

The Black Protests in Poland: An Example of an Anti-pastoral Revolution

Szymon Wróbel

University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

Michel Foucault in *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978* argues, that there has never been such a thing as an anti-pastoral revolution in Western societies. Yes, we have had revolutions against the disciplinary apparatus and legal devices of power (schools, hospitals, prisons) and we have had examples of revolutions against the economic foundations of social inequality, but there has never been a genuine revolution against pastoral power as a power relating to the conduct of individuals (but also entire social groups) and their disposition to “voluntary submission” to the will of external authorities. In my paper, I would like to reflect on this thesis, and taking it quite seriously, to look for examples of such revolutions. One of them is a women’s strike in Poland during the power of the conservative government of “Law and Justice”. Mainly referring to the texts of Silvia Federici and Paul Preciado, I will want to reflect on contemporary practices of reclaiming the body in contemporary capitalism. I will defend the thesis that regaining control over sexuality and reproduction means changing the material conditions of life and modern reproductive technologies.

Keywords: black protest, morning-after pill, primitive accumulation, procreation refusal, resistance, voluntary submission, women’s reproductive strike

Double Purpose (Poland in the World)

The task I am setting myself in this paper is twofold. First, I want to recall a certain political event, i.e., the Black Protest from a few years ago in Poland, when the parliament, on the initiative of conservative circles, tried to introduce a new law radicalizing the abortion ban. Until 2016, abortion in Poland was legal under three conditions: (1) a threat to the woman’s life, (2) irreversible damage to the fetus, and (3) pregnancy as a result of rape. On September 23, 2016, the Parliament rejected the project liberalizing the abortion law but supported the project entitled “Stop Abortion”, which the deputies submitted for further legislative work. After this decision, on September 25, “Partia Razem” (Together Party) organized demonstrations in many Polish cities under the slogan *#black protest*.

On October 3, 2016, over 100,000 people participated in the demonstrations. In Poland, the “black color” of mourning suddenly turned into the “national color”, replacing our flag’s white and red colors, and the *#czarnyprotest* hashtag became the most popular internet tag. Women took to the streets with black balloons, hangers, and banners with the following slogans: “I will not give birth to the dead”, “My uterus is not your chapel”,

“I think, I feel, I decide”, “We want children out of love and choice, not rape and terror”, “The government is not pregnant, it can be removed”, “My uterus, my business”. What was important in this protest was that people from different generations took to the streets against the actions of the ruling “Law and Justice” Party (“Prawo i Sprawiedliwość”); teenagers chanted “I am, I think, I decide” to shoulder with their mothers and grandmothers, manifesting intergenerational solidarity. Representatives of various professions, women in large and smaller cities, and men, in solidarity with women, protested together. The “black resistance” brought results—on the night of October 4-5, the Parliament rejected the draft law on the abortion ban. But, of course, this did not happen without a “public scandal” and “public accusations” directed at the protesters for violating public order, attacking the church, radicalism, a lack of responsibility and leading narcissistic lives without values. It’s a battle won, but not the war. Since then, repression and the “nativist regime” forcing women to bear children, regardless of the circumstances, are constantly threatened in Poland.

Summarizing this thread, I would say that the Black Protest was not only the largest public opposition in democratic Poland but also the most effective political protest in recent years, at least after our country’s “conservative turn” (authoritarian). Protests about the reform of the judiciary and the so-called “legitimacy” (separation of powers and political autonomy of the judiciary), although spectacular and regular, have not succeeded. Slogans and banners with the inscription “Constitution” were no longer as successful as those of the black protest—“I think, I feel, I decide”. The authorities, despite protests, introduced planned de-regulations in the field of the judiciary. Only the Women’s Black General Strike, which was a direct clash of “authoritarian power” and “autonomous population”, resulted in (at least temporarily) the suspension of the project of subordinating reproduction to the needs of the religious state.

The reason for my analysis is to highlight the Black Protest as a demonstration of opposition to authoritarian biopower. However, my aim is not limited to an empirical analysis of the particular sociological case of my country; this is just a starting point. The more theoretical, general, speculative goal concerns the very concept of “revolution” (or, in a less radical interpretation) “resistance”. Therefore, I ask a simple question: what is this resistance or revolution about? I say, it is about managing the body, regaining control over it, and running it according to our own rules.

In his theory of biopower, Michel Foucault has repeatedly emphasized that apart from the “economic revolution”, in terms of the means of production (taking place in the sphere of property and economics) and next to the “political revolution”, meaning the transition from the “sovereignty paradigm” (in which the law calls citizens to obey the threat of death) to the “biopolitical paradigm” (in which the authorities aim to supervise the parameters of life and the production of life), there is still an uncertain sphere of “conducting oneself”, the sphere of creating specific patterns of conduct, i.e., the sphere of “governing oneself”, in which we gain control over life. This “revolution” in terms of “self-techniques”, and “habitus of action” is my theoretical goal.

Michel Foucault argues in *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*, that there has never been such a thing as an anti-pastoral revolution in Western society (Foucault, 2007; 2008). Yes, we have had revolutions against the disciplinary apparatus and legal devices of power (schools, hospitals, prisons). We have had examples of revolutions against the economic foundations of social inequality (Russian revolution). Still, there has never been a genuine revolution against pastoral power as a power relating to the conduct of individuals (but also entire social groups) and their disposition to “voluntary submission” to the will of external authorities.

I want to reflect here on this thesis and, taking it quite seriously, look for examples of such revolutions. One of them will be the women's strike in Poland during the power of the conservative government of "Law and Justice" Party. Mainly referring to Silvia Federici's and Paul Preciado's texts, I will reflect on contemporary practices of reclaiming the body in contemporary capitalism and political authoritarianism. Finally, I will defend the thesis: regaining control over sexuality and reproduction means changing the material conditions of life. One cannot recover the body without changing the material conditions of everyday life.

First, one more caveat. I want to be well understood. My intention is not to ask about a strange symbiosis, the relationship of sovereign power, which seems to be historically obsolete with modern biopolitical regimes. However, this symbiosis to some extent appears to reflect the specificity of Poland—a country only "economically" modernized and not "mentally". However, that is not the problem at hand here. I am asking rather about ways of regaining control over oneself and one's body that allow one to make "procreative decisions" in the world of biotechnology, but also in a world where power easily destroys but creates the temptation (and even compulsion) to "give birth to children", to renew life, nation. My considerations are halfway between the question of "the return of the new right-wing authoritarianism" and the "neoliberal disposition" to improve and streamline bodies.

In neoliberalism, "improving bodies" seems to require economic advancement that reinforces social stratification. In neoliberal terms, a "man" is "something" that can be endlessly processed, transformed, and improved to obtain ever higher parameters of "intelligence", "efficiency", "longevity", "health", and "sexual fitness". Modern medicine allows the transformation of bodies indefinitely. It seems, however, this neoliberal "medical capitalism" is met by the "new authoritarianism" with its dream of controlling a "pure, homogeneous population" uncontaminated by foreign influences, infections, and mixing. As a result, it seems that contemporary capitalism can be simultaneously "progressive technologically" and "morally conservative", and even "morally puritanical". The same power sponsors new, technologically improved bodies and sends non-heteronormatives to prison or hospital. This is the modern dual soul of the "new right": reactionary politics and technological audacity. The planned organization of the medical industry and the dematerialization of the body are two aspects of the same project.

As a result, a key question arises: how should we relate to biotechnology and new body management regimes? Should we welcome these "modern temptations" with relief and confidence as forms of liberating our bodies? Or should we distrust this form of body liberation through pharmacy and biotechnology?

Between Materialism and Techno-Utopia

In answering this question, my analysis will go in two directions. Firstly, "feminist materialism", particularly as interpreted by Sylvia Federici, will be an important source of inspiration for me. Secondly, I will devote myself to reading the texts of Paul Preciado, who outlines a kind of pornotopia, a utopia of new bodies. As a result, my story will run between Federici's technological skepticism and Preciado's pharmacological enthusiasm. I start with Sylvia Federici.

Primitive Accumulation and Reproduction

It seems that the explicit intention of Federici's feminism is an attempt to go beyond the idea of primitive accumulation developed by Karl Marx and the metaphysics of power developed by Michel Foucault. Federici sourly notes that nowhere in *Capital* does Marx admit that the reproduction of the labor force includes women's unpaid labour (Federici, 2004). Marx never claimed that procreation could become a ground of exploitation and,

thus, a ground of resistance. He also never imagined that women could refuse to reproduce or that such a refusal could become part of the class struggle, which is what the Black Protest in Poland was about. Marx considers primitive accumulation from the point of view of the male proletariat and the development of commodity production. Federici examines it from the point of view of changes in the “reproductive conditions of production itself”, thus problematizing the relationship between class and gender. The process of primitive accumulation, therefore, involves (i) the development of a new sexual division of labor subordinating women’s work and women’s reproductive functions to the reproduction of men’s labor power; (ii) building a new patriarchal order based on the exclusion of women from wage labor and their subordination to men; (iii) the mechanization of the proletarian body and, in the case of women, making their bodies “machines for the production” of workers. Primitive accumulation, thus understood, has four main purposes: (a) to create a more disciplined mass of workers, (b) to disperse social protests, (c) to bind workers to their functions, and (d) to deprive women of any rights and wages, and, moreover, to denigrate and demonize their midwifery and medical skills in general; so much for Marx.

In the same style, Federici notes that at no point in his archaeological analysis does Foucault concern himself with the “women’s question” and investigate what constitutes the legal content of the new women’s reproductive crime, including abortion (Federici, 2004). Federici’s “witch-hunt” study also undermines Foucault’s theory of the history of biopower by stripping it of the “secret” with which Foucault surrounds the emergence of a new “care for life” regime. Federici unambiguously suggests that Foucault would have learned much more if he had studied the witch hunt in his *History of Sexuality* (1978) instead of concentrating on the pastoral confession (Foucault, 1998). Federici claims that starting from the middle of the 16th century, as Portuguese ships returned from Africa with the first enslaved people, European governments began imposing severe penalties for contraception, abortion, and infanticide. Federici argues that while in the Middle Ages, women could use various contraceptives and exercised control over childbirth, from the 16th century on, their wombs became public territory, controlled by men, doctors, and demonologists, and they were accused of contacts with the “devil’s spawn”. Procreation was placed directly at the service of capitalist accumulation (Federici, 2004).

Let’s take into account the historical context in which the witch hunt took place. We must conclude that the witch hunt in Europe was an attack on women’s resistance, a Black Protest of women, not limited to the territory of Poland, against the spread of capitalist relations of production and autonomy that women exuded because of their sexuality, control over reproduction, and ability to cure disease. In this sense, the “witchcraft charge” served a function similar to that of “high treason” and the charge of “terrorism” in our time. Federici bitterly concludes: “The world had to be disenchanted in order to be dominated” (Federici, 2004, p. 174). In this lesson, we can also conclude that the process of primitive accumulation in Poland has not been permanently completed.

The witch hunt brought women nothing but humiliation. It was the first step in the long march towards state-controlled sex and the transformation of women’s sexual activity into work, service to men, and “national procreation”. The state became the steward of class relations and the overseer of the reproduction of labor. As seen in the Polish example, this function has been fulfilled to this day. According to the new socio-sexual contract, women became a substitute for the land lost to dispossession for the male workers i.e., they became the primary means of reproduction and the “common good” that any “white male” could appropriate and use. Federici also reminds us that women usually initiated and led revolts and were the real force in proletarian struggles. The women’s reproductive strike is the only general strike.

What conclusion are we to draw from this important lesson about witches and the connection between the witch hunt and the rise of capitalism? Is it just that since the 16th century, tormented by the “madness of the lawsuit” for contact with devils, nothing has changed, at least in Poland? Federici draws a far-reaching conclusion, which does not, however, diminish the topicality of the accusations against brave, wise, strikers, and disobedient women.

Federici puts it bluntly: if we reject “women” as an analytical and political category, we will have to reject feminism as well, because it is hard to imagine an opposition existing in the absence of a common experience of injustice and oppression (Federici, 2018). The rejection of social and political identification is a “recipe for disaster”, and the denial of identity is the creation of a people without a history. Federici looks for a body that differs from Bachtin’s body that consumes everything edible in the world, a body understood as an expression of selfish genes and finally, a body completely determined and produced by power relations. Does such a body even exist? Well, the body, going “beyond its skin”, encounters not so much “paradise”, but “magical continuity” with other living organisms inhabiting the Earth. Federici generates the image of the body “unifying everything” that capitalism has separated. This is why Federici says that “politics must liberate us” or it is “corrupt politics”. Left-wing melancholy stems from the sadness that appears at the moment of postponement; when we postpone the realization of dreams for later.

According to Federici, procreation has an economic value that is not diminished by the technological growth of capital. Only labor creates value, value that machines do not. What is disappearing today is “pay for work”, not the work itself. Women should therefore fight for the guarantee of every woman’s right “not to be” deprived of the right to have children for material reasons. Federici searches for policies that could change not only our lives, but society as a whole. Finally, for her, “femininity” is not only the result of “role-playing”, but also the result of the division of labor, the organization of the family, and the “free wage” itself (Federici, 2018). Collective identities are not only systems of prisons created by the hegemonic system, but they are also “robes”, and “clothes” that cannot be “taken off” or “destroyed”. According to Federici, social and cultural filters do not prevent us from talking about the materiality of bodies, which does not mean that the body is solitary; rather, it means that the body was formed in a long co-evolution with and dependent on the environment. The question is, isn’t such a position reactionary? Isn’t it a re-essentialization or naturalization of the body? In what sense can the body be enacted and performed and at the same time “material” and “environmentally dependent”?

Well, Federici states that you can’t “reclaim the bodies” without changing the material conditions of life. What does this mean? This means we need a “reproductive justice” movement emphasizing the link between the fight for reproduction and “economic justice”. Changing bodies and regaining control over them is changing the material conditions of life. If I understand the main idea correctly, it’s not about “going back from reproduction” or making your body a place of “procreation refusal”, a kind of anti-natalism; it’s not about “deconstructing female fertility” like the biblical character Ruth from the *Book of Ruth*; the point is to fight for living conditions in which a reproductive strike, black protest, denial of procreation will become superfluous. Sexual liberation therefore, means not so much “liberation from sex” as liberation from the conditions in which it is currently taking place and in which it is now lived. Before we answer the question of what that means, let’s turn our attention to my second source of inspiration.

Pornotopia (Pharmacopornographic Capitalism)

The second direction of research is the analysis of Paul B. Preciado’s analysis on architecture, pornography, and sexuality in the era of pharmacopornographic capitalism (Preciado, 2013a). Preciado begins with the obvious

claim that the postulate that the sexual union of a man and a woman is necessary for reproduction is as unscientific as the claim that reproduction can take place between persons of the same religion. Sexual reproduction, today, does not require a union between a man and a woman, but is rather a process of the recombination of the genetic material of two haploid cells. The problem is that haploid cells never meet by chance. What does this mean?

This means that people reproduce with political support. Reproduction always requires the communization of the genetic material of the body through a particular social practice or heterosexual technique (e.g., penile ejaculation), “fluid exchange”, either by “emptying a syringe in a clinic” or in a petri dish in a laboratory. In a world of “no birth control pill and no paternity test”, the family was an essential patriarchal institution. The “uterine product” was treated as the property of the pater familiae. However, things are different today: we have both the contraceptive pill and artificial insemination technology. In the old world, “other empty bodies” that could not initiate the procreation process were excluded from the “heterosexual contract” as the founding act of modern democracy. What does this mean?

This means that for Preciado, homosexual, transgender, and asexual people are not only “sexual minorities”, but also “reproductive minorities”. These groups have been stripped of not only economic but also genetic inheritance. As Preciado poetically writes, “these groups are indisputably condemned to the genetic silence of the chromosomes” (Preciado, 2020, p. 40). As a result, Preciado claims, for non-heterosexual bodies, “the right to laboratory-assisted reproduction” (Preciado, 2020, p. 42). Of course, in countries like Poland, with a deep history entangled in “Catholic Baptism and Holy Communion”, where the separation of state and church has not yet irreversibly taken place, such a solution is unacceptable and even “scandalous”.

Preciado, remembering the Spanish experience of General Franco’s regime, i.e., the experience of fascism, writes directly that “National Catholicism invented a nation that never existed, it drew the myth of an eternal new Spain” (Preciado, 2020, p. 48). It is no different today in Poland. General Franco drew a legend about the population threat to Spain, but he himself destroyed it with his persecution mania. Preciado sadly adds that it is hard to believe that people are so “confused” that in the name of “national identity” they want to kill a significant part of the national population. Preciado speaks as if he were describing the current experience of Poland, and not the experience of Spain or the even earlier experience of Germany, about the “militarization of social relations”, the transformation of public space into a “space of control”, i.e., closing not only borders but also “concreting wombs”.

In his culminating essay, *Declaring a Uterus’ Strike*, Preciado writes that the uterus is the organ subject to “the strongest appropriation in the economic and political sense” (Preciado, 2020, p. 54). The uterine cavity, which can bear pregnancy, is not a private organ. It is instead a “public space” for which religious and political forces, the medical and pharmaceutical industries, and the agricultural and food industries are fighting. What does this mean in practice? Well, it means that every woman carries within her the laboratory of the nation-state and the ethnic purity of the nation depends on her conduct. The government and states are trying to reclaim the womb as a place of biopolitics. The national government imagines that once it has a uterus, it will succeed “to fix in place the old borders of the nation-state that are breaking apart” (Preciado, 2020, p. 55).

Perhaps now, also in Poland, the minister of justice sticks the red and white flag of our nation into the wombs of women, which means that Polish women will wake up one day with the Council of Ministers and the Episcopate deep in the endometrium. Fortunately, women have enough strength to respond with a “uterine strike” and display Black protest flags on the streets of Polish cities. But biopolitics is not limited to womb control. It is no different when it comes to the products of other organs, e.g., breast milk. As a product of women’s labor, milk

becomes a valuable “biopolitical fluid” through which national identity is filtered. As a result, milk ceases to belong to women and becomes the property of the state. To summarize this Nation-State Report, we will say that any biopolitics has three elements: (i) the devaluation of women’s work, (ii) the privatization of women’s fluids and products, (iii) the confinement of women-mothers in the domestic space or in the public space of “sex work”.

This last point is further developed in a scathing critique of the ideology of motherhood. Continuing his report on biopolitics, Preciado says (in the style of Pedro Almodóvar) that it is a lie to say that we only have one mother. It’s time to “decolonize mothers”, to honor the multiple bonds that kept the growing child alive. The “legal mother” is just a mask—they hide under other mothers who have been denied the “right to bond” after doing their reproductive work. A middle-class working birth mother, racked with guilt for leaving home, feels obligated to provide care for her children when she is away. What does he do in such a situation? It is clear that he introduces a “substitute figure” into the house while removing the signs of its presence, i.e., introducing a nanny who most often represents a different class and often a different cultural affiliation. The “legal biological mother”, portrayed as “loving”, must use “class and racial violence” to remain “the only mother”, which in practice means that she must “remove the nanny”. It’s all about our “legal mothers”.

After reading this Report, one should ask, what does Preciado want? What does the author of this report dream about? Well, I say that he dreams of a certain pornotopia. For Preciado, the “reproductive organs” are “outside the body”, but also the body is “outside the skin”, in a place that can no longer be thought of as the “abode” (home) of the “solitary I”, the ego. For Preciado, the body is not a “property” but a “relationship”. Preciado fantasizes about the day a “3D printer” will “print” sperm canals for him. Preciado tells the story of a society “in transition” from sexuality controlled by power apparatuses towards sexuality mediated by pharmacopornographic devices, i.e., by soft digital technologies and biomolecular engineering. What does “being in the aisle” mean? Well, it means that “modern sexuality” comprises molecules sold by the pharmaceutical industry and “intangible representations” circulating on social media. Unlike the condom, “chemical prophylaxis” no longer applies to the hegemonic body (finishing with ejaculation) but sexually subordinated, subalteric bodies. The problem is that the old world of patriarchal myths constantly surrounds these new technologies of the future—the nursing mother, the life-giving father, home as a place of love, and family as the only “sacred”.

So what utopia does the author of *Pornotopia* obey? Well, Preciado indulges in daydreams of an “alliance of norm-rejecting bodies”; he dreams of a micro-revolution that would be able to privilege the multiplicity of processes of empowerment of a world in which “our separateness” would be more important than maintaining the principles of a norm or identity. Preciado demands the absolute right to “be boys without a penis”, “girls without a womb”, and “not be a boy or a girl”. However, these are only dreams. The reality is a world where everybody born in a hospital is subjected to gender norm assessment protocols. If the body does not adapt to the norms, gender reconciliation operations are launched. In this world, transgender and intersex are still considered “pathologies” and not symptoms of maladjustment to the political-visual regime of gender difference (Preciado, 2020, p. 199). Homosexuality and heterosexuality do not exist outside the binary taxonomy that is designed to maintain the dominance of the pater familias. Homosexuality and heterosexuality do not exist outside the colonial and capitalist epistemology of binary. Within this epistemology, capital is reproduced, not life; power relations are reproduced, not individual liberties.

Returning to Foucault and his three revolutions, I would say that a revolution does not begin with economics or law, but with a change in the rhythm of conduct, with a pause, a hiatus, a displacement, a “Heraclitan deviation” (clinamen) in the game of improvisation and appearances. A revolution begins with a rebellion against the

conduct of our lives by an arbitrarily appointed authority. So the question is: how to create an “alliance of bodies” that have been denied the right to conduct themselves freely, to live independent of any external authority? How to create the conditions for this revolution enchanted in the displacement of our habits? And can such a revolution be made without ideology, without identity?

Preciado claims that “new feminism” does not need an ideology. New feminism is not a people of women. The new feminism does not require an ideology because it is not a nation. Ideologists say that “representation” is needed in politics. New feminism says all you need to do is experiment. Economics talks about human capital, new feminism talks about a “multi-species alliance”. Preciado urges us to put Foucault on a “radically feminist diet” and write *The Death of the Clinic*, in opposition to Foucault’s well-known book *The Birth of the Clinic*. Preciado argues that “it’s time to invite Marx to an ecosexual workshop” (Preciado, 2020, p. 34). Finally, Preciado warns that “new feminism” will not play a state disciplining the neoliberal market. So what will the “new feminism” be playing at? The new feminism will play the process of reclaiming the diversity of the world.

Sexual Heterogeneity (to Live on Uranus or Stay on Earth?)

Can we finally balance these two stories—“testo junkie” Preciado and “feminist materialist” Federica? Can we balance these two stories so that we realize both the “necessity of dreaming” and the “indispensability of political realism”? It seems that Federici and Preciado want to get out of a limited ontology; they want to go beyond the limitations of the skin—Federici towards the environment, Preciado towards techno-utopia, towards regaining magic and the diversity of life. They both talk about the need to regain control over the body, but they seem to formulate different conclusions for political activism and emancipatory action.

I argue that by this collision of “magical materialism” with “utopianism of infinite difference”, we return to the question already posed by Judith Butler: can the vagueness of the concept of gender be the cause of the failure of feminism? Butler said that “trouble is necessary”, you need to know how to cause it and how to get into it ultimately (Butler, 2006). It begs the question: do we constantly feel like repeating this statement about the “indispensability of trouble” today? We may have already experienced too many troubles to multiply them even more and want them at all. Yes, feminism does not have to have a “universal basis”, but politics and representation in the absence of a clear political subject are risky and controversial categories. Is “coalition politics” still possible, one which did not predetermine what constitutes the category of “women”? Is it really wrong to say that the existence of bodies is “meaningful” before gendering them? Is it really necessary to lead to the “destruction of gender” in order for women to gain the status of “universal subject”? Is our aim to defend “sexual heterogeneity” which implies “sexual impossibility of identity”?

So, once again: what conclusion would I like to draw from this “weave”, from this juxtapositions of the Polish Women’s “Black Protest”, Federici’s “materialist feminism”, and Preciado’s “sexual utopianism”? Well, there seems to be an alternative, a risky political “either-or”. Either we return to the critique of capitalism from the point of view of work, reproduction, and living conditions, directing our critique to contemporary technologies and we formulate an invitation to turn away from a purely “performative theory of gender/identity” towards a materialistic environment, i.e., a world in which “political theater” takes place in the “physical environment”. Or we see some opportunity in medical and even digital technologies, i.e., we further deepen the critique of identity and demand the extension of the system of differentiation, claiming that plurality and diversity are never enough and diverse enough. This either-or is a serious dilemma. It seems that in this dilemma, “concern for living conditions”, group identities, and human survival in the era of the climate crisis, and finally concern

for the freedom of “procreative choice”, clashes with “concern for the freedom” to shape oneself according to individual will and who one is, regardless of “conditions beginnings” of our biological life.

Perhaps Federici urges us to return to the world we knew before capitalism, urges us to “enchant” again and deepen the awareness that we are from the world and in the world; deepen the understanding that we are Earthlings, beings living on Earth. On the contrary, Preciado urges us to turn away from the world as we know it and the body as it is given to us in individual experience, implying that there are “other planets” to be inhabited, e.g. Uranus. Preciado says, “I have no soul and no body. I have an apartment on Uranus...” (Preciado, 2020, p. 25). Preciado is a fugitive from the world, and he is a “gender system dissident”; they feel “the manifold diversity of the cosmos locked in the binary regime”. In a word—Preciado is “a uranist locked within the limits of technoscience capitalism.” But who are the Uranists? Well, the Uranists survived the attempt to kill the diversity of life. Who are the Earthlings? Earthlings are beings from the Anthropocene, i.e., beings who realized their deadly impact on the planet, and yet they do not want to live on it, do not want to leave this planet, even hearing an offer to move to the planet Uranus.

Is it possible for there being a “common denominator” between moving to Uranus and staying on Earth? Yes, there is agreement that “in the beginning was the flesh” (not the Word/Command), and there is no practice, innovation, or production without the flesh. Biology is politics from the beginning, and it is impossible to talk about biology in a “neutral” way. In other words, there is no cultural practice that is not an intervention in the body. The body is the “natural” limit of exploitation, but it is also the “natural” limit of every utopia.

Appendix or Morning-After Pill

Morning-after pill or emergency contraception is the contraception which aims to create conditions that prevent fertilization. The pill does not cause a miscarriage and does not threaten the embryo that has already implanted itself in the uterus. Until April 2015, anyone over 15 years of age could buy the ellaOne tablet without a prescription. Escapelle has always been available by prescription only. At that time, the European Commission claimed that products of this type could be safely used without a prescription. The situation changed in July 2017 and now the morning-after pill is sold only by prescription again. It all started with the words of the then Minister of Health, Konstanty Radziwiłł, who stated that all contraceptives in Poland are available by prescription, except for the morning-after pill. On May 25, 2017, a bill was passed introducing prescriptions for morning-after pills. From July 22, 2017, it is no longer possible to purchase this type of products without first visiting a doctor. Morning-after pills are sold without a prescription only in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Russia, Ukraine, and Hungary.

The ruling of the Constitutional Tribunal of October 22, 2020 changed the conditions for legal abortion. But this decision does not affect morning-after pills because they are treated as a form of contraception, not an early abortifacient.

After winning the elections, the “October 15 Coalition” (*Koalicja 15 października*), which is a coalition of three parties—the liberal “Civic Platform” (directed by Donald Tusk, who previously led it from 2003 to 2014 and was president of the European Council from 2014 to 2019), the conservative “Poland 2050” (*Polska 2050 Szymona Hołowni*), and the left-wing “New Left” (*Nowa Lewica* of two leaders Włodzimierz Czarzasty and Robert Biedroń), on February 22 passed a law that assumes that the morning-after pill will be available without a prescription for people after 15 years old. The Parliament’s decision was the first step towards making emergency contraception widely available without a prescription. It is also not without significance that the

October 15 Coalition so much emphasizes in its program the financing from the state budget for the development of in vitro technology.

The President of Poland, Andrzej Duda, suggested in an interview for Polsat News that he would not sign such an act; for him—"It's a hormone bomb". This is the fate of biopolitics in the new liberal regime, in which the morning-after pill has become a new symbol of sexual emancipation. Indeed President Andrzej Duda on Friday, March 29, before the Easter holidays vetoed a law that would have allowed over-the-counter access to the morning-after pill for girls and women aged 15. It seems that for a long time we will remain in the grip of double biopolitical blackmail—liberalizing the right to the uterus pharmacopornographic capitalism and conservative appropriation in order to accumulate women's primary reproductive power.

At the moment we don't know how to recover, remake and reclaim the body. It seems that we are still held hostage by the following alternative. Either to reclaim the body means to recover the material world, what means that the reproductive justice movement must emphasizing the connection between reproductive struggles and economic justice. Or to reclaim the body means to regain trust in modern technologies, including medical technologies. The sexual union of a man and a woman is not necessary for reproduction, *in vitro* fertilization is a safer form of reproduction than any traditional one. This option would probably means that we, as human beings, are already in a post-sexual period of history.

References

- Butler, J. (2006) [1990]. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Federici, S. (2004). *Caliban and the witch: Women, the body and primitive accumulation*. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia.
- Federici, S. (2018). *Re-enchanting the world: Feminism and the politics of the commons*. Oakland, CA: Kairos/PM Press.
- Federici, S. (2020). *Beyond the periphery of the skin: Rethinking, remaking, and reclaiming the body in contemporary capitalism*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Foucault, M. (1998). *The history of sexuality: The will to knowledge* (Vol. 1). (R. Hurley, trans.). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*. (G. Burchell, Trans.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*. (G. Burchell, Trans.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Preciado, P. B. (2013a). Pharmaco-pornographic regime: Sex, gender, and subjectivity in the age of punk capitalism. In *The transgender studies reader remix*. London: Routledge.
- Preciado, P. B. (2013b). *Testo junkie. Sex, drugs, and biopolitics in the pharmacopornographic era*. New York: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York.
- Preciado, P. B. (2014). *Pornotopia: An essay on playboy's architecture and biopolitics*. New York, Zone Books.
- Preciado, P. B. (2020). *An apartment on Uranus*. London, Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).