



Partecipazione e Conflitto

<http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/paco>

ISSN: 1972-7623 (print version)

ISSN: 2035-6609 (electronic version)

PACO, Issue 19(1) 2026: 303-322

DOI: 10.1285/i20356609v19i1p303

Published 15 March, 2026

Work licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non commercial-
Share alike 3.0 Italian License

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The making of the transfeminist strike in Italy: addressing discourses and movement trajectories

Greta Rossi

Scuola Normale Superiore

ABSTRACT: This paper investigates the construction of the transfeminist strike in Italy by tracing the continuities and discontinuities between the Migrant, Social, and Gender strikes organized in the country after the 2008 economic crisis. Building on interviews and movement documents, the research explores how these strikes attempted to extend the realm of what a strike can be. To do so, they advanced competing understandings around what constitutes work and who qualifies as a worker. These efforts were organized around unexpected striking subjects – migrant and precarious workers, women, and queer people. In illuminating different trajectories of discourse construction leading to the transfeminist strike, this work identifies discursive rifts between unions and movements, and beyond. Ultimately, the article shows how movements changed the strike in times of crisis and how the strike became transfeminist.

KEYWORDS: crisis, discourses, transfeminism, social movements, strike.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: greta.rossi@sns.it

1. Introduction

In 2016, feminist and queer¹ activists worldwide recognized in the fights against abortion bans in Poland and against male violence in Argentina a universal character and joined their call to organize a Global Women's Strike on March 8th, 2017, thus opening up a process which "made a difference" (Rudan 2018). Involving more than 40 countries, the reach of the transfeminist strike showed at once the interconnectedness of different local struggles and the transnational character of patriarchal domination. In Italy, the 2017 Women's Strike, organized by *Non Una di Meno* (hereafter NUDM), the national transfeminist network born just a few months prior on the heels of a rising global tide, saw unexpected participation, with many workers striking² and rallies taking place in more than 60 cities. Since then, transfeminist strikes³ have been organized every year on International Women's Day, March 8th, in Italy and globally.

The importance of the transnational momentum that led to the proclamation of the strike has already been highlighted (Bonu 2022). In line with literature focusing on breaks and continuities within movement processes as well as with processual approaches to the study of contentious politics, this paper reconstructs, instead, the national genealogies of the transfeminist strike in Italy. To do so, it looks beyond the immediate present and at the larger cycle of protest that preceded it; at longer movement trajectories and at the discursive advancements they produced. In particular, it shows how activists from different collectives and backgrounds were able to reclaim the strike as a dynamic political tool in response to a crisis-embedded context, where recourse to striking was becoming more and more difficult. Migrant and precarious workers, women, and LGBT people were caught between the need to strike against their conditions of oppression and exploitation and being unable to do so in a traditional sense. As the crisis worsened their living *and* working conditions, joint calls for Migrant, Social, and Gender strikes were issued. These creative re-appropriations all went beyond an understanding of the strike as confined to industrial relations, but also deployed different political understandings of work, production and reproduction, oftentimes juxtaposing them – a richness in frictions, contradictions, and bargaining which the transfeminist strike surely inherited. Acknowledging how these innovations remain unexplored in the literature, this article addresses the discursive and political continuities and discontinuities between these strikes as the steps that paved the way for the transfeminist one.

The article is organized as follows. It first examines how the 2008 economic crisis impacted working conditions and union organizing and argues that, when considered alongside longer-term structural trends, this warrants a shift in focus beyond the sphere of production in the study of labor organizing. Specifically, it advocates for an analysis centered on reproduction and focused on the discursive dimension of strikes. After a section on data collection, the paper analyzes the Migrant, Social, and Gender strikes and provides an overview of their discourses around work and striking. The final section explores the transfeminist strike: first, it

¹From 2008 until 2016, grassroots groups described their politics as either 'feminist' or 'queer.' Their respective boundaries, however, were not always clear-cut, as neither label perfectly mirrored the individual composition of the assemblies at the time and feminist genealogies influenced queer collectives and vice-versa. 'Transfeminism' started to be adopted by a minority of groups and networks in the early 2010s (Baldo 2019), but gained traction at the end of the decade, when the national network against gendered violence *Non Una di Meno* popularized its use. The researcher will use all three terms – 'feminist,' 'queer,' and 'transfeminist' – to refer to the different political orientations within the movement during the period of interest.

² The Italian National Institute of Statistics stopped tracking strikes in 2009, so estimates of March 8th turnout are unavailable.

³ Throughout the years, its names changed: from the *Women's Strike* to the *feminist and transfeminist strikes waged against patriarchal violence*. In all its different iterations, the strike was always *transfeminist* insofar as it broke with an essentialist idea of women and with separatism, involving women and LGBT people in a common struggle. This is why the researcher will use the formulation 'transfeminist strike' in the remainder of the text.

investigates how activists made sense of the strike, focusing on how different political visions converged, clashed, and transformed in the process; then, it provides snippets of strike organizing.

2. Theorizing strikes between labor sociology and social movement studies

2.1 *The 2008 economic crisis strikes workers and unions*

Following the 2008 economic crisis, the EU imposed the adoption of fiscal consolidation policies on its member states through tight schedules and strict conditionalities. Major reforms and spending cuts were approved across the continent, affecting those countries that had been experiencing a severe sovereign debt crisis since 2011. In Italy, the crisis and the EU's insistent policy recommendations led to the appointment of former European Commissioner Mario Monti's technical government. Under his auspices, a labor reform aimed at increasing market flexibility was passed. Further measures included across-the-board cuts to public spending, such as budget reductions in health care and education, cuts to public sector jobs, to social care services and care allowances, as well as to regions and local authorities. While welfare maintained its universalistic design, these cuts undermined public service provision in the country (De Belvis, Ferrè, Specchia, Valerio, Fattore, and Ricciardi 2012).

The prioritization of fiscal consolidation and the crisis itself produced significant social costs, most importantly a severe contraction in total employment, with rising rates of unemployment and informal employment. In particular, it was foreign male laborers in Northern and Central Italy that bore the brunt of job cuts. Migrants lost their jobs earlier, stayed unemployed for longer, and were then re-integrated into the labor market irregularly, all the while suffering from a tightening of migration policies, which reclassified irregular entry and stay in the country as a criminal offense rather than an administrative infraction (Bonifazi and Marini 2012). Migrant women, mostly employed in care sectors, were not hit directly by the lay-offs, but they still faced sexed effects of the crisis, such as weakened maternity protections and an increase in unpaid care work, through which women compensated for severe cuts to services and welfare (Bettio, Corsi, D'Ippoliti, Lyberaki, Lodovici, and Verashchagina 2012).

The crisis struck Italy in the context of a long-term path of declining industrial struggles, with its effects also impacting organized labor in the country. In particular, the management of the crisis further weakened mainstream unions, sidelining them by technocratic design. As the government ignored social partners in formulating policies to address the crisis, unions lost their status of legitimation and recognition, becoming ever more excluded from negotiation processes (Gall 2012). Mainstream unions also failed to represent a diverse and precarious labor force: in terms of visibility, legitimacy, and effectiveness, outcomes of contentious labor processes initiated after the 2008 economic crisis still favored 'insider' occupational groups with strong ties to mainstream unions (Perra and Pilati 2023). This dualization left out entire segments of the labor force, as evidenced by mainstream unions' attempts to affiliate precarious workers. If, by the 2010s, all three major unions in the country had established ad-hoc separate bodies for precarious workers, these branches, however, had a limited role in early struggles against precarity and remained invisible for much of the decade. This is because mainstream unions focused on regulation and collective bargaining, a strategy that culminated, by the end of 2008, with the stipulation of more than 100 collective agreements, yet of questionable quality and yielding modest gains for workers (Choi and Mattoni 2010). A similar dynamic affected migrant workers, too. Mostly employed via precarious contracts and heavily impacted by the 2008 economic crisis, migrant workers were treated by unions either as migrants in need of assistance or as workers whose social condition was irrelevant. These contradictions are even more pronounced for migrant women, making up large proportions of workers employed in the care and agricultural sectors, yet severely under-represented within union

structures (Sacchetto and Vianello 2015). In both cases, emphasis on bargaining and service-provision came at the expense of building collective trust and power among workers.

Faced with long-term trends of privatization, deindustrialization, and globalization (Atzeni 2021), as well as with the destructive effects of the 2008 economic crisis, mainstream unions in Italy turned to institutional mediation and management of the workforce. In so doing, however, they proved impervious to the changes in their constituents' composition and failed to address intra-class divisions and their multiple possibilities of intersection. In facing the riddle of difference and its organization, Italian unions adopted either a universalistic approach, which saw "diverse categories of workers (...) incorporated into unitary and centralized union structures," or a diversity-oriented approach, which put "emphasis on bottom-up organization and autonomy of lower-level union structures in representing the needs of their diverse constituency." Neither model offered a straightforward solution, and both led to 'representation without membership' or to the creation of 'islands of representation' where the interests of marginalized groups were nominally represented, but unions' internal power balance remained unchallenged (Marino, Berniaciak, Mrozowicki, and Pulignano 2018, 114).

2.2 Reinventing the strike and its discourses

Unable to move beyond employment status and anchored to an 'ideal' productive worker, Italian unions struggled to organize across difference. Reflecting on these issues, labor sociologist Maurizio Atzeni maintained that trade unions can no longer be considered "organizations that almost symbiotically represent the working class" (2021, 1350) and suggested provincializing them in the study of labor organizing. Instead, other processes organized around today's "chaotic, multiethnic, multigendered" working class (Bhattacharya 2017, 74) and stemming from racism or gendered violence should be taken into account. Recognizing such a wider terrain of struggle and the variety of social subjects involved, however, does not solve the problem of organization and construction of a class politics that politicizes difference: if unions were either indifferent or unable to face these issues, social movements, too, struggled to provide an answer. The problem of class and difference is an open one, which the strikes reviewed in this article have tried to address, putting forward different political discourses and organizational hypotheses. In line with Atzeni's proposition, this paper explores these discourses, looking at class formation and organizing occurring in the "unknown, unconventional, unregulated, invisible zones and 'hidden abodes' of precarious production and exploitation" (2021, 1358).

Described by philosopher and feminist activist Cinzia Arruzza as "*the* international process of class formation of this phase" (2018, 4), the transfeminist strike offers precisely this possibility. Analyzing the phenomenon in Spain, Gallas (2024) highlights both the transfeminist strike's capacity to stimulate agentic processes and its continuity with the anti-austerity strikes of the mid-2010s. Both were political and general strikes involving overlapping networks of grassroots unions, local groups and collectives, and left-wing organizations. Launched in comparable political-economic conditions, these strikes opposed cuts to welfare as well as the widespread reliance on precarious labor, triggering "an expansive dynamic" (Gallas 2024, 188). This paper identifies similar genealogical links in Italy, connecting the transfeminist strike to earlier uses of this repertoire within the context of the broader anti-austerity strike wave in Italy – the Migrant, Social, and Gender strikes, organized between 2008 and 2014. Echoing Gallas' findings, these strikes were also organized outside mainstream unions' structures, involving a diverse coalition of workers, grassroots unions, and social movements. Even further, this paper claims these strikes enacted new practices of interruption and refusal, promoting the protagonism of subjects who do not fit stereotypical images of workers, but are nevertheless faced with the problem of work, exploitation, and how to refute both. Crucially, they disrupted union- and

male-centric visions of the strike, reinventing an established repertoire of contention by centering difference and via a critical engagement with ‘work,’ enlarged to invest the realm of production *and* reproduction.

The challenge, then, lies in capturing and analyzing this reinvention. To this end, the paper focuses on movement discourses, defined as the ideational framework through which activists understand the world as well as their position within society. While social movements are often studied through their contentious repertoires, a focus on the practices of the Migrant, Social, Gender, and transfeminist strikes risks overemphasizing their continuities. Instead, a focus on “processes of interpretation, discursive practices, and active meaning-making” (Lindekilde 2014, 203) is needed to uncover and explore their distinctive peculiarities. Attending to this aspect shows how ideas of work and striking have both built on and emerged in deliberate rupture with previous conceptualizations. Overall, it also shows discourses are crafted, a process which is anything but smooth and involves “social dialogue [...] across societal institutions, among individuals as well as groups, organizations,” with an end result that is neither monolithic nor fixed (Donati 1992, 139). This continuous circulation of ideas and political experimenting helps explain why, when the proposal for a Women’s Global Strike came from Latin America, Italian feminist and queer groups were ready. Linked to theories of diffusion within social movement studies, the concept of resonance describes precisely this phenomenon. It looks at how transnational practices – such as the transfeminist strike – circulate across borders and take root in local contexts. Resonance is defined as “the conscious process whereby endogenous potentialities for mobilization – which already lie dormant in each of the national contexts – are actualized,” through an “extensive local movement experience and pre-existing activist networks” (Oikonomakis and Roos 2014, 230; 228). This perspective foregrounds both activist agency and its temporal embeddedness, emphasizing the role that prior mobilizations and networks – in this case, those of the Migrant, Social, and Gender strikes – play in the reception and localization of practices.

3. Data and methods

This article is rooted in a larger research project, interrogating the persistence of critical perspectives within movements over time and looking in particular at how feminist, queer, and transfeminist groups in Italy politicized social reproduction from 2008 until today. So far, 16 individual interviews, 2 group interviews with two and three participants, as well as 120 movement texts have been collected and analyzed. It was through the first interviews, in which several activists reported having taken part in the Migrant, Social, and Gender strikes, that the rich genealogy behind the 2017 women’s strike started to emerge. This intuition of a longer trajectory toward the transfeminist strike represented the abductive starting point of the present article (Tavory and Timmermans 2013).

The author’s positionality as part of the NUDM network greatly facilitated access to interviewees. Participants were initially recruited through personal networks, resulting in a sample composed of diverse activists – primarily based in Northern cities, all part of NUDM and affiliated, over the years, with feminist and queer groups, anti-racist groups, mixed-movement organizations, and occupied spaces. Snowball sampling was then employed to recruit additional participants and to broaden the geographical scope of the study. Used to probe protest and movement persistence, semi-structured, in-depth interviews are geared towards explanatory analysis, offering thick narratives incorporating individual and collective “visions, imaginings, hopes, expectations, critique of the present, and projection of the future” (Blee and Taylor 2002, 95). To harness this analytical potential, the structure of the interviews was flexible. Their thematic outline covered activists’ political paths, their participation in grassroots politics; significant actions carried out or demands advanced, especially if related to work, wage, or income; and, finally, movement responses to the 2008 economic and pandemic crisis.

The texts collected focus on these same themes and range from blogs and Facebook posts to communiqués and relevant articles from movement magazines, with some of them donated by activists themselves. Collected over the period of two years, these texts include: fifteen documents on the Migrant strike, published between 2010 and 2014; five texts on the Social strike, all published in 2014; and fourteen documents on the Gender strike, published between 2014 and 2016. The remaining bulk of movement texts is represented by calls and documents coming from twenty feminist and queer groups and networks active between 2008 and 2016. For the period from 2016 until now, the researcher has collected forty-two NUDM documents, comprising blog and Facebook posts.

All data collected has been analyzed using the MAXQDA software, first via descriptive codes and then through analytical ones, focusing on individual and collective perception of movement politics and crisis, activists' self-reflections on past actions and discourses, and the meanings assigned to current practices and demands. To begin structuring the present paper, the researcher used both descriptive codes assigned to the Migrant, Social, Gender, and transfeminist strikes and analytical coding marking different conceptualizations of work, of one's constituents, of crises, as well as reflections on successes and failures. After this initial stage, a continuous back-and-forth between interviews and documents guided the researcher. Interviews illustrated how activists made sense of discursive production processes and helped to reconstruct group dynamics behind discussions. The documents spelled out the political perspectives mentioned in interviews and provided valuable insights into movement discourses as they unfolded, enabling the researcher to trace their fluctuations over time and to test them against activists' ex-post reconstruction.

This iterative process is typical of processual approaches to social movements. Understanding processes as a "sequence of individual and collective events, actions, and activities unfolding over time" (Pettigrew 1997, 338), this approach looks into time-sequences and turning points, as well as at actors and contexts, considered as co-constitutive of one another and never fixed. The epistemological novelty lies in understanding one's research 'object' through the processual steps in which it unfolds, approaching the 'why' through the 'how' (Bosi and Malthaner forthcoming). In line with this, this paper looks at *how* the transfeminist strike took hold in Italy by tracing and constructing its genealogy, one that comprises the different actors involved in the organizing of the Migrant, Social, and Gender strikes.

4. Migrant, Social, and Gender strikes: 2008-2016

In this first empirical section, this paper unpacks the various 'discourses of the strike' articulated within the selected strike actions organized since the 2008 economic crisis. Such discourses encompassed competing yet interconnected understandings of what the strike is, who it is for, and how it can be reimagined. In proposing original answers to these questions, the Migrant, Social, and Gender strike each enacted a deliberate break from 'striking as usual.' Queer and feminist groups, in many cases tied to larger movement networks, participated actively in such appropriation.

4.1 The 2010 Migrant strike

The outbreak of the economic crisis was preceded by a decade-long wave of migrant mobilizations, dating back to 2001, when a migrant rally opened the anti-G8 protests in Genoa. In 2002, a right-wing parliament approved the Bossi-Fini law, which for the first time tied legal residence to regular and continuous employment, making migrants vulnerable to employers' blackmail, occupational segregation, structural precarity, and exploitation. Local migrant strikes against such a government of migrant labor have been

organized throughout the years, inspired by the “Day Without Immigrants” mobilizations held in the United States on March 1st, 2006. This process underwent a decisive acceleration when, in 2010, two migrant agricultural workers were shot at and wounded by Italian citizens while returning from the fields in Rosarno, Calabria, triggering a spontaneous uprising among migrant workers, and giving way to what was later referred to as the ‘Rosarno uprisings.’ From there on, the idea of *national* strike began circulating: “no one knew who started it, but it was spreading: ‘on March 1st there will be the first Migrant strike’” (Cobbe and Grappi 2011, 58). Local committees were set up in major cities and organizing ensued. The 2010 Migrant strike saw demonstrations in at least 60 Italian towns and, according to the organizers, a total of 300,000 people taking part across the country (Primo marzo 2010). The strength of these events then produced further significant peaks in mobilizing, especially in Brescia, where, that same year, a crane in the city center was occupied for fifteen days to protest against the permit-to-stay system. Migrant strikes were called on March 1st until 2014, albeit with lesser and lesser resonance.

These strikes were waged against immigration laws and their tightening. For migrant workers, striking against exploitative working conditions was tied to opposing the legal regime that made it possible in the first place. This link between citizenship status and labor was explained by migrant organizers as follows:

We have fought for the residence permit because it is everything in this country. It means work, health, rights. All depends on the residence permit.⁴

For the first time, conflict has linked citizenship rights and working conditions. These were no longer abstract claims over civil rights. It was clear that migrants are a labor force that the law makes more manipulable.⁵

Thus, the strike was deployed outside industrial relations to oppose how racist immigration laws favored exploitation in the workplace and worsened migrants’ overall living conditions. Somehow anticipating the rationale behind the transfeminist strike, the Migrant strike redefined the boundaries of the political (Bracke 2014), making the link between migrants’ precarious working conditions and citizenship status a legitimate ground to call for a strike. It showed how policies impacting the lives of workers had effects on their working conditions as well, pointing out how production and reproduction were interconnected.

This use of the strike as an instrument to refuse racist dynamics of exploitation was contested by mainstream unions. The biggest confederal union in Italy, CGIL, defined the 2010 Migrants’ strike as a “nice suggestion,” “hardly feasible” because of migrants’ “subjugation, subjection, neo-slavery.” What is more, it considered “the choice of an immigrant-only strike strategically wrong:” given the risk of “segregation” migrants are subjected to, practicing “self-segregation” made little sense. What mainstream unions proposed instead was a one-hour strike or, even better, a *celebration* of migrants on a different day (Collettiva 2010). These responses painted the Migrant strike as a paradoxical experiment, tainted with segregationism and irrespective of the needs of a wider, unitary, and indivisible working class. Within mainstream unions’ compromise-based, “non-conflictual understanding of the relationship between labor and capital,” the former is necessary white, male, and Italian: any process of subjectivation going beyond these pre-established boundaries either went unnoticed or was ostracized (Peano 2017, 8). Besides disavowing migrants’ demands, these responses show how mainstream unions failed to recognize migrant workers’ autonomous organizing, as well as the capacities for alliance-making this organizational process displayed. These troubled relations with unions represent a significant element of continuity with the transfeminist strike: “unions said ‘we can't have a Migrant strike because it

⁴ M., undocumented migrant and activist of the Associazione diritti per tutti (from Montagna 2013, 46).

⁵ G., activist of the Associazione diritti per tutti (from Montagna 2013, 42).

divides the working class,' just like (...) they said, 'we can't have a women's strike because it divides the working class.'"⁶

Beyond clashes with mainstream unions, organizers also articulated differing political perspectives. On the one hand, migration was seen as *the* lens through which labor's transformations could be grasped, as it pointed to "a generalized state of precarity" (Peano 2017, 4). The argument put forward was built around the idea of a 'becoming-migrant of labor,' whereby working conditions to which migrants are subjected (such as informality, low salary, lack of union rights, total availability) are increasingly common (Casas-Cortés 2016). Wondering whether all workers are equally precarious and whether all precarious work is 'becoming migrant,' others rather posited migrant work as the *benchmark* of exploitation (Ricciardi and Mometti 2011, 10). There remained a peculiarity to migrant work that was canceled in the 'becoming migrant' perspective: migrant workers face everlasting risks of being discriminated against, imprisoned, deported on the grounds of race and citizenship status, and those risks cannot be generalized. These differences opened up a dilemma around the relationship between a general condition of precarization and a specific one, commanded by racist, sexed, and gendered hierarchies, which will continue to characterize the strikes analyzed in this article.

4.2 *The 2014 Social strike*

In 2014, the Jobs Act was approved, making fixed-term contracts more flexible and downgrading workers' protection measures. Precarity was addressed through measures that made contracts more flexible, the logic being that excessive protections had discouraged companies from hiring workers with permanent contracts. Launched that very year, the Social strike considered the Jobs Act as part of a process of institutionalization of precarity as the 'norm' of labor relations (Fumagalli 2014). The proposal was advanced by a platform of students, workers, migrants, queer collectives, and movement networks, a coalition which called for a 'diffused strike' going beyond the geographies of industrial production:

Each of us can influence the processes of production by crossing our arms for a day or for five minutes, by blocking a road or access to schools, the subway, or workplaces; through symbolic actions in squares, universities, stations. What would happen if, for one day, all students did not go to school, if all teachers refused to lecture, if all precarious, exploited, underpaid, illegal workers did not work?⁷

The Social strike was open to a variety of otherwise invisible workers and was meant to create opportunities for collective gathering, for gaining strength and power. Strikers claimed a European minimum wage, as well as European basic income and welfare, resorting to routine and creative practices. All in all, demonstrations took place in more than forty cities, with blockades, pickets, viral communication, and anti-Jobs Act propaganda actions. Throughout the process, this coalition tried and failed to start a conversation with mainstream unions. It succeeded, however, in creating a relationship with grassroots ones, creating lasting contacts that would later become valuable resources for transfeminist strikes. Most activists interviewed, however, reported the Social strike lacked a crucial final step, that of implementation. It never took off, obtaining minimal participation, and hardly moved beyond the movement milieu in which it was proposed. Activists were critical of having failed to construct a lasting organizational structure, as the Social strike was attempted only in 2014. They attributed this organizational breakdown to internal power dynamics among

⁶ Quote is from an interview with Carla (pseudonym), active in Bologna in mixed political collectives, 21/1/2024. All activists interviewed were part of NUDM, so only prior movement belongings will be specified. Translations from Italian are mine.

⁷ Zenobio 2014.

collectives, which made it difficult to ground the strike in concrete processes of engagement with workers.⁸ Some also underlined the strike faced high stakes: “how can you even organize a strike when everyone, even within the same assembly, has a different job, one that isn’t covered by a national contract, and where competition is always horizontal, always among peers, always racing to the bottom?”⁹

Despite being described as having “zero impact and participation,” the Social strike nevertheless represented a moment of advancement, at the discursive level, for the Italian movement as a whole.¹⁰ It fostered a “new vocabulary of precariousness,” which, until then, was caught between two opposite poles. On the one hand, there was a celebration of flexibility, seen as a positive development able to make work suitable to contemporary times. On the other hand, “a victimizing discourse,” which only provided a list of grievances and was unable to produce political subjectivation. Moving beyond such dichotomies, the Social strike made the point of striking precarity not so much “we want stable jobs,” but rather “we want social security.”¹¹ This innovation was reached within a process of “collective construction of political meaning,” involving a variety of social actors, including grassroots unions. Activists consider such collective efforts in building an “alternative vision of the traditional strike” one of the Social strike’s greatest successes.¹²

These elaborations relied on critical reflections on post-Fordism, a phase where production was diverted towards media, advertising, fashion, and software technologies. The formula ‘immaterial labor’ was used to acknowledge this qualitative change and name the different types of skills requested of workers within this context, going as far as to include activities that are not usually considered ‘work.’ Immaterial labor was then characterized by “precariousness, hyperexploitation, mobility, and hierarchy,” and it was carried out by “metropolitan,” “intellectual” proletarians whose private life had become inseparable from work (Lazzarato 1996, 83). If the Social strike posited work as all-encompassing, some activists disagreed. This idea that “you are continuously producing value, even when you’re just standing there with your Foodora shirt, waiting to start your shift” was “never really able to initiate processes of subjectivation”¹³ and obscured differences between work and non-work as well as within workers. Queer and feminist articulations of the strike intervened on these grounds.

4.3 Queering the (Social) strike

Queer and feminist voices had been pointing out how immaterial and cognitive work neglected other forms of precarious labor, such as domestic work, that have existed for a longer time. Fantone (2007) underlined that the immaterial worker is not a neutral figure: *he* is white, straight, single, creative, and revolutionary. Many within the Social strike agreed, finding immaterial labor “desexualized, degendered” and unable to grasp the complexity of contemporary labor transformations: “they talked of cognitive work, but it’s not! It’s affective work, it’s care work, but the words they were using to mobilize were cognitive work, cognitariat, cognitive proletarians.”¹⁴

⁸ Marta, feminist groups and queer networks, Milan, 19/3/2024; Elettra, occupied spaces and feminist collectives, Florence, 9/4/24.

⁹ Denise, feminist collectives and queer networks, Rome, 14/3/2024.

¹⁰ Denise.

¹¹ Ludovica, feminist collectives and queer networks, Bologna, 18/1/2024.

¹² Marta.

¹³ Andrea, queer collectives and networks, Bologna, 30/10/2023; Group Interview 1 with former student activists from Northern Italy, 16/3/2024.

¹⁴ Tommaso, queer groups and networks, Bologna, 9/1/2024.

These critical engagements with the Social strike were rooted in the idea of ‘labor feminization,’ developed, among others, by activist and independent scholar Cristina Morini (2007), and taken up in feminist and queer circles close to the queer national network SomMovimento NazioAnale, active in those years. Otherwise used to describe the increased share of working women in the labor market, in this context, ‘labor feminization’ was employed to underline the continuity between precarity and the qualitative characteristics of women’s care work. The argument was that this type of work was becoming a general paradigm for the organization and exploitation of *all* workers, regardless of their gender. If domestic work had historically been characterized by “precariousness, mobility, fragmentary nature, low salaries,” these properties were now extended to all labor under contemporary capitalism; if “capacities for relationships, emotional aspects, linguistic aspects, propensity for care,” had been naturally assigned to women as care workers, they were now expected from all workers. Both “the forms of the administration of labor” and its inherent “quality” were modeled on women’s work (Morini 2007, 42).

In its queer militant reception, labor feminization was stretched even further and became synonymous with the “continuous production of gender,” whereby all that is part of life, including one’s “passions, ideas, relational capacities, affectivity, subjectivity,” became profitable. Whether chosen or socially assigned, “genders are being put to work,” which, in turn, made striking *from gender* possible (somMovimento NazioAnale 2014). The provocation of the Gender strike, organized within the framework of the Social strike by queer and feminist activists, read as follows:

What would happen if (...) we practiced a strike against all the expectations, repetitions, acts, and roles with which we daily (re)produce the established order of genders and, with it, the established order of society as a whole?”¹⁵

In this sense, striking became a means to break with the naturalization linking gender to work, as well as a way to name those gendered activities that are not usually considered work. In doing that, the Gender strike recognized how “neoliberalism does not simply exclude based on difference, but it produces different subjects from which to extract value,” using gender to construct hierarchies and organize its “neoliberal capture.”¹⁶ Owning up to this complexity, the call to the strike talked of varieties of gendered exploitation, ranging from being “gay and thus considered more creative, more communicative, more willing to listen and mediate” to being trans and “ostracized from work or included in hypersexualized roles” (somMovimento nazioAnale 2014). The Gender strike was not a place where differences were flattened out, but rather one where gender was shown as a construct and its hierarchies unpacked. These were political and discursive advancements from which “there was no coming back from;”¹⁷ and, in fact, significant continuities (but also strong differences) would emerge between the queer and the transfeminist strike.

5. Transfeminist strikes: 2017 - now

In 2016, when Argentinian and Polish women took to the streets, Italian feminist and queer groups realized something was (or could be) happening in Italy as well. In Rome, a network of feminist collectives, *IoDecido*, along with the national network of anti-violence centers, *D.i.R.E.*, and a historical, non-profit feminist

¹⁵ somMovimento NazioAnale 2014.

¹⁶ Denise.

¹⁷ Andrea.

association, *UDI*, convened a series of assemblies starting from September and began planning a demonstration for November 25th under the banner ‘Non Una di Meno,’ literally translating their Latin-American counterparts. The successful organization of a march on the International Day Against Violence on Women, with two hundred thousand participants, as well as the “explosive” national assembly convened for the following day, crowded “with one thousand people crammed together and shouting on top of each other,”¹⁸ eager to participate, proved to activists that the tide had reached the country after all. In interviews, activists recounted how, after years of small-scale mobilizing, all those belonging to a wider “feminist field”¹⁹ either participated in or followed closely this process as it unfolded. The widespread feeling was that of being part of a scale shift, as one of the organizers of the first NUDM assemblies in Padua, belonging to a feminist collective active since the early 2000s, recounted in her interview:

We had tried so many times to put back together the different parts of feminism in Padua, but we had never managed. That year, after the national assembly in Rome, we launched the first public NUDM assembly in our city. We showed up, and there were 60 of us! It was huge. I still get chills remembering it [...]. Everyone came. The comrades from the anti-violence center came, the historical feminists came, an activist from the Wages for Housework campaign came, all the fragmented collectives that existed... I mean, everyone felt that the air was shifting.²⁰

While the input of pre-existing actors was crucial at this initial stage, giving a first organizational push in setting up local assemblies, the network went beyond being the sum of groups – so much so that several activists claim their collectives soon ‘dissolved’ into NUDM. Besides boosting numbers, organizational capacities, and transnational connections hardly seen in previous years, the scale-shift marked by NUDM was, at its core, qualitative. From the very beginning, the network started working on its *Feminist Plan against male and gendered violence*, written over the course of six national assemblies, animated by queer and feminist grassroots activists, anti-violence centers and operators (Non Una di Meno 2017a). With the *Plan*, NUDM was able to express its own transfeminist political vision, using gender as a “lens to read *everything*,” and making it “the terrain from which conflict restarts.”²¹

Throughout this process of collective elaboration, NUDM organized its first strike on March 8th, 2017. The idea of striking “lingered in the air”: “it was a watchword, a kind of refrain, for everyone.” After all, women’s strikes had already been organized by Polish feminists, and locally, there were “all these prior reflections on the strike, coming from the Social strike.”²² When the call for the Global Women’s Strike was issued in Argentina, NUDM was ready to take up such a challenge. Back then, striking as feminists felt *unprecedented*, and it went beyond the mere ‘borrowing’ of a pre-established practice:

Even *thinking* about striking... now it’s almost taken for granted. But I swear, in 2016, just thinking about the strike felt incredibly powerful... I mean, the idea that, as a feminist, you could take hold of something like that, something that had always belonged to the unions, that had never fully been yours... and you pulled the rug out from under them, making the strike your own, and did it all over the world!²³

¹⁸ Carla.

¹⁹ Clelia, queer collectives and networks, Naples, 4/3/2024.

²⁰ Elena, feminist collectives and queer networks, Padua, 22/2/2024.

²¹ Clelia.

²² Andrea.

²³ Elena.

After having embraced the call for the Global Women's Strike, activists were faced with the problem of constructing it, with the responsibility of figuring out what a transfeminist strike is and how it is practiced. The dilemma revolving around "how to go on strike, who is it that can't go on strike, who we are (are we workers, are we not), how do we build networks within such a fragmented and precarious scenario,"²⁴ is found in all strikes analyzed thus far. In this last section, the article will focus first on the discourses around working and striking NUDM elaborated to answer such questions. Then, it will turn to how the transfeminist strike has been practiced and provide some reflections on its limitations.

5.1 What is a strike, what is work: constructing discourses of the transfeminist strike

The months leading up to March 8th, 2017, were characterized by a complex balance between being drawn to the idea of a Global Women's Strike and puzzled as to how to organize it. This is because activists and groups from a whole range of political experiences were more or less at ease with the idea of a Global Women's Strike calling for an interruption of all types of work, productive and reproductive, formal and informal, and with its the explicit objective of "halting productive and reproductive activities by as many people as possible" (Non Una di Meno 2017b). The area behind the organization of Social strike, "who had been striking for a long time, from the Migrant strike against the Bossi-Fini law, to the social, precarious, transnational strikes, and so on," was "immediately on board with the idea of striking"²⁵ as women. Other movement areas, however, had never participated in such initiatives: when asked about the Social strike, an activist from Turin recalled how the groups she belonged to before joining NUDM had only observed such strikes from the margins.²⁶ In these cases, as well as for those who had just begun to pursue feminist politics, NUDM became the first political arena where they confronted the question of organizing a strike as subjects within precise societal hierarchies.

Such stretching of the boundaries of what constitutes a strike was problematic for union structures. When NUDM issued a document asking all unions to call for a general strike on March 8th, urging them to "be a useful tool for the strike and not an obstacle to the adherence of women workers and all those who intend to participate in this struggle for our self-determination" (Non Una di Meno 2017c), the call was met with reluctance and resistance. Albeit having participated in the November march, mainstream unions found it difficult to "imagine a strike outside traditional labor disputes," where economic claims came to be "intertwined with a broader set of demands," which for those more attuned to Migrant, Social or Gender strikes were "necessarily linked to labor," but whose connection to labor issues was not immediate on a superficial level.²⁷ In a letter to the movement, CGIL disclosed its perspective as to what a strike is: "not merely a symbolic act, but the shifting of the balance of power through mass participation." At most, strikes would be called only where "they might be concretely practiced"; even so, on March 8th, "other forms of participation, such as assemblies or demonstrations, [...] should be emphasized" (Camusso 2017). Rather than a *proper* strike, CGIL argued that the demands behind March 8th called for a demonstration. According to an interviewee, besides the 'political no' of union leadership, stating NUDM's claims were not worth striking for, a more technical issue

²⁴ Group interview 1.

²⁵ Carla.

²⁶ Alessandra, mixed political groups and feminist collectives, Turin, 26/5/2024.

²⁷ Marta.

was at stake: “for them strikes also serve, let’s say, for counting, and the fact that our strike had no guarantees in terms of numbers, that it was not linked to a labor specific dispute, was very problematic.”²⁸

Throughout the years, CGIL showed some signs of openness, with specific sectors deciding to sporadically call for a strike on March 8th, like the Education and Research Sector in 2024. For activists, these represented important possibilities for organizing; after all, while CGIL’s refusal did not impact the material possibility to strike, lacking their support in a country where mainstream unions still wield significant mobilization capacity lessened the possibility to reach workers. The most crucial support in this sense was provided by grassroots unions, who consistently granted union coverage on March 8th. In this case too, however, the incorporation of feminist claims into the strike constituted the grounds for relentless skepticism. There remained a degree of continuity between grassroots and mainstream unions’ political assessment of the transfeminist strike, perceived as a risky wager, marked by an inherent vagueness, lacking a clear interlocutor and clear demands, detached from women workers.²⁹

Besides different political perspectives on what constitutes a strike, NUDM also hosted multiple discourses around work. Unions’ rigid understanding of labor was linked with their aforementioned view of strikes as an exclusive tool of productive workers, one that cannot be extended beyond professional groups. Their interpretation overlooked the changes work had undergone since the 2008 economic crisis and resulted from a bias toward organizing formal rather than informal and precarious workers. Assemblies were shaken by internal tensions, with a rift between unionists and others willing to ensure the strike included unwaged, informal, and precarious workers, a perspective consistent with the Migrant, Social, and Gender strikes. Still, the political differences that played out in the organization of transfeminist strikes are not limited to a clash between two factions, nor was this clash identically reproduced everywhere; further political perspectives were also at stake.

NUDM also interacted with queer activists’ conceptualizations of work, centered around ‘labor feminization’ and elaborations coming from Gender Strike. With respect to unions’ understanding of work, this queer perspective recognized precarity and it also pointed to internal differences within precarious workers, rooted in societal hierarchies rather than caused solely by different contracts. For some, however, this perspective reproduced problems similar to those of the Social strike, with its flattening notion that “we all work all the time.”³⁰ Arguing that *all* labor is feminized makes a universal rule out of women’s specific conditions, thereby undermining the *specific* character of their work and erasing differences, as argued in the excerpt below:

R: I remember this presentation on the strike... There were these two scholars, men, who were talking about the strike in the traditional sense. And at the time there was the whole Italpizza labor dispute³¹, and they were talking about feminization or about the working class...

I: And not about women!

R: They just didn't understand... and I was there to talk about the feminist strike, and I was saying: damn, these Italpizza workers are not just working class, they are women and they are migrants! And it's no coincidence that they make them clean in the freezing cold. Even the type of punishment they underwent for the struggle they were

²⁸ Marta.

²⁹ Vera.

³⁰ Group interview 1.

³¹ Further details in the following section.

leading was specific. And these two wanted to show that they were up to the times by speaking of feminization, but it was bullshit.³²

Having acknowledged such limitations, NUDM transformed the discourse on work in several ways. First, by naming and addressing the racial, sexual, and gendered division of labor. In the report from the national assembly held in Bologna in February 2017, this conceptual leap was made explicit: acknowledging how labor had become feminized, activists also stressed that “although this process affects labor as a whole, it continues to impact women in particular, because a specific regime of sexual division of labor is still fully in place” (Non Una di Meno 2017d). Second, rather than resorting to labor feminization, the network opposed contemporary labor conditions by showing how production and reproduction were becoming intertwined. Third, while labor feminization conceived of reproduction as a precondition to analyze productive work, NUDM posited as crucial to contemporary struggles. The network focused on *who* carries out domestic and care work - predominantly, migrant women - and on the “hierarchies among women” and isolation such work commands (Non Una di Meno 2017e). These considerations are not without consequences: for years, claims for a European permit to stay and access to citizenship have been central in transfeminist strikes. Moreover, having spent years thinking about “what is essential within our society, what is imposed as essential and at what costs,” and having produced an analysis that looked at who was paying such costs,³³ was crucial during the COVID-19 pandemic, and equipped NUDM to “see what was going on behind bureaucratic language, how certain decisions were not objective but political, part of capitalist and patriarchal ideology.”³⁴ In times of emergency, activists were able to point out how the label ‘essential workers’ was “first and foremost a definition of class, gender, and race,” one that “reproduced pre-existing hierarchies.”³⁵

With its reinvention of the strike and its transfeminist vision of work, NUDM overcame generalist discourses on precarity and combined the queer analysis of the Gender strike with the need to name the specific working and living conditions of the strikers, as inherited from the Migrant strike. This discursive activity constituted a fertile terrain for praxis, as the following section will demonstrate.

5.2 Transfeminist strikers and the limits of the possible

Instead of creating stagnation, these debates were key to the richness of the strike. As one activist explained, “each of us had different discourses, but were willing to offer them, to contribute to collective elaboration,” and provide answers and strategies when “workers came saying ‘I was molested at the workplace and I want to make a mess.’”³⁶ This is also why, however complicated, relationships with unions were nevertheless pursued. In particular, dialogue was often possible with individual unionists or dissident areas, as recalled by an activist from Bologna: “there were some unionists who were inside the union, just enough to disregard internal dynamics and who [...] did their part and entered in conflict with their organizations’ political line.”³⁷ Unionists and unions’ territorial offices supplied technical knowledge, political experience, and they made

³² Group interview 1.

³³ Nadia, feminist collective and queer networks, Rome, 28/3/24.

³⁴ Clelia.

³⁵ Denise.

³⁶ Carla.

³⁷ Ludovica.

encounters with workers possible – a political priority in the construction of March 8th. Going to workplaces meant *really* understanding what striking means, “how to strike with different employment contracts, in different places, for different people... what happens if you are a migrant woman, if you are (or not) in a union.”³⁸

Through this type of work, local assemblies supported several territorial labor disputes over the years, constructing fruitful relationships and alliances with workers and sustaining their struggle within the context of the transfeminist strike. A sort of script of March 8th organizing was established, where the transfeminist strike enjoyed “support on the part of grassroots unions,” lacked approval of mainstream ones, and featured NUDM activists trying “to go to workplaces” for “‘feminist preaching,’ with this expectation to involve people who [...] wanted to join the strike in some way.”³⁹ In Turin, a virtuous circle ensued:

Throughout the years, we managed to provide continuity and became a point of reference in our territory. [...] Grassroots unions started to rely on us when they had labor disputes in female-dominated sectors [...], creating a material continuity of issues to follow up on. Then the strike also sparked a process of activation among people gravitating around our networks, many of whom were workers too... When you have a point of reference, your willingness to get involved at *your* workplace grows. [Sometimes] it started with people close to the network getting involved and asking us for support and letting us in on their labor struggles. Then... maybe word got around! So now, workers [...] hear about a particular struggle that was supported by us and reach out.⁴⁰

Similar patterns can be found elsewhere, too. An activist from Milan recalls a particular eventful time in this sense: in 2017, before the strike, they were able to organize assemblies in workplaces, where they “talked with municipal employees, as well as with metalworkers, which you would not think is the social group most susceptible to striking with us... but there are also a lot of women workers with that contract.”⁴¹ The following year, the group supported hotel workers who were facing “exploitation and double or triple discrimination: many of them were migrants, and blackmailed by the permit to stay system; a lot were mothers, so they found night shifts difficult because they could not manage care work at home.”⁴² The first years were similarly fruitful for Bologna, who was able to “get in workplaces [...] and organize assemblies, talk with workers, speak about the strike and about violence, about exploitation.”⁴³ Throughout the years, the assembly also supported a labor dispute against Yoox, a luxury retailer, both in their first strikes in 2018-2019 against workplace violence, as well as those in 2020-2021, when workers opposed shift changes that made it impossible for migrant mothers to continue working. The same assembly, led by a group from a smaller city, Modena, also supported ItalPizza food industry workers as they were protesting exploitative working conditions.

All over the country, the transfeminist strike intersected multiple workplaces in sectors with a high concentration of women and migrant workers, employed via subcontracting, through inadequate contracts, exposed to harsh and exploitative working conditions, and often sustained by grassroots unions. At its best, the transfeminist strike became the instrument through which these ‘unexpected’ strikers could speak out about their working *and* living conditions. Therein lies the leap the transfeminist strike produced: on the one hand,

³⁸ Silvia, anti-racist groups, Rome, 5/4/24.

³⁹ Silvia.

⁴⁰ Alessandra.

⁴¹ Marta.

⁴² Marta.

⁴³ Ludovica.

it enabled workers to connect the organization of production with their possibilities of reproduction; on the other, it considered exploitation as grounded precisely within this intersection, making the contradiction between production and reproduction a crucial terrain of struggle.

Still, this did not translate into a smooth strike. For once, being so reliant on relationships – with grassroots unions, individual unionists, or with groups of workers – the transfeminist strike hinged on contingency: “it depends on what is going on in the area, we did not just make up workers’ disputes on March 8th, it came from workers struggling, so there are events which you cannot influence.”⁴⁴ This also meant activists had to be receptive and invested in listening to potential developments on this front *throughout* the year, requiring overall “a great deal of care, in building relationships and in following up on the various labor disputes.” Activists also needed to attend to workers’ needs, “not waiting for them to come, but going to them, to their workplace, where they need to meet and organize.”⁴⁵ Exceptions aside, many areas lacked organizational continuity in this sense, as shared by an activist based in Florence: “we are not always able to be in assemblies with workers, in real-life workers’ disputes, and besides smaller episodes, there was not a real connection with women’s and feminist struggles in the workplace.”⁴⁶

Besides politicizing the intersection between production and reproduction as a site of exploitation and struggle, the transfeminist strike also tackled reproductive work *per se*, by promoting the interruption of all those daily domestic and caring activities still performed by women, underpaid or unpaid. Attempts to make reproductive work visible are discussed in the public, local assemblies NUDM organized yearly in preparation for the strike, where new practices of struggle and refusal are devised. Efforts to come up with concrete ways to practice such interruption are guided by a crucial initial question: ‘what is your strike?’ (Vega 2022, 629). Throughout the years, NUDM distributed make-shift devices to count the hours of care work performed at home; invited women to abstain from all or part of their domestic and care duties; if striking was difficult, it proposed to wear something fuchsia at work or to hang it outside the window at home; when, during the pandemic, striking became impossible, it gave instructions to participate to an at-home *cacerolazo* and promoted several forms of online engagement. Alternative practices of striking took on a collective character, too: several activists mentioned creating spaces for children to encourage participation in spite of one’s familial duties. These creative practices represent, for some, “the most fundamental strength of the strike, that of imagining a space and time to collectively experiment with things that are not there yet.”⁴⁷

Understanding the role of reproduction and reproductive work within the transfeminist strike still entails great difficulties and contradictions for activists. For once, even in the absence of a boss, the ‘reproductive worker’ is bound to care work by familial or affective ties: “you can avoid answering e-mails, but what if your elderly mom falls and breaks her femur?”⁴⁸ Moreover, refuting one’s familial duties for a day just means that “these tasks are added to the workload of the following day.”⁴⁹ The pandemic crisis, with its mandatory home confinement, heightened such problems. If, on the one hand, the reproductive strike unearthed the invisible, it also touched “the limits of what was possible” (Vega 2022, 618). In the words of an activist:

⁴⁴ Ludovica.

⁴⁵ Alessandra

⁴⁶ Elena.

⁴⁷ Clelia.

⁴⁸ Tommaso.

⁴⁹ Marta.

We are now at the core of the problem (...). There are needs that are irreducible and, above all, cannot be postponed; there are needs that are not elastic in nature. These needs are the tasks that society has assigned to women (...). There are aspects of reproductive labor that can be delegated, postponed, not done. There is, however, an ultimate core, which is that minimum subsistence, which affects everyone, especially the weak, non-independent part of the population: that thing cannot be erased. So, who does it? Or how do *we* do it?⁵⁰

Around this impossibility, doubts coalesce, creating rifts in the movement as to what constitutes a reproductive strike: unionists still struggle to imagine a strike going beyond industrial relations, others see the strike as an instrument to unveil and refuse reproductive work, carried out within and beyond patriarchal homes, and others again insist that reproduction is far more than work—it is societal. In this sense, taking social reproduction into account means not only considering the invisible work women carry out to reproduce the male worker, something which the international campaign of Wages for Housework had already pointed out in the 1970s. Instead, it requires showing how women, LGBT people, and migrants are put to work within specific political conditions, shaped by the necessity of reproducing a precise type of workers – precarious, fragmented, and blackmailable along gendered and racial lines. This is not just about reproductive labor; it is about the reproduction of (patriarchal) society itself. In referring to society at large, the meaning of reproduction goes beyond the boundaries of reproductive work, taking into account patriarchal violence and its gendered, classed, and racialized order. Thus, the transfeminist strike engages with both economy *and* society, interrogating not solely workplaces of waged blue-collar workers as sites of exploitation, but challenging the very boundaries of work, addressing its hierarchies, with the gendered and racial societal order they enforce and reproduce.

6. Final remarks

This paper has offered a processual analysis of the Italian transfeminist strike, borrowing from both social movement studies and labor sociology. Processuality was woven into the simultaneous attention to a specific phenomenon (the grounding of the transfeminist strike as a practice in Italy) and to the steps that explain how it came about, leading to the exploration of longer movement trajectories. In this sense, the article has provided an in-depth overview of previous underexplored experiments around striking which have taken place in the country since the 2008 economic crisis.

Empirically and analytically, this work has shown how the Migrant, Social, and Gender strikes put forward new understandings as to who is a legitimate striker, displacing male workers as the sole subjects of class struggle. It has also reconstructed how, within these processes, migrant, precarious, and queer workers appropriated a repertoire of action they had been otherwise denied. Using different subjective standpoints, they pushed forward discourses refusing work and how it is socially organized. All of these strikes proposed a reinvention of a seemingly fixed political practice, each putting forward an original contribution to rethinking labor organizing in the aftermath of the 2008 economic crisis. Still, within and across these strikes, strong political differences persisted concerning whether all work is precarious, feminized, or becoming-migrant.

In situating the transfeminist strike within this rich genealogy, this paper has stripped away its character of overnight sensation. As part of a longer process, the transfeminist strike contained many of the irreducible theoretical tensions found in the strikes analyzed in the article – around what is a strike, who qualifies as a legitimate striker, and what are the boundaries of women’s work and reproduction in general. It also inherited the Migrant, Social, and Gender strike complex, multi-faceted relations with unions and unionists. At the same

⁵⁰ Elettra.

time, in attempting the impossible, the transfeminist strike represented an unprecedented rupture. In a move typical of feminist politics, the transfeminist strike *stretched* ‘the political’ (Bracke 2014) to include all those private or informal relations where the oppression of women and LGBT people is practiced and reproduced. Throughout these ebbs and flows, the strike stood out as a repertoire in movement, constantly challenged and reinvented, yet representing a factor of continuity between different phases, groups, and mobilizations.

References

- Atzeni M. (2021), “Workers’ organizations and the fetishism of the trade union form: Toward new pathways for research on the labour movement?”, *Globalizations*, 18(8): 1349–1362.
- Arruzza C. (2018), *From Women’s Strikes to a New Class Movement: The Third Feminist Wave*. Revised March 3, 2012, Retrieved September 17, 2024 (<https://viewpointmag.com/2018/12/03/from-womens-strikes-to-a-new-class-movement-the-third-feminist-wave/>).
- Baldo M. (2019), “Translating Spanish transfeminist activism into Italian. Performativity, DIY, and affective contaminations”, *Gender/Sexuality/Italy*, 6: 66-84.
- Bettio F., M. Corsi, C. D’Ippoliti, A. Lyberaki, M. S. Lodovici, A. Verashchagina (2012), *The impact of the economic crisis on the situation of women and men and on gender equality policies*, Brussels: European Commission.
- Bhattacharya T. (2017), “How Not to Skip Class: Social Reproduction of Labor and the Global Working Class”, in T. Bhattacharya (ed.), *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentring Oppression*, London: Pluto Press, pp. 68-93.
- Blee K., V. Taylor (2002), “Semi-Structured Interviewing in Social Movement Research”, in B. Klandermans, S. Staggenborg (eds.), *Methods of Social Movement Research*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 92–117.
- Bonifazi C., C. Marini (2014), “The Impact of the Economic Crisis on Foreigners in the Italian Labour Market”, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(3): 493-511.
- Bonu G. (2022), “Diving into the Tide. Contemporary Feminist Mobilizations and Protests: a Global Perspective”, *AG About Gender International Journal of Gender Studies*, 11(21): 68-112.
- Bosi L., S. Malthaner (forthcoming), “Gaining momentum! Investigating collective action through processual research”, in Bosi L., S. Malthaner (eds.), *Processes of Collective Action*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bracke M. (2014), *Women and the Reinvention of the Political. Feminism in Italy, 1968- 1983*, London: Routledge.
- Camusso S. (2017). *[Lettera di risposta all’invito di Non Una di Meno]*. Revised March 1, 2017, Retrieved June 18, 2025 (<https://nonunadimeno.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/20170301-l-non-una-di-meno.pdf>).
- Casas-Cortés M. (2016), “A Genealogy of Precarity: A Toolbox for Rearticulating Fragmented Social Realities In and Out of the Workplace”, in C. Schierup, M.B. Jørgensen (eds.), *Politics of Precarity. Migrant Conditions, Struggles and Experiences*, London: Brill, pp. 30-51.
- Choi H., A. Mattoni (2010), “The contentious field of precarious work in Italy: political actors, strategies and coalitions”, *WorkingUSA*, 13(2): 213-243.

- Cobbe L., G. Grappi (2011), “Primo marzo, percorsi di uno sciopero inatteso”, in M. Ricciardi, F. Mometti (eds.), *La normale eccezione. Lotte migranti in Italia*, Roma: Alegre, pp. 21-87.
- Collettiva (2010), *Sciopero migranti: Soldini (CGIL), rischia di fallire*. Revised January 7, 2010, Retrieved October 10, 2024 (<https://www.collettiva.it/archivio-storico/rassegnait/sciopero-migranti-soldini-cgil-rischia-di-fallire-d6x4hy1t>).
- de Belvis A. G., F. Ferrè, M. L. Specchia, L. Valerio, G. Fattore, W. Ricciardi (2012) “The financial crisis in Italy: Implications for the healthcare sector”, *Health Policy*, 106: 10-16.
- Donati P. (1992), “Political Discourse Analysis”, in M. Diani, R. Eyerman (eds.), *Studying Collective Action*, Sage publications: London, pp. 107-135.
- Fantone L. (2007), “Precarious Changes: Gender and Generational Politics in Contemporary Italy”, *Feminist Review*, 87(1): 5-20.
- Fumagalli A. (2014), *Il job act è legge: dal lavoro precario al lavoro gratuito passando per la destituzione del potere legislativo*. Revised September 9, 2014, Retrieved October 3, 2024 (<https://effimera.org/il-job-act-e-legge-dal-lavoro-precario-al-lavoro-gratuito-passando-per-la-destituzione-del-potere-legislativo-di-andrea-fumagalli/>).
- Gall G. (2012), “Quiescence continued? Recent strike activity in nine Western European economies”, *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 34(4): 667-691.
- Gallas A. (2024), *Exiting the Factory: Strikes and Class Formation beyond the Industrial Sector*, Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- Lazzarato M. (1996), “Immaterial Labor”, in P. Virnò, M. Hardt (eds.) *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 133-147.
- Lindekilde L. (2014), “Discourse and Frame Analysis”, in D. della Porta (ed.), *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*, London: Oxford University Press, pp. 195-227.
- Marino S., M. Bernaciak, A. Mrozowicki, V. Pulignano (2018), “Unions for whom? Union democracy and precarious workers in Poland and Italy”, *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 40(1): 111–131.
- Montagna N. (2013), “Labor, Citizenship, and Subjectivity: Migrants’ Struggles within the Italian Crisis”, *Social Justice*, 39(1): 43-61.
- Morini C. (2007), “The Feminization of Labour in Cognitive Capitalism”, *Feminist Review*, 87: 40-59.
- Non una di meno (2017a), *Abbiamo Un Piano. Piano femminista contro la violenza maschile sulle donne e la violenza di genere*. Revised November 16, 2017, Retrieved October 27, 2021 (https://nonunadimeno.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/abbiamo_un_piano.pdf).
- Non Una di Meno (2017b), *8 marzo 2017: Sciopero delle donne >> Se le nostre vite non valgono, noi scioperiamo!* Revised January 17, 2017, Retrieved January 5, 2022 (<https://nonunadimeno.wordpress.com/2017/01/17/8-marzo-2017-sciopero-delle-donne-se-le-nostre-vite-non-valgono-allora-ci-fermiamo/>).
- Non Una di Meno (2017c), *Appello a tutti i sindacati di base, confederali e autonomi: l’8 marzo fermiamo il mondo per dire no alla violenza maschile sulle donne*. Revised January 17, 2017, Retrieved January 5, 2022 (<https://nonunadimeno.wordpress.com/2017/01/17/appello-a-tutti-i-sindacati-confederali-di-base-e-autonomi-l8-marzo-fermiamo-il-mondo-per-dire-no-alla-violenza-maschile-sulle-donne/>).
- Non Una di Meno (2017d), *Report del tavolo Lavoro e welfare (Assemblea nazionale 4- 5 febbraio 2017 a Bologna)*. Revised February 16, 2017, Retrieved June 20, 2024 (<https://nonunadimeno.wordpress.com/2017/02/16/report-del-tavolo-lavoro-e-welfareassemblea-nazionale-4-5-febbraio-2017-a-bologna/>).

- Non Una di Meno (2017e), *Report del tavolo femminismi e migrazioni (Assemblea nazionale 4- 5 febbraio 2017 a Bologna)*. Revised February 15, 2017, Retrieved June 15, 2024 (<https://nonunadimeno.wordpress.com/2017/02/15/report-del-tavolo-femminismi-e-migrazioni-assemblea-nazionale-4-5-febbraio-a-bologna/>).
- Oikonomakis L., J.E. Roos (2016), “A Global Movement for Real Democracy?: The Resonance of Anti-Austerity Protest from Spain and Greece to Occupy Wall Street”, in Dufour, P., M. Ancelovici, M. Nez, (eds.), *Street Politics in the Age of Austerity*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 227–250.
- Peano I. (2017), “Migrants' struggles? Rethinking citizenship, anti-racism and labour precarity through migration politics in Italy”, in Lazar, S. (ed.), *Where are the unions? Workers and Social Movements in Latin America, the Middle East and Europe*, London: Zed Books Editors, pp. 1-15.
- Perra M.C., K. Pilati (2023), “Political, general or economic strikes? New types of strikes and workers' contention”, *Partecipazione e Conflitto*, 16(2): 234-251.
- Pettigrew A. M. (1997), “What is a processual analysis?”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 13(4): 337–348.
- Primo marzo (2010), *Verso 1° marzo 2011, sulle ali di un racconto, Primo marzo 2010*. Revised October 22, 2010, Retrieved September 27, 2024 (<http://primomarzo2010.blogspot.com/2010/10/lo-scorso-anno-grazie-un-tam-tam.html>).
- Ricciardi M., F. Raimondi (2004), *Lavoro migrante. Esperienza e prospettive*, Roma: DeriveApprodi.
- Rudan P. (2018), “The Strike that Made a Difference”, *Critical Times*, 1(1): 241–262.
- Sacchetto D., F. A. Vianello (2015), “Donne migranti e organizzazioni sindacali nella crisi”, *Sociologia del lavoro*, 140: 159-172.
- somMovimento nazioAnale (2014), *SCIOPERO SOCIALE: SCIOPERO DAI /DEI GENERI*. Revised November 13, 2014, Retrieved October 15, 2023 (<https://sommovimentonazioanale.noblogs.org/post/2014/11/13/sciopero-sociale-sciopero-dai-generi-dei-generi/>).
- Tavory I., S. Timmermans (2014), *Abductive Analysis. Theorizing Qualitative Research*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Vega C. (2022), “Revisiting and Recreating the Strike. Questions for the Feminist Political Imagination”, *Critical Times*, 5(3): 618-631.
- Zenobio M. (2014), *#14N. Ma cos'è lo sciopero sociale?* Revised November 10, 2014, Retrieved July 4, 2023 (<https://www.popoffquotidiano.it/2014/11/10/14n-ma-che-cose-lo-sciopero-sociale/>).