Article

isw

International Social Work
1–13
© The Author(s) 2021
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/00208728211001417
journals.sagepub.com/home/isw

Cartography of Southern Feminisms: Contributions of decolonial feminisms and community feminisms

Silvana Martínez and Juan Agüero
National University of Mar del Plata, Argentina

Abstract
This work is based on a theoretical research study on Southern Feminisms and Social Intervention developed at the National University of Mar del Plata, Argentina. The South is understood as a metaphor for human suffering systematically caused by the oppression and domination of an imperialist, capitalist, colonial and patriarchal North. It is a very powerful geo-corporate-political and epistemological metaphor because it reveals and problematises the devices used for oppression and domination. This article uses cartography as a methodology to make explicit the analytical and interpretative matrices present in decolonial feminisms and community feminisms. It also makes explicit the criticisms that these feminisms make of hegemonic-academic-Western feminism. Contributions from feminist experiences in Australia and New Zealand are included and the specific contributions of Southern Feminisms to the theory and practice of social work are made explicit.

Keywords
Community, decoloniality, feminisms of the South, patriarchy, social work

Introduction

In its long history, the women's movement has gone through various moments of struggle. These struggles broadened and enriched the debates. Thus, today, we can no longer speak of feminism in the singular but of feminisms in the plural. In this historical development, the production of knowledge has also become one of the fields of epistemic-political-ideological struggle. Since the 1970s, the so-called *hegemonic-academic-White-Western* feminism has generated a deep epistemological debate because it poses a critique of the androcentric, sexist and patriarchal conception of modern

Corresponding author:
Silvana Martínez, National University of Mar del Plata, La Rioja 2720–Department 'A', 1st Floor, Ciudad, Mar del Plata, 7600, Argentina.
Email: silvanamartinezts@gmail.com

science. This feminism is in turn criticised by other feminisms, identified as *Feminisms of the South*, which include Black women, 'coloured' women, Chicanas, Third World women, Indigenous, impoverished, Muslims, migrants and peasant women. It also includes lesbian, gay, transgender, bisexual, intersex and queer (LGTBIQ) women. Critics of White-academic-Western feminism arise in the United States as South in the North, and also in other countries, for not taking into account the multiple forms of oppression and life experiences of other women. Also for raising *gender* as a homogeneous category, without considering its intersection with *race*, *class* and *sexuality*. In addition, other critical feminisms emerge that emphasise *coloniality* and the *colonial wound* (Anzaldúa, [1987] 2016) such as post-colonial, decolonial and Indigenous feminisms, among others.

This article addresses *decolonial feminisms* and *community feminisms* as fundamental experiences of Feminisms of the South, analysing their main debates, authors and contributions. The first part briefly addresses a discussion of what is understood by Feminisms of the South. Feminist experiences from Australia and New Zealand are included. In the second part, the links between Southern Feminisms and post-colonial and decolonial studies are made explicit. The third deals with decolonial feminisms. The fourth analyses community feminisms. Finally, the specific contributions of Southern Feminisms to the theory and practice of social work are made explicit.

Feminisms of the South

The South is understood by Boaventura de Sousa Santos as a 'metaphor for human suffering systematically caused by colonialism and capitalism' (De Sousa Santos, 2009). In this metaphor, the author does not include *patriarchy*, a category that is expressly included in this article because it alludes to the system of oppression on which colonialism, coloniality and capitalism are based. It is a metaphor because the South also exists in the North and the North in the South, in the local practices of complicity with colonialism, coloniality, patriarchy and capitalism. It is a very powerful geo-corporate-political and epistemological metaphor because it reveals and problematises, on the one hand, the devices of oppression and domination of an imperialist, capitalist, colonial and patriarchal North and, on the other hand, the practices and subjects that in the South reproduce these devices of power.

For Catherine Moore Torres, when speaking of the South, she does not only refer to Latin America, Africa and the East as geographical territories, but also to an epistemological and symbolic approach that is permeated by the experience of coloniality (Moore Torres, 2018). For this author, there are two central ideas that support the commitment of post-colonial and decolonial feminisms. One is an internal critique of Western hegemonic feminisms, in particular, the idea of the *Third World woman* as a monolithic and a-historical subject. Another is the idea of *epistemic* rupture or *detachment* from the border or exteriority, built by the matrix of modernity–coloniality and leading to other epistemologies.

It is important to emphasise that community feminists also propose an epistemic rupture, but not based on the matrix of modernity–coloniality but on a *cosmogony of suspicion*, on the *patriarchal junction* and on *women's bodies*, where all the violence and multiple oppressions produced by patriarchy, colonialism, coloniality and capitalism are inscribed (Cabnal, 2010; Guzmán Arroyo, 2019).

These ideas, built by community feminism, exceed the matrix of modernity–coloniality and colonial wounding. Furthermore, they are deeper and more radical, because they recover the ancestral wisdom of the original peoples and the oral tradition prior to the European colonial invasion of *Abya Yala*[1] in 1492. For this reason, this article includes community feminisms within the Feminisms of the South, but not as part of decolonial feminisms. Both post-colonial and decolonial

feminisms, and also community feminisms, have in common an anti-capitalist, anti-racist and anti-patriarchal stance. Because they share this radical critique of the capitalist-patriarchal-modern-colonial order, these feminisms are called Feminisms of the South, although they are also called Peripheral Feminisms or Feminisms-Others by other authors, for example, Rocío Medina Martín (2013).

Other feminist experiences such as the women's movement in Australia and New Zealand are also Feminisms of the South. Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2000) analyses in her work the representations of Indigenous women in the ethnographies produced by White Australian feminists and how they differ from Indigenous women's own accounts of themselves. For their part, Pat Dudgeon and Abigail Bray (2016) in a short article describe the struggles for over 200 years of Indigenous women in Australia and the Torres Strait Islands against the White colonial patriarchy installed from 1788 onwards, which dismantled the equal rights that had existed between men and women until then.

However, Marian Sawer and Jennifer Curtin (2016) in an extensive article analyse the issue of diversity in Australian and New Zealand political studies. They support the hypothesis that diversity was not an object of study until 1970 and that it was feminist organisations that contributed to greater pluralism in political science. However, they also analyse how, despite the increased diversity, a hierarchy of knowledge still exists, which is a serious obstacle to equality policies and programmes.

Feminisms of the South and post-colonial and decolonial studies

Post-colonial and decolonial studies constitute the main theoretical, epistemological and political support for the internal reflections and debates of post-colonial and decolonial feminisms. These studies differ from each other because they come from different intellectual traditions, historical experiences and geographical locations. *Post-colonial studies* emerged in India, Southeast Asia and Africa from the decolonisation process promoted by the United Nations in the 1950s and 1960s. In this context, the Indian *Subaltern Studies Group*, founded by Ranajit Guha, was formed to study the cultural heritage of British colonialism and the colonial domination of Indian nationalism. The *subaltern* concept, coined by Antonio Gramsci, is recovered by this group. Post-colonial criticism is constructed with authors from the African and Black French-speaking diaspora such as Frantz Fanon, Aimé Césaire, Léopold Sédar Senghor, Édouard Glissant and the classic work *Orientalism* by Edward Said (1978). This group is also influenced by French post-structuralist thought, mainly by Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida and Jacques Lacan.

Post-colonial feminism has among its most prominent representatives Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, among others. As Yetzy Villarroel Peña (2019) argues, these feminists show, from the linguistic turn, the invisibility of the other non-Western. It is a structural silencing within the historical narrative, in which the valid subject is Western. Spivak coined the idea of *epistemic violence* and Mohanty that of *discursive colonialism*. They also reveal that patriarchy is not the only oppression suffered by women, that *gender* is racialised and that *race* is always generalised. They show the individual and collective resistance to domination and criticise the supposed superiority of Western women who try to establish themselves as models for other non-Western women.

For their part, *decolonial studies* focus on the *colonial difference* that dates back to 1492. They are based on the diverse intellectual traditions of Latin American thought and *Abya Yala*. In Latin America, there were no decolonisation processes as there were in Asia and Africa in the 1950s and 1960s. Decolonial studies take as a reference authors such as Aníbal Quijano and Enrique Dussel whose contributions began in the 1960s. In the 2000s, the *Modernity-Coloniality Studies Group*

was formed, comprising authors such as Arturo Escobar, Walter Mignolo, Edgardo Lander, Ramón Grosfoguel, Catherine Walsh, María Lugones, Santiago Castro-Gómez, Nelson Maldonado Torres and, of course, Aníbal Quijano and Enrique Dussel.

Decolonial studies rescue, problematise and are tributary to many of the ideas that founded the struggles for liberation in Latin America. These include liberation theology, liberation philosophy, liberation pedagogy, dependency theories, popular education, participatory action-research, oral history, Indigenism, Black and Chicano feminisms, cultural studies, and post-colonial studies, among others (Martínez and Agüero, 2017).

Decolonial feminisms

The Latin American feminist movement began as a women's movement, influenced by the *Decade of Women* established by the United Nations for the period 1975–1985. It was also influenced by the recovery of democracy after long periods of civil–military dictatorships. In its origins, it is influenced by the feminisms of Europe and the United States, that is, by hegemonic White-Western-modern feminism. Consequently, its origin is markedly ethnocentric and Eurocentric.

In the 1980s and 1990s, a feminism emerged that was recognised as *institutional feminism*, due to its links with universities, non-governmental organisations, political parties and international organisms that financed programmes, projects and lines of research on women and gender. This feminism is strongly criticised for *autonomous feminism*, for its political and financial dependence, for the academicism of 'gender specialists' and for constituting a neo-colonialism and neo-developmentalism promoted by the United States and the politics of the New World Order. On the contrary, *autonomous feminism* maintains the need for self-organisation and self-management, as a condition of possibility for the construction of critical thinking and autonomous political practices.

The critique of autonomous feminism is shared, expanded and deepened, starting in the 2000s, by *decolonial feminisms*. This plural expression includes many forms of feminism. In these feminisms, there is a plurality of voices and places of enunciation. There are heterogeneities, dialogues, divergences and diverse historical trajectories and theoretical and political positions. However, they share the reinterpretation of history as a critique of the patriarchal-capitalist-modern-colonial order. They also share the criticism of hegemonic White-academic-Western feminism.

Decolonial feminisms share a critique of the universal way of thinking about the subordination of women. They reject the idea of a universal woman expressed in the category of *gender*, as conceived by hegemonic feminism. Instead, they propose a re-reading of the history of *Abya Yala* from a situated thinking that considers the multiple oppressions of race, sex, class, sexuality and geopolitics. As Yetzy Villarroel Peña (2019) argues,

> It is a matter of generating what Quijano called an epistemic revolution, from which the contributions of the hegemonic feminists are reviewed, questioned, criticised and also recognised, but naming everything that they failed to name, what remained on the outside, what they could not look at because it was not part of their own experiences. (p. 112)

In this sense, decolonial feminisms recover the political struggle of Afro-descendant and Indigenous women in our continent. These women denounce their invisibility within their own movements, as well as within feminism, showing their importance in the resistance and struggle against colonialism. This is a political commitment to *epistemic disobedience* that allows for the construction of new epistemological-theoretical-interpretative frameworks of history. It is about reconceptualising categories, rescuing the wisdom of the original peoples of *Abya Yala* who have resisted colonialism.

Decolonial feminisms share the metaphor of the *colonial wound* proposed by the lesbian Chicana feminist Gloria Anzaldúa, whom Walter Mignolo recognises as fundamental in the evolution of his decolonial thought (Medina Martín, 2013: 61). Among the decolonial feminists are María Lugones, Francesca Gargallo Celentani, Sueli Carneiro, Karina Ochoa, Ochy Curiel, among many others. Decoloniality in feminism was proposed by María Lugones, a member of the Modernity–Coloniality Study Group. This Argentine philosopher's work is based on the concept of *intersectionality* and the concept of the *coloniality of power*. The first was constructed by *Black feminists* and *Third World feminists* (Alexander and Mohanty, 1997; Allen, [1986]1992; Amos and Parmar, 1984; Anzaldúa, 1987; bell, 1984; Collins, 2000; Davis, [1981]2005; Hull et al., 1982; Lorde, 1984; McClintock, 1995; Oyewumi, 1997). The second was built by Aníbal Quijano (1991, 2000a, 2000b).

Lugones proposes the concept of a *modern-colonial gender system* to make visible the subjugation of both men and women of colour in all areas of social life. Maria Lugones (2011) argues,

> Decolonising gender is necessarily a practical task. It is to engage in a critique of racialized, colonial and capitalist, heterosexualized gender oppression as a lived transformation of the social [. . .] I call the analysis of racialized and capitalist gender oppression 'gender coloniality'. I call 'decolonial feminism' the possibility of overcoming the coloniality of gender. (p. 110)

For this author, it is necessary to reflect on racialised and capitalist gender oppression, that is, on the coloniality of gender, in order to overcome it through a decolonial feminism. Decolonial feminism criticises modernity because it organises thought in homogeneous, universal and dichotomous categories. This critique focuses on the intersection between race, class, sexuality and gender, which goes beyond modernity. For Yetzy Villarroel Peña (2019), 'Lugones gives gender the same explanatory power that Quijano gives race. Therefore, race and gender become inseparable categories to understand women's oppressions' (p. 111).

The native peoples of *Abya Yala* and the enslaved African peoples have resisted capitalist modernity and have put forward other non-modern-capitalist alternative forms of social organisation. They have also rejected the hierarchical dichotomy between the human and the non-human, the human referring to the civilised European and the non-human referring to the original peoples and the enslaved African peoples. The resistance of these peoples was in the intimacy of everyday life.

For Lugones (2011), the expression 'colonised woman' is an empty category because there are no colonised women in these villages, as they were considered non-human. However, this position of Lugones has no factual basis since the European colonisers built subjectivity into the colonised women, for their own benefit. At the same time, this process of subjectivation generated resistance. Therefore, we have to talk about a *resistant subjectivity*, which is not expressed publicly but remains in the intimate spaces of everyday life. For this reason, it is denied authority, legitimacy, voice, meaning and visibility (Martínez, 2019). For us, thinking about decolonial feminisms implies building power from these *resisting subjectivities* or from *historicised intersubjectivities*.

Within decolonial feminisms, Black feminists emphasise *race* and recognise themselves as *anti-racial Black feminists*. For these feminists, *race* determines the gender hierarchy in *Abya Yala*. For Sueli Carneiro (2009), this new anti-racist feminist approach is identified and integrated into the struggle of the Black movements and also into the women's movement. It shapes a new political identity resulting from the specific condition of being a woman and a Black woman. In this respect, she argues,

> The current black women's movement, by bringing race, class and gender to the political scene, promotes a synthesis of the flags of struggle that have historically been raised by the black movements and the women's movement in Brazil. On the one hand, it blackens the feminist demands to make them more representative of all Brazilian women. On the other hand, it promotes the feminization of the proposals and demands of the black movements. (Carneiro, 2009: 2)

Decolonial Black Feminists take up the debates of the American Black Feminists and the Chicano and Coloured Feminists. In 1981, bell hooks takes up again the question posed in 1851 by Sojourner Truth, 'Am I not a woman?' This issue questions and problematises the category of *woman* constructed in a homogeneous, universal and univocal way by White-hegemonic feminism. This makes it possible to deconstruct the *being-woman* and the *not-being-woman*. Black and coloured feminists, therefore, propose *intersectionality* as a theoretical-political-epistemological category that is fundamental for deconstructing the being-woman. This allows for an understanding of racialised women's own life experiences. For their part, Chicano feminists (Gloria Anzaldúa, Norma Alarcón and Cherrie Moraga) construct a *frontier thinking*. This allows them to understand the experience of mestizaje and deconstruct closed and finished identities.

Both decolonial Black feminists and American Black feminists share a critique of White-hegemonic feminism for its universally pretended construction of categories and analytical-interpretative frameworks that do not include the diversity of Black and coloured women's experiences. One of these issues is the sexual division of labour. As Sueli Carneiro (2009) relates, Black women worked for centuries as slaves, tilling the land or on the streets, selling or prostituting themselves. For this reason, they did not understand when White-hegemonic feminists said that women had to earn on the streets and go out to work. They, the Black feminists, had already done this for centuries as slaves.

Yuderkys Espinosa-Miñoso (2013) proposes the category of *gender racism* in order to understand the impossibility of White-hegemonic feminists to recognise their privileged place in terms of race and class. Indeed, they hide their place of enunciation when they speak of 'women' by criticising the androcentrism and sexism of modern science. For the author,

> the important debate opened by white feminist epistemologists, despite their unquestionable contributions, has not been able to resolve the problems highlighted by black, lesbian and coloured feminists. These women understood early on the deep interconnection between structures of domination, in particular the relationship between the androcentric gaze, racism, modernity and coloniality. (Espinosa-Miñoso, 2013: 10)

For their part, *Indigenous feminists* raise the problem of the *ethnocentrism* of White-hegemonic feminists, who do not consider the worldviews of the original peoples to be valid. Francesca Gargallo Celentani (2015) distinguishes the following four groups of Indigenous feminists: (a) those who fight for the Good Life of women at the community level, according to their own culture, but who do not recognise themselves as feminists and claim solidarity between women and men as a constitutive duality of their Indigenous being, (b) those who refuse to call themselves feminists because they question White-urban feminists, (c) those who recognise themselves as feminists because they defend the rights of women in their community and do not question White-urban feminists, and (d) those who recognise themselves as feminists and have a situated autonomous thought.

For Antonella Busconi (2018), Indigenous feminisms are related to *Latin American ecofeminisms*. She argues that Indigenous women are resisting and fighting against the expansion of agrarian capitalism, polluting mining and water exploitation. Both feminisms are critical of patriarchy and share the idea that the subordination of women to men and the exploitation of nature are two

sides of the same coin and respond to the logic of domination and the subjugation of life to the logic of economic accumulation.

Community feminisms

The community feminisms come from different communities of native peoples of *Abya Yala*, mainly *Aymara* women from Bolivia and *Maya-Xinka* women from Guatemala. *Aymara* feminists define themselves as *anti-patriarchal* community feminists. The two groups share a common set of ideas as community feminists. These ideas were built up collectively in the 2000s and 2010s. *Maya-Xinka* feminists built a proposal that was born out of the *outraged bodies* and daily lives of native women, not out of academia (Cabnal, 2018). They reinterpret their history from the multiple oppressions they have suffered, but also from the emancipation of native women.

Some references of community feminisms are Adriana Guzmán Arroyo, Jimena Tejerina, Diana Vargas, Julia Castillo, María Galindo, Lorena Cabnal, among others. Community feminisms differ from other feminisms in that they have built *their own theory or interpretative framework* from the experiential-community-political. This theoretical and interpretative framework is an instrument of political struggle for liberation and emancipation, the decolonisation of thought and the depatriarchalisation of bodies. In this sense, they do not emphasise gender – like other feminisms – but *patriarchy* as an explanatory category for the historical oppression of women's bodies.

Community feminisms differ from decolonial feminisms because of the historical moment that each one takes as a starting point for its theoretical-analytical construction. For decolonial feminists, it is the invasion of *Abya Yala* in 1492 by the European colonisers. For community feminists, the oppression of women's bodies did not begin in 1492, but there is an ancestral history of oppression that was reinforced and deepened by colonisation.

Community *feminists* understand *feminism* as the struggle of any woman, anywhere in the world and at any time in history, who rebels against the patriarchy that oppresses her. For their part, *Aymara* feminists reconceptualise *patriarchy* by defining it as 'the' system of all the oppressions, all the discriminations and all the violence that humanity (men, women, intersex people, bodies and non-genders) and nature live and suffer, historically built on women's bodies. Furthermore, they propose the concept of *patriarchal junction* to explain how colonial patriarchy reinforces and deepens the ancestral patriarchy that already existed before the invasion of the European colonisers (Guzmán Arroyo, 2019).

Maya-Xinka feminists emphasise the relationship between the *body*, *the territory and everyday life*. They build the concept of *territory-body* and *the body as territory* as resistance against ancestral patriarchy and colonial patriarchy. They consider that women's bodies have historically been the disputed territory of the patriarchy, to ensure their perpetuation. They propose the *territory-body* as a place of enunciation and bodily and historical memory. The body-territory is home to the history of colonial expropriation. The rebels associated with their liberation and emancipation also live there. The body has memory, memory inhabits the body (Cabnal, 2010).

In turn, the territory-body is linked to the *territory-earth*. It is interrelated with the long memory of the peoples, where the sign of expropriation and colonial violence is. Community feminists point to the heart of patriarchy, capitalism and colonialism, by arguing that the *body-territory-earth* is not appropriable. In this sense, they reject the classic vision of private property and individual rights upheld by liberalism. They claim that rights are not individual but collective. The *community* is the place of history, common identity and ancestral memory.

Community feminists resignify the notion of *community* as a core idea. They maintain *autonomy* as an anti-patriarchal and decolonising organisational principle. This principle ensures that criticism or dissent is not seen as a betrayal of the community, but as part of its own dynamics.

They conceive each member as a singularity and not as an identical reproduction or individual repetition of a totality. Autonomy guarantees that the relations between the members of the community are horizontal, reciprocal and democratic (Moore Torres, 2018). For Francesca Gargallo Celentani (2015),

> When community feminism thinks of the community from the perspective of autonomy, it accepts the existence of a being and exists from its own intimate and personal world, in community with the public world, with the community world. (p. 334)

For *Aymara* feminists, Western feminism positioned women as individuals in relation to men, seeking equality or difference. In contrast, community feminism proposes reciprocity between men and women in the community, as an inclusive principle for taking care of life. To resignify, the community implies thinking of it as being devoid of machismo, racism, classism, without hierarchies, without oppression, without violence. Thinking of it as presence, existence, representation and decision. This re-signification is the starting point and the point of arrival to transform the relationships between men and women into community (Guzmán Arroyo, 2019).

Community feminisms have constructed a proposal with various elements of analysis that allow for the interpretation of historical and structural oppression of women. On one hand, it recovers elements of ancestral patriarchy and ethnic fundamentalisms within the communities themselves. On the other hand, it recovers elements of the memory of the original transgressor women. Lorena Cabnal (2018) calls them *femiologies* or oral forms of the language of the ancestors. This community feminist rejects the idea of Indigenous women victimised by the colonial system in a passive way. Instead, she rescues the struggles and resistances of the ancestors, who have provided life and energy.

Fundamental to Cabnal's proposal is the concept of 'acuerpamiento' understood as mutual physical and spiritual support between Indigenous women. It is a process of emotional and spiritual recovery for Indigenous women who defend ancestral territories and fight for life in their communities in the face of criminalisation and judicialisation. It is a need to remember in the face of the illnesses, sadness, stigmatisation and displacement experienced by Indigenous women and their families in defence of their bodies and the land.

To understand the historical subjugation of Indigenous women, Cabnal proposes the concept of *cosmogony*, understood as a way of interpreting life in the world. Every ancestral people has a cosmogony. As an example, to understand violence against women in the communities, the *Maya-Xinka* do not use the gender category or the patriarchy category, because these are words from colonial Spanish that many women in the communities do not speak. Instead, they use the idea of *disharmonisation of the network of life*, an idea that comes from the body since the multiple oppressions and forms of violence build feelings in bodies. From what is felt in the body, ideas are constructed to interpret unequal power relations that are totally naturalised.

For Lorena Cabnal (2018), the key to denaturalising and building another scheme of thought is to evidence and verify what is felt in the body. It is necessary to intentionally bring the pain of the multiple oppressions felt in the body in order to initiate a process of liberation and emancipation. With this process, women are enabled to *desire what is denied*: more harmonious relationships, knowing other places, being more in touch with nature, meeting other women, other experiences, studying, reading or whatever. The body thus becomes the vital space of verification, both of oppression and of emancipation.

Cabnal asks the question of why the situation of oppression experienced by native women is *cosmogonic suspicion*. This suspicion leads to *indignation* and the search for answers. The search leads to *feeling rather* than thinking. Feeling constitutes a vital act of epistemic recovery in the

bodies. To feel is to put the body into experience. This allows the discovery of the relational thread of the historical memory of the oppression of the ancestral patriarchy, which manifests itself in a different way from the colonial patriarchy. To interpret the ancestral patriarchy and the territorial and body disputes of Indigenous women prior to colonialism, constitutes an act of cosmogonic political claim of the original women. Furthermore, with epistemic authority from the bodies that have lived through this violence. It is a complexity that disharmonises life but at the same time brings a proposal that has been re-woven since emancipation (Cabnal, 2018).

Contributions of Southern Feminisms to the theory and practice of social work

Feminisms of the South are an important source of contribution of new ideas, concepts, categories and theoretical proposals that can be very useful for the theory and practice of social work. Equally useful can be the experiences of women's struggles and the organisational capacity built up in many places in the world to confront situations of oppression and domination. For Gray and Schubert (2016), social work is not only a profession dedicated to providing social services to very diverse populations, but also a profession with strong participation and commitment to social movements, especially the feminist movement. They have accompanied and even led many struggles for civil, political and economic rights, for refugees, for environmental protection, for human rights, against gender violence, racism and social inequalities. 'Do something, change something' is the emphatic harangue that Gray and Schubert put forward as feminists in the practice of social work.

In their article, Lasmery Girsang et al. (2018) discuss the results of qualitative research on women's struggles for transformation in the community of Rusunawa, Indonesia. Taking as their analytical framework knowledge, experience and power relations, three substantive ideas from the theory of the feminist point of view, the authors analyse the transformations taking place in health, education, economics and leadership.

In another study published by Christine Morley and Phillip Ablett (2017), the authors discuss the paradox of wealth growth and income inequality. This paradox is caused in New Zealand by the systematic application of neoliberal public policies. With very strong statistical data, the authors analyse how these neoliberal public policies affect the living conditions and development possibilities of the population. Radical social work suggests a substantive change in public policies, accompanied by changes in social policies and programmes.

Feminisms of the South bring to social work a diverse view of social reality. There are many ways of seeing and interpreting reality. There are many ways of being and being in the world. There are always options, even when there seems to be only one course of action. There are many ways of thinking and conceiving the world, social relations, the way of living with others in the world. This multi-faceted view substantially improves social work practices and democratises power and social interactions. Furthermore, it accepts what is different, the other, accepts the alternative and the possibility of other ways of being and being in the world.

In addition, Feminisms of the South provide a dynamic view of social reality. Social reality is always under construction and in movement. It is a constant evolution, a trajectory that is being formed. Therefore, there is always the possibility of change and transformation. What today is, tomorrow can be very different. In social work, this view of social reality has enormous implications because it gives meaning to intervention and professional practice. If social reality is not something fixed and immovable, but variable and mobile, then the possibility of change is present and this makes possible a social work practice that critically seeks social transformation. The

dynamism of the social reality supports the idea that things can always be different and that social transformation is possible from professional practices.

Likewise, Feminisms of the South provide a complex view of social reality that allows us to see reality beyond the obvious and to consider social phenomena from multiple perspectives and dimensions. This view allows us to denaturalise what is naturalised, to deconstruct what is constructed, to question what appears to us as given and established. Social problems are always complex. That is to say, they are multi-causal, multi-dimensional, multi-faceted. The complex gaze always sees many constitutive components of reality. Consequently, social work practices must also have these same characteristics. It is not possible to understand the complex with a simple look.

Another substantive contribution of Southern Feminisms is the focus on everyday life. Everyday life is what happens every day. Our whole life always passes through everyday life, where reality has meaning for us. It is in everyday life that social subjects are built, that life in common, community and social life are built. Social problems are made flesh and become meaningful in everyday life. Life stories, memory, experiences, life projects, everything is built and takes place in everyday life. Social work practices also take place in everyday life. Hence, its importance.

Feminisms of the South also provide a situated view of social work. Socio-historical contexts and circumstances are key to the development of meaningful social work practices. They allow that the feminist proposal of intersectionality implies relating and combining categories among themselves, increasing the possibilities of understanding social reality. Intersectionality makes social work practices more specific, because it allows them to focus on unique situations, crossed by gender, race, ethnicity, age and sexuality, among other categories.

Another important contribution of Feminisms of the South is the value of the collective, of collective action, where the community stands out as a place of construction of meaning. Understanding this is fundamental in social work. Social subjects are unique and must be understood in terms of the collective. A social subject always represents a social collective. Social struggles are always collective and so are social changes. Social work practices must always find their meaning and justification in the collective.

Conclusion

In this article, we have tried to make a cartography of decolonial feminisms and community feminisms, both members of the so-called Feminisms of the South, peripheral feminisms or feminisms-Others. These denominations are used to contrast White-Western-hegemonic-academic-bourgeois feminism with other experiences, feelings and interpretative analytical frameworks of feminists who do not feel included in it because of their essentialist, universalist, univocal and ethnocentric conception.

When reference is made to the South in this article, it is a metaphor for human suffering and the multiple oppressions and violence systematically provoked by the patriarchal-capitalist-colonial order. The Feminisms of the South include a constellation of feminisms developed in different geographical places and historical-political-social contexts, although for reasons of space this article only addresses decolonial feminisms and community feminisms. However, feminisms from Australia and New Zealand, which share the name Feminisms of the South, were also mentioned.

Decolonial feminisms refer to a historical period that began in 1492 with the invasion of *Abya Yala* by European colonisers. They emphasise the analytical-interpretative framework of modernity or coloniality and resignify the category of gender as one of the multiple oppressions suffered by women at the intersection of class, race and sexuality. For their part, community feminisms

consider a historical period that does not begin in 1492 but goes back to the long ancestral memory of the original peoples.

Community feminisms do not use the category of gender to account for the unequal power relations and multiple oppressions that women historically suffer and have suffered. They argue that there can be no decolonisation of thought without depatriarchalisation. For this reason, they reconceptualise patriarchy and develop the idea of patriarchal junction to give an account of the existence of an original ancestral patriarchy that is reinforced and deepened by the colonial patriarchy. In this sense, they define patriarchy as 'the' system of all the oppressions and all the violence suffered by humanity (men, women, intersex people, bodies and non-genders) and nature, historically built on women's bodies.

Community feminists have constructed their own radicalised thinking, generating a profound epistemic rupture based on the cosmogony of the native peoples, from which they construct interpretative elements such as body-territory-daily life, territory-earth, community, autonomy, cosmogonic suspicion, agreement, disharmonisation of the network of life, among others. It is a proposal that is born from the indignant bodies of Indigenous women.

Although community feminists share a set of interpretative elements to account for the multiple oppressions and violence suffered by Indigenous women, it can be seen that their constructions of thought come from different places. Bolivian *Aymara* feminists rely on the community as a starting and end point for transformation into a community, while Guatemalan *Maya-Xinka* feminists rely on bodies outraged by the process of healing and emancipation.

The feminist movements in their long historical development have generated deep transformations in all areas of social life. They have demonstrated enormous potential as a capacity for struggle and resistance and as a capacity for building thought, beyond the differences that can be observed in the ideas, debates and strategies used. This potentiality is also expressed in the epistemological dispute and in the production of knowledge. Here, we can observe a process of radicalisation and epistemic rupture, which began in the 1970s with the questioning by White feminists in North America and Europe of the sexism, androcentrism and patriarchy of modern science. Today, the year 2021, it finds its most radicalised and original point in the community feminists who build their thought on the cosmogony of the original peoples. In this sense, this article is a contribution to understanding this complex and rich process.

The Feminisms of the South are a rich source of contributions to social work. Experiences from Australia and New Zealand, as well as Indonesia, have been mentioned in the article. Some of the most outstanding contributions are the complex, dynamic and diverse views of social reality, the centrality of everyday life, intersectionality, situated practice and the value of the collective, among other contributions.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Silvana Martínez https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1912-0868

Note

1. Indigenous denomination of Latin America.

References

Alexander, J. and C. Mohanty (eds) (1997) *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. New York: Routledge.

Allen, P. ([1986] 1992) *The Sacred Hoop. Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Amos, V. and P. Parmar (1984) 'Challenging Imperial Feminism', in E. K.-K. Bhavnani (ed.) *Feminism and 'Race'*, pp. 348–65. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anzaldúa, G. ([1987] 2016) *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. Madrid: Capitan Swings.

Busconi, A. (2018) 'Cuerpo y territorio: una aproximación al activismo ecofeminista en América Latina', *Anuario en Relaciones Internacionales*, pp. 25–37.

Cabnal, L. (2010) 'Acercamiento a la construcción de la propuesta de pensamiento epistémico de las mujeres indígenas feministas comunitarias de Abya Yala', En ACSUR-Las Segovias: *Feminismos diversos: El feminismo comunitario*, Partnership for cooperation with the South, pp. 11–25.

Cabnal, L. (2018) 'Tzk'at, Red de Sanadoras Ancestrales del Feminismo Comunitario desde Iximulew-Guatemala', *Ecología Política* 54: 100–4.

Carneiro, S. (2009) 'Ennegrecer el feminismo', Available online at: http://www.bivipas.unal.edu.co/jspui/bitstream/10720/644/1/264-Sueli%20Carneiro.pdf

Collins, P. (2000). *Black Feminist Thought*. New York: Routledge.

Davis, A. ([1981] 2005) *Mujeres, raza y clase*. Madrid: Akal.

De Sousa Santos, B. (2009) *Una epistemología del sur*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.

Dudgeon, P. and A. Bray (2016) 'Women's and Feminist Activism in Aboriginal Australia and Torres Strait Islands', *Wiley Online Library*. Epub ahead of print 21 April. DOI: 10.1002/9781118663219.wbegss635.

Espinosa-Miñoso, Y. (2013) 'Una crítica descolonial a la epistemología feminista crítica', *El Cotidiano* 184: 7–12.

Gargallo Celentani, F. (2015) *Feminismos desde Abya Yala. Ideas y proposiciones de las mujeres de 607 pueblos en nuestra América*. México City: UNAM.

Girsang, L., A. Sihabudin and M. Ronda (2018) 'Indonesian Women's Struggle Towards Transformation: A Case from "Rusunawa" Community', *Asian Social Science* 14(10): 38.

Gray, M. and L. Schubert (2016) 'Do Something, Change Something', in S. Wendt and N. Moulding (eds) *Contemporary Feminisms in Social Work Practice*, pp. 113–8. London: Routledge.

Guzmán Arroyo, A. (2019) *Descolonizar la memoria. Descolonizar los feminismos*. La Paz: Llojeta.

hooks, b. (1984) *'Mujeres Negras. Dar forma a la teoría feminista', En b. hooks et al. Otras inapropiables. Feminismos desde las fronteras*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.

Hull, G., P. Bell and B. Smith (1982) *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, but Some of Us Are Brave*. New York: Feminist Press.

Lorde, A. ([1984] 1988) 'Las herramientas del amo nunca desarmarán la casa del amo', En C. Moraga and A. Castillo (eds) *Esta puente mi espalda. Voces de mujeres tercermundistas en los Estados Unidos*, pp. 18–28. San Francisco, CA: ISM.

Lugones, M. (2011) 'Hacia un feminismo descolonial', *La Manzana de la Discordia* 6(2): 105–19.

McClintock, A. (1995) *Imperial Leather. Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge.

Martínez, S. (2019) 'Feminismo Comunitario. Una propuesta teórica y política desde Abya Yala', *Servicios Sociales Y Política Social* XXXV(118): 25–34.

Martínez, S. and J. Agüero (2017) 'El trabajo social emancipador como aporte a los procesos de decolonialidad', En M. Hermida and P. Meschini (eds) *Trabajo Social y Descolonialidad. Epistemologías insurgentes para la intervención en lo social*, pp. 105–124. Mar del Plata: EUDEM.

Medina Martin, R. (2013) 'Feminismos Periféricos, Feminismos-Otros: una genealogía feminista decolonial por reivindicar', *Revista Internacional de Pensamiento Político* 8: 53–79.

Moore Torres, C. (2018) 'Feminismos del Sur, abriendo horizontes de descolonización. Los feminismos indígenas y los feminismos comunitarios', *Estudios Políticos* 53: 237–59.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2000) *Talkin' Up to the White Woman: Indigenous Women and Feminism*. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.

Morley, C. and P. Ablett (2017) 'Rising Wealth and Income Inequality: A Radical Social Work Critique and Response', *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work* 29(2): 6–18.

Oyewumi, O. (1997) *The Invention of Women. Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourses*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Quijano, A. (1991) ‘Colonialidad, modernidad/racionalidad’, *Perú Indígena* 13(29): 11–29.
Quijano, A. (2000a) ‘Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina’, En E. Lander (ed.) *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas*, pp. 201–237. Buenos Aires: UNESCO-FACES-UCV.
Quijano, A. (2000b) ‘Colonialidad del poder y clasificación social’, *Journal of World Systems Research* XI(2): 342–86.
Said, E. ([1978] 2008) *Orientalismo*. Barcelona: Debolsillo.
Sawer, M. and J. Curtin (2016) ‘Organising for a More Diverse Political Science: Australia and New Zealand’, *European Political Science* 15: 441–56.
Villarroel Peña, Y. (2019) ‘Feminismos descoloniales latinoamericanos: geopolítica, resistencia y Relaciones Internacionales’, *Relaciones Internacionales* 39: 103–19.

Author biographies

Silvana Martinez holds a PhD in social sciences, a bachelor’s and master’s degree in social work. She is a research professor at the National University of Mar del Plata, Argentina, and president of the International Federation of Social Workers.

Juan Agüero holds a master’s and doctorate in social work, and a doctorate in economic sciences. They are professor, researcher and director of social policies at the National University of Mar del Plata, Argentina.