

Ermelinda Rodilloso

The Critical Need for an Anticapitalist and Intersectional Paradigm for Ecological Thinking

Introduction

A multifaceted crisis – or “polycrisis”, to adopt a term used by Edgar Morin (Morin and Kern, 1999) and recently revitalized by Adam Tooze (Tooze, 2022) – has characterized the past few years, condensed into disconcerting and catastrophic events. A global pandemic, countless natural disasters, humanitarian crises, extreme poverty rising, unbridgeable inequalities, the consolidation of political extremism, and the possibility of a nuclear war. Never before have we felt so deprived of certainty, crushed by the magnitude of these issues and the inability to handle them.

However, this crisis has clarified the capitalist production-consumption system’s repercussions on the biosphere and the social sphere. Therefore, it has involved an increase in public debate on capitalism and its relations to contemporary matters of concern, together with the emergence of numerous environmental and social change movements. In this case, as in many others, Marxist thinking – Critical Theory Marxism in particular – has proven forward-looking. Indeed, this crisis was anticipated and analyzed long before it became evident in all its force, in an attempt to trace its links to social injustice, racism, patriarchy, homophobia, neo-colonialism, and climate change.

Among the thinkers who have grasped the peculiarities of this crisis, Nancy Fraser has certainly left a profound mark on the philosophical debate. In particular, although not often explored, Fraser’s ecological reflection is of great interest in the contemporary scenario, as it brings an intersectional paradigm that concretely applies to the aforementioned polycrisis. In this regard, Fraser has achieved at least two important outcomes. First, she exposed the need for renewal within Marxism, condensed into the elaboration of a much broader conception of capitalism. She also provided strong and effective lines of connection between the different impacts that the capitalist system has on the social, political, and

environmental dimensions, coming up with a coherent and all-encompassing account.

In this work, I intend to focus on Fraser's ecological thought, which I believe can provide a solid philosophical-political framework and effectively show the necessity of an anticapitalist and intersectional paradigm within environmental reflection. A counterhegemonic project aimed at subverting the current production-consumption system is a fundamental precondition, in fact, for ensuring the natural environment's future survival.

In the following sections I will first introduce Fraser's critique of capitalism, which presents fruitful notions such as capitalism as an "institutionalized social order." (Fraser 2014) In this part, I will also trace connections with other thinkers, such as Rosa Luxemburg, David Harvey, Antonio Negri, and Michael Hardt. Second, I will unfold the characteristics of her ecological reflection – with a focus on the text *Cannibal Capitalism* – emphasizing Fraser's ability to develop an ecological theory that is consistent with other forms of domination and oppression perpetuated by capitalism. I believe the latter is one of the most challenging parts of her elaboration. Finally, I will attempt to suggest some potential future directions that, from Fraser's ecological thought, can be further expanded and explored.

1.1. The many and the one: Toward a broader notion of capitalism

It is undeniable that the capitalist system is the main direct cause of the ecological crisis. As noted by James O'Connor, capitalism implies a fundamental internal contradiction in which the principles of unlimited accumulation, growth, and exploitation inevitably endanger the natural environment (O'Connor, 1991). This argument is intuitive: we cannot apply unlimited growth to a limited planet. John Bellamy Foster takes up and widens O'Connor's notion, naming it "the absolute general law of environmental degradation under capitalism" (Foster, 1992, p. 78). According to his analysis, capital accumulation requires an increasing amount of ecological demands, which involve environmental degradation. The reason is self-evident. An economic system that a) promotes the goal of endless growth at the expense of any ecological or social need, b) conceives the market as free from any external constraint or intervention, and c) puts absolute self-interest as its mainstay, leads to the overexploitation of natural and human resources in ways that our planet and society cannot sustain.

After establishing this baseline, it is necessary, Fraser says, to clarify what the foundations of the capitalist system are. It would seem a rather

simple, if not trivial, operation. The Marxist tradition has produced, in fact, thousands of pages examining, expanding, and questioning the core features of capitalism. However, the question is by no means a settled matter. Indeed, it is clear that the current form of capitalism has a much more diversified and complex structure than in the past. The operations and internal mechanisms of capitalism are characterized by a “dynamic polymorphism” (Brenner et al., 2010, 184) and by flexibility and pliability (Mezzadra and Neilson, 2019, 37). More than ever, capitalism develops in different ways according to different social and geographical spaces, changing from time to time according to the contexts in which it is embedded, or crystallizing in heterogeneous crisis situations (Mezzadra and Neilson, 2019, chap. 1). Furthermore, the capitalist system has expanded to become something new, something else: a multidimensional system that incorporates not only the economic realm but also the political, social and natural ones (Fraser, 2022, pp. 1-26). Therefore, the development of a concrete critique of capitalism requires going beyond economic contradictions: we need to extend our scope to the “inter-realm” contradictions (Fraser, 2022, p. 118) with which it is interconnected. In other words, we need to formulate a theory of capitalism that can embrace its multiformity, integrating “the insights of Marxism with those of newer paradigms, including feminism, ecology, and Postcolonialism” (Fraser and Jaeggi, 2018, p. 10).

Fraser’s groundbreaking insight consists precisely in defining capitalism as an “institutionalized social order” (ibid.), a pivotal notion that leads to an unorthodox but at the same time accurate view of the capitalist system. This constitutes an interpretive lens capable of elucidating “its structural divisions and institutional separations” (ivi, p. 52) and represents, I believe, a key element that any contemporary theory of capitalism should assume. Clearly, it may have different names (e.g. “form of life” by Rahel Jaeggi), but the idea behind it is essential to grasp the vastness of the phenomenon. Through a broader notion of capitalism, it is indeed possible to identify common patterns that determine its functioning.

1.1.2. Divide et impera: The topography of systemic divisions in capitalism

To fully understand Fraser’s notion of capitalism as an institutionalized social order, it is necessary to dwell on the argumentation she developed with the cooperation of Rahel Jaeggi, which I believe gives birth to outstanding results. In *Capitalism: A Conversation in Critical Theory*, the two thinkers engage in a challenging dialogue that attempts to provide a comprehensive critical theory with capitalism as its centerpiece. The

exchange between the two is lively and stimulating, providing us with an account that concretely illustrates the links to its social, political, and natural background.

Their capitalism analysis departs from an orthodox approach: they recover the foundations of capitalism developed by Marxist tradition and analyze their intraspecific characteristics. Through this method, they identify four basic features: a) private ownership of the means of production and class division between owners and producers, b) the commercialization of wage labor, c) capital accumulation, with the orientation toward profit-making instead of need satisfaction, d) the use of the market for the allocation of factors of production and surplus, to direct society's use of its accumulated wealth (Fraser and Jaeggi, 2018, pp. 15-28). After laying the theoretical foundations, the analysis takes an unorthodox direction.

If we examine these features in detail, two crucial findings emerge. The first shows that these four characteristics don't subsist per se (ivi, p. 29). The existence of capital and the market depends on something else: it must rely on certain conditions of possibility. These conditions are, for example, social reproductive activity, natural environment, and political power – where capital itself comes from. Here Fraser and Jaeggi evidently depart from the traditional base/superstructure model, bringing a re-conceptualization of the relationships between the economic and non-economic dimensions. These two levels are in fact mutually imbricated and interacting (ivi, p. 47), as the non-economic background represents the foundation through which the economic system can thrive. The second finding identifies the matrix of structural crises and injustices within capitalist society. The insight elaborated in this section, which is foundational to Fraser's entire critique, is that although the economic system is directly dependent on its non-economic background, at the same time, it sharply differentiates the economic from the non-economic.

Three clarifications need to be made regarding the division between economic and non-economic. First, it is a *paradoxical* division, as the economic sphere is closely dependent on the non-economic but, despite this, the former does not attach any value to the latter (Fraser, 2022, p. 45; Fraser and Jaeggi, 2018, p. 28). It is consequently *artifactual* because it is arbitrarily operated by capitalism itself (Fraser and Jaeggi, 2018, pp. 68, 92, 153). Finally, this division is not merely formal, but *normative* and endowed with a value framework (ivi, p. 36). Capitalist societies, through this constitutive division, trace a demarcation between what does have value – the economic – and what does not – the non-economic. The non-economic realm, in this way, is defined as a mere raw material supplier, as a spring of resources that the economic realm can appropriate through mechanisms of oppression, exclusion, and predation.

However, Fraser adds a fourth element to this line of thought: the capitalist system institutionalizes the above-mentioned apparatus of divisions. This statement takes us back, in a circular motion, to the beating heart of Fraser's theory: the concept of capitalism as an institutionalized social order. In this view, the capitalist system is neither a mere economic system nor a generic social system. The structure of capitalism stands on an institutionalized societal topography consisting of asymmetrical relationships. Throughout such topography, we can find the separation between owners and producers, production and reproduction, economy and polity, human society and non-human nature, exploitation and expropriation (*ibid.*, p. 54). These separations provide a certain shape to the capitalist social order and may vary according to the context and the historical moment in which it is situated.

To summarize: starting with the division between economic and non-economic – which I would call “primary” – there arise intraspecific divisions relating to the different aspects composing human society. I would call “secondary” this second type of separation, which include the distinction between owners/producers, production/reproduction, economy/polity, human society/non-human nature, and exploitation/expropriation. We can see that these divisions: a) are determined by value/disvalue attributions and, based on these criteria, constitute a network of hierarchical relations, b) make possible the accumulation of capital through mechanisms of oppression, c) being institutionalized, they give shape and structure to capitalist society.

This argument can only come to two disconcerting conclusions: a) capitalism constantly tends to systemic crises of various kinds (political, environmental, social) and is therefore self-destabilizing (*ivi*, p. 28), b) the phenomena of racial, gender, political, and environmental oppression are non-accidental and structural to capitalism (*ivi*, pp. 46, 52, 55, 123). There is more: these divisions are “utterly fundamental to capitalism” (*ivi*, p. 33), and it is through them that this system can survive.

As regards the first conclusion, we need to refer to a scheme that Nancy Fraser often makes use of in her theoretical account, namely the “4-Ds”: division, dependence, disavowal, and destabilization. The analysis concerning the structural divisions of capitalism has already shed light on the relationships between these first three elements. The institutional divisions internal to the capitalist system are characterized by a paradoxical nature, in the sense that: they entail a condition of structural dependence of the economic system on the non-economic one and, at the same time, an ontological disavowal of the non-economic sphere. This internal contradiction leads to non-accidental destabilization and, therefore, makes capitalism prone to continuous system crises (Fraser, 2021, p. 88).

Regarding the second conclusion, Fraser certainly owes much to the

bountiful legacy of intersectional literature, which identifies systematic processes of oppression and discrimination in capitalism as functional to its maintenance (e.g., D'Eaubonne, 1974; Federici, 1975; Davis, 1981; Crenshaw, 1989; Herndon, 1993). However, Fraser extends this reflection with a specific insight: her framework postulates that discrimination, injustice, and brutal expropriations are structural to the capitalist system and allow primitive accumulation and dispossession to perpetuate themselves. This claim is evidently in line with what Rosa Luxemburg and David Harvey theorized since Fraser asserts that primitive accumulation and dispossession are by no means a finite phenomenon as Marx had assumed but are a constitutive element of capitalism and continue to fuel it to this day (Fraser and Jaeggi, 2018, p. 43; Luxemburg, 2004; Harvey, 2003).

These two conclusions have relevant consequences. As reiterated repeatedly, if forms of oppression and crises are structural to the capitalist system, we need a structural change. At the point when we see that the capitalist system destabilizes (or cannibalizes) itself and its own conditions of possibility, it is not acceptable to settle for weak reformism: we need to build a counterhegemonic project that is capable of overcoming the contradictions and divisions within the capitalist system (Fraser and Monticelli, 2021). Fraser thus develops an effective, coherent critical theory that can diagnose the pathologies of capitalism and, at the same time, justify the need for its radical overcoming.

1.1.3. A missing piece: The real subsumption of society under capital

Although Fraser's theoretical framework is quite comprehensive, I believe it can be further enriched by other insights. In this section, I focus on the potential inherent in combining the concept of capitalism as an "institutionalized social order" with that of "real subsumption of society under capital". Indeed, I believe that Fraser's theory effectively explains the processes by which capitalism appropriates and cannibalizes its non-economic background, that is, all aspects of human (and natural) life that lie outside the economic sphere. This mechanism or movement by which the social and natural dimensions are engulfed by the capitalist system, I call "inward".

Alongside this process, we can juxtapose another of the opposite kind. This movement – which I call "outward" – has instead been theorized by Antonio Negri, Michael Hardt, and some exponents of Italian Autonomist Marxism. In this view, Marxian concepts of formal and real subsumption can expand. Indeed, the current neoliberal system has achieved a real subsumption of society under capital, in which capitalist

relations of production extend to the entire society (Hardt and Negri, 2018) and – I would add – also to the natural environment. As a result, those spaces that were once autonomous from capitalist logic are now part of its sphere of influence and have become places where capital accumulation and commodity production take place. We are facing a “Social factory” (Negri, 2005; Tronti, 2019, pp. 12-35) in which all elements of social (and environmental) life have the function of contributing to capital accumulation. This process results in the reduction of human beings and the environment to a set of functions superimposed by the capitalist system, whose roles are defined by unjust relations of domination and inequality. In this way, “the whole society is placed at the disposal of profit” (Negri, 1989, p. 79).

I think the comparison between Fraser’s theory and this elaboration can be coherent. As has been said, the capitalist system is in a condition of interchange with the non-economic realm. Consequently, it does not merely co-opt this dimension: at the same time, it actively influences it. With this integration, the ideological mechanism behind the institutionalized order can emerge even more strongly: the non-economic realm is not only parceled out but reduced to a mere “function”, the function of expanding capital. In *Capitalism: A Conversation in Critical Theory* we find some passages in which we can see similarities to this account. Here it is reiterated that the capitalist system possesses “an objective systemic thrust or directionality: the accumulation of capital. Everything the owners do is and must be aimed at expanding their capital” (Fraser and Jaeggi, 2018, p. 18) and that “capital itself becomes the subject. Human beings are its pawns, reduced to figuring out how they can get what they need in the interstices by feeding the beast” (ibid.). We can conclude that Negri’s and Fraser’s theories possess at least one point in common: the capitalist system is directed toward neither the fulfillment of needs nor, apparently, toward humankind’s survival. On the contrary, capitalism co-opts the various dimensions of social and environmental life to sustain itself.

Seemingly, a crossover between these theories could initiate an inquiry that is both political and ethical-moral. The concept of the real subsumption of society into capital illustrates how capitalist logic expands within the social fabric to determine the visions and attitudes of the individuals who comprise it. When the attitudes of individuals are influenced by the attitudes of production processes, it is necessary to explore how this influence is determined and what effects it has not only on the individual sphere but also on the social and natural spheres. This comparison would require further exploration but, as this is not the focus of this paper, it is meant to be merely an indication for further elaboration.

1.2. A self-destructive ouroboros: How capitalism is cannibalizing our planet

Although the preceding paragraphs may appear to be a digression from the topic of my paper, they constitute a preliminary section that is fundamental to the understanding of Fraser's ecological thinking. As specified at the beginning of my examination, the different crises we are experiencing are not one-dimensional, but multifaceted and interconnected. Hence, to adequately grasp the scope of ecological degradation we need to compare it with the other forms of crises to which it is related. Unfortunately, Fraser points out, the theoretical models we have at our disposal are unable to capture this complexity. Even traditional Marxist theories tend to have a compartmentalized view since they prioritize certain forms of oppression at the expense of others (e.g., they focus on the inequities of the division between owners and producers, leaving out the relations that it has with the division between production and reproduction). We can infer, therefore, that one of the major limitations of contemporary Marxism is its failure to recognize that forms of oppression relating to gender, race, sexual orientation, ecology, and political power are part of the same structure of capitalist domination and that they share similar processes of operation.

In a nutshell, any analysis that intends to examine a specific crisis that is structural to capitalism, such as the ecological one, must necessarily refer to grand theorizing that illustrates capitalism's links with the social and natural spheres and clarifies the ways in which these different dimensions affect each other. As Fraser says, we need conceptions of capitalism that are "adequate to our time" (Fraser, 2022, pp. 2-3) and we must avoid relying on a "reductive ecologism" (ivi, p. 78). These two problems are often present in ecological thinking. It is not uncommon to find inquiries that, while accurate in some of their parts, draw inspiration from outdated models or forms of sentimentalism that make them ineffective. It should also be acknowledged that the development of theories that combine a comprehensive capitalism critique with environmentalist philosophies is currently quite poor despite the urgency of these issues.

Delving into Fraser's ecological reflection, we can observe that she is very clear about the references to the eco-socialist and eco-Marxist traditions (ivi, p. 36), which she takes as references for her analysis. The author points out that these approaches ushered in a new paradigm shift in Marxist theory: they identified strong links between capitalism and ecological degradation through specific patterns that, until then, had not been sufficiently explicated. In particular, they emphasized how the natural environment is viewed: a) as a source of raw materials for production and b) at the same time, as a "sink" where waste from production pro-

cesses is stored. Her critique, however, has a much bolder starting point: Fraser states that capitalism is undoubtedly “the main socio-historical driver of global warming” (ivi, p. 79). This first assertion focuses its attention not so much on the anthropogenic sources of climate change, but on the production-consumption system that sees companies and entrepreneurs releasing immense amounts of greenhouse gases and unrestrainedly consuming the resources of the natural environment. Not only that: it could be argued – using terminology dear to Herbert Marcuse – that the capitalist system directs the needs of individuals by imposing *false needs* (Marcuse, 1964) that drive them to compulsively consume the products of the *economic realm* (and here I would return to making use of Fraserian definitions). It is therefore a paradigm that, rather than referring to anthropogenic causes, is based on capitalogenic causes. In this way, Fraser places herself in the contemporary ecosocialist scenario in line with what has been affirmed by Donna Haraway (Haraway, 2016), Andreas Malm (Malm, 2018; Malm, 2020), and Jason Moore (Moore, 2015; Moore, 2016; Moore and Patel, 2017), elaborating a theoretical structure that tends to move away from visions oriented towards a generic attribution of responsibility to human beings as such, or on an allegedly malign and self-destructive nature of the same, as much as towards attributing responsibility to an economic system incapable of sustaining itself without irreversibly damaging society and the environment, a system that at the same time induces individual humans to unsustainable habits.

However, this approach, although having many advantages, carries the risk of removing individual and collective responsibility from the causes of climate change. Needless to say, such an exclusion would have several repercussions from a moral standpoint and could result in difficult communication between ethical and political dimensions. Therefore, we need to clarify that although capitalogenic issues form the foundation of the ecological crisis, it is also individual and collective human actions that have a decisive impact on the biosphere and the well-being of non-human species.

Moving forward to a general analysis of Fraser’s ecological account, the devastating repercussions on the natural environment are not accidental, but structural to the capitalist system. These effects come, first and foremost, from the institutionalized divisions through which hierarchical models are promoted. In the case of ecological degradation, we can find a sharp distinction between human society and non-human nature. The former is associated with the spiritual, sociocultural, economic, and historical dimensions, while the latter constitutes a material, inert and ahistorical dimension (Fraser and Jaeggi, p. 36). What distinguishes them is, above all, the attribution of value to the economic sphere and the denial of value to the natural dimension, which is regarded as a mere

source of raw materials that constantly feed the processes of production and accumulation. This division has two main consequences: nature is de-historicized, and human beings are de-naturalized. In this regard, Harvey points out that the removal of the human being from the natural dimension has dramatic repercussions that coincide with a form of extreme alienation (Harvey, 2014, pp. 261-263), which prevents our species from reaching its potential and, consequently, from effectively interacting with its environment.

Obvious problems arise here. First, as explained in the introduction, a system that aims for unlimited accumulation and a form of self-expansion that knows no boundaries cannot be applied to a real ecological system, which is closed and limited. On this subject, we have empirical data that repeats every year when the overshoot day occurs, the moment when humanity has already used all the natural resources that planet Earth is capable of generating during a year. The capital accumulation that claims to be unconstrained and does not take into account the structural limits of the environment is inevitably bound to lead us to collapse. Second, it is paradoxical to disvalue the dimension that provides and determines our very livelihood. Fraser notes that nature is historical, constantly changing, and influenced by its own natural and human processes. At the same time, humans are part of nature and directly dependent on its rhythms and resources (Fraser and Jaeggi, 2018, p. 93). Therefore, any system that tries to deny this mutual relationship brings with it serious contradictions and the germ of a relational crisis between humanity and the environment. Because of this inaccurate ontological division, from which derives an inaccurate attribution of value, capitalism engages in self-harming behavior. Exactly like the ouroboros, it eats its own body to draw sustenance.

A further relevant aspect of Fraser's reflection is the identification of a strong bond between the division of the human from the non-human and the division of exploitation from expropriation. Accordingly, a direct link between environmental degradation and colonial oppression is theorized here. Such connection is consistent with the current structuring of the ecological crisis. According to this account, we find a division between, on one side, formally free citizens who have access to forms of political protection and the right to sell their labor power in return for wages and, on the other, enslaved, colonized populations whose territories have been expropriated by capital holders to obtain cheap materials and resources. The link between expropriation and climate change can be easily traced in studies on the ethics of sustainability, which show us that developing countries support the overproduction of rich countries at the expense of workers' welfare, who are enslaved and forced into relationships of domination and dependence. More disconcertingly, the same countries

that capitalism subjugates for cheap labor are often a resource for storing waste that highly industrialized countries cannot dispose of. These conditions demonstrate the utter unsustainability of the capitalist social order and the correlation between environmental injustice and social injustice.

At this point, Nancy Fraser's call for the establishment of a counter-hegemonic, trans-ecological, and anti-capitalist project resonates powerfully. This is undoubtedly a radical position that nonetheless seems to be crucial in destroying the barriers and forms of oppression that make human and non-human societies increasingly dysfunctional. We need to ask ourselves whether we are really willing to put humanity's survival at risk and let human dignity be violated by unacceptable forms of prevarication. Once we get this answer, we can decide whether to take up Fraser's challenge or proceed in a different direction.

1.3. Conclusion

In this brief, I initially clarified the need to reformulate a theory of capitalism that can embrace its multiformity. In this regard, Fraser makes an excellent diagnosis of Marxist thought and clearly exposes its need for renewal through grand theorizing that integrates the Marxist approach with new paradigms of thought. Such a renewal is challenging, but I think Fraser has provided an excellent starting point in developing new coordinates that may help to structure a critique of capitalism that incorporates the dynamics that govern our current context. Fraser and Jaeggi conduct a sharp analysis to identify the contradictory and dysfunctional elements of capitalism and come to conceive it as a much broader system than merely economic. The concept of capitalism as an "institutionalized social order" constitutes a key node in the evolution of Nancy Fraser's theory and represents a revolutionary conceptual milestone that we can integrate into any capitalist theory.

I also believe that this notion could open up new horizons for concretely interpreting the current environmental and social situation through a dynamic theoretical framework in which the various pathological manifestations of the capitalist system imply each other. Only through an intersectional approach we reach an authentic critique of capitalism. Indeed, the forms of oppression that characterize our society fit in a complex system involving class domination, racial persecution, gender and sexual discrimination, ecological degradation, and colonialist appropriation. Although these types of oppression exhibit intraspecific characteristics, it is crucial to enucleate the patterns that determine the relationships and points of intersection between the various forms of inequality. Clearly, our inquiries must also pay attention to the particularities inherent in in-

dividual systems and not neglect the specificities that characterize them. But we must also move beyond a parceled model of analyzing capitalism, which turns out to be obsolete.

Nancy Fraser's theory turns out to be clear and well-functioning. In it, we identify the main features of the capitalist system and the mutual interactions between them. The process is outlined in great detail: we can recognize its starting points and junctions, all the way to the terminal parts of its structure. In light of this exhaustiveness, I have reason to believe that the grand theorizing advanced by Fraser can serve as the basis for any intersectional account of capitalism. In this sense, the description of the relations between capitalism and the natural environment can effectively clarify what are the origins of the contradictory relations between humanity and the environment.

In conclusion, I would suggest two directions for future research. The first is to define what are the links between capitalism and anthropogenic issues determined by the actions of individuals. The second, directly related to the first, is to develop an environmental ethics with Fraser's intersectional and anticapitalist account as its basis.

Bibliography

- Armstrong, E., *Marxist and Socialist Feminism*, in Naples, N., (ed.) *Companion to Feminist Studies*, Hoboken, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 2021.
- Arruzza, C., Bhattacharya, T., Fraser, N., *Feminism for the 99%. A Manifesto*, London and New York, Verso, 2019.
- Artner, A., "Can Capitalism Be Truly Democratic?", *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 50 (4) (2018): 793-809.
- Buller, A., *The Value of a Whale: On the Illusions of Green Capitalism*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2022.
- Bottici, C., *Imaginal Politics: Images Beyond Imagination and the Imaginary*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2019.
- Brenner, N., Peck, J., and Theodore, N., "Variegated Neoliberalization: Geographies, Modalities, Pathways", *Global Networks*, 10(2) (2010): 182-222.
- Butler, J., "Merely Cultural", *Social Text*, 52/53 (1997): 265-277.
- Campbell, S., "Anthropology and the Social Factory", *Dialectical Anthropology*, 42(3) (2018): 227-239.
- Crenshaw, K., "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics", *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1 (1989): 139-167.
- D'Eaubonne F., *Le féminisme ou la mort*, Paris, Pierre Horay, 1974.
- Davis, A., *Women, Race and Class*, New York, Random House, 1981.
- Federici, S., *Wages Against Housework*, Bristol, Falling Wall, 1975.
- Ferrara, A., "Capitalism in Neoliberal Times: Rethinking the Left", *Philosophy and Public Issues*, 11 (2) (2021): 19-34.

- Foster, J., "The Absolute General Law of Environmental Degradation Under Capitalism", *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 3/3, (1992): 77-81.
- Fraser, N., "Behind Marx's Hidden Abode: For an Expanded Conception of Capitalism", *New Left Review*, 86 (2014): 55-72.
- Fraser, N., *Cannibal Capitalism: How Our System Is Devouring Democracy, Care, and the Planet and What We Can Do about It*, London-New York, Verso, 2022a.
- Fraser, N., "Capitalism, Socialism, Populism: Continuing the Conversation", *Philosophy and Public Issues*, 11 (2) (2021): 81-98.
- Fraser, N., "Feminism, Capitalism, and the Cunning of History: An Introduction", *Cahiers du Genre*, 1 (2012): 165-192.
- Fraser, N., Jaeggi, R., *Capitalism: A Conversation in Critical Theory*, Hoboken, John Wiley & Sons, 2018.
- Fraser, N., Marino, S., Preti, A., Todeschini, F., Vitali, R., Volpi, A., "The Perfect Storm: A Conversation with Nancy Fraser about Capitalism, Feminism and the Pandemic", *Meta: Research in Hermeneutics, Phenomenology and Practical Philosophy*, 14 (2022b): 273-297.
- Fraser, N., Monticelli, L., "Progressive Neoliberalism isn't the Solution. We Need a Radical, Counter-hegemonic and Anti-capitalist Alliance. A conversation with Nancy Fraser", *Emancipations: A Journal of Critical Analysis*, 1(1) (2021).
- Fraser, N., "Recognition without Ethics?", *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18 (2-3) (2001): 21-42.
- Haraway, D., *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*, Durham, Duke University Press, 2016.
- Hardt, M., Negri, A., "The Powers of the Exploited and the Social Ontology of Praxis", *Triple C*, 16 (2) (2018): 415-423.
- Harvey, D., *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*, London, Profile, 2014.
- Harvey, D., *The Limits to Capital*, London, Verso, 2006.
- Harvey, D., *The New Imperialism*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Herndon, G., "Gender Construction and Neocolonialism", *World Literature Today*, 67(4) (1993): 731-736.
- Jaeggi, R., *A Wide Concept of Economy: Economy as a Social Practice and the Critique of Capitalism*, in Deutscher, P., Lafont, C., (eds.) *Critical Theory in Critical Times*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2018.
- Jaeggi, R., "What (If Anything) Is Wrong with Capitalism? Dysfunctionality, Exploitation and Alienation: Three Approaches to the Critique of Capitalism", *Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 54 (2016): 44-65.
- Luxemburg, R., *The Accumulation of Capital*, London and New York, Routledge, 2004.
- Malm, A., *Corona, Climate, Chronic Emergency: War Communism in the Twenty-First Century*, London, Verso, 2020.
- Malm, A., *The Progress of This Storm: Nature and Society in the Warming Condition*, London, Verso, 2018.
- Marcuse, H., *One-Dimensional Man*, Boston, Beacon, 1964.
- Mezzadra, S., Neilson, B., *The Politics of Operations. Excavating Contemporary*

- Capitalism*, Durham – London, Duke University Press, 2019.
- Moore, J., Patel, R., *A History of the World in Seven Cheap Things: A Guide to Capitalism, Nature, and the Future of the Planet*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2017.
- Moore, J. (ed.), *Anthropocene or Capitalocene? Nature, History, and the Crisis of Capitalism*, Oakland, PM Press, 2016.
- Morin, E., Kern, A., *Homeland Earth: A Manifesto for the New Millennium*, Cresskill, Hampton Press, 1999.
- Moore, J., *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*, London, Verso, 2015.
- Negri, A., *Books for Burning: Between Civil War and Democracy in 1970s Italy*, trans. and ed. Murphy, T., trans. Bove, A., Emery, E., Murphy, T., and Novello, F., London and New York, Verso, 2005.
- Negri, A., *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons On The Grundrisse*, New York, Autonomedia, 1991.
- Negri, A., *The Politics of Subversion: a Manifesto for the Twenty-first Century*, Cambridge, Blackwell, 1989.
- O'Connor, J., "On the Two Contradictions of Capitalism", *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 2 (3) (1991):107-109.
- O'Connor, J., *The Intrinsic Relationship between Marxism and Ecology*, in Xue-ming, C., Wu, L., Baixiang, L., (eds.) *The Ecological Crisis and the Logic of Capital*, Leiden, Brill, 2017.
- Spence, M., Capital Against Nature: James O'Connor's Theory of the Second Contradiction of Capitalism, *Capital and Class*, 24 (2000): 81-110.
- Tooze, A., "Welcome to the World of Polycrisis", *Financial Times*, 28 October 2022.
- Tronti, M., *Workers and Capital*, trans. Broder, D., London and New York, Verso, 2019.

The Critical Need for an Anticapitalist and Intersectional Paradigm for Ecological Thinking

In this paper I intend to outline the main features of Nancy Fraser's ecological thinking, drawing attention to the most cutting-edge aspects of her elaboration. In particular, I connect the concept of capitalism as an institutionalized social order with the identification of an intersectional ecological framework that can provide an articulated view of the environmental crisis. Indeed, the assumption of an intersectional model is the first step in building a theoretical account that integrates ecological thinking and socio-political dimensions. Before diving into any Marxist investigation on climate change, however, one must ask the age-old question: what is capitalism? By comprehensively answering this query, Fraser confronts us with contradictory and dysfunctional elements that force us to question the existing relationship between capitalism and nature. This reflection raises our awareness about the need to build an account that is counter-hegemonic and oriented toward a radical modification (if not deterioration) of this institutionalized social order.

KEYWORDS: Climate Change, Marxist Theory, Nancy Fraser, Ecosocialism, Intersectionality