



Xenofeminism: A Politics for Alienation

Laboria Cuboniks

[Download now](#)

[Read Online](#) 

Xenofeminism: A Politics for Alienation

Laboria Cuboniks

Xenofeminism: A Politics for Alienation Laboria Cuboniks

“Xenofeminism is gender-abolitionist... Let a hundred sexes bloom! ...[And, let’s] construct a society where traits currently assembled under the rubric of gender, no longer furnish a grid for the asymmetric operation of power... You’re not exploited or oppressed because you are a wage labourer or poor; you are a labourer or poor because you are exploited...”

Xenofeminism: A Politics for Alienation Details

Date : Published June 2015 by Laboria Cuboniks

ISBN :

Author : Laboria Cuboniks

Format : ebook 20 pages

Genre : Feminism, Philosophy, Theory, Nonfiction, Politics, Writing, Essays

 [Download Xenofeminism: A Politics for Alienation ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online Xenofeminism: A Politics for Alienation ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online Xenofeminism: A Politics for Alienation Laboria Cuboniks

From Reader Review *Xenofeminism: A Politics for Alienation* for online ebook

Matilde Park says

A manifesto for the future manifestos. By the time I found xenofeminism, everyone around me said the same thing: that nothing came of it, that it was disappointing, that it wasn't made into a movement in itself, life went on.

But xenofeminism isn't the movement. Xenofeminism is the movement that starts the future movements. Xenofeminism is setting new guidelines for the movement. Xenofeminism is about positively advocating for a united future feminism, a feminism of Difference, without the politics of purity, without image. Xenofeminism should be as uncool as running Debian — "yeah, it's just so *basic*, though." If we're following the metaphor, it seeks to be more like Arch, a baseline upon which you install whatever package is necessary, but Arch is seen as cool.

Xenofeminism is about creating the order that manifests the future, an individual and a collective metapraxis. It's critique in disguise as a manifesto. It's a goodbye to the feminist Puritanism that dominated the 1900s, and at the same time: what's the future, now?

The future is Different, the future is Rational, and the future is a united, communistic technological embrace. Accelerate alienation.

Xenofeminism is the start of our independent movements. It's for how we guide our communities and how we decide to move forward. And at the same time, it's about what we do as individuals, too.

You've read it, you agree. Now what? That's our job. No book can solve that.

Martin Hare Michno says

You can find the *Xenofeminist Manifesto* for free on their website, PDF download included:
<http://www.laboriacuboniks.net/>

As far as I understand, Xenofeminism is a call for radical intersectionalism. The prefix 'Xeno-' refers to the alien, the strange, the unnatural. It is precisely the unnatural which Xenofeminism seeks: "Anyone who's been deemed 'unnatural' in the face of reigning biological norms, anyone who's experienced injustices wrought in the name of natural order, will realize that the glorification of 'nature' has nothing to offer us". Along with its anti-naturalism, Xenofeminism is grounded on ideas of technomaterialism and gender abolitionism.

It is technomaterialist because it believes in the potential of technological advances, and in the repurposing of technology as a feminist tool. The focus on technomaterialism is what makes it a futuristic theory which has announced the inevitable end of capitalism. Technology should be used for the good of society, not to breed the wealth of the few.

It's gender abolitionist ideas are recognisable to anyone who has basic knowledge in gender theory. It

desires not to do away with gender, but to do away with the limits imposed on gender. The Manifesto solidifies this idea with the haunting words: "We have no interest in seeing the sexuate diversity of the world reduced. Let a hundred sexes bloom!"

It can be a difficult read, however, it's brevity and conciseness allows for multiple re-reads, easy dissections and clear ideas. I cannot summarise all of its ideas here. It is a manifesto which I think every student should read, and after having reading it myself, I cannot believe a feminist ideology can be complete without it. It should be discussed on campuses all around the world. An essential read for today, and I hope it is a beginning of a new language and re-construction of life itself.

Titus Hjelm says

Wow! A blast from the past! The substance of this manifesto, and its visual outlook, are pure gold. Intersectionality is the only way forward, that's for sure. But like the best/worst postmodernists from the 80s, the authors seem to think that the only way to bridge the gap between the academic, the political, and the poetical is to use completely unnecessary jargon. Ironically, then, in its attempt to be avant-garde, the text ends up sounding very old-fashioned.

Aung Sett Kyaw Min says

techno-rational-universalist abolitionist inhumanism

David says

Short, pithy, bracing. As a manifesto should be. I love the graphic design, too. The explosions of colors communicate urgency and passion. But the text itself would be a great call to arms regardless.

One of many great lines comes near the end: "If nature is unjust, change nature."

Obviously things can get complicated (as the collective author Laboria Cuboniks emphasizes several times) but this is a good starting place, no? No more arguments from "this is how is so this is how ought..."

Chris says

This a manifesto of intersectional feminism as well as an outright attack on capitalism.

It's flashy. It's a nice package. What ideas there are, seem like ones I would agree with it. In particular the bits about gender. It just it needs a little more meat.

Jack says

...melancholy -- so endemic to the left -- teaches us that emancipation is an extinct species to be wept over and that blips of negation are the best we can hope for. At its worst, such an attitude generates nothing but political lassitude, and at its best, installs an atmosphere of pervasive despair which too often degenerates into factionalism and petty moralizing.

Alex Sarll says

I'm not a natural fan of the manifesto as a form; they're built on grand statements, and my default response to those is to either point out that they're truisms, or note the various exceptions to the proposed rule. But for the most part, this one is very good. The style is perhaps too academic to be described as rabble-rousing, but it's appropriately exasperated with the various misguided surrenders of territory made by progressive causes, whether that be a tendency towards conceding (if attempting to reframe) the idea that natural equals good, or the problem with beginning from the notion that the oppressed are necessarily the virtuous, and then attempting to convert that into a power capable of changing the system. Furious at the notion of allowing the enemy to retain their sole claim to technology or large-scale operations or rationality itself, impatient with the essentialism which has taken the place of fluidity and volatility in supposedly progressive circles, the authors have come up with something as close as I've seen to a real-world Quellism. Albeit, alas and of course, one fairly short on concrete solutions to the problems it identifies. What follows from this, I don't know, but I certainly hope something does, because "a politics without the infection of purity" feels like something we could use right now.

Marie-Therese says

Beautifully designed little book. Too bad the text is nothing but absurdly obfuscatory jargon with barely a fresh thought or interesting idea hidden within. I can't imagine anyone but a first-year gender studies student getting much out of this. Old news, prettily packaged. Save your reading time for something genuinely revolutionary like Shulamith Firestone's practically antique (1970!) but still rabble-rousing 'Dialectic of Sex'. Not recommended for anyone who's passed those first-year philosophy and gender courses.

Claire Newton says

a must read for alien futurists!

Paula says

very necessary

now make it accessible for the people you advocate for not just those involved in academia :-))

Kevin says

The Good:

--Feminist critique and (often neglected) embrace/control of high-technology is desperately needed, given the alarming centralization of technological reach and power under capitalism.

The Bad:

--Like many manifestos, this one tries to build the “ideological infrastructure” while thoroughly-lacking constructive steps to address the pressing questions (i.e. How to seize control? Actual ideas to transform institutions/networks of production/resource distribution in the real world?).

--The delivery needs a complete overhaul if a wider audience is desired. I grow ever more wary of insufferable academic verbiage; are we trying to build mass movements or our own ivory towers?

ralowe says

facetune feminism. talking about desire gets old precisely because it never does. the always different, always the same of what's desired. like gazing at a campfire under the chilly cosmos at night. listening for a telemachiad scratchily told over and through the artifacts of a smoky flicker. a missing presence that's not, yet always returns to the eurocentric viral marketing of a non-cyclical history. a fairly circular hole in the (non-)plot being told orally that dramatically enravishes the epigononic appetite for a patriarchal bite. food coma, splitting the bill between those whom were never eaten. a contract, a commitment, till the always allegedly futural oncoming meal to come. maybe i'm speaking from always having to see and here your techie mouth when you eat. the hegelian all-encompassing snarl of a widening economic maw. nothing escapes, all eat to be eaten. nothing's escaped. i feel like the test of hegel is in the scope of what's commodifiable. it seems an accelerationist must talk under the assumption that there's ever been anything left to sell. like the world hasn't been weighed down by numerous repeat endings. the horrific drama of chattel enslavement offers a different perspective on what's left. so it's like when you say “materiality” whose eviction are you referring to? god i hate the way this is written, as if scrawled in combustible dumpster juice. the traction of the accelerationist perspective sort of depends on whether the qualities of your oppression can be tracked to specific events. perhaps the alleged lack of a discrete event is what makes gender oppression so palatable to this ideology. there's much placed on trans entirely over to medical science so that the shape of the bodymind must be coextensive with technological advancement. what's stupid about you is that you miss all the anoriginal otherwises that always were and await. it's like you're rhythm sucks or something. donna haraway wore it better.

tout says

The design of this book is excellent, and as a designer, this is what really drew me in. It's also what redeems this at all for me, pushing it beyond a one star review. It's a pretty and playful little book.

Some fundamental disagreements with this are its under-nuanced and under-problematized conception of technology and the call to embrace alienation. In modern technology and technology in general, there is more at stake than simply wresting it away from capitalism and patriarchy. Is this not vulgar? Don't we hear the same thing of the state form? What is at stake is how we conceive of our world and how we situate ourselves within it. A perspective that sees itself in this dulled experience of being in the world, as autonomous and alien from the "coming into presence of beings" is little different than the route we're currently given. The fact that we cling to being alien to the chaotic and ever changing and changeable world is a supreme weakness rather than a strength. We can reject what is called "natural" without falling into alienation as its supposed opposite. Similarly how does the author's call to reclaim the "universals" make any sense in our time, of social fragmentation and the potentials for communist multiplicity, and why would the return to the one over the multiple be seen as anything but a technocratic stalinism?

Kamen Nedev says

"We want neither clean hands nor beautiful souls, neither virtue nor terror. We want superior forms of corruption."
