

**We Come Last: Women's Liberation
Settles Under Capitalism**

Catalina Buitano

Dr. Joseph Campisi

PHIL 477

October 22 2021

Introduction

The average woman is deeply repressed in our global society and this subsequently leads to an unshakable sense of alienation. The international inability to establish true gender equality has made it increasingly difficult to solve issues that aren't typically seen as pertaining to women particularly. Issues such as generational poverty, universal alienation from a unique concept of self, and the commodification of labor and existence, cannot be eliminated as long as gender inequality remains widespread. "One is not born, but rather becomes a woman." This was Simone De Beauvoir's formulation about what distinguishes sex from gender. She argued that gender is an aspect of identity that is gradually obtained. I will be using De Beauvoir's formulation of this distinction between sex and gender in order to better comprehend this conception of gender inequality as an issue that has not solely befallen those who identify as women. The active reproduction of the patriarchy is contradictory to the aspiration for altruism and following "the greater good," because it doesn't just repress women, it represses every individual. Feminists use this distinction to convey that anatomy is not destiny. Sex is defined to be the invariant and factic aspects of the female body, while gender is defined to be the cultural meaning and form that the body acquires. After making this distinction, it is not possible to attribute the social functions of women to being a product of biological necessity, and therefore, we would not be able meaningfully attribute it to natural or unnatural gendered behavior. With that stated, gender inequality is an issue that relates more to social relations than biological ones. A large misconception about feminism is that it aspires to replace the patriarchy with a matriarchy. Instead, feminists, under an umbrella term, ultimately seek gender equality in which no gender holds more value and power over the other. The United States uses capitalism as its central economic system, which, according to radical feminists, has been oppressive to women

and the rest of the working class. Political philosophers are then faced with the following question: Is total women's liberation possible under capitalism? As previously stated, gender inequality is a pervasive social issue that affects all individuals, therefore it is crucial to determine whether the feminist movement for total women's liberation can ever reach its full potential under capitalism.

After briefly focusing on outlining the different positions held on determining whether the concept of women's liberation is compatible with capitalism, this paper aims to convey the following points. First, that capitalism in mainstream consumer culture is existentially repressive and counterproductive. Second, I will argue that capitalism commodifies the existence of women and alienates them from their true identity as a result of gender norms. Third, I will argue that internalized misogyny is a significant obstacle in implementing intersectional feminist legislation which can be attributed to capitalism. And finally, I will lay out a discussion concerning different kinds of more moderate feminisms and how they fail to pivot around the objections proposed by radical feminists regarding the feasibility of women's liberation under capitalism. Specifically, I argue that patriarchal capitalism produces adverse tangible, existential effects as a result of gender inequality and therefore cannot sustainably foster total women's liberation. This argument underlines the intention to demonstrate how resolving gender inequality is an issue that prevents all individuals from living a truly "free" existence which is perpetuated by capitalism. This entails that no one is truly "free" until we establish total gender equality. In making the aforementioned claims, I am not arguing that overthrowing capitalism will eradicate all gender inequality, only that capitalism does not provide suitable conditions to ever be able to establish gender equality.

Capitalism in Consumer Culture

Women never fully realize their own potential as individuals under the patriarchy. This is a complex phenomena, but it is extremely unlikely for an individual who has lived their entire life walking on eggshells to ever truly “be themselves.” Women have to tiptoe around society in order to receive the acceptance and societal validation that every human being ultimately craves to a certain degree. Men also crave this validation as well to a different extent. Much like women, men are faced with a similar obstacle. Women, as a result of patriarchal capitalism are pressured to fit beauty norms that they could never realistically attain.

The beauty and fashion industry are infamously toxic because they reinforce unrealistic body standards leading to eating disorders, and the trends they market to consumers assure that women’s beauty standards always revolve around appealing to the “male gaze.” Feminist movements within the fashion industry have even been criticized for being contradictory and overlooking intersectionality. The paper “‘I Want to Wear It’: Fashioning Black Feminism in *Mahogany* (1975),” by Kimberly Lamm, she focuses on the portrayal of fashionable attire in the 1975 film *Mahogany* and draws a connection to the history of African American women engaging in sartorial self-representation as a form of asserting their visibility in racist American culture. She wants to depict how the movie’s representation of fashion diminishes the historically embedded bias against highly adorned clothing while also highlighting how this bias has played a significant role in perpetuating the racism and sexism that Black women have encountered by excluding them from the recognition that the category of femininity offers. Put simply, she argues that *Mahogany* represents these obstacles and the sexual and racial commodification underlying these issues. This is one aspect of how gender identity is heavily connected to social norms and biases in the fashion industry. For example, in the case of highly adorned clothing,

which was typically worn by black women and labeled as being “ratchet” and “lacking femininity and class,” there is a clear connection between race, sex, and class. Highly adorned clothing when worn by black women is highly criticized, but seen as a trend in white culture. This is because the fashion industry uses capitalism as means to “buy out” racial identities and commodify them by turning them into trends.

Both men and women belonging to cultural minority groups are adversely affected by the fashion industry’s commodification of racial and sexual identities, making it an intersectional problem. Patriarchal capitalism promotes the erasure of cultural and racial identities and “white washes” them. This causes members of racial minorities to become alienated and limits their modes of cultural and racial expression because capitalism has orchestrated the illusion that one can simply purchase physical features from marginalized cultures without being subjected to experiencing the oppression perpetuated by the patriarchy. Black women and men are scrutinized for looking “unprofessional” for having an Afro or braided hair, while white rappers are praised for appearing “edgy” in pop-culture. This portrays how there is a double standard in society between white and black people in America. One detrimental existential implication can be observed in how white people in America are afforded the freedom of expressing themselves without being scrutinized, while Black people have to strive to resemble the patriarchal “concept of whiteness” at the expense of having the freedom of asserting and expressing themselves.

Additionally, gender inequality in fashion has been a big factor in the repression of individual’s personal identities entirely as a result of living under the conditions of patriarchal capitalism. I suggest that the continued subjugation of women and their identities in fashion has also led to the repression of other genders’ and the ability to express oneself. This is a significant aspect of understanding the “meaning” of fashion and its purpose, as means of self-expression

and human creativity. Fashion is arguably a branch of aesthetics, and a concept of aesthetic is unique to humans; this entails that humans created fashion and therefore determine its meaning, which is ultimately to express our own social, cultural, ethnic, and personal identities.

On a further note, In *'Awaken your incredible': Love your body discourses and postfeminist contradictions*, Rosalind Gill, and Ana Sofia Elias discuss the “Love Your Body” movement or LYB, and argue that LYB is perpetuated by commodity fetishism and ultimately fails to liberate women from unhealthy body standards. Capitalism essentially promotes consumers to “buy into” the beauty standard even if it leads to horrific consequences. Mainstream celebrities and beauty influencers like Khloe Kardashain promoted products like “Flat Tummy Tea” which was not approved by the U.S. Federal Drug Administration and encouraged fans to consider this meal replacement option in order to look like her. This raises concerns about how movements like LYB, which was curated by capitalist corporations, tries to hypocritically promote messages about body-image positivity while simultaneously marketing products that contradict this lifestyle. The reality behind this is that influencers like Khloe Kardashian for example, are allowed to mislead the public and have access to personal trainers, dieticians, and healthy food options. The poor do not have that luxury, yet they are sold this idea that in order to possess value in this society, one must live up to these standards imposed upon them by members of the ruling class. In other words, women cannot just simply afford a Brazilian Butt Lift, Lip Filler Procedures, and all the latest designer brand handbags. Similarly, obesity is a pervasive issue in the U.S. because capitalism enables corporations to make healthy food options expensive and fast-food and junk foods inexpensive. Especially in single-parent households where the parent simply does not have the time to work to provide for their children and cook abstract meals at dinner time every night. Therefore, it is absurd to promote an

unrealistic beauty norm of “thinness” as being easily attainable through impulsively purchasing products like Flat Tummy Tea when encouraging society to live a “healthy lifestyle” is dependent upon having the means to afford the luxury and commodity that health and fitness has become. Not everyone can look like Khloe Kardashian because they can’t afford anything other than a meal from McDonald’s, but they are still expected to be under patriarchal capitalism.

Furthermore, movements like LYB ultimately create the illusion that capitalism is capable of promoting body-positivity, however, this is a facade because capitalism frequently uses movements as a strategy for commercializing social issues and tries to avoid taking accountability for the larger issues that capitalism generates. Women are never truly “free” to dress the way that they want because capitalism has ensured that the majority of mainstream fashion moguls are men, who will subsequently produce products that appeal to the “male gaze.” Fashion has been used as a medium of self-expression, and I suggest that one of the ways in which humans assert their own “freedom” is by expressing their own human creativity. Since capitalism also promotes products and services that perpetuate body image issues and dangerous trends, this prevents women from ever feeling comfortable in their own bodies and being “free.” Women look at the surgically modified bodies on social media and see themselves as the “other” and strive to obtain this unrealistic standard of perfection.

Existence is Commodified

The cis-gendered man is innately unaware of their privilege over every woman in the world. Women have been degraded and diminished by a man whose sexual or romantic advances they rejected and then when they express their grievances with society, patriarchy finds any excuse to justify why men measure the value of women based on how much they can get out of

her sexually, romantically, or economically. Like stocks in the stock market, women are seen as investments with instrumental value. This means that rather than possessing value in themselves, which is intrinsic value, they are valued instrumentally as far as they can be useful to the patriarchy. The man sees the woman as a product or good which holds monetary value. This is due to women becoming commercialized objects as a result of capitalism. Women are seen to possess no inherent value in and of themselves. How can one test this hypothesis? For example, women in Texas are ascribed the label “host body” and are being forced to birth children into a broken society that invests more into the police force and military than it does on social programs to support raising these children sustainably. They are forced to birth these children, and then once society gets what it needs it turns its back on these very children. The man, who is responsible for the existence of “single mothers” fails to recognize what having a child actually entails. Bringing an individual into existence from non-existence, is not an action to take lightly. It is not the equivalent of a seventh grader bringing home their first pet Betta fish. Children need to be socialized properly in order to lead productive and fulfilling lives as well as contribute to their own respective communities. Attachment Theory has helped further our understanding of why it is important to nurture our children properly because we know that the human experience largely revolves around relations to other people and other things. If society wants to produce competent and productive citizens, it must establish a secure foundation for the children who are born outside of the nuclear family structure to thrive in. That is major reason women have abortions to begin with: to spare the fetus from being born into a hostile universe; it is not a selfish decision. It is unfortunately one of compassion, especially under the capitalist economic system. The child’s father, no matter how involved or uninvolved he is in the pregnancy and raising of the baby, will never have to be subjected to nine months in which they feel the iron fist

of patriarchy come down on them particularly harder than ever before. It is not commonplace for women to receive paid maternity leave, and if the woman is looking for a job, many employers automatically discriminate against pregnant women for the sake of not needing to honor maternity leave. They are kicked out of schools and denied the right of education, and in states like Texas, still forced to have the child. The man does not grow a humongous pregnant belly and walks everywhere with it. They do not have to become immune to judgemental stares and humiliation even though they are doing as they are told and keeping the baby. Not only does patriarchy feel entitled to pregnancy, it also stigmatizes it. The demands of fulfilling the role of a father of an unplanned child are significantly disproportionate to those that fulfilling the role of single pregnant mother entails. Even though “pregnant” woman is a temporary disadvantaged social identity, “mother” is not. The nursing mother does not stop being oppressed after she gives birth to the child. In fact, her existence will ever be as free as when she was a woman without a child. Men have the luxury of being able to hide the label “baby daddy” which generates stigma and gossip. Women on the other hand, do not have this ability because they are the ones who carry the child.

The issue is rooted in the mind and thus, the law. Women have to try twice as hard as men in order to reach the same goal. Women know the implications of being a woman without a degree or career in this hostile environment. Women in poverty don't only lack basic human resources, they also lack the right to bodily autonomy as we have observed in forced sterilization of low-income women. Capitalism casting down its iron fist on the poor and making society hate these individuals is a whole problem in itself, but this paper will primarily focus on its effect on women. With that said, we still have men in society and in decision-making positions who try to pass legislation on women's issues. It is one thing to discuss the morality of abortion among

women, but it is completely different to seek the guidance of a practically non-existent stakeholder. With or without the abortion, the man will always come out in a position of dominance over their female counterpart. The woman is ostracized in both cases.

On a similar note, existence has been commodified in and of itself and I will support this claim by using Jean Paul Sartre's concept of "surpassing the body" in *Being and Nothingness* to further develop my argument that women lack meaningful existence and live a commodified existence under capitalism. Albeit Sartre's concept of "surpassing the body" can be argued to presuppose mind and body dualism, but Judith Butler redefines this idea of self-transcendence as in itself as corporeal movement in order to refute this claim. The body should be seen as a mode of desire and directional force. It gives consciousness the ability to access the world and in doing this the body is surpassing itself. To Sartre, the body is "lived and experienced" and is the vessel needed to access the world rather than being a static phenomenon. He argues that all human beings strive for possibilities that have not been realized and shows how humans are "beyond themselves" and reducible to just their bodies. Sartre's view of the role of the body in existence is useful because it can help set the foundation for Beauvoir's aforementioned formulation of the distinction between sex and gender. Beauvoir expands upon Sartre's concept of the body which helps further highlight how gender identity is determined by social relations. She would use the word "exist" as a transitive verb and suggests that consciousness exists in its body which is compatible with her argument about "becoming" a gender. Sartre claims that "we can never apprehend this contingency as such insofar as our body is for us; for we are a choice, and for us, to be is to choose ourselves." I read this to alternatively convey the need for individuals to *choose* and *assert* themselves in order to fully "exist" and that "choosing ourselves" is dependent upon being able to exist freely. I argue that the aforementioned formulations from Sartre and

Beauvoir can be applied to contemporary issues concerning women's liberation in order to convey how capitalism generates alienation for women and reduces them to the value of their existence to instrumental capabilities of their bodies; making it difficult for women to truly "surpass their bodies" and choose themselves. I contest that capitalism alienates women from ever developing their unique personal identities as well as forming an authentic conception of selfhood. I propose that this occurs because: (i) Women as consumers are pressured to engage in the capitalist economy in order to access and appeal to beauty standards set by the ruling class rather than their own desires. (ii) The products and services advertised through capitalism are representative of the "ruling ideas" of the ruling class rather than stemming from the consumer. (iii) Women and their labor has been commodified and uncompensated subsequently leading to their exploitation which prevents them from existing freely and choosing themselves. (iiii) Society has trivialized existence and created a life-negating narrative that coming into existence doesn't have other entailments other than reproducing the capitalist agenda.

To substantiate my first claim, I will refer to Karl Marx's formulation of the "illusion of epoch" in *The German Ideology* in which he argues that the ideas of the ruling class are the ruling ideas in society in every epoch. For example, the class which rules the material force of society also rules over the intellectual force of society. The class that controls the means of production also controls mental products, so that the ideas stemming from individuals who lack the means of mental production are also subjected to it. Marx claims that the ruling ideas of every epoch are the ideal expression of the dominant material relations expressed as ideas.

Because of gender norms however, women are unable to materialize their own concept of self. They are completely alienated from their authentic desires as free agents because the ruling class, which controls the capitalist means of production, commercializes intangible ideas into material

objects in order to appeal to the ruling ideas of that epoch. This inadvertently causes a gap between what is desired by a free agent's own concept of self and "the other" which in this section of my paper I will use to describe the existentially repressive ideas imposed on society by the small ruling class. The other's presence within an agent's psyche subsequently leads to the distinction between the "self" and "the other" becoming lost in translation and a form of alienation. Rather than experience a truly "free" existence and total liberation, women appeal to buying the trends fed to them by the ruling class in order to meet the standards of beauty of that particular epoch. Women are pressured to strip themselves of their capacity for unique self-expression which is a mode for surpassing one's body as mentioned by Sartre in the Beauvorian formulation. Consequently, women cease to live their lives according to the "self" and instead are motivated by "the other." The dominance of the other over the self is responsible for this existential state of subservience and enslavement. This enslavement ensures that the ruling ideals are thought to one's own and that they are reproduced. Women are pressured and psychologically manipulated into striving to use the capital they obtained through their exploitation to fit the bourgeoisie orchestrated caricature of the ideal woman and her role in society. With that being so, this state of mental enslavement causes women to engage in Marx's idea of commodity fetishism and suggests that there is a connection between capitalism and gender inequality. The beauty standards set by the ruling class are patriarchal and repressive because they commercialize ideas that appeal to the male gaze, and in doing so it commodifies women; bringing me to my second claim.

(ii) The products and services advertised through capitalism are representative of the "ruling ideas" of the ruling class rather than stemming from the consumer. As previously discussed Marx argues that the division of labour is one of the chief forces of history and also

manifests itself within the ruling class, which he emphasizes is the division of mental and material labour. The division between these two forms of labour is orchestrated intentionally so that one part inside the ruling class appears as the active conceptive ideologists of the class, while the other part of the class can hold more passive and receptive attitudes towards these ideals. This occurs because they are in reality members of the ruling class and do not have time to orchestrate illusions about themselves. Marx also suggests that opposition and hostility can brew from within this class cleavage, and cause conflict between the two parts. However, in the circumstance of what he calls “practical collision,” in which the reproduction of the ruling class itself is threatened, automatically reaps nothing, which simultaneously highlights that the ruling ideas were not the ideas of the ruling class and possessed a power distinct from this class. One way in which this concept can be applied to the contemporary world is by going back to the Khloe Kardashian example. The family she is a part of would be considered a part of the passive and receptive aspect of the ruling class that is capable of condemning the ideas of their class in order to relate to the proletariat. In the event of a practical collision however, in which the survival of the class is being threatened, the interests of the members of the Kardashian’s family will end up aligning with those of the bourgeoisie. Marx contends that when the French bourgeoisie overthrew the power of the aristocracy, it made it possible for many proletarians to “raise themselves above the proletariat” but only to the extent that they became bourgeois. Now relating this idea back to my claim that capitalism trivializes existence, this mode of production sets the conditions that prevent the proletariat from raising themselves from this repressive state of existence. Marx’s main goal is to establish a relationship between capitalism and the exploitation of the working class to benefit the very few. One can apply this theory to women, who work and are exploited under capitalism by shifting focus to my third claim.

(iii) Women and their labor has been commodified and uncompensated subsequently leading to their exploitation which prevents them from existing freely and choosing themselves. I will substantiate this claim by relating to chapter 13 of Angela Davis' book, *Women, Race and Class the Approaching Obsolescence of Housework: A Working-Class Perspective*, as well as *Feminism for the 99%: a Manifesto* by Cinzia Artuzza, Tithi Bhattacharya, and Nancy Fraser.

In *Women, Race and Class the Approaching Obsolescence of Housework: A Working-Class Perspective*, Angela Davis argues that women have been exploited in the home and have been uncompensated for household chores otherwise known as housework. She supports this claim by referring to the statistic that the average housewife spends around three to four thousand hours on housework. She adds to this by discussing how time spent on household chores does not account for time spent between a mother and her child (childcare). She suggests that one of the closely guarded secrets of advanced capitalist societies involves the possibility of changing the nature of housework. This could manifest itself in hiring teams of trained (skilled) and well-paid workers that move from household to household and could efficiently accomplish the chores performed by the housewife. According to Davis however, the capitalist economy prevents this from ever materializing because it is structurally hostile to the industrialisation of housework. Capitalism is opposed to the idea of socializing housework because this would consist of generating large government subsidies in order to ensure that working-class families such as single parent i.e, have access to this service. Capitalism prioritizes profit above all else, because in generating profit they are able to exploit the working class for their labor. Similarly, women have not only been tied to the household by the patriarchy. They are also exploited in the household and between chores and childcare. Consider spending three to four thousand hours on housework, pressured by mainstream society to mirror the qualities of the ideal woman, and also

“sacrificing” one’s time to prioritize childcare. They are exploited for their labor; and one example of this is women being forced to spend money and time raising a child they didn’t want to have because they are otherwise seen as irresponsible senseless murderers. Women are a commodity much like objects are under capitalism which creates its own manifestation of fetishism over living beings. There is a significantly larger percentage of irresponsible men who inseminate multiple women than irresponsible women who are inseminated and can only carry one man’s child at once. Men are capable of impregnating multiple women at once and trade capital (child support) for the mother of their child to provide the service of sole caretaker if they even choose to honor their duty of monetary compensation. I would like to emphasize that the concept of child support is another clear example of how women are exploited for their labour, causing alienation and preventing women from existing “freely.” In other words, it is no secret that child support mandates implemented by the government are often fraudulent and inaccurately estimate the fair wage for the time women spend on childcare and in this sense, women are exploited. The tangible price ascribed to child care in courtrooms misinterprets the actual time and labour power going into taking care of a child. Individuals have hidden documents disclosing passive income and have even been ordered to pay under ten dollars a month for three children. To be able to fit the ruling social norm of being a “good mother” women must detach themselves from their individuality and creative capabilities in order to sustain the household alone. Capitalist society sees women as an object that holds value only to the extent that it helps reproduce the goals of the ruling class or is useful to them. As previously emphasized, women are host bodies and caretakers therefore they never truly surpass the exploitation faced by the proletariat because most of their time is spent performing labour of some kind. This is why Angela Davis highlights the socialisation of housework as an objective

social need; women need to exist outside of their role of “worker” and capitalism refuses to sacrifice its goal of generating profit from exploited labor in order to sustain true women’s liberation.

On a similar note, in *Feminism for the 99%: a Manifesto*, the authors outline the ground for debate between the two main opposing voices involved in representing opposing paths for the feminist movement. On one hand, Sandberg and her colleagues describe feminism as the handmaiden of capitalism, in which their ultimate goal is a world where the role of managing exploitation in the workplace as well as oppression in the collective social whole is equally shared among men and women. The authors propose that Sandberg’s liberal feminist vision mirrors one of equal opportunity domination: which in the name of feminism orders normal people to ironically feel “grateful” that it was a woman instead of a man who “who busts their union, orders a drone to kill their parent, or locks their child in a cage at the border.” In sharp contrast to Sandberg’s liberal feminism, the authors emphasize that the organizers of the *huelga feminista* who insist on abolishing capitalism; the system that generates boss, produces national borders, and produces the drones that protect them. The goal is to live in an altruistic world where wealth and natural resources are distributed amongst all and where gender equality and existential freedom are materialized rather than remaining an unfulfilled aspiration.

Finally I will address the fourth premise in explaining how women are commodified.

(iii) Society has trivialized existence and created a life-negating narrative that coming into existence doesn’t have other entailments other than reproducing the capitalist agenda. I will substantiate this claim by relating to the paper *De Beauvoir, Existentialism, and Marx*, in which Angela Shepherd focuses on analyzing De Beauvoir’s view and argues that alongside an original account of existential freedom, Beauvoir utilises a “Marx-inspired” historical materialism and

uses it as a methodological tool to examine the social position of women. She also examines Karl Marx's formulation of freedom and uses De Beauvoir's introduction of gender to explain how the concepts of material, social, and situational conditions restrict the possibility of bodily agency for women. Shepherd uses these two formulations, to endorse Beauvoir's idea that material change is required in order to promote human flourishing.

(Note for reader: will be continued and revised, body paragraph unfinished).

Capitalism and Internalized Misogyny

In this section of my paper I will discuss internalized misogyny and its role in women's repression by posing as a barrier to women's liberation. I argue that internalized misogyny in one's consciousness could be considered a repressed and enslaved state of being. Internalized misogyny was best defined in *The Fabric of Internalized Sexism*, in which the authors characterize this phenomenon as occurring when women enact learned sexist behaviors upon themselves and other women. Women who struggle with deep internalized misogyny are perhaps one of the most significant obstacles in women's liberation. In contemporary society, feminists have coined the term "pick-me girl" to describe women who enact these sexist behaviors at their own expense and that of other women because the pick-me girl appeals to patriarchal norms. As of the present, capitalism has been criticized for being patriarchal and oppressive; the pick-me girl actively works against the idea of women's complete liberation which makes it difficult to form a coalition of women who are all feminists. I suggest that capitalism also reinforces rape-culture which is one of the leading forms of violence gender-based violence facing women because it promotes the objectification of women and perpetuates their hypersexualization in society and their role possessing instrumental value. The pick-me girl experiences this alienation from her what her best interests actually are first hand because she her consciousness have been

completely dominated by the other (governed by patriarchy) resulting in her actively enacting behaviors that are consistent with the idea that she has to manipulate her body and concept of self to obtain male validation.

Another example of the concept of internalized misogyny can be observed by analyzing the frequently repeated phrase “Not all Men.” The problem with this phrase is that it reinforces violence against women. Although not all men are sexist, this phrase diminishes the need to hold men accountable for their own desires and subsequent behaviors rather than attacking women. When we say that not all men are guilty of crimes like sexual assault, harassment, and exploitation, we transfer the responsibility to prevent these incidents from occurring onto women rather than hold men accountable for their hypersexualization of women. Instead, society comes up with useless dress codes and tries to justify sexual violence by entertaining the idea that whatever outfit a woman is wearing can prevent her from becoming a victim of this kind of attack. Society shifts responsibility to women to prevent these attacks rather than prevent men from committing them. This narrative makes women responsible for the actions of men. Instead of questioning why a young woman’s shoulder is a sexual object that distracts men from school work, school boards socialize their female students to feel guilt and shame towards their own body.

Moderate Feminisms Can’t See The Bigger Picture

People often complain about generational poverty, but fail to see the bigger picture. Generational poverty is a direct consequence of colonialism, slavery, capitalism, and the everlong oppression of women globally. Capitalism continues to reproduce poverty and economic inequality intentionally in order to ensure there are individuals whose labor it can count on being able to exploit.

Conclusion

Sources

1. Lamm, Kimberly. “‘I Want to Wear It’: Fashioning Black Feminism in Mahogany (1975).” *Australian Feminist Studies*, vol. 33, no. 98, Routledge, 2018, pp. 428–46, <https://doi.org/10.1080/08164649.2019.1567257>.
2. Butler, Judith. “Butler on Beauvoir - Columbia University.” Sex and Gender in Simone de Beauvoir's *Second Sex*. Yale University Press, October 10, 2019. <http://blogs.law.columbia.edu/critique1313/files/2019/10/Butler-on-Beauvoir.pdf>.
3. Davis, Angela. “Women, Race and Class the Approaching Obsolescence of Housework: A Working-Class Perspective.” *Women, Race and Class* by Angela Davis 1981. Accessed November 8, 2021. <https://www.marxists.org/subject/women/authors/davis-angela/housework.htm>.
4. “Khloe Kardashian and Toxic Beauty Standards.” *Concrete*, May 4, 2021. <https://www.concrete-online.co.uk/khloe-kardashian-and-toxic-beauty-standards/>.
5. “The Whitewashing of the Beauty Industry.” *Submission Beauty*, February 19, 2021. <https://submissionbeauty.com/impact/whitewashing-in-the-beauty-industry/>.
6. Gill, Rosalind, and Ana Sofia Elias. “‘Awaken Your Incredible’: Love Your Body Discourses and Postfeminist Contradictions.” *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics* 10, no. 2 (2014): 179–88. https://doi.org/10.1386/macp.10.2.179_1.
7. BAUER, NANCY. *Simone de Beauvoir, Philosophy, and Feminism*. Columbia University Press, 2001. <https://doi.org/10.7312/baue11664>.
8. Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. *Feminism Without Borders Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Duke University Press, 2003, doi:10.1515/9780822384649.

9. Cudd, Ann E. "Is Capitalism Good for Women?" *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 127, no. 4, Springer, 2015, pp. 761–70, doi:10.1007/s10551-014-2185-9.
10. . Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness: An Essay in Phenomenological Ontology*, trans. Hazel E. Barnes (New York: Philosophical Library, 1947), 329.
11. Marx, Karl. "B. The Illusion of the Epoch." *The German Ideology*. Karl Marx 1845. Accessed November 8, 2021.
<https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/ch01b.htm>.
12. Bearman , Steve, Avril Thorne, and Neill Korobov. "The Fabric of Internalized Sexism - JISS." *Journal of Integrated Social Sciences*. *Journal of Integrated Social Sciences*. Accessed November 8, 2021.
https://www.jiss.org/documents/volume_1/issue_1/JISS_2009_1-1_10-47_Fabric_of_Internalized_Sexism.pdf?source=post_page-----.
13. Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. *Feminism Without Borders Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity* . Duke University Press, 2003, doi:10.1515/9780822384649.
14. Shepherd, Angela. 2018. "De Beauvoir, Existentialism and Marx." *Sartre Studies International* 24 (1) (06): 70-70–90.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3167/ssi.2018.240106>.
<https://marist.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journal/s/de-beauvoir-existentialism-marx/docview/2100377576/se-2?accountid=28549>.
15. Arruzza, Cinzia, Tithi Bhattacharya, and Nancy Fraser. "Esto - Outras Palavras." Accessed November 8, 2021.
<https://outraspalavras.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Feminism-for-the-99.pdf>.

16. Ghodsee, Kristen. "Feminism-by-Design: Emerging Capitalisms, Cultural Feminism, and Women's Nongovernmental Organizations in Postsocialist Eastern Europe." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, vol. 29, no. 3, The University of Chicago Press, 2004, pp. 727–53, doi:10.1086/380631.