MODULE 7.

INTRODUCTION TO INTERSECTIONAL FEMINISM
Learning outcomes

This module provides a theoretical introduction to intersectionality and intersectional feminism, providing tools for their application in everyday life, both on a personal level and as part of projects and organizations. We aim to stimulate a range of reflections that encourage the incorporation of the intersectional perspective, one which is sensitive to social complexities, and critical of discourses which fuel discrimination. From the concepts and debates posed by intersectional theory, you will have the opportunity to reflect on the ways in which discrimination is reproduced, and also on its relationship with social privilege. In addition, you will be provided with a series of tools in order to identify and contribute to transforming these dynamics and relationships.

**KNOWLEDGE**

— To gain knowledge of intersectional theory, its theoretical and methodological approaches, in order to widen the perspectives of people and professionals on social issues.

— Acquire tools for the application of intersectional perspectives in daily life and in voluntary work and international collaborative partnerships.

— To gain knowledge of the genealogy of black and intersectional feminist critiques of hegemonic feminism.

**SKILLS**

— Reflect and discuss systems that generate oppression and privilege.

— Observe and reflect on our own position in society, and the implications inherent.

— Develop a critical perspective, and apply a practical intersectional perspective to different areas of interaction.
ATTITUDES

— Be mindful of situations of injustice that are a consequence of relationships built on dynamics of oppression and privilege between people, and to practices of respect for diversity, inclusion and equity.

— Show social awareness and self-awareness, which translate into transformative practices.
Intersectional Feminism: What Are We Talking About?

Gender as a category of analysis has served to highlight the way in which the patriarchal system has constructed and legitimized social inequalities between men and women on the basis of a supposed “sexual difference”. However, it is a theory that has tended to focus on woman as an undifferentiated social category. Black and decolonial feminists have drawn attention to the fact that, in the absence of a universal woman, such theories produced in the West do not provide a response to the specific oppressions they have suffered. In feminist theory, what position has analysis of race taken up? In racism studies, where does gender feature? How do gender and race shape social class?

**Discrimination on the grounds of sex / gender cannot be understood in isolation.** To be woman is a social category that is built and experienced in constant interaction with other categories: background, social class, skin color, sexual desire, age, abilities, etc. Capitalism, patriarchy and colonialism are intertwined and act together, shaping social identities and hierarchies of power that place people and groups in different positions which condition their opportunities. Within this system, the privileges of some are sustained by the oppression of others, and it is for this reason that we require theories and methodologies that allow us to critically analyze the attendant social context.

*Image 7.1.* Given the interconnected nature of existing inequalities, intersectional feminism asserts that the fight against gender inequality cannot be understood in isolation. Source: janeclarejones.com
It is here that intersectional theory emerges as a necessary tool. This school of thought draws attention to the way in which combined systems of oppression create the conditions that make inequality possible, and also invites us to reflect on our own position: as such, it is not only a methodological but also a political perspective. Contemplating social identities as constructed, complex and changing moves us away from essentialist conceptions, as well as from discourses that naturalize social inequality, leading to more conscious, accurate and critical approaches to the social domain. Intersectionality is the phenomenon through which each individual faces oppression, or holds privileges, as a result of the multiple social categories to which they belong. Adopting an intersectional perspective is a question of being able to appreciate this complexity in a given context.

Incorporating intersectionality into the feminist struggle means rethinking discourses and methods in order to integrate the inherent link between gender, race and social class, and thus jointly challenge all aspects of the dominant white supremacist capitalist patriarchy power structure (hooks, 2013), which exerts varying degrees of violence against women. Focusing exclusively on gender as a rubric that generates oppression is an incomplete view which often does not take into account the diversity of circumstances that affect women according to their social class, background, and so on. A feminist movement that seeks to combat the root cause of inequalities cannot establish hierarchies of oppression, and instead must explore the dynamic relationship between coexisting identities (e.g., women, black) and interconnected systems of oppression (e.g., white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, etc.). This means listening to the voices of women’s diversity in feminist spaces, and taking on board the issues that are important to each of them, not just those of women belonging to the hegemonic group. It is a matter of recognizing the existence of a patriarchy that is not only sexist, but also racist and classist, and that gender discrimination coexists and is intertwined with racism, that is to say, the dehumanization of people who receive discriminatory treatment in relation to the racial category attributed to them.

1 We use the term racialization to point out that races are not pre-existing realities, but are historical social constructs, the products of processes of identification, distinction and differentiation of human beings. As such, the term emphasizes the fact that racial groups do not exist per se, but groups become socially racialized as a result of a process determined by relations of power. The term emphasizes the relational character of racial classifications: the category of the white man emerges as the result of the creation of an other (Campos García, 2012). It follows that, while we are all racialized (as in, we are all ascribed certain racial, ethnic, cultural categorizations), we do not all suffer the impact of racism (Gehehou, 2020).

When feminism does not explicitly oppose racism, and when antiracism does not incorporate opposition to patriarchy, race and gender politics often end up being antagonistic to each other, and both interests lose. (Crenshaw, 1992)

Feminisms are intersectional when they do not reproduce the biases that characterize hegemonic positions within feminism indicated by black and decolonial feminist perspectives. Such hegemonic feminist positions are partial and exclusionary, in that they consider gender as a separate category of oppression, one not intertwined with other dimensions that generate oppression (thus obscuring differences in power, interests, and
privileges). They overlook the plurality of women’s experiences concealed by the universal subject of woman, which represents the interests of white, middle class women. Hegemonic feminism does not allow itself to be challenged, and does not recognize its own privilege, nor the effects of structural racism, as an integral part of what the feminist struggle is fighting against. It is a perspective which, by reproducing ethnocentric, Eurocentric and racist frameworks, positions itself, its demands and its ways of doing things as the norm, undermining other forms of resistance.

Intersectional feminism incorporates into its structural analysis and action an awareness of the superposition of the oppressions of race, sex, sexuality and more, in order to accommodate and understand the life experiences of all women. Intersectional praxis avoids reproducing the marginalization and hierarchization of women within the feminist movement and challenges the expectation that racialized feminists should prioritize sex/gender in their analyses of and struggles against oppression (Heuchan, 2019), or have to choose between one of the two poles of their identity (opting either for a feminist or an anti-racist struggle).

In short, intersectional feminist perspectives: recognize and assert that there are multiple axes of intertwined discrimination; recognize the diversity of women’s experiences, strategies of resistance, and knowledge; respect how they choose to prioritise their activism; defend alliances as the basis of the collective organization of the movement, and are simultaneously anti-patriarchal, anti-racist and anti-capitalist.

These feminisms recognize that women are not a homogeneous group, and that women’s experiences are defined by the intersection of the diverse identities and roles - social and political - that they occupy in various systems of domination, in which not only gender, but also other categories such as ethnicity, nationality, class, sexual orientation, age, physical and mental abilities, etc., play an operative part. The central problem, then, is the social construction of the subordination or “inferiority” of certain groups. (GRUP ANTÍGONA)
The origin of intersectional theory

_Intersectionality_ is a term coined in 1989 by the African-American lawyer Kimberlé W. Crenshaw, who collected and systematized black feminist critiques of feminist theory which focused on women as an undifferentiated social category, something which in reality represented the interests and needs of white, middle-class women.

Feeling relegated by white feminists’ lack of sensitivity to their specific oppression, the African-American feminist group Combahee River Collective drew attention early on to the need to address the differences between women. There being no universal woman, what until then had been the political subject of feminism - the figure of the woman - was brought under the spotlight. In their famous manifesto, the group defined intersectionality as a political position committed to the liberation of black women, defining it as the aim of their struggle:

> We are actively committed to struggling against racial, sexual, heterosexual, and class oppression, and see as our particular task the development of integrated analysis and practice based upon the fact that the major systems of oppression are interlocking. The synthesis of these oppressions creates the conditions of our lives. As Black women we see Black feminism as the logical political movement to combat the manifold and simultaneous oppressions that all women of color face. (The Combahee River Collective Statement, 1977)

Crenshaw, who provides legal analysis of cases of discrimination against black women, posits the use of the term as a means of addressing the marginalization of African American women in both anti-discrimination legislation and feminist and anti-racist theory and policy. The notion of considering race and gender as mutually exclusive categories of experience and analysis, that is, to make use of analytical perspectives which do not reflect the interaction between the systems that generate oppression and privilege, results in the invisibilization of those social positions marked by multiple oppressions. Adopting an intersectional view, Crenshaw tells us, is an imperative benchmark in the fight for human rights and social justice, given that we require frames that allow us to appreciate the social problems of all members of a given group. This is truer still where those who are least protected are also those who are most marginalized by systems of oppression.
The experience of the most privileged members within each social category is the one that tends to be more visible, and to enjoy more discursive prominence. Black women are excluded from feminist theory in cases of sexual discrimination, for example, in which the subject of reference is a white woman (privileged within the racial system and, ultimately, by class). At the same time, in anti-racist politics, the subject afforded visibility is that of the black male.

Crenshaw’s theoretical view was strongly motivated by the case of Emma DeGraffenreid, one of five black women who in 1976 sued General Motors for discrimination, alleging that the company was excluding black women. Emma’s case was dismissed by the Court, on the grounds that, as the company hired women (white, for administrative positions), the company did not discriminate on grounds of gender and, as it also hired black people (men, for industrial work), nor did it engage in racial discrimination. However, the real problem, which the judge was unwilling to acknowledge, was what Emma was actually trying to prove: that black women, as a group affected by two systems of discrimination, were collectively subject to a specific type of discrimination which is not merely the sum of the discrimination suffered, respectively, by black men and white women. Despite being doubly affected, however, she received no attention from either group: neither from the markedly masculine civil rights movement, nor from an American feminist movement led mostly by affluent white women.

Such exclusion cannot be resolved by simply embedding black women within already-established analytical structures. Given that the intersectional experience is more than the sum of racism and sexism, any analysis which does not take intersectionality into account cannot sufficiently address the specific subordination of black women. (Crenshaw, 1988)
Intersectionality has been manifest in black feminist writing since the 1960s. Michele Wallace was a pioneering thinker in this regard, criticizing misogyny within the Black Power movement, and pointing to the framework common to misogyny and racism. Angela Davis’ texts were instrumental in analyzing the relationship between class and race, exploring the role of both in the particular marginalization of black women. bell hooks also identified racism and sexism as inherently interconnected forms of structural oppression, pointing to the black national liberation movement as patriarchal and feminism as a white, middle-class movement, entirely alien to the needs of non-white and poor women.

The process begins with the individual woman's acceptance that American women, without exception, are socialized to be racist, classist, and sexist, in varying degrees, and that labeling ourselves as feminists does not change the fact that we must consciously work to rid ourselves of the legacy of negative socialization. (bell hooks, 1981)

It was in this context that Crenshaw developed the concept of intersectionality, pointing out the relationships between social positions and oppression. Black activist and theorist Patricia Hill Collins (2002) refers to the multiple intertwined axes of oppression as a matrix of domination in which individual identity is shaped, emphasizing the interdependence between conditions of oppression, and the possibility that people may simultaneously find themselves in the positions of oppressor and oppressed.
Intersectionality as a critical framework for analysis and action

Insofar as the intersectional approach places attention on oppression suffered, or privileges enjoyed, by each individual based on their belonging to multiple social categories, it allows us to perceive and fight against the discrimination suffered by people placed on the “margins” of social categories, or those affected by various categories of oppression.

As an epistemological and political paradigm, it allows us to fight against the multiple forms of oppression within social change movements, and pushes us to break away from fragmented perspectives, encouraging alliances. Within the social sciences, it is used as an essential analytical tool to study the ways in which power structures interact in order to produce distinct conditions of inequality that affect groups and individuals differently. These domains of power interact to create social hierarchies based on different factors that shape social identities or positions. That is to say, intersectionality makes it possible to make systemic analyses of the elements involved in the configuration of power relations and the volatility of specific manifestations of oppression, subject to their wider social environment.

This is why we talk about the different axes of privilege and oppression, which make the existence of different systems of discrimination that operate in a combined way visible, giving rise to discrimination according not only to sex, race and social class, but also according to origin (such as Eurocentrism), sexuality (heterosexism), abilities (ableism), age (ageism), educational attainment, and so on. The social identities placed at the top of the graph are those that will have privileges ascribed to them, implicitly based on the oppression of people who "deviate" from the norm. Any given person can simultaneously experience oppression and privileges in relation to their belonging to multiple identities (e.g. woman, white, working-class, lesbian), or having different status in different spaces (e.g. the home, work, or grouping to which they belong). As social, and socially constructed, categorizations, attributes which entail privilege in one given context may bring discrimination in another (for example, declaring oneself a feminist).

This use of the intersectional paradigm to address multiple identities and oppressions, if used uncritically, carries the danger of whitewashing a theory in which racism emerges as a constituent element of gender oppression for many women. In other words, the critique of structural racism which underpins the theory may end up buried under a vast array of axes of identity. This centrality of the axis of racialization must also be understood by the fact that racism, following Frantz Fanon, is a global hierarchy of superiority and inferiority along the line of the human, a division that translates into systematic denial of humanity and fundamental rights to those people situated below, in the zone of non-being (in Grosfoguel, 2012).

Lucas Platero (2014) has developed the concept of intersectionality as a critical pedagogy concerning social identities. It is an approach that situates social categories such as gender, ethnicity, class or sexual orientation as social constructions which, far from being “natural” or “biological”, are contrived, and makes us aware of the mutual relations between the different sources of structural inequality (e.g. that capitalism is intrinsically racialized and gendered). It invites us to consider the processes through which certain attributes or identities may be considered deviant and the object of marginalization in certain contexts. It casts its gaze over the social construction of inequalities, and as such focuses on the laws, institutions and administrative bodies complicit in inequality.

It provides a theoretical consideration of the privileges and strategies (conscious or otherwise) of dominant groups, through which their position of supremacy is preserved, moving away from the traditional focus of the social sciences and social movements on oppression. Hill

---

2 Sirma Bilge criticizes a "whitewashing" of intersectionality which, at a time of institutionalization of this theory (and its application to public policy), entails the danger of the decentralization of race and the political character that guided Black feminists’ critiques. Good practice in intersectionality, Bilge points out, involves maintaining the centrality of radical anti-racism and the critique of neoliberalism (in Zugaza, 2020)
Collins uses the metaphor of the *matrix of domination* within which all people are immersed in a situation of oppressor-oppressed, relative to a series multiple social identities, and subject to being a site of resistance to oppression.

*In reality, it is not so much a matter of trying to identify each of the forms of oppression, but of ensuring that each person be respected.*

*(Youmna Chlala)*

As such, *intersectional theory challenges us to be aware of ourselves as privileged subjects*, that is, ones who have opportunities and advantages over others who do not benefit from the hierarchization of social identities ingrained in the capitalist, cis-heterosexist, Eurocentric, colonial system. Within our system, the *so-called "mythical norm"* (Lorde, 2002) - white, male, heterosexual, Christian and financially secure - is the dominant and most privileged subjectivity, defined as socially and culturally *normal*, and around which all *alterities* are constructed.

Mindell (1995) defines privilege as “a conscious or unconscious social or personal ability or power arising from culture, community support, personal psychology and/or spiritual power”. Privileges are benefits or advantages, provided by Rank - that is, the sum of the privileges granted to us by a particular social system - in any given context. It is a power relative to others who have previously been deprived of it by the same system. **The greater the privileges, the greater the ability, the opportunities, the ease with which we will be able to act, communicate, decide, be, etc.** A high rank is also often accompanied by a greater unawareness of it, as well as of the fact that not everyone starts from the same position. The privileges granted by hierarchical systems that often naturalize inequality - by attributing it to *natural differences*, even when engendering these very differences - may, from perspectives which have not challenged these discourses,
be understood as emanating from a kind of natural order (e.g. of men over women, of whites over non-whites, etc.). Not being racist or sexist in a system that is structurally so, Mindell says, is a daily undertaking. Therefore, it is a question of assuming the responsibility of carrying out the personal and political work implicit in reaching awareness, of and not participating in, the reproduction of these frameworks.

The loss of privileges is often experienced as oppression. Robin DiAngelo (2011) theorized about what he called white fragility, which includes a whole series of defensive strategies and reactions that, from a position of white privilege, are deployed in situations of racial tension - that is, when white privilege is pointed out, or allusion is made to an example of racist behaviour– and which aim to restore the “imbalance” produced by the initial criticism. These reactions (which include victimization, mockery, anger, denial, guilt, and fear) are not intentional strategies, but are the result of an unconscious disposition resulting from how society is structured (through racial and class segregation, and so on). That notwithstanding, white fragility aims to keep the very existence of racial hierarchies out of the debate, and therefore seeks to defend the social advantages of those who, as a result of a racially structured system, benefit from them. Fragility and privilege are connected: concepts such as white tears or male tears ironically point to victimization as a strategy for not recognizing, and thus upholding, structural privileges of gender and race.
Tools and reflections for the practical application of intersectionality

Intersectionality is a concept more advanced in theory than in practice. The potential of this perspective in tackling social inequalities makes it an essential political and theoretical instrument for advancing the goals of radical social justice that are at the heart of its conceptualization.

Intersectional theory postulates itself as a broad frame of reference that allows us to address social complexity from an attitude of critical analysis of categories, discourses and hierarchies, with the aim of identifying all of the factors that contribute to generating identities, diverse social positions and specific discriminations. It decries and corrects the tendency towards invisibilization among fragmentary approaches that part from fixed categories (woman, lesbian, black): that is, those approaches which do not take into account the diversity within each category, or the specific situations of those located at the crossroads between categories, who - despite bearing the burden of the combined and simultaneous impact of various systems of oppression, and therefore finding their access to rights and opportunities particularly limited - are often excluded from policies, projects, and legislation which lack an intersectional outlook.

Intersectionality is a critical discursive approach to social categories and their effects. This is not only because it warns us of the need to pay attention to the plurality within these categories, but also because it denounces the very effects of social categorization as an integral part of the conduct of systems of power and domination, such as racism, the cis-heteropatriarchy, and the capitalist-imperialist-colonial system. It points out the socially constructed nature of social categories and discourses that produce, legitimize and naturalize inequalities, and analyzes the elements present in the rhetoric set in motion to generate systems of privilege and/or oppression. It is a theory of political practice formulated from the ground up – from anti-racist feminist activism – which runs counter to neoliberal discourses, focusing not on individual behaviours as a source of discrimination (as implied by meritocratic thinking), but instead on structural agents: governments and their laws and policies, businesses, and institutional bodies.

It invites us to cast our gaze towards structures, institutions, laws, and discourses of power, and how hegemony, norms, and privilege are constructed. It calls on us to undertake critical
analyses of social categorizations, and of how the use of fragmentary categories contributes, among other effects, to perpetuating structural discrimination within public policy-making. It is sceptical of the array of “egalitarian” approaches blind to intersectional dynamics with respect to people’s rights and opportunities, seeking to correct them by asking: in the formulation of laws, projects, policies, who is being considered? Generic citizens? It is a critique of the epistemic, social and political representations that emerge from white Eurocentrism (including white feminism), while valuing the resistance and knowledge of oppressed groups. It draws attention to the need to give voice to the protagonists of this resistance and their strategies. In short, it is a methodological manifesto, a tool not just for analysis but also for politics: to engage in politics from the perspective of intersectionality is to change the rules of the game.

For feminists, it challenges us to work not only against patriarchy or capitalism, but also against internalized racism, to recognize ourselves not only as oppressed, but also as oppressors, and to become aware of our privileges and the way we contribute, whether by action or inaction, to the reproduction of patterns of discrimination. From this position, we are invited to listen (and to be silent when necessary, as well), to be empathetic, to show solidarity with all women, and to be self-critical: to be able to break with Western-centric forms of thinking, to realize the ways (conscious or unconscious) in which our spaces and ways of doing things are, on many occasions, exclusive. It provides us with a predisposition to critically evaluate and rethink our alliances, to ask ourselves which causes motivate us and why, and which people are absent from our spaces.

In relation to intersectionality as a political practice (Crenshaw, 1989) both at the institutional and activist level, Coll-Planas and Solà-Morales (2019) highlight some premises focused on strengthening this perspective in public policy-making. They indicate that, despite the fact that policies may not be not formulated in an intersectional way, insofar as they are aimed at the citizenry or focus on a particular axis, their effects can understood in these terms, in that they contribute either to combatting oppression or to reproducing it. This is why it is essential to critically examine organizational and institutional practices in order to determine who is excluded, and to what extent the heterogeneity of groups is recognized or certain identities are reinforced:

"The aim would be that policies were consciously intersectional (assuming inclusions and exclusions, establishing priorities...), and that they would seek to fight against these inequalities that occur as a result of the intersection of axes."
Working to solve specific problems instead of focusing on social categories (women, the elderly, young people, migrants), elaborating common frameworks of understanding in relation to these problems, creating spaces to collect information or joint-working between different areas are some of the strategies highlighted by the authors of the “Toolkit to incorporate intersectionality into local policies” to adequately address the complexity and plurality of society. Their outlook would be one of intersectional transversality, which is to say that, in all areas and segmented policies, all axes and intersections are taken into account.
Is my project intersectional?
Let's think about it...

There are no magic formulas for the application of intersectional theory. Reflexivity is a crucial element in not reproducing preconceived notions and categories that fail to take into account the different aspects we have dealt with thus far. Asking a series of questions in regard to the different aspects of our projects and ways of working can make a difference:

— In terms of **motivations**: Where does the idea come from? Why am I doing it? For what purposes? Who might it be useful to? What are my intentions?

— In relation to **positionality and privileges**: What position am I acting from? What is my rank within the organization? How do I use it, or try to mitigate it?

— In relation to **project design**: How is the objective or problem that the project will address - or the needs it will meet - defined? Who is participating in this process of definition and/or diagnosis? Who is it aimed at? Who is included/excluded and why? Am I focused on a specific group or a cross-cutting issue? If I’m focused on a specific group (e.g. young people), am I taking that group’s internal diversity into account? Am I taking into account the various axes that cause exclusion and lack of opportunities? Am I taking into account those that perpetuate privileges? What mechanisms are available to offset the impact of intersectional inequalities within the collective or deal with the problem I intend to address?

— In relation to **the team and organizational dynamics**: What is the make-up of my team like? Is it diverse or homogeneous? Why? Who do I form alliances with? Is my working approach collaborative or hierarchical? Do we pay attention to and deal with internal dynamics of power? Are we aware of intersectional perspectives?

— In relation to **communication and discourse**: What language do I use? Why? Who am I talking to? Who do I cite? Does my discourse reinforce stereotypes or does it combat them? Is it critical of the institutions, laws, and beliefs that perpetuate social inequalities?
**SELF-LEARNING ACTIVITY**

1. **Ask the other question:**

   Working from an intersectional perspective forces us to investigate the connections of obvious, and not-so-obvious, power relations, helping us to realize that a form of subordination never works in isolation. Matsuda (1991, in Soeters et al.) proposes a method she calls “Ask the Other Question,” which she uses to try to understand the interconnections between all forms of subordination.

   — When I see something that seems racist, I ask: where is the patriarchy in this?
   — When I see something that seems sexist, I ask, where is the heterosexism in this?
   — When I observe behavior that seems homophobic, I ask, where are the class interests in this?

2. **The Power Flower** is a tool developed by Canadian educators for group work on our relationship to different categories of power. Various social categories are listed at the centre of the flower, surrounded by a double strip of petals. The outer strips represent the attributes considered dominant in society, while the inner ones represent those that are, or in certain contexts could be, grounds for discrimination. Blank segments can be reserved to address specific categories of privilege/oppression.

   The idea is that each person fills the internal or external petals with the attributes that they are identified by (on the outside if they are a bearer of power/privilege, or the inside if they are discriminated against). The aim is to visualize the rank/power of each person, to be able to compare ours with that of our peers, and to be able to discuss the relationship between power and social categories.

   Work can be undertaken in pairs initially, thereafter commenting within the group as a whole on the aspects that have emerged from the exercise, and considering the diversity of experiences and ranges present. In the group as a whole, debates can be raised about which social identities should go on the outer strips (power bearers), the inner petals, and why, in addition to further discussions on the awareness of aspects related to one’s own rank, or on the differences that have emerged within the group itself. The results of each of the individual flowers can also be transferred to a large flower, which would serve to illustrate the community identity of the group.

   

4 To learn more and to find out different opportunities for discussion on this issue.
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