanholo, 2013, p. 101).

Super-exploitation is at the core of dependency, resulting from unequal exchange (i.e., loss of value) in territories in the global peripheries (Féliz, 2021). Operating as a "compensation mechanism" for this loss of value, super-exploitation allows capital to reproduce in conditions far removed from state-of-the-art capitalist

valorisation. The strategies based on the extensive accumulation of living labour in the dependent economy (i.e., with low levels of organic composition of capital, thus lower ratios of machines to labour), aim to achieve through the "absolute" exploitation of labour (i.e., increasing the work day or labour's intensity) what they cannot achieve through its "relative" exploitation (i.e., increasing labour's productivity). That said, super-exploitation is not simply a form of absolute surplus-value (Marini, 2015, p. 17). The local capitals that are furthest removed from the global production conditions can only remain competitive in a dependent setting to the extent that they manage to transform part of the workers' consumption fund (i.e., variable capital) into additional surplus-value (Marini, 2015).

The prevalence of super-exploitation "denies [the worker] the conditions necessary to replenish the wear and tear on his or her labour power" (Marini, 2015, p. 12; our brackets) and therefore refers to its value relative to the reproduction of labour-power and not to the absolute value of those conditions of reproduction. Thus, the super-exploitation of the labour force is not synonymous with low wages (Cueva, 1974; Katz, 2017; Osorio Urbina, 2017, 2018; Sotelo Valencia, 2017). On the contrary, it refers to the conditions of value production and not just the reproduction of living conditions (Bambirra, 1978). Wages may rise during a specific period, but if the value of labour-power rises simultaneously, super-exploitation may persist.

The essential nature of super-exploitation of labour in dependency leads us to understand that it operates as the centre of gravity of the reproduction of capital in these territories. This means that although we could find "empirical" forms of super-exploitation in core, imperialist countries, this will not happen in the magnitude that appears in dependent contexts, and will not have the same role in the production and reproduction of capital. While in core countries, super-exploitation can appear as a marginal, although important phenomenon, in "dependent" countries, this process has a key role in the reproduction of capital and backwardness.

Precarisation of the labour force as a condition for super-exploitation

The process of super-exploitation is only feasible to the extent that capital succeeds in deteriorating the conditions of use and reproduction of labour-power as a whole in the territory in which it operates. Thus, labour super-exploitation results from

political, social and economic practices that create conditions for the persistent, generalised and extended precarisation of the labour force. In the case of dependent territories, where this phenomenon is fundamental to their capitalist reproduction, this dynamic requires the production of conditions of extended precariousness of life and labour relations. In other words, it involves the formation of a relative overpopulation (Marini, 1978, p. 63).

Firstly, the generalisation of forms of unemployment or under-occupation of the labour force conditions the possibilities for it to be paid around its value (Marini, 2015). To the extent that capital in dependent territories finds it difficult to expand in globally determined, average conditions, the mass of the relative surplus population (unemployed, underemployed, latent) tends to increase, putting downward pressure on wages, leading a larger portion of the working population to be paid below their value. At the same time, in the face of capital's difficulties in guaranteeing its expanded reproduction, the capitalist State maintains labour force management policies that favour super-exploitation, through flexible hiring and firing rules, or limited labour rights and regulations (Féliz, 2017; Selwyn, 2019).

Second, widespread precarious labour conditions make the political organisation of the working class more difficult and encourage fragmentation (Selwyn, 2019). In such a context, the trade union struggle will face worse conditions for securing remuneration closer to the value of labour or increasing this value (Lebowitz, 2005). Organisational fragmentation will foster greater dispersion in pay and working conditions, widening the range of super-exploited workers.

On the other hand, in some sectors of the economy, big capital, in many cases transnational corporations, generate a greater fragmentation of the labour collective through outsourcing or decentralisation in production (Starosta, 2010). Indeed, outsourcing practices allow companies to optimise the processes of value production while expanding the rate of exploitation of fractions of the working class (Selwyn, 2019). While keeping the core of organised workers relatively protected, the outsourced fractions of labourers face conditions of greater precariousness and greater prevalence of super-exploitation. Capitals operating closely to dominant capitals can survive by maintaining prices below prices of production, reproducing the labour force they employ under conditions of super-exploitation (Starosta, 2010). In turn,

other small capitals - such as small businesses or family enterprises - reproduce themselves in the peripheries of each of these branches and markets without being able to expand.

Maria Mies, in her classical work, presents a similar conclusion, although she has a different definition for super-exploitation. For her, super-exploitation “is not based on the appropriation (by the capitalist) of the time and labour over and above the ‘necessary’ labour time, the surplus labour, but of the time and labour necessary for people’s own survival or subsistence production.” (Mies, 1998, p. 48). Thus, the expenditure of labour “is not compensated for by a wage, the size of which is calculated on the ‘necessary’ reproduction costs of the labourer, but is mainly determined by force or coercive institutions. This is the main reason for the growing poverty and starvation of Third World producers. In their case, the principle of an exchange of equivalents underlying the wage negotiations of workers in the West is not applied” (Mies, 1998, p. 48).

Super-exploitation, value and labour beyond “the factory”

In dependent economies, the conditions of generalisation of the super-exploitation of labour-power are the conditions of the generalisation of the law of value on an international scale. The very category of super-exploitation presupposes the prevalence of global production prices for most commodities (Amin, 1971). Production prices are a form of value and, therefore, are linked to value formation by the socially necessary labour time imposed on social reproduction. As capitalist relations of production prevail on a world scale, the law of value operates through the uneven development of the productive forces (Amin, 1975). The existence of different social formations in different value spaces (i.e., territories where value appears as distinct currencies and is produced in conditions of production that are diverse) does not imply the denial of the predominance of the tendencies towards the constitution of global prices of production of the primary commodities produced (Astarita, 2010; Harvey, 2006).

For its part, the unequal exchange that results from the formation of production prices and the "reduction" of a diverse mix of concrete labour to socially abstract labour, leads to the unequal remuneration of labour in different territories (Amin, 1971). While in the central territories - in the imperialist powers - this

imposition privileges 'objectified' forms - such as machinery, or technologies - linked to processes of exploitation centred on the production of relative surplus value, in the dependent territories capital privileges more archaic (but capitalistic as well) forms of social control that refer to the prevalence of absolute forms of surplus value as one of the modalities of super-exploitation (i.e., long hours, greater labour intensity, modern forms of slavery, etc.) (Féliz, 2021). At all times, to overcome the barriers they face in the global market, local capital in those settings seeks to create conditions for the reproduction of labour power that maintains its value at levels compatible with its valorisation on an average scale (Dias Carcanholo, 2013, pp. 108–110).

It is worth noting that value is not a thing, but a relation that allows for the imposition of social control through abstract labour (Clever, 2000). Value is created through the imposition of socially necessary (abstract) labour (i.e., imposition of the commodity-form). The measure of capital's enforcement of labour is value, and the index of its control is surplus value (Clever, 2000, p. 91). Thus, we can understand that capital's inability to valorise itself in the periphery does not simply entail the actual loss of value in competition, as the problem of unequal exchange is often thought of (Féliz, 2021; Reyes, 2020). In reality, on the whole, capital in dependent territories lacks the appropriate technical-political conditions to control the available social labour as effectively as capitals in the core countries do. Thus, it faces difficulties positing abstract labour as value in commodities (Arthur, 2013; Bonefeld, 2010; Féliz, 2023). In the competition between capitals on a global scale, value, whose content is the socially necessary time invested in the production of commodities on a worldwide scale, appears to be unequally produced/appropriated and expressed in the form of differential rates of exploitation of labour. Super-exploitation occurs whenever the appropriation of surplus value of one capital by another cannot be compensated in advance by expanding that surplus value through the endogenous generation of technology by the expropriated capital (Martins, 2011, p. 287).

In core territories, the labour force is effectively controlled through abstract social mechanisms imposed by huge masses of fixed capital and associated technology, and by high levels of commodification of everyday life. Capital in core countries operates under conditions of greater development of productive forces, not just labour productivity, due to the historical accumulation of absolute advantages:

scale, technology, workers' qualifications, etc (Silva Amaral and Dias Carcanholo, 2009, pp. 218–219).

On the contrary, in the dependent countries, the forms of reproduction of the social life of the working and popular classes are still largely outside the abstract control of capitalist technologies and the forms of reproduction imposed by the commodification of life. The failure of capital to impose direct abstract control over the processes of production and labour on a societal scale in dependent societies leads capital to engineer strategies of exploitation and value production based on forms of absolute surplus value, especially those linked to the super-exploitation of labour. In dependent countries, part of the labour performed by local capital does not translate into socially necessary labour time, i.e. it does not produce value (Féliz, 2023). Given the low levels of relative labour productivity, labour is performed in excess and is not expressed in the value of commodities (Féliz, 2021). Above all, this labour does not appear as surplus value produced/appropriated by dependent capitals. In this way, we can think that the imposition of the law of value on a global scale - in the expression of production prices - operates in dependent territories in more openly violent modalities, less hidden behind the abstract forms of commodity fetishism. As Mies states, labour's payment "is mainly determined by force or coercive institutions" in these settings (Mies, 1998, p. 48). Since directly exploited labour appears less productive, the consequent lower profitability also needs compensation by super-exploiting the so-called "unproductive labour", mainly care and reproductive labour outside the factory.

This is not to say that commodity fetishism does not operate in these territories. On the contrary, it operates in more imprecise, even subtler formats, and more uncertain modalities. Unlike other commodities, labour-power is not produced as a commodity but appears as such (Polanyi, 2001) by force of the hidden compulsion of capital (Mau, 2023), and actively operates in the process of determining its own value. The content of the needs of labour-power is not external to the workers' action, but is a product of the class struggle and is thus embedded with a historical and moral element (Lebowitz, 2003, p. 74). The working class operates actively through its own subjectivity and political action in the production of both society and its work as labour-power (Cleaver, 2000). However, this does not happen in a vacuum, as labourers make their history in conditions they do not choose (Marx, 2003). Abstract labour as a form of labour in capitalism operates tendentially

but in a contested way. Human activity, even within the domain of capital, is not wholly abstract, a-sensory (De Angelis, 1995), thus being a contradiction lived through struggle. Following Dussel, we understand that the antagonism established by labour, as absolute exteriority, prevents the complete domination of capital over non-capital (Dussel, 1988). This struggle involves the struggle for forms of organising life in and beyond capital: a political economy of working people (Féliz, 2011; Lebowitz, 2003). We differ from Starosta and Caligaris (2017, pp. 138–139) who point out that “the process of individual consumption has no other content than the production and reproduction of the materiality of the productive subjectivity of wage earners”. People’s struggle is shaped not only by the impositions of capital but also by the history of previous struggles.

If value is a form of social control based on the imposition of abstract labour, the debate about the productive or reproductive nature of all forms of labour is at the centre. The abstraction of labour - at the heart of value as a social relation- is not directly linked to the measurability of labour in monetary form (Varela, 2020): it is connected to the process of social control that capital engineers to make it so (Clarke, 1991a; De Angelis, 1995).

While capital’s pressures on a global scale condition and create conditions for its reproduction in dependent capitalism, they do not in themselves unilaterally define the value of labour-power. It expresses the social conditions for the reproduction of labour-power. On the one hand, this is represented in a mass of value appropriate for the production and use of means of consumption necessary for the vital reproduction of the working class. On the other hand, the value of labour-power involves the production of a specific form of human subjectivity (Starosta and Fitzsimons, 2017), requiring a certain form of social organisation of reproductive and care work (Dalla Costa and James, 1972). The value of labour-power is closely connected to the way reproductive work is performed and organised, thus the super-exploitation of “productive” labour will be closely tied to the super-exploitation of reproductive and care labour, mostly done outside the factories.

Determining the value of labour-power is neither universal nor directly linked to labour’s mobility across countries (Féliz and Haro, 2019). There are no unique global parameters to determine the socially necessary time for the

reproduction of labour. Historical trajectories are countless, configuring different patterns of worker consumption, forms of articulation of market and non-market production, productive and care work, and so on.

Only one parameter articulates the mobility of capital: potential profitability, the law of value, a concrete quantitative parameter that operates as an expression of capital's success in exploiting labour (Cleaver, 2000). On the other hand, the labour-force structures its vital activity around a multidimensional figure: the reproduction of life in all its forms (Pérez Orozco, 2014). The alienation imposed by capitalist social reproduction and commodity fetishism (i.e., the real abstraction of labour) only operates tendentially and permanently confronts human rebellion against the full reification of social relations.

Super-exploitation and reproductive labour

The theoretical production coming from the field of feminist struggles provides several relevant elements of analysis. In the 1960s and 1970s, a first generation of Marxist feminists raised the need to make unpaid work visible as essential in value production (i.e., capitalist social wealth) (Dalla Costa and James, 1972). Without such work, workers' labour-power in factories and offices cannot be properly reproduced. Placing reproductive labour at the centre of capitalist reproduction helps to understand that capitalist reproduction requires the production of a particular type of worker, family and sexuality, the reproduction of which involves much more than the simple consumption of commodities (Félic and Díaz Lozano, 2020; Félic and Migliaro, 2018).

In the same way that capital can outsource activities to small productive units as a form of fragmentation of the labour force, capital outsources reproductive and care work mostly on the heads and bodies of women and feminised people, to favour its capacity to appropriate social wealth in the form of value (surplus value) and to multiply its possibilities of expanded reproduction (Mezzadri, 2019). In dependent territories, much of this outsourced reproductive and care labour appears unpaid, much more so than in core countries where the mercantilisation of caring has greatly expanded.

As a result of their invisibilisation and devaluation, these activities are presented as non-productive work (of value). This is a product of assuming that they

are not the result of a political process but a natural fact, a parameter outside the conditions of the general reproduction of society (Mezzadri, 2019; Moore, 2015). The devaluation of reproductive work has historically been connected to the devaluation of women's social position (Federici, 2013, p. 161) and includes forms of blatant violence, which - again - are amplified in dependent territories (Mies, 1998). In these territories, the colonial matrix articulated between the class and ethno-racial dimensions establishes the basis for an unequal pact between the colonising male elites and the men of the peoples "to be colonised". This connects to Bambirra's concept of "dominated-dominant classes" (Antunes de Oliveira, 2021, pp. 114–116). The "class" of colonised men are compensated with the possibility of super-exploitation of women's labour - invisible reproductive and care work - and the usufruct of their bodies (i.e., violence and sexual abuse). In this way, dependent capitalism organically integrates a form of dependent patriarchy, which operates as an instrument for the extension of the forms of absolute exploitation of the labour force (Féliz and Migliaro, 2018). While capital in dependent regions projects the pressures of unequal exchange into super-exploitation, men in these contexts 'compensate' for their own super-exploitation with exacerbated modes of super-exploitation and domination of women's labour and bodies. Patriarchy and dependent capitalism create a matrix of appropriation of women's labour for capitalist appropriation at the centre. More precisely, male domination is exercised not only against women but against any feminised subject who does not conform to the stereotype of male, bourgeois, Western, white, adult, heterosexual and proprietary (Haraway, 2018; Lorde, 2003).

The work of feminised women and bodies is not only in domestic, reproductive and care work, mostly poorly paid or not paid at all, but they also actively participate in the paid labour force (Bambirra, 1972; Bambirra et al., 1972; Mies, 1998). The mechanisms of devaluation of their work in the non-productive or reproductive spheres lead to similar processes of extended devaluation of their work in the spaces directly under capitalist command.

Super-exploitation is constituted hierarchically within the structure of capital, the class structure and the intersection of class/gender/race (Antunes de Oliveira, 2021). On the one hand, while big capital concentrates the core of formalised, paid, white and masculinised labour, small and medium-sized enterprises

concentrate most of the informal, unpaid, racialised (in/migrant) and feminised labour. In part, super-exploitation of men is compensated with the super-exploitation of women in paid and unpaid work. It is no coincidence that the most discriminated and oppressed fractions of society are simultaneously those that concentrate the burden of super-exploitation in paid work, in particular, in those qualified as female and/or destined for migrants, and super-exploitation in reproductive work. It is also no coincidence that the production of value in the nuclei of big capital requires the organic production of this increasingly dispossessed labour force. The extraordinary magnitude of constant capital invested in current extractivist processes in dependent capitalism - for example, open-pit mega-mining, hydrocarbon extraction via fracking, lithium extraction in salt flats, etc. - requires the existence of extended and extraordinary sources of surplus labour, compensating for the relative absence of living labour in these productive processes (Caffentzis, 2013, 2017). Capital (and labour) in capital-intensive activities in dependent settings survive by super-exploiting feminised labour elsewhere. For its valorisation, big capital concentrated around immeasurable masses of constant capital needs to suck living labour out of spheres that garner the bulk of labour super-exploitation, among which care and reproduction work is the most important. In parallel, the reinforcement of extractive forms promotes subjective practices that reproduce cruelty towards nature, women, native communities, and all non-hegemonic subjects, naturalising the "pedagogy of cruelty" (Segato, 2013), creating the political conditions for the super-exploitation of their work (and that of nature; Félix, 2019; Félix and Haro, 2019). Disciplining through systematic violence is evident in the territories in the parallel routes between extractivism and the trafficking of women and children for sexual exploitation (Scandizzo, 2010).

On the other hand, through social policies promoted by international financial organisations (e.g., IMF and World Bank), a network of basic income support is articulated to contain social conflict while reproducing patriarchal modalities of life reproduction (Félix and Díaz Lozano, 2018). Combining the expansion of women's access to the labour market, the deterioration of services provided by the precarious peripheral welfare states and the disarticulation of community and collective forms of organising for the reproduction of life, these State interventions place women at the very centre of the expanded reproduction of capital in dependent territories. Social policies place the burden of sustaining life in the homes and communities on the shoulders of already super-exploited women. By

naming women as beneficiaries responsible for caring for the elderly, children, etc., in exchange for an insufficient cash transfers, the State's policies in dependent settings contribute to the expanded reproduction of super-exploitation of women's labour outside (but also inside) the factory. These policies lower the direct cost of reproducing labour (i.e., fostering lower wages and thus super-exploitation of 'productive' labour) while not solving the actual crisis of care within the families, induced by super-exploitation. Women are forced to increase their work of reproduction to compensate for the lack of sufficient income and public provision of social services. Thus, women are also super-exploited if they remain in the homes and communities, but also when other carers migrate, leaving their families in search of better opportunities (Gordillo Kempff et al., 2023).

The present discussion necessarily leads to the realisation that the super-exploitation of the labour force goes beyond the factories and offices, but above all beyond the body of the "classical" workers - male, mostly white, heterosexual. Indeed, the super-exploitation that characterises labour in dependent territories expands and escalates in those spheres of production and reproduction occupied by racialised women. The extraction of labour from labour-power, and thus the production of value, is process that goes beyond the factory. In dependent territories, this also implies the super-exploitation of women's labour even outside commodified relations. To a large extent, these super-exploited and feminised spheres of labour are those that have become the focus of what is now known as the "popular economy" (Fernández-Álvarez, 2020; Mazzeo and Stratta, 2021; Stratta and Mazzeo, 2024). These social spaces include not only extensive unpaid tasks of reproduction and immediate reproduction of the labour force, but also numerous tasks of care of nature (e.g., care of forests and waters, but also the urban habitat) and the reproduction of life (e.g., care of children and the elderly, promotion of community health) (Féliz and Díaz Lozano, 2020; Veas et al., 2023). These activities have traditionally been presented as tasks outside the cycle of extended reproduction of capital, as they are mostly non-market and unpaid work. In short, feminised labour operates as an essential element of the expanded reproduction of capital (Mezzadri, 2019) and the reproduction of dependency relations worldwide.

Brief conclusions for further reflection

The traditional reading of the super-exploitation of labour power in the Marxist tradition of dependency assumes that the working class is homogeneously white and male. In this sense, it tends to overlook that the organisation of capitalist processes of value production requires not only paid work in factories and offices but also the deployment of numerous forms of reproductive and care work in households and communities. This invisible and devalued work, mostly carried out by women and feminised bodies, plays a central role in the production of capitalist value in dependent territories and is therefore at the centre of valorisation.

By making explicit the place of reproductive labour hidden behind the valorisation process, we can more adequately understand the place that such labour occupies in the organisation of the exploitation of labour. In this sense, by making this hidden labour visible, we can grasp more precisely how capitalism produces and reproduces the relations of dependency that structure its reproduction on a global scale.

In this perspective, the super-exploitation of labour power gains analytical strength and conceptual richness. How women's reproductive and care work is organised and performed in all dependent territories and the peripheries of the imperialist centres help to understand how super-exploitation is articulated both outside and inside the productive processes. Understanding the relations between reproductive labour and the value of labour-power is key to analytically developing the red thread that runs from feminist struggles to class struggles, in their interweaving with other struggles for social change (Falquet, 2022).

References

- Amin, S. (1971). El comercio internacional y los flujos internacionales de capitales. In A. Emmanuel, C. Bettelheim, C. Palloix, and S. Amin (Eds.), *Imperialismo y comercio internacional: [El intercambio desigual]* (1era ed., p. 191). Pasado y Presente.
- Amin, S. (with Saigal, J. C.). (1975). *¿Cómo funciona el capitalismo? El intercambio desigual y la ley del valor* (1ra ed.). Siglo XXI Argentina Editores.

- Antunes de Oliveira, F. (2021). Who Are the Super-Exploited? Gender, Race, and the Intersectional Potentialities of Dependency Theory. In A. Madariaga and S. Palestini (Eds.), *Dependent Capitalisms in Contemporary Latin America and Europe* (pp. 101–128). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71315-7_5
- Arruzza, C., and Bhattacharya, T. (2020). Teoría de la Reproducción Social. Elementos fundamentales para un feminismo marxista. *Archivos de Historia del Movimiento Obrero y la Izquierda*, 16, Article 16. <https://doi.org/10.46688/ahmoi.n16.251>
- Arthur, C. J. (2013). The Practical Truth of Abstract Labour. In R. Bellofiore, G. Starosta, and P. D. Thomas (Eds.), *In Marx's Laboratory. Critical Interpretations of the Grundrisse* (1ra ed., Vol. 48, pp. 101–120). Brill.
- Astarita, R. (2010). *Economía política de la dependencia y el subdesarrollo. Tipo de cambio y renta agraria en la Argentina*. (1ra ed.). Universidad Nacional de Quilmes. <http://www.izquierdalatinoamericana.org.ar/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Astarita-Econom%C3%ADa-pol%C3%ADtica-de-la-dependencia-y-el-subdesarrollo.pdf>
- Bambirra, V. (1972, February 15). Liberación de la mujer y lucha de clases. *Punto Final*, VI(151), 10–15.
- Bambirra, V. (1978). *Teoría de la dependencia: Una anticrítica*. Ediciones Era. <https://www.ufrgs.br/vaniabambirra/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Teor%C3%ADa-de-la-dependencia.-Una-anticr%C3%ADtica-1978.pdf>
- Bambirra, V., Krebs, L., and Bayer, B. (1972). Women's Liberation and Class Struggle. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 4(3), 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/048661347200400307>
- Bonefeld, W. (2010). Abstract labour: Against its nature and on its time. *Capital & Class*, 34(2), 257–276. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309816810367769>
- Caffentzis, G. (2013). *In Letters of Blood and Fire: Work, Machines, and the Crisis of Capitalism*. PM Press : Common Notions. <http://libcom.org/library/george-caffentzis-letters-blood-fire>
- Caffentzis, G. (2017). *No Blood for Oil! Essays on Energy, Class Struggle, and War, 1998–2016*. Autonomedia / Constantine George Caffentzis.

- Clarke, S. (1991a). *Marx, Marginalism and Modern Sociology. From Adam Smith to Max Weber* (2da ed.). Macmillan.
- Clarke, S. (1991b). *The State Debate*. Palgrave.
- Cleaver, H. (2000). *Reading 'Capital' Politically*. Anti/Theses : AK Press.
- Costantino, A. (2023, March). *El rol de las mujeres en la acumulación de capital. Los aportes de Vania Bambirra*.
- Cueva, A. (1974). Problemas y perspectivas de la teoría de la dependencia. *Revista Historia y Sociedad*, 3, 55–77.
- Dalla Costa, M. (2009). Poder femenino y subversión social. In *Dinero, perlas y flores en la reproducción feminista* (pp. 21–52). Akal.
- Dalla Costa, M., and James, S. (1972). Las mujeres y la subversión de la comunidad. In M. Dalla Costa (Ed.), *El poder de la mujer y la subversión de la comunidad*. Siglo XXI.
- De Angelis, M. (1995). Beyond the Technological and the Social Paradigms: A Political Reading of Abstract Labour as the Substance of Value. *Capital & Class*, 19(3), 107–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030981689505700105>
- Dias Carcanholo, M. (2013). (Im)precisiones acerca de la categoría superexplotación de la fuerza de trabajo*. *Razón y Revolución*, 25, 91–124.
- Dussel, E. (1988). *Hacia un Marx desconocido. Un comentario de los Manuscritos del 61-63*. Siglo veintiuno editores. <http://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/clacso/otros/20120329094702/marx.pdf>
- Falquet, J. (2022). *Imbricación. Más allá de la interseccionalidad. Mujeres, raza y clase en los movimientos sociales* (1ra ed.). Madreselva.
- Federici, S. (2013). *Revolución en punto cero. Trabajo doméstico, reproducción y luchas feministas*. Traficantes de Sueños.
- Félix, M. (2011). El fundamento de la política del vivir bien: La economía política de los trabajadores y las trabajadoras como alternativa. In *Vivir Bien. ¿Paradigma no capitalista?* (pp. 169–185). Plural Editores.
- Félix, M. (2017). Acumulación de capital y lucha de clase(s) en y a través del Estado en la Argentina neodesarrollista. *Revista Theomai. Estudios Sobre Sociedad y Desarrollo, Red de Estudios Sobre Sociedad, Naturaleza y Desarrollo*, 35, 171–186.

- Félic, M. (2019). Neodevelopmentalism and Dependency in Twenty-first-Century Argentina: Insights from the Work of Ruy Mauro Marini. *Latin American Perspectives*, 46(1), 105–121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582X18806588>
- Félic, M. (2021). Notes For a Discussion on Unequal Exchange and the Marxist Theory of Dependency. *Historical Materialism*, 29(4), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1569206X-12341897>
- Félic, M. (2023). Sobre una polémica acerca da dependência, do valor e da troca desigual. *Nexos Econômicos*, 16(2), 125–133. <https://doi.org/10.9771/rene.v16i2.55747>
- Félic, M., and Díaz Lozano, J. A. (2018). Trabajo, territorio y cuerpos en clave neodesarrollista. Argentina, 2002-2016. *Revista Perfiles Latinoamericanos*, 26(52), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.18504/pl2652-005-2018>
- Félic, M., and Díaz Lozano, J. A. (2020). Reproducción de la vida, superexplotación y organización popular en clave feminista. Una lectura desde Argentina. *Cuestiones de Sociología*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.24215/23468904e101>
- Félic, M., and Haro, A. C. (2019). Dependencia, valor y naturaleza. Hacia una revitalización crítica de la teoría marxista de la dependencia. *Revista Sociedad*, 38, 45–56.
- Félic, M., and Migliaro, A. I. (2018). Superexplotación de la naturaleza y el trabajo en sociedades extractivas. Capitalismo y patriarcado en el neodesarrollismo en la Argentina. *Ambiente & Educación. Revista de Educación Ambiental*, 23(3), 201–229.
- Ferguson, S. (2020). Las visiones del trabajo en la teoría feminista. *Archivos de Historia del Movimiento Obrero y la Izquierda*, 16, Article 16. <https://doi.org/10.46688/ahmoi.n16.242>
- Fernández-Álvarez, M. I. (2020). Building from heterogeneity: The decomposition and recomposition of the working class viewed from the “popular economy” in Argentina. *Dialectical Anthropology*, 44(1), 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10624-018-9509-6>
- Gordillo Kempff, M. J., Félic, M., and Farcy, D. (2023). *Crisis, extractivismo y deuda. Razones estructurales para la migración*. Movement Hub.
- Haraway, D. (2018). *Modest-Witness@Second-Millennium.FemaleMan-Meets-OncoMouse: Feminism and technoscience* (1ra ed.). Routledge.

- Harvey, D. (2006). *The limits to capital*. Verso Book.
- Katz, C. (2017, September 12). Aciertos y problemas de la superexplotación. *Rebelión.Org*. <http://www.rebelion.org/noticia.php?id=231417>
- Lebowitz, M. A. (2003). *Beyond Capital. Marx's political economy of the working class* (2da ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lebowitz, M. A. (2005). *Más allá de El Capital. La economía política de la clase trabajadora en Marx*. Akal. https://www.akal.com/libro/mas-alla-de-el-capital_33748/
- Lorde, A. (2003). *La hermana, la extranjera. Artículos y conferencias*. horas y HORAS. la editorial.
- Marini, R. M. (1978). Las razones del neodesarrollismo (respuesta a F. H. Cardoso y J. Serra). *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, 40(Número extraordinario), 57–106. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3539683>
- Marini, R. M. (2015). *América Latina, dependencia y globalización / Ruy Mauro Marini* (C. E. Martins, Ed.). Siglo XXI Editores / CLACSO. https://www.clacso.org.ar/antologias/detalle.php?id_libro=1034
- Martins, C. E. (2011). *Globalização, dependência e neoliberalismo na América Latina* (1ra ed.). Boitempo.
- Marx, C. (2003). *El dieciocho brumario de Luis Bonaparte*. Fundación Federico Engels. <https://www.marxists.org/espanol/m-e/1850s/brumaire/brum1.htm>
- Mau, S. (2023). *Mute Compulsion: A Marxist Theory of the Economic Power of Capital* (1ra ed., p. 325). Verso Books.
- Mazzeo, M., and Stratta, F. (Eds.). (2021). *¿Qué es la economía popular? Experiencias, voces y debates: Vol. Colección Realismo y Utopía* (1ra ed.). Editorial El Colectivo.
- Mezzadri, A. (2019). On the value of social reproduction. Informal labour, the majority world and the need for inclusive theories and politics. *Radical Philosophy*, 2(4), 33–41.
- Mies, M. (1998). *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale* (6ta ed.). Zed Books Ltd.
- Moore, J. W. (2015). *Capitalism in the Web of Life. Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*. Verso Books.
- Osorio, J. (2013). Sobre dialéctica, superexplotación y dependencia: Notas acerca de Dialéctica de la dependencia. *Argumentos*, 26(72), 57–73.

- Osorio Urbina, J. (2017, September 14). *Teoría marxista de la dependencia sin superexplotación. Una propuesta de desarme teórico para avanzar*. <http://marxismoyrevolucion.org/?p=713>
- Osorio Urbina, J. (2018). Acerca de la superexplotación y el capitalismo dependiente. *Cuadernos de Economía Crítica*, 4(8), 153–181.
- Pérez Orozco, A. (2014). *Subversión feminista de la economía. Aportes para un debate sobre el conflicto capital-vida*. Traficantes de Sueños.
- Polanyi, K. (2001). *The Great Transformation*. Beacon Press.
- Reyes, C. (2020). El intercambio desigual como fundamento de la heterogeneidad en el sistema mundial capitalista. In J. Osorio and C. Reyes, *La diversidad en el sistema mundial capitalista. Procesos y relaciones en la heterogeneidad imperante* (1ra ed., pp. 89–170). Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana :: Editorial Gedisa.
- Scandizzo, H. (2010). El negocio de la trata en la ruta del petróleo. In C. Korol (Ed.), *Resistencias populares a la recolonización del continente. Segunda Parte* (1ra ed.). Centro de Investigación y Formación de los Movimientos Sociales Latinoamericanos: América Libre: Rosa-Luxemburg Stiftung. <http://libros.metabiblioteca.org/bitstream/001/537/1/Resistencias%20populares%20a%20la%20recolonización%20del%20continente.pdf>
- Segato, R. L. (2013). *La escritura en el cuerpo de las mujeres asesinadas en Ciudad Juárez*. Tinta Limón Ediciones. <http://tintalimon.com.ar/libro/LA-ESCRITURA-EN-EL-CUERPO-DE-LAS-MUJERES-ASESINADAS-EN-CIUDAD-JUREZ>
- Selwyn, B. (2019). Poverty chains and global capitalism. *Competition & Change*, 23(1), 71–97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1024529418809067>
- Silva Amaral, M., and Dias Carcanholo, M. (2009). A superexploração do trabalho em economias periféricas dependentes. *Revista Katálysis*, 12(2), 216–225.
- Sotelo Valencia, A. (2017, December 19). *Crítica a la crítica de Katz a Marini: ¿Una teoría de la dependencia sin superexplotación? Mejor una teoría de la dependencia con superexplotación revisitada y actualizada*. <http://lhblog.nuevaradio.org/b2-img/KatzPDF.pdf>
- Starosta, G. (2010). Global Commodity Chains and the Marxian Law of Value. *Antipode*, 42(2), 433–465. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2009.00753.x>

- Starosta, G., and Caligaris, G. (2017). *Trabajo, valor y capital. De la crítica marxiana de la economía política al capitalismo contemporáneo* (1ra ed.). Universidad Nacional de Quilmes.
- Starosta, G., and Fitzsimons, A. (2017). Rethinking the Determination of the Value of Labor Power. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613416670968>
- Stratta, F., and Mazzeo, M. (Eds.). (2024). *La economía popular. Perspectivas críticas y miradas desde Nuestra América* (1ra ed.). Editorial El Colectivo. <https://editorialelcolectivo.com/producto/la-economia-popular-perspectivas-criticas-y-miradas-desde-nuestra-america/>
- Varela, P. (2020). La reproducción social en disputa: Un debate entre autonomistas y marxistas. *Archivos de Historia del Movimiento Obrero y la Izquierda*, 16, Article 16. <https://doi.org/10.46688/ahmoi.n16.241>
- Veas, R., Sotiru, M., and Féliz, M. (2023). La economía política de la economía popular. Miradas y debates. In M. Mazzeo and F. Stratta (Eds.), *La economía popular. Perspectivas críticas y miradas desde Nuestra América* (1ra ed., p. 20). DDTyT / UNLa :: Observatorio de la Economía Popular / UNLa.
- Vogel, L. (with Ferguson, S., and McNally, D.). (2013). *Marxism and the oppression of women. Toward a Unitary Theory* (Vol. 45). Brill.