

## **Ethnography of the kitchen: the Women's House, a space for feminist alliance and intercultural encounter**

### **Abstract**

In this article we delve into a debate about whether a kitchen was to be installed in a new Women's House, in a city in the Basque Country (Hernani, Gipuzkoa). The ethnography presented here was conducted by observing the participants' collective deliberative process about the House. Articulating the debate's main points led us to examine the dominant cultural assumptions about cooking in Basque society, especially in view of the opposing feminist positions on the kitchen and the domestic sphere. To understand the changes happened, it is essential to consider the participants' previous experience, the shape the discussion took and the diffractions and interferences that occurred during the process, as well as the priority placed on "being and doing together", being-aware of the (self)imposed limits while also allowing, even for a short period of time, the dichotomies that characterize and delimit this intercultural encounter to be questioned.

**Keywords:** Feminism, social movements, Basque society, Women's Houses, kitchen, alliances, diversity, dichotomies.

### **1. Introduction**

The kitchen and the very act of cooking have very different social and cultural meanings, depending on their contexts. Indeed, anthropology has always shown interest in this area, though in recent decades it has become integrated with more general studies on food (Faizul, 2018). The kitchen is the place where life happens, is arranged and sustained; it is a political, physical, symbolic and affective space that allows us to reflect on very different themes. Beyond being a physical space, it is a social space "made up of material and symbolic elements, positioned actors, a producer of rhetoric, assumptions, mythologies, contradictions, hierarchies" (Licona García and Cortés, 2019: 172).

Given the above ideas, in this article we delve into a debate about whether a kitchen was to be installed in a new Women's House in a city in the Basque Country and during which different feminist and cultural approaches emerged. Our unit of observation is the very process that the participants undertook collectively in determining the interior

1  
2  
3 design of the House how the House would be run. There is a traditional saying in  
4 Spanish—“hasta la cocina” (lit. ‘as far as the kitchen’)—which takes on three distinct  
5 meanings in our study: in its most ethnographic sense, it refers to “going to the core” of  
6 said process; in a more literal sense, it means examining the specific discussions about  
7 the consequences of there being or not being a kitchen in that space; and in a deeper and  
8 more processual sense, we will address the “kitchen work” itself, including of the  
9 reflection and dialogue work that the participants undertook together to make both this  
10 and other decisions with regard to the House itself and how it is run.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 The participatory process that we analyze began in 2016 and took place in  
18 Hernani, a city of 20,000 inhabitants with a lively social, cultural and political life. It is  
19 located a few kilometers from Donostia-San Sebastián, the capital of Gipuzkoa, one of  
20 the seven provinces of the Basque Country (located between France and Spain, on the  
21 Bay of Biscay and on both sides of the Pyrenees).

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Women's Houses are municipal spaces pioneered by the feminist movement and  
in close collaboration with local institutions. They began to operate in 2003, and since  
then, they have spread throughout the Basque Country, uniting various types of women's  
associations, city councils, and equality advisory boards. The Houses run a variety of  
programs and have legal, labor and sexual health counseling services, and provide  
targeted support for precarious groups (Authors). The Women's House in Hernani is  
called *Kulturarteko Plaza Feminista* (Intercultural Feminist Space; in this article we will  
use the Basque abbreviation, KFP), because it houses both the local feminist and anti-  
racist movements, the latter of which is led by AMHER, the Multicultural Association of  
Hernani, a collective that works on issues related to immigration, interculturality and  
coexistence.

The primary aim of this article is to show how the debate about the kitchen allows  
us to investigate into the assembly manages social diversity and the work done to arrive  
at a consensus. It is a consensus that is, like the KPF project itself, under continuous  
construction, and yet despite being unfinished, it is sufficiently stable to allow different  
genealogies, histories and practices to intersect and continue nurturing the consensus  
process. All this takes place in a social context of profound change that creates alliances  
between different parties and social movements. Achieving such alliances requires an  
openness to dialogue, to mutual knowledge and reciprocity, and it also enlists the  
application of specific techniques and know-how. The feminist movement has a know-

1  
2  
3 how that is not always present in other social movements (Authors); it is a know-how  
4 rooted in a long history of encounters and disagreements between different feminists and  
5 one that allows for improvisation. It is a dialogue that materializes in the physical and  
6 emotional encounter between different people who make up the movement. Such an  
7 encounter means that theoretical and political displacements occur, responsibilities are  
8 assumed, and the observation of social inequalities becomes more complex. Thus, in  
9 using the concept of tension applied in Teresa Del Valle's (2005) study of feminism, the  
10 kitchen becomes a metaphor, a juncture of critical and creative tension: it is critical,  
11 because it is based on a position of continuous analysis of and judgment about problems  
12 and ways of acting; it is creative, because it promotes imagining the possible alternatives  
13 and solutions for achieving the necessary consensus.

14  
15 To achieve our aim, we will first explain our research methodology and then we  
16 will describe our ethnographic framework and the social changes that Basque society is  
17 experiencing, including the changes related to how politics are done. In the sections that  
18 follow, we will delve into the debates and the various views that emerged in the conflict  
19 analyzed. We will refer to the dominant cultural assumptions and imaginaries held about  
20 cooking in Basque society, as well as to the opposing feminist positions regarding the  
21 domestic sphere and cooking, which paint a theoretical and practical picture that is very  
22 complex. And we will show how the participatory process is dynamic in two senses: on  
23 the one hand, the immediate issues at hand are addressed; on the other hand, as positions  
24 become more flexible and are projected into the future, it becomes necessary to build and  
25 maintain the conditions that keep the relationships from breaking and allow the pact to be  
26 renewed and nurtured as many times as necessary. This is a process in which priority is  
27 placed on "being and doing together", which entails an awareness of (self)imposed limits,  
28 but also allows for, even if only for a short period of time, the dichotomies that  
29 characterize and limit the intercultural encounter to be questioned. We end by proposing  
30 and discussing some conclusions.

31  
32 Following Maria Livia Alga (2018), we will assert that the KPF's approach to  
33 diversity gives rise to oblique and transversal readings of feminist convictions, which are  
34 enhanced by the interferences and diffraction (Haraway, 1999) that occur in the fixed and  
35 dichotomous understandings of cultural and gender differences. The result is that the  
36 political subjectivities that are formed, despite their being situated in a specific territory  
37 and society, tend to transgress and overflow "normative, sexual and cultural, linguistic  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and geographical borders, which are not identified with a single ‘world’ nor a single  
4 category” (Alga, 2018: 147).  
5  
6  
7

## 8 **2. Methodology**

9  
10 The specific analysis that we will present in this article is part of two research projects.  
11 The first, XXX, is financed by the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and  
12 Competitiveness (anonymized). The second, XXX, was carried out in 2018 with financial  
13 support from the Provincial Council of Gipuzkoa’s in agreement with the Vice-Rector’s  
14 Office at the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU). The research team is  
15 composed of a large group of people belonging to different research groups funded by the  
16 Basque government. Specifically, the authors of this article are part of a research group  
17 that has a long history and specializes in feminist anthropological and sociological  
18 studies.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Both projects aim to analyze the actions launched by different social movements,  
26 focusing on the collaboration, alliances and interactions between different actors and  
27 movements (especially feminism, anti-racism, environmentalism and the promotion of  
28 the Basque language), because we believe that a close examination of these processes is  
29 essential for understanding how the different communities are (re)weaving themselves.  
30 To that end, we implemented a qualitative and ethnographic methodological design, one  
31 that combines different research techniques.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 The part of the study that we present here is based on an extended ethnography  
38 (two years of field work), where we participated in the process of creating the Women’s  
39 House, the KPF, from the very beginning. In addition, we observed very different events  
40 that were related to the House, to feminism and to the dynamics of other social  
41 movements in the municipality. Secondly, between 2018 and 2020, we conducted 13 in-  
42 depth interviews with people directly involved in the KPF and/or other socio-political  
43 initiatives in the municipality. Thirdly, we analyzed a variety of materials: the various  
44 collectives’ and entities’ websites, articles from *Kronika*<sup>1</sup> (the local newspaper) and  
45 leaflets and manifestos, among others. Lastly, we compared our results with the results  
46 corresponding to the study of other Women’s Houses in the province of Gipuzkoa, namely  
47 the analysis of the processes observed in the Houses in the cities of Arrasate,  
48 Donostia/San Sebastián and Errenteria, as part of the same project. Though these Houses  
49 are all at different stages of operation, their social outreach and scope are similar;  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 however, they differ in terms of the characteristics of the municipality and the people who  
4 participate in them.  
5  
6  
7

### 8 **3. Promoting social change in a changing society**

9

10 In recent decades, there have been transformations in all areas of the so-called  
11 Western societies, from the political and economic to the most intimate; changes that have  
12 been highlighted further by the Covid-19 crisis. On one hand, we have witnessed the  
13 deinstitutionalization of social relations (Touraine, 2005), which have impacted social  
14 cohesion and order. Additionally, we are facing an ecological crisis, a care crisis and a  
15 civilizational crisis (Herrero, 2016), crises which have been denounced by feminism in  
16 different parts of the world. Likewise, unemployment has spread, working conditions  
17 have deteriorated and public services are increasingly precarious, while inequalities  
18 between rich and poor have increased (Gaindegia, 2016; Gálvez, 2013). As a result, there  
19 is greater pessimism about the role of institutional democracy (Subirats, 2005), and at  
20 same time collective responses and different proposals regarding participatory democracy  
21 have emerged (Santos, 2004). Indeed, the need to rethink politics has led to an increase  
22 in citizen participation initiatives (Martínez-Palacios, 2017). All these changes have  
23 influenced how political action and the political subject are conceived, and new forms of  
24 political participation have gained importance (Authors), giving rise to models that are  
25 more open, less rigid, and coherent (Authors) and processes of subjectivation that are  
26 dynamic, contingent and decentralized and made and remade at each step (Berardi, 2013;  
27 Diz, 2019; García, 2019).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Basque society is similarly affected by all these new realities. With its population  
42 of 3,000,000, the Basque Country has had the historic claim of being an independent  
43 nation for a very long time. The region's political and armed conflict of recent decades  
44 has had a profound influence, along with all its unfortunate consequences (deaths, torture,  
45 attacks, repression by the State, and so on), but the political coordinates have been  
46 reconfigured in the wake of the ceasefire and the dissolution of ETA in 2011 and 2018,  
47 respectively. Furthermore, throughout most of the Basque Country there are two official  
48 languages, Spanish and Basque (Euskara), though they are far from equal; additional  
49 languages are also spoken in the territory as a result of migration. Coexisting in different  
50 languages and the simultaneous defense of the Basque language entails a great deal of  
51 social activity.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In this context, feminism is a growing social movement, becoming a transversal  
4 axis and a significant impetus for many other initiatives and movements. Feminists are  
5 proposing more dynamic and horizontal participation methods, paying attention to  
6 relationships between people and taking care of collective processes (Authors).  
7  
8 Furthermore, feminist debates are becoming increasingly complex, refining the analysis  
9 of social and gender inequalities through an especially interesting intersection between  
10 queer, transfeminist, anti-racist and class perspectives and positions favorable to the  
11 recognition of the people's sovereignty. Likewise, such debates try to address the system  
12 of privileges and the lack of material and symbolic redistribution among women and the  
13 population in general from an approach that is accountable and self-critical. In fact, one  
14 of the challenges that the Basque feminist movement has on its political agenda and which  
15 it laid out at the 5th edition of Euskal Herria Feminist Conference (Durango, Bizkaia,  
16 November 2019) is to commit to a practice that is anti-racist, intersectional and  
17 decolonial. It is precisely for this reason that we believe that a space shared by feminist  
18 and anti-racist groups, such as the KPF, is a privileged laboratory not only for analysis,  
19 but also for learning and experimenting with necessary social transformations.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

#### 32 **4. Results: The participatory process at the House and the debate over the kitchen**

33  
34 Before focusing on the debate at KPF, we would like to make two general points  
35 about the Women's Houses in the Basque Country. This first is to note that the  
36 horizontality of the dynamics surrounding House management is a key principle of those  
37 very dynamics, but this does not mean that there are no internal power imbalances. The  
38 second is that the Women's Houses are run in a joint manner by the feminist movement  
39 and local institutions, where many times the institutions themselves are the ones that  
40 initiate the establishment of a House in response to community demands, which in many  
41 cases are quasi-historical. This is the case for the KPF of Hernani.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Hernani's Women's House project emerged from a proposal by the city's Equal  
49 Opportunity Board (a body made up of citizens, equality specialists and political party  
50 representatives), following a participatory process that began in 2016. This process,  
51 which is still ongoing, was originated by the city council, but facilitation has been carried  
52 out by a cooperative that is specialized in participatory processes and group-facilitation  
53 methodologies. Members of relevant associations and groups, as well as individuals,  
54 participated in the process, and the meetings served as the primary space for debate and  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 decision-making, although there was also a steering group that coordinated and led the  
4 process.  
5

6 As we have already noted, the Women's House will be home to various groups  
7 and individuals involved in the city's feminist movement as well as the immigrant  
8 association AMHER. AMHER's members come from more than twenty different  
9 countries and the association has various working groups. One such group is made up of  
10 women, and it participates in local feminist initiatives, including the creation of the  
11 Women's House. Thus, in addition to collaborating, both movements intersect. This  
12 enriches the process, and it also blurs, to a certain extent, the boundaries between the two  
13 groups. All those participating in the House process view the KPF as a point of reference  
14 against all types of discrimination, although they are also aware of the difficulties  
15 involved in managing “diversity” in its most general sense.  
16  
17

18 The people involved in these two groups are also involved in other initiatives in  
19 the city: youth movements, political parties and unions, environmental and cultural  
20 associations, and collectives that support the Basque language or the LGTBI community.  
21 Furthermore, many of the same people are engaged in more than one initiative at any one  
22 time, a phenomenon that characterizes Basque activism in general, as it tends to be  
23 multiple, multi-sited and interrelated. The fact that people in a city like Hernani  
24 participate in multiple initiatives, know each other, come together and collaborate  
25 enriches the project by involving a multiplicity of perspectives and understandings of  
26 sources of oppression. This guarantees a more inclusive vision regarding the building the  
27 common space, one that is supported by the affective relationships that bind the  
28 participants together. All of this directly affects their desire for “being and doing things  
29 together”, an idea inspired by various authors (Authors; Gil, 2011; Kypriotaki, 2012). As  
30 we will explain later, this desire is an effective way to weave bridges between different  
31 groups and create solidarity networks.  
32  
33

34 Some of the most intense discussions that emerged in our analysis of the  
35 participatory process were related to the physical and architectural design of the house,  
36 the most illustrative example of this being the decision about whether to dedicate a  
37 specific space to the kitchen. This topic came up in all the conversations we had with the  
38 participants without us needing to prompt them. Some people gave it more importance  
39 than others, but it was a recurring topic, and everyone had an opinion about it; almost  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 from the beginning we realized that there was a sticking point there that would allow us  
4 to discern the process as a whole.  
5

6  
7 At the time when the interior layout of the House was being decided, some women  
8 from AMHER proposed that space be set aside for a large kitchen and a day-care for  
9 children, sparking a very passionate debate around both issues. Although the issues are  
10 related, we will save the second for another occasion<sup>2</sup> and focus on the controversy over  
11 the kitchen, which was more extensive.  
12  
13  
14

15 Aisha, a woman who is very active in AMHER and also has ties with the feminists,  
16 summed it up by saying that the kitchen is a fundamental space for the women in  
17 AMHER. She argued that the space that they were using at that time, where they would  
18 meet and have their Spanish classes, was also equipped for cooking. It was a space that  
19 they used often, not only because cooking and eating in a group was the main event of  
20 any meeting. But it was also the case that having a space to prepare food enabled some  
21 women to earn money, because they received orders for “food from different countries  
22 around the world.” Ángel, who is of Latin American origin and a member of the AMHER  
23 collective, noted in a conversation about women from African and Latin American  
24 countries: “Women from Morocco or other African countries have the custom of inviting  
25 people to their home and receiving them in the kitchen, and they always offer you  
26 something to eat as a way of expressing that you are welcome.”  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 But for some other women at the meeting, the idea of the kitchen generated great  
37 contradictions and a very intense debate broke out. These women, who had spent many  
38 years in the feminist movement and had attained a high degree of education, were  
39 radically opposed since they problematized the fact of relating the specific spaces for  
40 women with the domestic tasks traditionally assigned to them. Additionally, they thought  
41 that using the KPF premises as a place of employment for some would be a very difficult  
42 issue to administer and there would be endless consequences. Mari Karmen, one of the  
43 women opposed to the kitchen, reported that what had caught her attention most was the  
44 reaction of the young feminists who were not members of AMHER. Not only did the  
45 young women not understand the debate, they thought that having a kitchen would be a  
46 good opportunity to prepare vegan food and eat together, bringing the topic of food into  
47 the idea of group mutual care. In later conversations with her, she added that over time  
48 she had realized that what these young women stood for at the time was becoming the  
49 general trend in some feminist or mixed associations.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 As we noted, the deliberations, which took place over several sessions, were  
4 complicated and of interest to everyone, although the idea of imposing some kind of limits  
5 on the physical space of the kitchen prevailed. The final agreement was that the House  
6 would have simple (rather than industrial grade) equipment for cooking, but the space  
7 would be multipurpose, meaning that meetings and other types of activities could be held  
8 there.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Before going further into the details of the debate over the kitchen, let us first  
14 review different feminist readings on the kitchen, readings that, as we will see, are  
15 reflected in the various positions found in the KPF. We will also take into account the  
16 cultural significance that the act of cooking has acquired in the Basque Country in recent  
17 years, as we believe that this significance undoubtedly influences the feminist position  
18 “against the kitchen”. We will start with the latter.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

#### 26 **4.1. The symbolic importance of the kitchen in Basque culture and the usurpation** 27 **of female knowledge** 28

29 As Mabel Gracia-Arnaiz (2014: 26) points out, based on the work of George Peter  
30 Murdock and Caterina Provost (1973),  
31

32 “ethnographically and historically, women have been and are—with the exception  
33 of those who are part of elite groups in differentiated societies—the people  
34 responsible for daily sustenance, especially in relation to the tasks of provisioning  
35 and preparing family meals.”<sup>3</sup>  
36  
37  
38

39 Gracia-Arnaiz also points to Stephen Mennell (1985): “In societies where a  
40 gender-differentiated kitchen exists, the role of the cook—the *chef*—is male” (Gracia,  
41 2014). This distinction between cooks and chefs is present in very different societies,  
42 including Basque society. The differentiation is based on a gender-based division of labor  
43 that does not view many of the tasks performed by women to be labor; this division, in  
44 turn, is articulated, though not always linearly, through the dual characterization of space  
45 and a differential allocation of prestige. Thus, everything related to the female world is  
46 considered “domestic” and less prestigious, and everything related to the male world is  
47 considered public and more prestigious. The separation between male and female  
48 kitchens is a phenomenon that takes different forms in time and space. An example of  
49 this are televised cooking shows. Such shows enjoy tremendous popularity, and for  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 authors like Todd JM Holden (2013), they serve “to represent masculinity, associating  
4 the ideas of power, authority and possession with the labor of being chef” (Gracia, 2014).  
5

6  
7 Turning our attention to Basque society, the first thing that must be stressed is that  
8 the kitchen, just like the house, plays a central role in our cultural context. The kitchen is  
9 a place of caring that invokes the family and the act of gathering, and women have  
10 traditionally played a key role in this regard. But the practice of cooking in Basque  
11 society, like in many societies, is increasingly mediated by technology, processed foods  
12 and/or transformations in what caring looks like, and the home is now organized and  
13 designed around leisure. And the act of cooking, as a hobby in the *gourmet* sense, has  
14 become connected to the consumer society. Authors such as Anne Murcott (1983) hold  
15 that some technological advances “both simplify and complicate women’s tasks but do  
16 not, crucially, not cancel them” (Gracia, 2014). At the same time, care should be taken  
17 with generalizations, since women’s and families’ situations can vary greatly if we take  
18 into account variables such as social class, age, occupation or educational level (Gracia,  
19 2014 Hupkens, 2000; Moore; 1991).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Gathering to eat is fundamental to the social imaginary and identity at the Basque  
30 culture. It is an act that tends to be related to consumption and leisure, and one that we  
31 cannot fail to link with the primordial material and symbolic place occupied by what are  
32 known as gastronomic societies, which are member-operated clubs for private recreation  
33 and gatherings. Given that these societies are present in cities and neighborhoods, they  
34 play an important role in socialization, social engagement and the creation of networks  
35 of influence and power. But gastronomic societies have traditionally been led and run by  
36 men, and through them women have been socially excluded. Today, in the vast majority  
37 of cases women can be members, but they are not always allowed in all the spaces,  
38 especially the kitchen (Farapi, 2010).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 The most paradigmatic example of the transformations that have occurred around  
47 the kitchen in the Basque Country is represented by the male cooks who run the Michelin-  
48 starred restaurants that are the drivers of what is known as the new Basque cuisine. It is a  
49 highly prestigious profession and very clearly gendered, and since the creation of the  
50 Basque Culinary Center (which is part of the Mondragon University, an affiliate of the  
51 Mondragon Corporation) it is a profession that is now associated with a university degree.  
52 Once again, we see the separation between female cooks and chefs, a phenomenon that  
53 is criticized among feminists, such as the criticism by anthropologist Del Valle (2000),  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 who has described it as a usurpation of women's knowledge: "... a usurpation that implies  
4 the denial of genealogies despite the fact that they make references to their grandmothers  
5 to highlight the traditional nature of their stews" (2000: 55).  
6  
7

8 In fact, inside the Basque Country as well as outside it, the belief that "men know  
9 more about cooking, do it with more imagination and refinement, and are better able  
10 handle large, industrial stoves, is a platitude shared by professionals and many food  
11 critics" (González; 1999: 14). Thus, men perch at the top of the pyramid in a lofty  
12 position, bounded by their exception and located in a time and space outside of everyday  
13 life, while women bear "the weight of [the pyramid's] broad and subordinated base, that  
14 of the everyday routine, next to the anonymous stove" (González; 1999: 14).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## 22 **4.2. Feminist readings of the kitchen and the domestic**

23 In the second half of the 20th century, feminists belonging to the hegemonic  
24 tradition of the time, that is, those in Anglo-European societies, began to problematize  
25 the link between the traditional role of women and the domestic sphere. The home was  
26 primarily seen as representing a symbolic space where the discipline and oppression of  
27 women occur. In the words of Priscilla Gac-Artigas (2009: 512), "everything belonging  
28 to the intimate (and exclusive) sphere of the woman, the family or the home was rejected  
29 because it was considered to be the cause of the subordinate status of women in a  
30 patriarchal society". This movement, with its desire to "integrate" women into the social  
31 sphere and belief that "the personal is political", politicized everything that happened in  
32 the intimate sphere, the home and social relations, among other arenas. Symbolically, we  
33 could say that this breaks with the ideology and archetype of a woman and a perfect  
34 "housewife".  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 This approach was also supported by the work of authors such as Michelle  
45 Rosaldo (1974), who, like other contemporary feminist anthropologists, investigated the  
46 symbolic causes of the subordination of women. She showed how the conceptualization  
47 and opposition between the "domestic" and the "public" arose at one point in Western  
48 history and provides the basis for a structural model that allows the subordination of  
49 women to be identified and explored, arguing that men have acquired authority, hierarchy  
50 and rank through their actions in a separate political world (Maquieira, 2001). However,  
51 Rosaldo (1980, 1983) soon revised her theory, aware of the universality of the categories  
52 and theories used and of the essentialist dualist schemes. In addition, it became clear  
53 that  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the public/private dichotomy has a clear ethnocentric bias, and that it cannot be applied  
4 as an absolute model of analysis in the West, either, due to the difficulty of defining the  
5 limits and character of these areas as well as the complexity of reality (Authors;  
6 Maquieira, 2001). In that first period, artists like Martha Rosler, creator of the  
7 videoperformance *Semiotics of the Kitchen* (1975), also made a significant contribution  
8 to the criticism of the domestic.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 If we widen our gaze, embrace other societies and other feminist traditions, and  
14 arrive at the present, we see that the approaches have not always been the same: while for  
15 many activists the kitchen remains a symbolic space that reflects women's oppression,  
16 for others it is or can be a space of agency, collective resistance and solidarity, where  
17 community and sisterhood are woven. In this regard, the impact of certain novels by  
18 renowned Latin American writers is relevant. Gac-Artigas (2009) analyzed the work of  
19 Rosario Castellanos, Isabel Allende, Laura Esquivel and Rosario Ferré, whose works turn  
20 the kitchen into a space for women's self-discovery and liberation.  
21

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 A similar turn is also observed in ethnographies that review the anthropological  
28 theory of gender systems. Sherry Ortner and Harriet Whitehead (1996), for example,  
29 analyzed the distribution of power, authority and prestige, and emphasized "the  
30 preeminence of men in public space and women in private" (Curiel, 2019: 168). An  
31 example of a critical rereading of this tradition is Charlyne Curiel's (2019) research in  
32 Oaxaca. She proposes rethinking the analysis of the cargo or mayordomía system in  
33 Mixtec society (performed until the mid-eighties in some societies), which  
34

35  
36  
37  
38  
39 "made the work and activities carried out by cargo women invisible.  
40 Subsequently, the gender lens made this work visible, although it maintained the  
41 distinction between public and private for activities considered political, such as  
42 participation in assemblies, and domestic and less prestigious, such as cooking for  
43 a ritual—however, in all fiestas in Mexico, food is perhaps the most important  
44 element" (2019: 185-186).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

#### 50 51 **4.3. "Entangled in the kitchen": the collective management of diversity and** 52 **consensus building** 53

54  
55 Returning to the KPF, we observed that for some immigrant feminists, cooking  
56 had both a practical and cultural value; additionally, feminists of a certain age were, in a  
57 way, "feminists born and trained against cooking", and the youngest Basque women did  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 not see where the problem was. Many of these young women adhere to a kind of feminism  
4 that, inspired by approaches that emerged in recent decades, turns many of the previous  
5 theories around, and they are also influenced by a combination of alternative perspectives:  
6 from ecofeminist approaches and spiritualist worldviews, to the growing influx of  
7 communal feminisms and the postcolonial and decolonial theories of Latin American  
8 thinkers and activists. For them, the motto “put life at the center”, which has become one  
9 of the signals of feminist identity today, allows them to fully accommodate the idea that  
10 cooking as a group is positive and can even be transformative.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Capitalist culture accelerates, commodifies and reduces time and space in the  
18 kitchen and, more generally, the daily tasks that sustain life, and many feminists are very  
19 sensitive to this process and demand time and space for collective care, turning it into an  
20 anti-capitalist symbol. And as we noted above, the decolonial critique has led many  
21 women to broaden, question and revise ideas and practices about intersectionality,  
22 geopolitics, social class, care, and the politicization of the personal. In the Basque context  
23 and throughout the Spanish State, this shift has come from the knowledge of and  
24 questioning by immigrant feminists who define themselves as racialized.

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Meanwhile, what has happened or is happening with the kitchen in other Women’s  
Houses in the Basque Country? Broadly speaking, in many of them there is a space  
equipped for preparing coffee or tea, or to heat food, but at the same time there is a  
tendency to put limits on this space in some way, sometimes intentionally and other times  
not. And if we leave our borders and focus on other spaces, such as the Women’s House  
known as the “Centro Interculturale delle donne di Ramia” in Verona (Italy), an  
intercultural center for women that we are very familiar with, it allows us to find other  
nuances. That House is included in the social services provided by Verona’s City Council  
and its operation is inspired by ideas from difference feminism. They conceive of that  
House as a new space, a “third space”<sup>4</sup>, where the kitchen is a multipurpose space and a  
meeting place, serving as a space to eat together and, above all, a space that promotes the  
feeling of “being at home”; it is also an economic strategy for people who have fewer  
resources. In addition, this House places great importance on recognizing all kinds of  
traditional and generational knowledge that is left out of the market.

Returning to the KPF, an aspect that we want to highlight from the debate about  
the kitchen is that it made many of the participants understand that what for some  
symbolized the danger of engaging in gender essentialisms was for others a kind

1  
2  
3 emancipation—a practical resource for their economic survival and gathering with others.  
4 Being able to listen to each other and bear witness to power relationships and privileges  
5 implies a willingness to move and go beyond one's principles, or at least, to make them  
6 more flexible. Although in the end the participants opted for the kitchen, it is viewed as a  
7 space for a multitude of uses. In short, thanks to the participants' previous experience and  
8 the facilitator's help, they were able to identify disagreements, leave room for dissent,  
9 and build consensus among everyone.

15 Feminism has ample expertise in the above regard, and the kitchen itself was used  
16 as a metaphor during the process. It is evident that this new House is already generating  
17 physical gatherings and will generate more in the future. Political and emotional  
18 relationships, especially when the politics of intimacy occur within them (Ahmed, 2004),  
19 are embodied and lead to the reinvention of ways to do politics (Authors). However, it  
20 bears repeating that managing diversity is not without complications and interferences.  
21 But it is precisely these interferences, as we will comment on in the next section, which  
22 allow for the development of a self-critical and regenerative approach. Thus, diversity is  
23 not merely an objective; rather it is more than anything else an exercise in unlearning  
24 certain attitudes, questioning one's own view of things and making the journey together.

32 The Women's Houses are spaces where new forms of solidarity, new methods and  
33 new ways of doing politics are being tested; spaces where "community is made", a  
34 community rooted in and committed to specific political, social and cultural coordinates,  
35 while aware of the need for thinking that goes beyond geographical and human borders.  
36 They are laboratories where horizontal forms of learning, mutual knowledge, conflict  
37 management, and practices of care regarding process, concrete projects, and the group  
38 are tested, experienced and developed. This is true even when projects sometimes fail.  
39 Because what is important is not the final product, but the path traveled together.

## 48 **5. Discussion. The kitchen as a breaking of dichotomies and the renewal of politics**

49 The debate analyzed here also allows us to highlight the importance of women's  
50 participation in urban planning and in all decisions related to the projects in which they  
51 are involved. This is true especially when these projects emerge from the joining of  
52 institutions and social movements, given the risks that are involved. In this sense, the real  
53 decision-making capacity that the participants have had in some Women's Houses has  
54 been quite a controversial issue (Authors), not only due to the very processes involved  
55 in



1  
2  
3 their creation but also due to the social limitations placed on the ability of certain groups,  
4 for example, immigrants, to participate in political decisions.  
5

6 From the beginning of the process, both the feminists and the city government  
7 made the effort to bring together people of different origins, social positions and ages.  
8 And, in general, most of the people interviewed have been satisfied with the extent to  
9 which women have participated in the process and the diversity among the women.  
10 Nevertheless, with the help of the participants, we have identified a set of obstacles that  
11 particularly affect immigrant women. Such obstacles are not always easy to deal with,  
12 and in some cases, they are not even readily apparent. Obstacles include their lack of time  
13 to participate in socio-political action due to their employment situations and/or the lack  
14 of childcare networks; city policies that support multiculturalism (which is also promoted  
15 by progressive groups) but which often tend toward folklorism (particularly the  
16 privileging of activities related to food); and, most crucially, the division between “us”  
17 and “them”, which is present even in the mind of the youngest women.  
18  
19

20 It is not our intention to present a simplistic or excessively positive reading of  
21 what happened, nor to present the case analyzed as a fluid and linear process, running  
22 cleanly from back to front and always moving forward. If we probe further into the pitfalls  
23 of the process, including the elements discussed in the previous paragraph, we find certain  
24 key points that conditioned the debate and that will still be present in the future. These  
25 key points include differences in education and experience in politics among the women  
26 in the KPF and the format in which the discussion took place, which has some features  
27 that favor mutual understanding and others that do not.  
28  
29

30 When Aintzane, the group facilitator, describes her experience with the process,  
31 several essential elements appear. On the one hand, the women who were strongly  
32 opposed to the kitchen had a higher level of education and greater linguistic competence  
33 from their years of being trained to defend their position in a group discussion. But this  
34 was not the case for many others, whether they were in favor of the kitchen or they did  
35 not understand what was happening, and who merely asked, time and again, why not have  
36 a kitchen. On the other hand, there is the fact that the sessions were held in Basque,  
37 facilitated by an interpreting service that was funded by the city council. While all of the  
38 women accepted the bilingual nature of the deliberations, this meant that the debate  
39 become less fluid at the most heated moments. This shows the difficulty that can arise  
40 when different languages are involved, even when technical and economic resources are  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 available. In any case, the role of the facilitator was essential (and praised by all); even  
4 when she did not fully understand what was happening, she made the effort to ensure that  
5 the floor was held equitably and to soften and streamline the tone of the discussion.  
6  
7

8 From our conversations with many of the participants, we have concluded that  
9 they were all aware of, or at least intuited, all the factors mentioned here—despite their  
10 not being made explicit as such—and in the end this awareness had a direct effect on  
11 participants' capacity to compromise and take more flexible positions. In other words,  
12 both the participants and the facilitator looked for mechanisms that could compensate for,  
13 even if only partially, the unequal position that some of the participants found themselves  
14 in. All of this is in keeping with their feminist philosophy and their long-standing political  
15 tradition.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 But we would like to take the analysis a little further and delve into a couple of  
23 aspects mentioned in the introduction, aspects that strike us as defining. Our first  
24 observation has to do with the concrete form in which the discussion took place, which  
25 requires additional detail about how the meetings were held. From time to time, those  
26 participating in the House creation process would meet to discuss various topics, and  
27 everyone would sit in a large circle. A circular arrangement is “composed of a multiplicity  
28 of voices and hands (...) generates a specific way of sharing knowledge” (Cima, 2020:  
29 XIV), favors eye contact, listening and paying attention to others, as well as a sense of  
30 group belonging; this, in turn, enhances the space, making it more welcoming and  
31 promoting reciprocity (Cima, 2020). The center is an empty but non-neutral space which  
32 symbolizes, according to Alga (2019), the encounter and the possibility of thinking  
33 without predetermined schema. The facilitator is also in the center, occupying this special  
34 place while also being perfectly aware of her position. She moves around and “appears  
35 and disappears”, synthesizing what is being said, asking questions—sewing the stitches  
36 that make it possible to baste the difficult discussions together. And all of this takes place  
37 within a framework of attachments, which play a key role in collective action. The  
38 attachments are learning and dialogue: the presence, the encounter between bodies that  
39 open themselves to relationships and to different languages and knowledge.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 The second aspect, which is related to the above, has to do with a comment by  
54 Mari Karmen in which she stressed, in a tone that evoked the emotion she felt at that  
55 moment, that she was truly astonished by the reaction of some of the young feminists,  
56 who, despite having been schooled in Basque feminism, were surprised by what was  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 happening. What happened in that scene, and in similar other scenes they told us about?  
4 From our point of view, it was an instance of what Donna Haraway (1999) would call a  
5 diffraction, an interference in individual and collective thought. This would lead us to  
6 conclude that a map of diffractions and interferences that is drawn in a political and  
7 emotional territory that is ripe for criticism and self-criticism, such as the KPF, can  
8 introduce fissures and ask meaningful questions; in this case, we refer to the questioning  
9 of the dichotomous perspective of “us/them”, “native-born/immigrant feminists”. In other  
10 words, the accumulation of interferences facilitates an oblique, transversal look at  
11 feminist thought and action, which fractures verticality, the antagonistic gaze, and  
12 disposes those involved to be able to “widen the circle” (Alga and Cima, 2020) that they  
13 construct together. As long as circumstances are favorable, as was the case here.

14  
15 In other words, in essence we believe the kitchen debate served to break,  
16 regardless of whether it was temporarily so, the dichotomy “us = native-born  
17 population/them = immigrant population.” This dichotomy, despite the anti-racist  
18 ideology of social movements, is not easy to overcome, and feminists like Itsaso, another  
19 of the participants in the House process, consider it crucial to be very aware of the  
20 intersection of different factors and, crucially, not forget the importance of racialization,  
21 social class and educational training.

22  
23 Recall that the process has not ended, not only because the building itself is not  
24 yet ready and the internal operating protocol is pending, but also because the work on  
25 feminist viewpoints continues. In other words, it is a consensus still under construction,  
26 not because the decisions made are not firm, but because it can be reviewed and  
27 completed later, and the shapes drawn do not have to be linear. In this regard, it is  
28 interesting that some of the participants who had not fully understood the reactions  
29 “against cooking”, later told us that by taking part in other activities in the city, they were  
30 able to broaden their perspective. Specifically, they cite as a milestone a conference held  
31 in April 2018 as a tribute to Empar Pineda, a long-established Spanish feminist, who had  
32 been born in Hernani. The conference’s organizers made an effort to integrate the feminist  
33 genealogy of the last five decades, which made it possible to contextualize the feminist  
34 proposals and analyses from the 1970s and 1980s.

35  
36 In our field work, we have noticed that alliances emerge along with a renewed  
37 way of working together, which we have called “being and doing things together”. This  
38 also happened in the case of Hernani. In this “being together”, the projects and  
39 platforms

1  
2  
3 that are made up different groups and created on the fly through the participation of  
4 everyone are of the utmost importance. In general, we have also found that initiatives of  
5 a limited duration and that require a temporary commitment are particularly successful in  
6 today's social movements. This change is leading us to rethink socio-political  
7 participation. Activists involved in different movements have linked "being together" and  
8 "doing things together" with a renewed model of understanding citizenship that is based  
9 on active participation and clashes with other traditional ways of understanding  
10 citizenship, which are based on merely administrative or legal criteria.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 The KPF's kitchen has been redefined as a privileged feminist space in which to  
18 think about all these questions. It is not because it the natural space for being a woman or  
19 women's relationship with the kitchen has prevailed, nor is it because it is believed that  
20 having a kitchen and cooking is better for a political space. Rather, it is precisely because  
21 this kitchen symbolizes the debate, the process, the listening, and the agreement reached  
22 among various political subjectivities that reformed themselves through the process.  
23 Although all those involved remember the deliberations as having been difficult, these  
24 debates are now part of the *body's memory* (Del Valle, 1997), which can be evoked and  
25 reactivated at another time as a way hold on to the awareness of how arduous but  
26 necessary it is to have a policy that is aware of intersectionality and internal and external  
27 inequalities, which promotes thinking that is constantly moving. Understanding a social  
28 action as a physical and emotional phenomenon provides the appropriate framework for  
29 investigating the place that community, relationships and emotions have within them  
30 (Author). The individual and collective subjectivities that we refer to in this article are in  
31 continuous transformation and allow the emergence of other ways of doing feminist  
32 politics and living a feminist life together (Ahmed, 2018).

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 Similarly, the specific case of the kitchen illustrates quite well the relevance of  
45 anthropological work. Being able to know the details of the discussions that took place,  
46 observing them in situ, and relating them to the feminist and cultural viewpoints that are  
47 behind ideas and experiences helps us better understand the limits and the complexity of  
48 the policies and social changes that are occurring and/or being proposed and be able to  
49 render account. Hernani's KPF is a project still under construction and one that will  
50 continue to be under construction after it begins operating. For only when under  
51 construction is it possible to face the dilemmas and difficulties of a politics that is aware  
52 of its (own) limits but aims for new agreements and consensus.

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

Ahmed S 2004 *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York/Abingdon: Routledge.

Ahmed S 2017 *Living a Feminist Life*. Durham (US): Duke University Press.

Alga ML 2018 *Etnografía “terrona” de sujetos excéntricos*. Bellaterra: Barcelona.

Alga ML 2019. Construyendo en común la investigación. El trabajo con los movimientos sociales. In: *Tejiendo comunidades desde iniciativas ciudadanas* (Summer Courses UPV/EHU), Donostia, Spain 17-18 June 2019.

Alga ML and Cima R (eds) 2020 *Allargare il cerchio. Pratiche per una comune umanità*. MeTis International Journal. Bari: Progedit.

Berardi (Bifo) F 2013. *La sublevación*. Barcelona: Artefakte.

Cima R 2020 La circolarità dei saperi. In: Alga ML and Cima R (eds) *Allargare il cerchio. Pratiche per una comune umanità*. Bari: Progedit, pp. XIII-XVII.

Curiel C 2019 Mujeres en la cocina de la mayordomía. Prestigio y costumbre en la mixteca de Oaxaca. *Entre diversidades* 6, 1(12): 163-194.

Del Valle T 1997 La memoria del cuerpo. *Arenal-Revista de Historia de las Mujeres* 4(1): 59-74.

Del Valle, Teresa. 2000. La organización del tiempo y del espacio. Análisis feminista de la ciudad. *Zainak* 19: 53-60.

Del Valle T 2005 El potencial de la tensión y su aportación a la antropología desde la crítica la feminista: fuentes, procesos y tipologías. In Maquieira V et al. (eds) *Democracia, feminismo y universidad en el siglo XXI*. Madrid: Instituto Universitario de Estudios de la Mujer/Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, pp. 227-242.

Diz C 2019 Maneras de vivir: emoción, política e identidades en movimiento. *ANDULI, Revista Andaluza de Ciencias Sociales* 18: 93-117.

Farapi/Consultoría de Antropología Aplicada 2010 *La relevancia e impacto social de las sociedades gastronómicas*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Defensoría para la Igualdad de Mujeres y Hombres/Eusko Jaurlaritza.

Gac-Artigas, P 2009 La cocina: de cerrado espacio de servidumbre a abierto espacio de creación. *Destiempos. Revista de Curiosidad Cultural* 19: 512-522.

Gaindegia 2016 *Des-herria. Hausturak eta etenak Euskal Herrian*. Andoain: Gaindegia/Ipar Hegoa.

1  
2  
3 Gálvez L 2013 Una lectura feminista del austericidio. *Revista de Economía Crítica* 15  
4 (1): 80-110.  
5

6  
7 García E 2019 *La construcción social del activismo en Madrid durante el ciclo 15M: subjetividades políticas y resistencia antiausteritaria*. PhD Thesis, Universidad  
8 Autónoma de Madrid, Spain.  
9

10  
11 Gil S 2011 *Nuevos feminismos. Sentidos comunes en la dispersión*. Madrid: Traficantes  
12 de Sueños.  
13

14  
15 González I (1999) La dimensión social de la cocina desde la antropología de la  
16 alimentación. In: *Alimentación y cultura: actas del congreso internacional, 1998, Museo*  
17 *Nacional de Antropología, España*. Huesca: La Val de Onsera, pp. 245-257.  
18

19  
20 Gracia-Arnaiz M 2014 Alimentación, trabajo y género. De cocinas, cocineras y otros  
21 trabajos domésticos. *Panorama Social* 19: 25-36.  
22

23  
24 Haraway D 1999 La promesa de los monstruos: Una política regeneradora para otros  
25 inapropiados/bles. *Política y Sociedad* 30: 121-163.  
26

27  
28 Herrero Y 2016 Economía feminista y economía ecológica, el diálogo necesario y  
29 urgente. *Revista de economía crítica* 22: 144-161.  
30

31  
32 Holden TJM 2013 The overcooked and the underdone: Masculinities in Japanese food  
33 programming. *Food and Culture* 13 (1-2): 39-65.  
34

35  
36 Hupkens CLH 2000 Social class differences in food consumption. The explanatory value  
37 of permissiveness and health and cost considerations. *The European Journal of Public*  
38 *Health* 10 (2): 108–113.  
39

40  
41 Ibrahim FH 2018 *Kitchen Anthropology: Understanding Food, Cooking and Eating in*  
42 *Bruneian Middle-Class Families*. Institute of Asian Studies. Working Paper Series 38.  
43

44  
45 Kypriotaki AO (2012) Una nueva zona temporal del ser (los griegos y la nueva  
46 psicodelia). Available at: [https://blogs.publico.es/fueradelugar/1625/%c2%bfy-si-no-](https://blogs.publico.es/fueradelugar/1625/%c2%bfy-si-no-hiciesemos-nada)  
47 [hiciesemos-nada](https://blogs.publico.es/fueradelugar/1625/%c2%bfy-si-no-hiciesemos-nada) (accessed 30 October 2020).  
48

49  
50 Licona E, García IC and Cortés A 2019 El espacio culinario. Una propuesta de análisis  
51 desde la Antropología de la Alimentación. *Antropología Experimental* 19 (15): 165-172.  
52

53  
54 Maquieira V 2001 Género, diferencia y desigualdad. In: Beltrán E and Maquieira V (eds)  
55 *Feminismos. Debates teóricos contemporáneos*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, pp. 127-190.  
56

57  
58 Martínez-Palacios J (ed) 2017 *Participar desde los feminismos. Ausencias, expulsiones y*  
59 *resistencias*. Barcelona: Icaria.  
60

Mennell S 1985 *All Manners of Food. Eating and Taste in England and France from the*  
*Middle Ages to the Present*. London: Basil.

Moore HL 1991 *Antropología y feminismo*. Madrid: Cátedra.



1  
2  
3  
4 Murcott A 1983 Cooking and the cooked: A note on the domestic preparation of meals.  
5 In: Murcott A (ed) *The Sociology of Food and Eating*. Aldershot: Gower, pp. 78–85.  
6

7  
8 Murdock GP and Provost C 1973 Factors in the division of labor by sex: A cross-cultural  
9 analysis. *Ethnology* 2 (2): 203-225.  
10

11 Ortner S 2006 *Anthropology and Social Theory culture, power and the acting subject*.  
12 Durham: Duke University Press.  
13

14 Ortner S and Whitehead H 1996 Indagaciones acerca de los significados sexuales. In:  
15 Lamas M (ed) *El género. La construcción cultural de la diferencia sexual*. México DF:  
16 PUEG, pp. 127-180.  
17

18  
19 Rosaldo M 1974 Mujer, cultura y sociedad: una visión teórica. In: Harris O and Young  
20 K (eds) *Antropología y feminismo*. Barcelona: Anagrama, pp. 153-180.  
21

22 Rosaldo M 1980 Use and Abuse of Anthropology: reflections on Feminism and Cross  
23 cultural Understanding. *Signs* 5 (3): 389-417.  
24

25  
26 Rosaldo M 1983 Moral/Analytic Dilemmas Posed by the Intersection of Feminism and  
27 Social Science. In: Haan N et al. (eds) *Social Science as Moral Inquiry*. New York:  
28 Columbia University Press, pp. 76-95.  
29

30 Rosler M 1975 *Semiotics of the Kitchen (videoperformance)*. New York: Courtesy  
31 Electronic Arts Intermix (EAI).  
32

33  
34 Santos BS 2004 *Democratizar la democracia. Los caminos de la democracia*  
35 *participativa*. México DF: FCE.  
36

37 Subirats J 2005 Democracia, participación y transformación social. *Polis Revista*  
38 *Latinoamericana*. Available at: <http://journals.openedition.org/polis/5599> (accessed 17  
39 September 2020).  
40

41  
42 Touraine A 2005 *Un nuevo paradigma para comprender el mundo de hoy*. Barcelona:  
43 Paidós.  
44

45  
46  
47  
48 

---

1 <https://kronika.eus/hernani/>

49  
50 2 Regarding the issue of day-care, the final decision was to guarantee day-care as a  
51 service, as has been done during local feminist activities, but not to dedicate an  
52 exclusive or permanent space to it.  
53

54 3 All the quotes in this article have been translated from Spanish by the authors, and  
55 thus they may vary slightly from versions published elsewhere in English  
56  
57

58 4 The “third spaces” are “relational places that, giving all the value to the subjective  
59 experience, the bodily experience of each one, allow mediation with social reality and  
60

---

with institutions, from a position of strength or, rather, of empowerment” (Alga, 2020: VIII).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## **Ethnography of the kitchen: the Women's House, a space for feminist alliance and intercultural encounter**

### **Abstract**

In this article we delve into a debate about whether a kitchen was to be installed in a new Women's House in a city in the Basque Country (Hernani, Gipuzkoa). The ethnography presented here was conducted by observing the process around the creation of the House. Articulating the debate's main points led us to examine the dominant cultural assumptions about cooking in Basque society, especially in view of the opposing feminist positions on the kitchen and the domestic sphere. To understand the changes that took place, it is essential to consider the participants' previous experience, the shape the discussion took and the diffractions and interferences that occurred during the process, as well as the priority placed on "being and doing together" and being aware of the (self-)imposed limits while also allowing, even for a short period of time, the dichotomies that characterize and delimit this intercultural encounter to be questioned.

**Keywords:** Feminism, social movements, Basque society, Women's Houses, kitchen, alliances, diversity, dichotomies.

### **1. Introduction**

The kitchen and the very act of cooking have very different social and cultural meanings, depending on their contexts. Indeed, anthropology has always shown interest in this area, though in recent decades it has become integrated with more general studies on food (Faizul, 2018). The kitchen is the place where life happens, is arranged and sustained; it is a political, physical, symbolic and affective space that allows us to reflect on very different themes. Beyond being a physical space, it is a social space "made up of material and symbolic elements, positioned actors, a producer of rhetoric, assumptions, mythologies, contradictions, hierarchies" (Licona García and Cortés, 2019: 172). It is also a space that is of particular interest from a feminist perspective (see, for example, Rosaldo, 1974; Abarca 2006; Gac-Artigas 2009; Williams 2014).

In this article, we delve into a debate about whether a kitchen was to be installed in a new Women's House in a city in the Basque Country and during which different feminist and cultural approaches emerged. Our unit of observation is the very process that

1  
2  
3 the participants undertook collectively in determining the interior design of the House  
4 how the House would be run. There is a traditional saying in Spanish—“hasta la cocina”  
5 (lit. ‘as far as the kitchen’)—which takes on three distinct meanings in our study: in its  
6 most ethnographic sense, it refers to “going to the core” of said process; in a more literal  
7 sense, it means examining the specific discussions about the consequences of there being  
8 or not being a kitchen in that space; and in a deeper and more procedural sense, we will  
9 address the “kitchen work” itself, including of the reflection and dialogue work that  
10 participants undertook collectively to make both this and other decisions with regard to  
11 the House itself and how it is run.

12  
13 The participatory process that we analyze began in 2016 and took place in  
14 Hernani, a city of 20,000 inhabitants with a lively social, cultural and political life. It is  
15 located about ten kilometers from Donostia-San Sebastián, the capital of Gipuzkoa, which  
16 is one of the seven provinces of the Basque Country (located between France and Spain,  
17 on the Bay of Biscay and on both sides of the Pyrenees).

18  
19 Women's Houses are municipal spaces pioneered by the feminist movement, in  
20 close collaboration with local institutions. They began to operate in 2003, and since then,  
21 they have spread throughout the Basque Country, uniting various types of women's  
22 associations, city councils, and equality advisory boards. The Houses run a variety of  
23 programs and have legal, labor and sexual health counseling services, and provide  
24 targeted support for precarious groups (Authors). The Women's House in Hernani is  
25 called *Kulturarteko Plaza Feminista* (Intercultural Feminist Plaza; in this article we will  
26 use the Basque abbreviation, KPF), because it houses both the local feminist and anti-  
27 racist movements, the latter of which is led by AMHER, the Multicultural Association of  
28 Hernani, a collective that works on issues related to immigration, interculturality and  
29 coexistence.

30  
31 The primary aim of this article is to show how the debate about the kitchen allows  
32 us to investigate how association members manage social diversity and the work done to  
33 arrive at a consensus. It is a consensus that is, like the KPF project itself, under continuous  
34 construction, yet despite being unfinished, it is sufficiently stable to allow different  
35 genealogies, histories and practices to intersect and continue nurturing the consensus  
36 process. All this takes place in a social context of profound change that creates alliances  
37 between different parties and social movements. Achieving such alliances requires an  
38 openness to dialogue and to mutual knowledge and reciprocity, and it also enlists the  
39 application of specific techniques and know-how. The feminist movement has a know-  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 how that is not always present in other social movements (Authors); it is a know-how  
4 rooted in a long history of encounters and disagreements between different feminists, and  
5 one that allows for improvisation. It is a dialogue that materializes in the physical and  
6 emotional encounter between different people who make up the movement. Such an  
7 encounter means that theoretical and political displacements occur, responsibilities are  
8 assumed, and the observation of social inequalities becomes more complex. Thus, in  
9 using the concept of tension applied in Teresa Del Valle's (2005) study of feminism, the  
10 kitchen becomes a metaphor, a juncture of critical and creative tension: it is critical,  
11 because it is based on a position of continuous analysis of and judgment about problems  
12 and ways of acting; it is creative, because it promotes imagining the possible alternatives  
13 and solutions for achieving the necessary consensus.

14  
15 To achieve our aim, we will first explain our research methodology and then we  
16 will describe our ethnographic framework and the social changes that Basque society is  
17 experiencing, including the changes related to how politics are done. In the sections that  
18 follow, we will delve into the debates and the various views that emerged in the conflict  
19 analyzed. We will refer to the dominant cultural assumptions and imaginaries held about  
20 cooking in Basque society, as well as to the opposing feminist positions regarding the  
21 domestic sphere and cooking, all of which paint a very complex theoretical and practical  
22 picture. We will also show that the participatory process is dynamic in two senses: on the  
23 one hand, the immediate issues at hand are addressed; on the other hand, as positions  
24 become more flexible and are projected into the future, it becomes necessary to build and  
25 maintain the conditions that keep relationships from breaking and allow the pact to be  
26 renewed and nurtured as many times as necessary. This is a process in which priority is  
27 placed on "being and doing together", which entails an awareness of (self-)imposed  
28 limits, but also allows for—even if only for a short period of time—the dichotomies that  
29 characterize and limit the intercultural encounter to be questioned. We end by discussing  
30 the results of our analysis and proposing and discussing some conclusions.

31  
32 Following Maria Livia Alga (2018), we will assert that the KPF's approach to  
33 diversity gives rise to oblique and transversal readings of feminist convictions, which are  
34 enhanced by the interferences and diffraction (Haraway, 1999) that occur in the fixed and  
35 dichotomous understandings of cultural and gender differences. The result is that the  
36 political subjectivities that are formed, despite their being situated in a specific territory  
37 and society, tend to transgress and overflow "normative, sexual and cultural, linguistic  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and geographical borders, which are not identified with a single ‘world’ nor a single  
4 category” (Alga, 2018: 147).  
5  
6  
7

## 8 **2. Methodology**

9

10 The specific analysis that we present in this article is part of two research projects. The  
11 first, XXX, is financed by the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and  
12 Competitiveness (anonymized). The second, XXX, was carried out in 2018 with financial  
13 support from the Provincial Council of Gipuzkoa in agreement with the Vice-Rector’s  
14 Office at the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU). The research team is  
15 composed of a large group of people belonging to different research groups funded by the  
16 Basque government. Specifically, the authors of this article are part of a long-standing  
17 research group that specializes in feminist anthropological and sociological studies.  
18  
19

20 Both projects aim to analyze actions taken by different social movements,  
21 focusing on the collaboration, alliances and interactions between different actors and  
22 movements (especially feminism, anti-racism, environmentalism and the promotion of  
23 the Basque language), because we believe that a close examination of these processes is  
24 essential for understanding how the different communities are (re)weaving themselves  
25 together. To that end, we implemented a qualitative and ethnographic methodological  
26 design, one that combines different research techniques.  
27  
28

29 The portion of the study that we present here is based on an extended ethnography  
30 (two years of fieldwork), where we participated in the process of creating the Women’s  
31 House in Hernani, the KPF, from the very beginning. In addition, we observed very  
32 different events that were related to the House, to feminism and to the dynamics of other  
33 social movements in the municipality. Secondly, between 2018 and 2020, we conducted  
34 13 in-depth interviews with people directly involved in the KPF and/or other socio-  
35 political initiatives in the municipality. Thirdly, we analyzed a variety of materials: the  
36 websites of various collectives and entities, articles from *Kronika*<sup>1</sup> (the local newspaper)  
37 and leaflets and manifestos, among others. Lastly, we compared our results with the  
38 results corresponding to the study of other Women’s Houses in the province of Gipuzkoa,  
39 namely the analysis of the processes observed in the same study in the Houses in the cities  
40 of Arrasate, Donostia/San Sebastián and Errenteria. Though these Houses are all at  
41 different stages of operation, their social outreach and scope are similar; however, they  
42 differ in terms of the characteristics of the municipality and the people who participate in  
43 them.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### 3. Promoting social change in a changing society

In recent decades, there have been transformations in all areas of the so-called Western societies, from the political and economic to the most intimate; changes that have been highlighted further by the Covid-19 crisis. On one hand, we have witnessed the deinstitutionalization of social relations (Touraine, 2005), which have impacted social cohesion and order. Additionally, we are facing an ecological crisis, a care crisis and a civilizational crisis (Herrero, 2016), all of which feminism has denounced in different parts of the world. Likewise, unemployment has spread, working conditions have deteriorated and public services are increasingly precarious, while inequalities between rich and poor have increased (Gaindegia, 2016; Gálvez, 2013). As a result, there is greater pessimism about the role of institutional democracy (Subirats, 2005), and at same time collective responses and different proposals regarding participatory democracy have emerged (Santos, 2004). Indeed, the need to rethink politics has led to an increase in citizen participation initiatives (Martínez-Palacios, 2017). All these changes have influenced how political action and the political subject are conceived, and new forms of political participation have gained importance (Authors), giving rise to models that are more open, less rigid, and coherent (Authors) and processes of subjectivation that are dynamic, contingent and decentralized and made and remade at each step (Berardi, 2013; Diz, 2019; García, 2019).

Basque society is similarly affected by all these new realities. With a population of 3,000,000, the Basque Country has the historic claim of having been an independent nation for a very long time. The region's political and armed conflict of recent decades has had a profound influence, along with all its unfortunate consequences (deaths, torture, attacks, repression by the State, and so on), but the political coordinates have been reconfigured in the wake of the ceasefire and the dissolution of ETA in 2011 and 2018, respectively. Furthermore, throughout most of the Basque Country there are two official languages, Spanish and Basque (Euskara), though they are far from equal; additional languages are also spoken in the territory as a result of migration. Coexisting in different languages and simultaneously engaging in defense of the Basque language entails a great deal of social activity.

In this context, feminism is a growing social movement, becoming a transversal axis and a significant impetus for many other initiatives and movements. Feminists are proposing more dynamic and horizontal participation methods, paying attention to

1  
2  
3 relationships between people and taking care of collective processes (Authors).  
4 Furthermore, feminist debates are becoming increasingly complex, refining the analysis  
5 of social and gender inequalities through an especially interesting intersection between  
6 queer, transfeminist, anti-racist and class perspectives and positions favorable to the  
7 recognition of the people's sovereignty. Likewise, such debates try to address the system  
8 of privileges and the lack of material and symbolic redistribution among women and the  
9 population in general from an approach that is accountable and self-critical. In fact, one  
10 of the challenges that the Basque feminist movement has on its political agenda and which  
11 it laid out at the 5th edition of Euskal Herria Feminist Conference (Durango, Bizkaia,  
12 November 2019) is to commit to a practice that is anti-racist, intersectional and  
13 decolonial. It is precisely for this reason that we believe that a space shared by feminist  
14 and anti-racist groups, such as the KPF, is a privileged laboratory not only for analysis,  
15 but also for learning and experimenting with necessary social transformations.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

#### 27 **4. Results: The participatory process at the House and the debate over the kitchen**

28  
29 Before focusing on the debate at KPF, we would like to make two general points  
30 about Women's Houses in the Basque Country. This first is to note that the horizontality  
31 of the dynamics surrounding House management is a key principle of those very  
32 dynamics, but this does not mean that there are no internal power imbalances. The second  
33 is that the Women's Houses are jointly run by the feminist movement and local  
34 institutions, where many times the institutions themselves initiate the establishment of a  
35 House in response to community demands, which in many cases are quasi-historical. This  
36 is the case for the KPF in Hernani.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Hernani's Women's House project emerged from a proposal by the city's Equal  
44 Opportunity Board (a body made up of citizens, equality specialists and political party  
45 representatives), following a participatory process that began in 2016. This process,  
46 which is still ongoing, was originated by the city council, but facilitation has been  
47 provided by a cooperative that is specialized in participatory processes and group-  
48 facilitation methodologies. Members of the relevant associations and groups, as well as  
49 individuals, participated in the process, and the meetings served as the primary space for  
50 debate and decision-making, although there was also a steering group that coordinated  
51 and led the process.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

58 As we have already noted, the KPF will be home to various groups and individuals  
59 involved in the city's feminist movement as well as the immigrant association AMHER.  
60

1  
2  
3 The members of AMHER represent more than twenty different countries and the  
4 association has various working groups. One such group is made up of women, and it  
5 participates in local feminist initiatives, including the creation of the Women's House.  
6  
7 Thus, in addition to collaborating, the two movements intersect. This enriches the process,  
8 and it also blurs, to a certain extent, the boundaries between the two groups. All those  
9 participating in the House process view the KPF as a point of reference against all types  
10 of discrimination, although they are also aware of the difficulties involved in managing  
11 “diversity” in its most general sense.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 The people involved in these two groups are also involved in other initiatives in  
18 the city: youth movements, political parties and unions, environmental and cultural  
19 associations, and collectives that support the Basque language or the LGTBI community.  
20 Furthermore, many of the same people are engaged in more than one initiative at any one  
21 time, a phenomenon that characterizes Basque activism in general, as it tends to be  
22 multiple, multi-sited and interrelated. The fact that people in a city like Hernani  
23 participate in multiple initiatives, know each other, come together and collaborate  
24 enriches the project by involving a multiplicity of perspectives and understandings of  
25 sources of oppression. This guarantees a more inclusive vision regarding the building the  
26 common space, one that is supported by the affective relationships that bind the  
27 participants together. All of this directly affects their desire for “being and doing things  
28 together”, an idea inspired by various authors (Authors; Gil, 2011; Kypriotaki, 2012). As  
29 we will explain later, this desire is an effective way to weave bridges between different  
30 groups and create solidarity networks.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Some of the most intense discussions that emerged in our analysis of the  
42 participatory process were related to the physical and architectural design of the house,  
43 the most illustrative example of this being the decision about whether to dedicate a  
44 specific space to the kitchen. This topic came up in all the conversations we had with the  
45 participants without us needing to prompt them. Some people gave it more importance  
46 than others, but it was a recurring topic, and everyone had an opinion about it. Almost  
47 from the beginning we realized that there was a sticking point there that would allow us  
48 to discern the process as a whole.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 At the time when the interior layout of the House was being decided, some women  
56 from AMHER proposed that space be set aside for a large kitchen and a day-care for  
57 children, sparking a very passionate debate around both issues. Although the issues are  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 related, we will save the second for another occasion<sup>2</sup> and focus on the controversy over  
4 the kitchen, which was more extensive.  
5

6 Aisha, a woman who is very active in AMHER and also has ties with the feminists,  
7 summed it up by saying that the kitchen is a fundamental space for the women in  
8 AMHER. She argued that the space that they were using at that time, where they would  
9 meet and have their Spanish classes, was also equipped for cooking. It was a space that  
10 they used often, not only because cooking and eating as a group was the main event of  
11 any meeting. But it was also the case that having a space to prepare food enabled some  
12 women to earn money, because they received orders for “food from different countries  
13 around the world.” Ángel, who is of Latin American origin and a member of the AMHER  
14 collective, noted in a conversation about women from African and Latin American  
15 countries: “Women from Morocco or other African countries have the custom of inviting  
16 people to their home and receiving them in the kitchen, and they always offer you  
17 something to eat as a way of expressing that you are welcome.”  
18  
19

20 But for some other women at the meeting, the idea of the kitchen generated great  
21 contradictions, and an extremely intense debate broke out. These women, who had  
22 attained a high degree of education, had spent many years in the feminist movement  
23 and/or had been union members, and were experienced in debating political topics (in  
24 both Spanish and Basque), were radically opposed since they problematized the fact of  
25 relating the specific spaces for women with the domestic tasks traditionally assigned to  
26 them. Additionally, they thought that using the KPF premises as a place of employment  
27 for some would be a very difficult issue to administer and there would be endless  
28 consequences.  
29  
30

31 Mari Karmen, one of the women opposed to the kitchen, reported that what had  
32 caught her attention most was the reaction of the young feminists who were not members  
33 of AMHER. Not only did the young women not understand the debate, they thought that  
34 having a kitchen would be a good opportunity to prepare and eat vegan food together,  
35 bringing the topic of food into the idea of group mutual care. In later conversations with  
36 her, she added that over time she had realized that what these young women stood for at  
37 the time was becoming the general trend in some feminist or mixed associations. These  
38 were very young women, many of them either high school or university students who  
39 participated in their schools’ feminist groups as well as in the Urumea transfeminist squat  
40 coordinated the young Basque feminists who organize *Udaleku Feministak*, or feminist  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 summer camps. As antispeciesism and veganism are found in the latter two spaces, any  
4 activity relative to the kitchen has become a political issue.  
5

6 As we have noted, the deliberations, which took place over several sessions, were  
7 complicated and of interest to everyone, although the idea of imposing some kind of limit  
8 on the physical space of the kitchen prevailed. The final agreement was that the House  
9 would have simple (rather than industrial grade) equipment for cooking, but the space  
10 would be multipurpose, meaning that meetings and other types of activities could be held  
11 there.  
12

13 Before going further into the details of the debate over the kitchen, let us first  
14 review different feminist readings on the kitchen, readings that, as we will see, are  
15 reflected in the various positions found in the KPF. We also take into account the cultural  
16 significance that the act of cooking has acquired in the Basque Country in recent years,  
17 as we believe that this significance undoubtedly influences the feminist position “against  
18 the kitchen”. We start with the latter.  
19

#### 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 **4.1. Feminist readings of the kitchen and the domestic**

30 Mabel Gracia-Arnaiz (2014: 26), following the work of George Peter Murdock  
31 and Caterina Provost (1973), points out that

32 “ethnographically and historically, women have been and are—with the exception  
33 of those who are part of elite groups in differentiated societies—the people  
34 responsible for daily sustenance, especially in relation to the tasks of provisioning  
35 and preparing family meals.”<sup>3</sup>  
36

37 Gracia-Arnaiz also points to Stephen Mennell (1985): “In societies where a  
38 gender-differentiated kitchen exists, the role of the cook—the *chef*—is male” (Gracia-  
39 Arnaiz, 2014). This distinction between cooks and chefs is present in very different  
40 societies, including Basque society. The differentiation is based on a gender-based  
41 division of labor that does not view many of the tasks performed by women to be labor;  
42 this division, in turn, is articulated, though not always linearly, through the dual  
43 characterization of space and a differential allocation of prestige. Thus, everything related  
44 to the female world is considered “domestic” and less prestigious, and everything related  
45 to the male world is considered public and more prestigious.  
46

47 Gathering to eat is fundamental to the social imaginary and identity in Basque  
48 culture. It is an act that tends to be related to consumption and leisure, and one that we  
49 cannot fail to link with the primordial material and symbolic place occupied by what are  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 known as gastronomic societies (*txokoak* in Basque), which are member-operated clubs  
4 for private recreation and gatherings. Given that these societies are present in cities and  
5 neighborhoods, they play an important role in socialization, social engagement and the  
6 creation of networks of influence and power. But gastronomic societies have traditionally  
7 been led and run by men, and women have been socially excluded. Today, women can be  
8 members in the vast majority of cases, but they are not always allowed in all the spaces,  
9 especially the kitchen (Farapi, 2010).

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 The most paradigmatic example of the transformations that have occurred around  
16 the kitchen in the Basque Country is represented by the male cooks who run the Michelin-  
17 starred restaurants that are the drivers of what is known as new Basque cuisine. It is a  
18 highly prestigious profession and very clearly gendered, and since the creation of the  
19 Basque Culinary Center (which is part of the Mondragon University, an affiliate of the  
20 Mondragon Corporation) it is a profession that is now associated with a university degree.  
21 Once again, we see the separation between female cooks and chefs, a phenomenon  
22 criticized among feminists; one such criticism comes from anthropologist Del Valle  
23 (2000), who has described this male-dominated professionalization of the kitchen as a  
24 usurpation of women's knowledge: "... a usurpation that implies the denial of genealogies  
25 despite the fact that they make references to their grandmothers to highlight the traditional  
26 nature of their stews" (2000: 55).

27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 The gender-differentiated kitchen, and the specific transformations and divisions  
37 engendered by this division in Basque society, allow us to understand the "disaffection"  
38 noted by feminists in our study who are local-born and over the age of 40 and the  
39 disagreement over whether to give the kitchen a central space in the KPF. Those feminists  
40 are also influenced by a feminist tradition that is critical of identifying women with the  
41 domestic arena, as we will detail below; this critique extends to the name given to this  
42 particular Women's House, *Plaza Feminista Intercultural*, where *plaza* (a public space)  
43 was expressly chosen over Spanish *casa* (house) or Basque *txoko* (private spaces).

44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50 In the second half of the 20th century, feminists belonging to the hegemonic  
51 tradition of the time, that is, those in Anglo-European societies, began to problematize  
52 the link between the traditional role of women and the domestic sphere. The home was  
53 primarily seen as representing a symbolic space where the discipline and oppression of  
54 women occur. In the words of Priscilla Gac-Artigas (2009: 512), "everything belonging  
55 to the intimate (and exclusive) sphere of the woman, the family or the home was rejected  
56 because it was considered to be the cause of the subordinate status of women in a  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 patriarchal society”. This movement, with its desire to “integrate” women into the social  
4 sphere and its belief that “the personal is political”, politicized everything that happened  
5 in the intimate sphere, in the home and in social relations, among other arenas.  
6 Symbolically, we could say that this breaks with the ideology and archetype of a woman  
7 and a perfect “housewife”.  
8  
9

10  
11 This approach was also supported by the work of authors such as Michelle  
12 Rosaldo (1974), who, like other contemporary feminist anthropologists, investigated the  
13 symbolic causes of the subordination of women. She showed how the conceptualization  
14 and opposition between the “domestic” and the “public” arose at one point in Western  
15 history and provided the basis for a structural model that allows the subordination of  
16 women to be identified and explored, arguing that men have acquired authority, hierarchy  
17 and rank through their actions in a separate political world (Maquieira, 2001). However,  
18 Rosaldo (1980, 1983) soon revised her theory, aware of the universality of the categories  
19 and theories used and of the essentialist dualist schemes. In addition, it became clear that  
20 the public/private dichotomy has a clear ethnocentric bias, and that it cannot be applied  
21 as an absolute model of analysis in the West, either, due to the difficulty of defining the  
22 limits and character of these areas as well as the complexity of reality (Authors;  
23 Maquieira, 2001).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The feminists who problematized the kitchen as a feminized space described it as  
35 “rejecting the housewife role and the actions that accompany it, while focusing on the  
36 attempts to integrate women into previously male-dominated public spaces” (Williams,  
37 2014, 2016). But as Stacey J. Williams (ibid) points out, although they have been less  
38 frequently discussed, during that period there were also proposals that suggested engaging  
39 with cooking in ways that were subversive and challenged patriarchal institutions. Some  
40 feminists suggested time- and labor-saving cooking methods, encouraged men to cook,  
41 and proposed that women make money from cooking. These ways of politicizing cooking  
42 “were meant to increase women’s control of economic resources”, bringing about “a more  
43 gender-equal world” (Williams, 2016: 270). Moreover, there are other studies that show  
44 how the kitchen, as a collective space, can be a space for women’s self-care and collective  
45 care. Meredith Abarca (2006), for example, in her work on views of food and the world  
46 from working-class Mexican and Mexican American women, showed how cooking  
47 allowed them to express themselves, strengthen family relationships, and create a world  
48 of shared meanings with other women. Thus, Abarca (ibid), explores the importance of  
49 the knowledge found in the practical, concrete, and temporal aspects of the ordinary  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 **practice of everyday cooking.** In this regard, the impact of certain novels by renowned  
4 Latin American writers **is also relevant.** Gac-Artigas (2009) analyzed the work of Rosario  
5 Castellanos, Isabel Allende, Laura Esquivel and Rosario Ferré, whose works turn the  
6 kitchen into a space for women's self-discovery and liberation.  
7  
8  
9

#### 10 11 **4.2. "Entangled in the kitchen": the collective management of diversity and** 12 **consensus building** 13

14  
15 Returning to the KPF, we observed that for some immigrant feminists, cooking  
16 had both a practical and cultural value; additionally, feminists of a certain age were, to  
17 one extent or other, "feminists born and trained to be against cooking", and the youngest  
18 Basque women did not see where the problem lay. Many of these young women adhere  
19 to a kind of feminism that, inspired by approaches that emerged in recent decades, turns  
20 over many of the previous theories, and they are also influenced by a combination of  
21 alternative perspectives: from ecofeminist approaches and spiritualist worldviews, to the  
22 growing influx of communal feminisms and the postcolonial and decolonial theories of  
23 Latin American thinkers and activists. For them, the motto "put life at the center", which  
24 has become one of the signals of feminist identity today, allows them to fully  
25 accommodate the idea that cooking as a group is positive and can even be transformative.  
26  
27 **As already noted, these young feminists participate in other political spaces that are**  
28 **committed to vegetarianism or veganism, where cooking and eating as a group is directly**  
29 **linked to one's politics.**  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39  
40 Capitalist culture accelerates, commodifies and reduces time and space in the  
41 kitchen and, more generally, the daily tasks that sustain life, and many feminists are very  
42 sensitive to this process and demand time and space for collective care, turning it into an  
43 anti-capitalist symbol. And as we noted above, the decolonial critique has led many  
44 women to broaden, question and revise ideas and practices about intersectionality,  
45 geopolitics, social class, care, and the politicization of the personal. In the Basque context  
46 and throughout the Spanish State, this shift has come from the knowledge of and  
47 questioning by immigrant feminists who define themselves as racialized.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 Meanwhile, what has happened or is happening with the kitchen in other Women's  
55 Houses in the Basque Country? Broadly speaking, in many of them there is a space  
56 equipped for preparing coffee or tea, or to heat food, but at the same time there is a  
57 tendency to put limits on this space in some way, sometimes intentionally and other times  
58 not. And if we leave our borders and focus on other spaces, such as the Women's House  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 known as the “Centro Interculturale delle donne di Ramia” in Verona (Italy), an  
4 intercultural center for women that we are very familiar with, it allows us to find other  
5 nuances. The House is included in the social services provided by Verona’s City Council  
6 and its operation is inspired by ideas from difference feminism. They conceive of that  
7 House as a new space, a “third space”<sup>4</sup>, where the kitchen is a multipurpose space and a  
8 meeting place, serving as a space to eat together and, above all, a space that promotes the  
9 feeling of “being at home”; it is also is an economic strategy for people who have fewer  
10 resources. In addition, the House places great importance on recognizing all kinds of  
11 traditional and generational knowledge that is left out of the market. **Nevertheless, it’s**  
12 **worth noting that in this case there was also a discussion about the suitability of using the**  
13 **space to carry out economic activity, the result being the creation of a cooperative.**

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 Returning to the KPF, an aspect that we want to highlight from the debate about  
23 the kitchen is that it made many of the participants understand that what for some  
24 symbolized the danger of engaging in gender essentialisms was for others a kind  
25 emancipation—a practical resource for their economic survival and gathering with others.  
26 Being able to listen to each other and bear witness to power relationships and privileges  
27 implies a willingness to move and go beyond one’s principles, or at least to make them  
28 more flexible. Although in the end the participants opted to create the kitchen, it is viewed  
29 as a space for a multitude of uses. In short, thanks to the participants’ previous experience  
30 and the facilitator’s help, they were able to identify disagreements, leave room for dissent,  
31 and build consensus among everyone. **This is reflected in the way meetings ended, with**  
32 **everyone sitting in a circle and facing the other participants; once the meeting was over,**  
33 **lively conversation followed, both in the meeting room and on the way home.**

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Feminism has ample expertise in the above regard, and the kitchen itself was used  
as a metaphor during the process. It is evident that this new House is already generating  
physical gatherings and will generate more in the future. Political and emotional  
relationships, especially when the politics of intimacy occur within them (Ahmed, 2004),  
are embodied and lead to the reinvention of ways to do politics (Authors). **In this regard,**  
**the key elements were how the sessions ran—always in movement and maintaining**  
**physical contact, alternating small group work with work in the larger circle—and the**  
**facilitators’ ability to give voice to all voices, soothe heated spirits and redirect the**  
**discussion when necessary.** However, it bears repeating that managing diversity is not  
without complications and interferences. But it is precisely these interferences, as we will  
comment on in the next section, which allow for the development of a self-critical and

1  
2  
3 regenerative approach. Thus, diversity is not merely an objective; rather, it is more than  
4 anything else an exercise in unlearning certain attitudes, questioning one's own view of  
5 things and making the journey together.  
6  
7

8 The Women's Houses are spaces where new forms of solidarity, new methods and  
9 new ways of doing politics are being tested; spaces where "community is made", a  
10 community rooted in and committed to specific political, social and cultural coordinates,  
11 while being aware of the need for thinking that goes beyond geographical and human  
12 borders. They are laboratories where horizontal forms of learning, mutual knowledge,  
13 conflict management, and practices of care regarding process, concrete projects, and the  
14 group are tested, experienced and developed. This is true even when projects sometimes  
15 fail. Because what is important is not the final product, but the path traveled together.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **5. Discussion. The kitchen as a breaking of dichotomies and the renewal of politics**

25 The debate analyzed here also allows us to highlight the importance of women's  
26 participation in urban planning and in all decisions related to the projects in which they  
27 are involved. This is true especially when these projects emerge from the joining of  
28 institutions and social movements, given the risks that are involved. In this sense, the real  
29 decision-making capacity that the participants have had in some Women's Houses has  
30 been quite a controversial issue (Authors), not only due to the very processes involved in  
31 their creation but also due to the social limitations placed on the ability of certain groups,  
32 for example, immigrants, to participate in political decisions.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 From the beginning of the process, both the feminists and the city government  
40 made the effort to bring together people of different origins, social positions and ages. In  
41 general, most of the people interviewed have been satisfied with the extent to which  
42 women have participated in the process and the diversity among the women.  
43 Nevertheless, with the help of the participants, we have identified a set of obstacles that  
44 particularly affect immigrant women. Such obstacles are not always easy to deal with,  
45 and in some cases, they are not even readily apparent. Obstacles include their lack of time  
46 for participating in socio-political action due to their employment situations and/or the  
47 lack of childcare networks; city policies that support multiculturalism (which is also  
48 promoted by progressive groups) but which often tend toward folklorism (particularly the  
49 privileging of activities related to food); and, most crucially, the division between "us"  
50 and "them", which is present even in the mind of the youngest women. **Even though this**  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 issue was always questioned when theorized about in the interviews, in more spontaneous  
4  
5 speech and discussions, this issue often emerged.

6  
7 It is not our intention to present a simplistic or excessively positive reading of  
8  
9 what happened, nor to present the case analyzed as a fluid and linear process, running  
10  
11 cleanly from back to front and always moving forward. If we probe further into the pitfalls  
12  
13 of the process, including the elements discussed in the previous paragraph, we find certain  
14  
15 key points that conditioned the debate and that will still be present in the future. These  
16  
17 key points include differences in education and experience in politics among the women  
18  
19 in the KPF and the format in which the discussion took place, which has some features  
20  
21 that favor mutual understanding and others that do not.

22  
23 When Aintzane, the group facilitator, describes her experience with the process,  
24  
25 several essential elements appear. On the one hand, the women who were strongly  
26  
27 opposed to the kitchen had a higher level of education and greater linguistic competence  
28  
29 from their years of being trained to defend their position in a group discussion. But this  
30  
31 was not the case for many others—whether they were in favor of the kitchen or they did  
32  
33 not understand what was happening—who merely asked, time and again, why not have a  
34  
35 kitchen. On the other hand, there is the fact that the sessions were held in Basque,  
36  
37 facilitated by an interpreting service that was funded by the city council. While all of the  
38  
39 women accepted the bilingual nature of the deliberations, this meant that the debate  
40  
41 became less fluid at the most heated moments. This shows the difficulty that can arise  
42  
43 when different languages are involved, even when technical and economic resources are  
44  
45 available. In any case, the role of the facilitator was essential (and praised by all); even  
46  
47 when she did not fully understand what was happening, she made the effort to ensure that  
48  
49 the floor was held equitably and to soften and streamline the tone of the discussion.  
50  
51 Aintzane uses the term “orthopedic” to refer to communication during the discussions:  
52  
53 arguments in favor of the kitchen made in Spanish, often expressed in a less than fluid  
54  
55 manner, and arguments against the kitchen made in Basque, often dynamically and  
56  
57 loudly; words that cross each other but don’t make it to the other side. In our interview  
58  
59 with Pilar, she elaborates on the simultaneous interpretation used to facilitate  
60  
61 communication between everyone and adds an arresting visual image of these moments:  
62  
63 “Yes, but the immigrant women really stood out, they wore little antennas (from the  
64  
65 headsets they wore to hear the interpreter) and sat together”.

66  
67 From our conversations with many of the participants, we have concluded that  
68  
69 they were all aware of, or at least intuited, all the factors mentioned here—despite their  
70

1  
2  
3 not being made explicit as such—and in the end this awareness had a direct effect on  
4 participants' capacity to compromise and take more flexible positions. In other words,  
5 both the participants and the facilitator looked for mechanisms that could compensate for,  
6 even if only partially, the unequal position that some of the participants found themselves  
7 in. All of this is in keeping with their feminist philosophy and their long-standing political  
8 tradition.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 But we would like to take the analysis a little further and delve into a couple of  
14 aspects mentioned in the introduction, aspects that strike us as defining. The first has to  
15 do with the concrete form in which the discussion took place, which requires additional  
16 detail about how the meetings were held. From time to time, those participating in the  
17 House creation process would meet to discuss various topics, and everyone would sit in  
18 a large circle. A circular arrangement “composed of a multiplicity of voices and hands  
19 (...) generates a specific way of sharing knowledge” (Cima, 2020: XIV), favors eye  
20 contact, listening and paying attention to others, as well as a sense of group belonging;  
21 this, in turn, enhances the space, making it more welcoming and promoting reciprocity  
22 (Cima, 2020). The center is an empty but non-neutral space which symbolizes, according  
23 to Alga (2019), the encounter and the possibility of thinking without predetermined  
24 schema. The facilitator is also in the center, occupying this special place while also being  
25 perfectly aware of her position. She moves around and “appears and disappears”,  
26 synthesizing what is being said, asking questions—sewing the stitches that make it  
27 possible to baste the difficult discussions together. And all of this takes place within a  
28 framework of attachments, which play a key role in collective action. The attachments  
29 are learning and dialogue: the presence, the encounter between bodies that open  
30 themselves to relationships and to different languages and knowledge.  
31  
32  
33

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
The second aspect, which is related to the previous one, has to do with a comment  
by Mari Karmen in which she stressed, in a tone that evoked the emotion she felt at that  
moment, that she was genuinely astonished by the reaction of some of the young  
feminists, who, despite having been schooled in Basque feminism, were surprised by  
what was happening. From our point of view, it was an instance of what Donna Haraway  
(1999) would call a diffraction, an interference in individual and collective thought. **This  
optical metaphor allows Haraway to include two aspects that she considers key to the  
critical exercise: the ability to look from the other side and to recuperate views that have  
been kept outside the hegemonic rationales. This is precisely what we believe was**

1  
2  
3 happening in this scene and in many other similar scenes that occurred during the process  
4 of creating the KPF.  
5

6 This would lead us to conclude that a map of diffractions and interferences that is  
7 drawn in a political and emotional territory that is ripe for criticism and self-criticism,  
8 such as the KPF, can introduce fissures and raise meaningful questions; in this case, we  
9 refer to the questioning of the dichotomous perspective of “us/them”, “native-  
10 born/immigrant feminists”. In other words, the accumulation of interferences facilitates  
11 an oblique, transversal look at feminist thought and action, which fractures verticality and  
12 the antagonistic gaze, and disposes those involved toward “widening the circle” (Alga  
13 and Cima, 2020) that they construct together. As long as circumstances are favorable, that  
14 is, as was the case here.  
15

16 In other words, in essence we believe the kitchen debate served to break,  
17 regardless of whether it was temporarily so, the dichotomy “us = native-born  
18 population/them = immigrant population.” This dichotomy, despite the anti-racist  
19 ideology of social movements, is not easy to overcome, and feminists like Itsaso, another  
20 of the participants in the House creation process, consider it crucial that participants be  
21 very aware of the intersection of different factors and, crucially, not forget the importance  
22 of racialization, social class and educational training.  
23

24 Recall that the process has not ended, not only because the building itself is not  
25 yet ready and the internal operating protocol is pending, but also because the work on  
26 feminist viewpoints continues. In other words, it is a consensus still under construction,  
27 not because the decisions made are not firm, but because it can be reviewed and  
28 completed later, and the shapes drawn do not have to be linear. In this regard, it is  
29 interesting that some of the participants who had not fully understood the reactions  
30 “against cooking” later told us that, by taking part in other activities in the city, they were  
31 able to broaden their perspective. Specifically, they cite a conference held in April 2018  
32 as a tribute to Empar Pineda, a long-established Spanish feminist, who had been born in  
33 Hernani, as a watershed moment. The conference’s organizers made an effort to integrate  
34 the feminist genealogy of the last five decades, which made it possible to contextualize  
35 the feminist proposals and analyses from the 1970s and 1980s.  
36

37 In our fieldwork, we have noticed that alliances emerge along with a renewed way  
38 of working together, which we have called “being and doing things together”. This also  
39 happened in the case of Hernani. In this “being together”, the projects and platforms that  
40 are made up of different groups and created on the fly through the participation of everyone  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 are of the utmost importance. In general, we have also found that initiatives of a limited  
4 duration and that require a temporary commitment are particularly successful in today's  
5 social movements. This change is leading us to rethink socio-political participation.  
6 Activists involved in different movements have linked "being together" and "doing things  
7 together" with a renewed model of understanding citizenship that is based on active  
8 participation and clashes with other traditional ways of understanding citizenship, which  
9 are based on merely administrative or legal criteria.

10  
11 The KPF's kitchen has been redefined as a privileged feminist space in which to  
12 think about all these questions. It is not because it is the natural space for being a woman  
13 or because women's relationship with the kitchen has prevailed, nor is it because it is  
14 believed that having a kitchen and cooking is better for a political space. Rather, it is  
15 precisely because this kitchen symbolizes the debate, the process, the listening, and the  
16 agreement reached among various political subjectivities that reformed themselves  
17 through the process. Although all those involved remember the deliberations as having  
18 been difficult, these debates are now part of the *body's memory* (Del Valle, 1997), which  
19 can be evoked and reactivated at another time as a way hold on to the awareness of how  
20 arduous but necessary it is to have a policy that is aware of intersectionality and internal  
21 and external inequalities, which promotes thinking that is constantly moving.  
22 Understanding a social action as a physical and emotional phenomenon provides the  
23 appropriate framework for investigating the place that community, relationships and  
24 emotions have within them (Author). The individual and collective subjectivities that we  
25 refer to in this article are in continuous transformation and allow the emergence of other  
26 ways of doing feminist politics and living a feminist life together (Ahmed, 2018).

27  
28 Similarly, the specific case of the kitchen illustrates quite well the relevance of  
29 anthropological work. Being able to know the details of the discussions that took place,  
30 observing them in situ, and relating them to the feminist and cultural viewpoints that are  
31 behind ideas and experiences helps us better understand the limits and the complexity of  
32 the policies and social changes that are occurring and/or being proposed and be able to  
33 render account. Hernani's KPF is a project still under construction and one that will  
34 continue to be under construction after it begins operating. For only when under  
35 construction is it possible to face the dilemmas and difficulties of a politics that is aware  
36 of its (own) limits but aims for new agreements and consensus.

## References



1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Abarca M 2006 *Voices in the Kitchen: Views of Food and the World from Working-*  
6 *Class Mexican and Mexican American Women*. College Station: Texas A&M  
7 University Press.  
8  
9

10 Ahmed S 2004 *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York/Abingdon: Routledge.  
11

12 Ahmed S 2017 *Living a Feminist Life*. Durham (US): Duke University Press.  
13

14 Alga ML 2018 *Etnografía “terrona” de sujetos excéntricos*. Bellaterra: Barcelona.  
15

16 Alga ML 2019. Construyendo en común la investigación. El trabajo con los movimientos  
17 sociales. In: *Tejiendo comunidades desde iniciativas ciudadanas* (Summer Courses  
18 UPV/EHU), Donostia, Spain 17-18 June 2019.  
19

20 Alga ML and Cima R (eds) 2020 *Allargare il cerchio. Pratiche per una comune umanità*.  
21 MeTis International Journal. Bari: Progedit.  
22

23 Berardi (Bifo) F 2013. *La sublevación*. Barcelona: Artefakte.  
24

25 Cima R 2020 La circolarità dei saperi. In: Alga ML and Cima R (eds) *Allargare il cerchio*.  
26 *Pratiche per una comune umanità*. Bari: Progedit, pp. XIII-XVII.  
27

28 Curiel C 2019 Mujeres en la cocina de la mayordomía. Prestigio y costumbre en la  
29 mixteca de Oaxaca. *Entre diversidades* 6, 1(12): 163-194.  
30

31 Del Valle T 1997 La memoria del cuerpo. *Arenal-Revista de Historia de las Mujeres* 4(1):  
32 59-74.  
33

34 Del Valle, Teresa. 2000. La organización del tiempo y del espacio. Análisis feminista de  
35 la ciudad. *Zainak* 19: 53-60.  
36

37 Del Valle T 2005 El potencial de la tensión y su aportación a la antropología desde la  
38 crítica la feminista: fuentes, procesos y tipologías. In Maquieira V et al. (eds)  
39 *Democracia, feminismo y universidad en el siglo XXI*. Madrid: Instituto Universitario de  
40 Estudios de la Mujer/Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, pp. 227-242.  
41

42 Diz C 2019 Maneras de vivir: emoción, política e identidades en movimiento. *ANDULL*,  
43 *Revista Andaluza de Ciencias Sociales* 18: 93-117.  
44

45 Farapi/Consultoría de Antropología Aplicada 2010 *La relevancia e impacto social de las*  
46 *sociedades gastronómicas*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Defensoría para la Igualdad de Mujeres y  
47 Hombres/Eusko Jaurlaritza.  
48

49 Gac-Artigas, P 2009 La cocina: de cerrado espacio de servidumbre a abierto espacio de  
50 creación. *Destiempos. Revista de Curiosidad Cultural* 19: 512-522.  
51

52 Gaindegia 2016 *Des-herria. Hausturak eta etenak Euskal Herrian*. Andoain:  
53 Gaindegia/Ipar Hegoa.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Gálvez L 2013 Una lectura feminista del austericidio. *Revista de Economía Crítica* 15  
4 (1): 80-110.  
5

6  
7 García E 2019 *La construcción social del activismo en Madrid durante el ciclo 15M: subjetividades políticas y resistencia antiausteritaria*. PhD Thesis, Universidad  
8 Autónoma de Madrid, Spain.  
9

10  
11 Gil S 2011 *Nuevos feminismos. Sentidos comunes en la dispersión*. Madrid: Traficantes  
12 de Sueños.  
13

14  
15 González I (1999) La dimensión social de la cocina desde la antropología de la  
16 alimentación. In: *Alimentación y cultura: actas del congreso internacional, 1998, Museo*  
17 *Nacional de Antropología, España*. Huesca: La Val de Onsera, pp. 245-257.  
18

19  
20 Gracia-Arnaiz M 2014 Alimentación, trabajo y género. De cocinas, cocineras y otros  
21 trabajos domésticos. *Panorama Social* 19: 25-36.  
22

23  
24 Haraway D 1999 La promesa de los monstruos: Una política regeneradora para otros  
25 inapropiados/bles. *Política y Sociedad* 30: 121-163.  
26

27  
28 Herrero Y 2016 Economía feminista y economía ecológica, el diálogo necesario y  
29 urgente. *Revista de economía crítica* 22: 144-161.  
30

31  
32 Holden TJM 2013 The overcooked and the underdone: Masculinities in Japanese food  
33 programming. *Food and Culture* 13 (1-2): 39-65.  
34

35  
36 Hupkens CLH 2000 Social class differences in food consumption. The explanatory value  
37 of permissiveness and health and cost considerations. *The European Journal of Public*  
38 *Health* 10 (2): 108–113.  
39

40  
41 Ibrahim FH 2018 *Kitchen Anthropology: Understanding Food, Cooking and Eating in*  
42 *Bruneian Middle-Class Families*. Institute of Asian Studies. Working Paper Series 38.  
43

44  
45 Kypriotaki AO (2012) Una nueva zona temporal del ser (los griegos y la nueva  
46 psicodelia). Available at: [https://blogs.publico.es/fueradelugar/1625/%c2%bfy-si-no-](https://blogs.publico.es/fueradelugar/1625/%c2%bfy-si-no-hiciesemos-nada)  
47 [hiciesemos-nada](https://blogs.publico.es/fueradelugar/1625/%c2%bfy-si-no-hiciesemos-nada) (accessed 30 October 2020).  
48

49  
50 Licona E, García IC and Cortés A 2019 El espacio culinario. Una propuesta de análisis  
51 desde la Antropología de la Alimentación. *Antropología Experimental* 19 (15): 165-172.  
52

53  
54 Maquieira V 2001 Género, diferencia y desigualdad. In: Beltrán E and Maquieira V (eds)  
55 *Feminismos. Debates teóricos contemporáneos*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, pp. 127-190.  
56

57  
58 Martínez-Palacios J (ed) 2017 *Participar desde los feminismos. Ausencias, expulsiones y*  
59 *resistencias*. Barcelona: Icaria.  
60

Mennell S 1985 *All Manners of Food. Eating and Taste in England and France from the*  
*Middle Ages to the Present*. London: Basil.

Moore HL 1991 *Antropología y feminismo*. Madrid: Cátedra.

1  
2  
3  
4 Murcott A 1983 Cooking and the cooked: A note on the domestic preparation of meals.  
5 In: Murcott A (ed) *The Sociology of Food and Eating*. Aldershot: Gower, pp. 78–85.  
6

7  
8 Murdock GP and Provost C 1973 Factors in the division of labor by sex: A cross-cultural  
9 analysis. *Ethnology* 2 (2): 203-225.  
10

11 Ortner S 2006 *Anthropology and Social Theory culture, power and the acting subject*.  
12 Durham: Duke University Press.  
13

14 Ortner S and Whitehead H 1996 Indagaciones acerca de los significados sexuales. In:  
15 Lamas M (ed) *El género. La construcción cultural de la diferencia sexual*. México DF:  
16 PUEG, pp. 127-180.  
17  
18

19 Rosaldo M 1974 Mujer, cultura y sociedad: una visión teórica. In: Harris O and Young  
20 K (eds) *Antropología y feminismo*. Barcelona: Anagrama, pp. 153-180.  
21

22 Rosaldo M 1980 Use and Abuse of Anthropology: reflections on Feminism and Cross  
23 cultural Understanding. *Signs* 5 (3): 389-417.  
24

25 Rosaldo M 1983 Moral/Analytic Dilemmas Posed by the Intersection of Feminism and  
26 Social Science. In: Haan N et al. (eds) *Social Science as Moral Inquiry*. New York:  
27 Columbia University Press, pp. 76-95.  
28  
29

30 Rosler M 1975 *Semiotics of the Kitchen (videoperformance)*. New York: Courtesy  
31 Electronic Arts Intermix (EAI).  
32

33 Santos BS 2004 *Democratizar la democracia. Los caminos de la democracia*  
34 *participativa*. México DF: FCE.  
35  
36

37 Subirats J 2005 Democracia, participación y transformación social. *Polis Revista*  
38 *Latinoamericana*. Available at: <http://journals.openedition.org/polis/5599> (accessed 17  
39 September 2020).  
40  
41

42 Touraine A 2005 *Un nuevo paradigma para comprender el mundo de hoy*. Barcelona:  
43 Paidós.  
44

45 Williams, SJ 2016 Subversive Cooking in Liberal Feminism, 1963–1985. *Gender and*  
46 *Food: From Production to Consumption and After*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing  
47 Limited, pp. 265-286.  
48

49 Williams SJ 2014 Feminist Guide to Cooking. *Contexts* 13 (3): 59-61.  
50  
51

---

52  
53  
54 1 <https://kronika.eus/hernani/>

55  
56 2 Regarding the issue of day-care, the final decision was to guarantee day-care as a  
57 service, as has been done during local feminist activities, but not to dedicate an  
58 exclusive or permanent space to it.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

3 All the quotes in this article have been translated from Spanish by the authors, and thus they may vary slightly from versions published elsewhere in English.

4 The “third spaces” are “relational places that, giving all the value to the subjective experience, the bodily experience of each one, allow mediation with social reality and with institutions, from a position of strength or, rather, of empowerment” (Alga, 2020: VIII).