



Beverly Bain

11/07/2015

00:00:04

LEC: Okay, today is Saturday the 7th November 2015 and we're here with Beverly Bain, a scholar activist in Toronto. And we are really happy to be here with you and we are so glad you can participate in this project, which we are tentatively calling Feminist Warriors—Feminist Freedom Warriors.

BB: Wow, amazing, amazing! Thank you for inviting me to be part of this. I think this is amazing. Thank you.

LEC: So we would like to begin by having you tell us a bit about how you—what brought you to feminist work and feminist activist work, particularly? So this is about how you see your contribution—in terms of your vision, change, what do you think worked—like the NAC example was great.

CTM: Yes.

BB: One of the places where I—I think I worked particularly intensely was in the anti-violence movement. And particularly in the context of i.e., sexual assault and I think one of the things that I did in the last ten years was to push for much more of an inclusive understanding of women who are racialized who experience violence in this city, particularly in the context of reporting sexual assault, reporting violence and putting forward an understanding of intersectional analysis within that context of understanding violence against women. And I brought that to NAC because in terms of my work because I sort of, took on the portfolio of violence against women in NAC, to actually stress—because the conversations—and yet, you know, it's still not a very satisfying conversation. And the reason why it's not a satisfying conversation is because part and parcel of doing this work, once you do it in the context of the state—and I mean this is where the struggle becomes difficult—is that it gets organized within the institution of—the regulatory institution of the police, of the law, the judiciary, that takes up women's lives in such ways that it also feeds into something that's already pretty much foundation, which is white women's bodies. So

that when you start doing this work, you bring an intersectional analysis. And this is where I kind of—which is where I like Himani—that asks us to think about you know, how we take up gender and how we take up women. That we take it up without an understanding of class, and without an understanding of ideology and how that organizes the lives of women and organizes our lives in such ways that you know, we start taking things apart, but when we take it apart, other things drain out of it so we don't get a sense of what it means for a woman who is, let's say a black woman or an indigenous woman, who is raped and reports to the police—and because her body is already considered disposable or non-rape-able, disposable and rape-able at the same time that that body also becomes accessible, even like the police or like the state—right—which in turn then rapes that women—right? So that if we are calling for a—if we are emphasizing that we should encourage women to report, how do we understand racialized women who actually report and are then put at risk—at violent risk, even further by the state. So, it's that kind of, having to come to terms with saying, well, wait a minute, you know—this push for more police regulation of sexual assault is something we need to think about, right. Maybe that's not what we want. Maybe it's good for middle class white women because middle class white women get protected anyway but is it good for indigenous women's bodies? Is it good for black women's bodies? All we have to do is look at what happens in terms of the context of, you know, black lives in—and in terms of Black Lives Matter, where black women's lives are not counted in that whole context of Black Lives Matter, right?

00:05:04

So, how do we then account for the fact that women's lives get somehow emptied out of the context of violence when actually our bodies tend to be the ones where violence are visited upon—you know—with impunity—right, so that's—I think that's where I've kind of pushed to try to bring some kind of conversation. I don't know how much in terms of actual change because you're dealing with regulatory bodies but I certainly felt that I've intervened in having conversations in that way and have argued for that kind of discourse, if you want to use that narrative to become a kind of narrative that we start taking up. So I feel that I've done that kind of work.

CTM: And do you think it was taken up in a particular way in the organization itself?

BB: I think it was taken up in terms of—NAC, there is some of that that's happened. I think it's gotten taken up in women's organizations and shelters, in shelters and women's centers. I think that conversation has happened—

CTM: Well, that's interesting and important because I don't know that this has happened in the US. For instance, that whether this has been picked up...the critique, the understanding of racialized women and classed bodies within the violence against women movement, right—

BB: I think we're having that conversation and I'm one of a number of people who are doing it. I think they're doing it--I think people like Angela Robertson, they're doing it in the Health Services. I think the conversation is happening—right—it's not—the thing is that you're up against a system. Now here in Canada we just had a new—we just had an election. We now have a liberal government. I need to say that I'm seeing—you know—even on Facebook, with some of my progressive Facebook friends that they're seeing this as something very positive. I, on the other hand, feel very differently. I feel like it's very representational. I mean it just came out that the women who were actually identified were women who are Ministers of State. What that means is that you're actually not full ministers so you're getting paid \$20,000 less.

CTM: Oh yeah?

BB: Yeah. Than the ministers. That just came out. Than the other ministers. Now the Ministers of State are five. They are five of them and two of them are South Asian women. One is Minister for Small Businesses and the other one is a Minister for—I'm trying to remember what it is—I can't remember what it is—but anyway, what it means is that they will be reporting to another minister. So they are getting paid \$20,000 less, yet it's set up as if they're all full cabinet ministers.

CTM: Well, that's what all the narratives are about—gender parity.

BB: Exactly! Now that it's out in the open, Trudeau jumps in and says they will shift that. Now that can go on forever, but the point being is that this is—for me, this is the kind of thing that I always worry about and I think, you know I think—people have talked about it in terms of what this means in terms of when we don't understand how things get organized and ideology plays a role in shaping and hiding. So you have this presentation of this very savvy—we're into suave-y looks and presentation, right—he comes across—you know, he's trying to do an Obama kind of moment, you know. Man of the people, right! You know, cool—trying to kind of reach back to his father but in a much more modern, hip way.

CTM: Oh yeah, he goes and dances bhangra with—

BB: He dances bhangra, he do soka, he dance bhangra, he dance soka—and he could do—what's the new thing they call today?

00:10:00

CTM: I have no clue.

LEC: But he is doing a good representation of representation.

BB: I have no idea but I'm trying all kind of things, right, so connect to the young 'uns, okay?

CTM: Yeah, yeah. Good.

BB: What's it dance they call? The new hip dance—

KP: Nae Nae.

BB: The nae nae! Him doing the nae nae! *[Laughs]* He's doing the nae nae, and the soka and the bhangra. I don't think half of us here in Toronto do the nae nae but he's doing it. *[Laughs]* The point being anyway is that, you know—so, that's very appealing and then he chooses equal numbers of ministers, so that feels really mm-hmm! People are like, "Oh, this is a good opening"—I mean the thing is the vote was against Harper, for very good reasons. We wanted Harper gone, because the policies that he was putting forward were very dangerous.

LEC: And certainly didn't address any of the issues around violence against women, any color.

BB: No, right? But the problem with this is what I feel is going to happen is that, you know...so, for instance, the first thing with the—pipeline, where Obama shoots that down, where we're saying we're disappointed but it's actually good for the environmental movement, right, that Obama shot it down. So, I think in some ways it's probably good for him, because he gets to save face as well around this stuff. Otherwise—

CTM: Then he can just follow Obama.

BB: Right? And then of course...just to let you know—I don't know if you know this but the minister—the Defense Minister is Punjabi and he's one of the—so, I guess we can expect that he'll be taking us to war.

CTM: No, absolutely, and there was a piece on his support for Israel today. Like serious support.

LEC: Wow.

BB: Exactly! So you see where we're going, right? You see where we're going. I'm not—I can't be as jovial or as positive as I see some people being positive.

CTM: No, because it's representation politics.

BB: Because it's representation. It has nothing to do with shifting any ground. And the liberals have actually created—have actually brought in some of the most problematic policies. In the 2000s when we were at NAC, they were the ones who pulled the budget for women's work.

LEC: That's right.

BB: They started this process, so to assume that they will come back and the neoliberalism is something that they would actually try to interrupt—I don't see that happening at all. I think we are in for a fight, you know. We are going down the same road and the question is that we have to continue to push, continue to do the work that we have been doing, which is calling our governments to account, challenging the policies, moving forward. We can't assume that this is a moment to relax—

CTM: To celebrate—

BB: To celebrate—or that we've won something and that we should just relax.

LEC: Well, in that context, Beverly, and in the face of this new change and the past history—how many years was it with Harper? Like, thirteen or something?

BB: Was it? Was it twelve?

LEC: Yeah, like three terms. Yeah, twelve years, that's right. So, the movement, feminists were doing this kind of work, need to continue, as you said, and build a particular kind of solidarity. How do you see that solidarity as possible across race, class divides in—ethnic divides in this country—and within the national borders and outside?

BB: That's—I think—what I've been seeing so far is that there is work. Work has been happening and I think I need to acknowledge that there has been work going on at a transnational level, right. Women here, women across the border. I mean, you all do that work yourselves, right. So, I've seen that kind of work happening. But I've also seen that... there's a certain kind of almost, passivity here not apathy, but you know, more it's the co-optation. I should call it what it is. And I mean—just to say—Poonam and I have a lot of conversations about this as feminists and we've worked together as feminists for years.

00:15:02

CTM: Right.

BB: When I was at NAC I had her do the Situation of Women in Canada for us. So I—we were having this conversation about even with this government, whether the fact that women’s groups here have not even talked about what happens to women, now that we have a liberal government. The fact that the women’s program here has been killed by the conservative government. The fact that what we would be looking for now is funding for our programs. This is what it becomes. So the women’s movement here in Canada, in my sense, as it is now, is really a movement of institutionalization, right? It is not a movement, one where activism takes place. Where everything becomes controlled by the institutions, or everything is taken up within an institutional form and what becomes a priority is ensuring that we can keep our agencies open, we can gather fundings to run our services, to run our programs, to run our—but it’s really not a feminist movement. At least, that’s not what I consider a feminist movement. It’s not a feminist activist movement. Like we’re not doing activism work as we used to, let’s say, ten years ago. Fifteen years ago. We’re not doing activism. There are women who are, outside of that realm, on the ground, who are still doing the day-to-day, kind of trying to do stuff, but their voices are somehow shut out. And I think where the work is happening, it’s happening in academic circles because they have connections. You know, you have the privilege of being able to travel and make connections with other feminists in the South. But I’m not...there isn’t a movement here, where we’re actually doing—we’re actually on the ground as we used to be, where we’re actually speaking out, where we’re actually calling people to account. Right. There isn’t that ongoing movement.

CTM: When you’re talking about movement, are you talking about a movement that is, in fact, multi-racial—

BB: Yes! Yes!

CTM: So you’re not talking about movements which are happening, which may not be inclusive movements. Because there are those movements happening.

LEC: Yeah, that’s what I was referring to: what is preventing the solidarity, right? So, what you are saying is that this is not happening. What used to happen is not happening. But you made the point about the professionalization. That has worked for some women and it’s been really good for some women and they have continued to do their work in their isolated sites.

BB: That’s right.

LEC: But what do you think needs to happen to create movement across those, right. That’s what the solidarity—what’s blocking that?

BB: I think what’s blocking it is the institutionalization. I really do think that that’s actually—I think that’s what is actually blocking that work. I think people are

invested in a certain kind of institutionalization. And I'll be honest and say—and this, people might knock me for this—but I'll be honest and say that most of our work as racialized people in this city has been institutionalized—right, we have become institutionalized in our work, right. I mean I participated in that institutionalization at the city. And had to eventually say, this is not—I can't do this anymore.

CTM: Okay so explain a little bit what you mean by institutionalized.

BB: Meaning that there are lots of us who actually, the racialized women of color who are feminist, who are activists, who actually started a lot of the work on the ground, you know, are now running organizations, right? We all have to live, so there's a reality to this, but what happens is that under the—with neoliberalism—so, the work that people started out to do, even within these environments that are agencies, right, people started out to do this work, got co-opted by the state through funding purposes, through funding networks, right? So, you started off with throwing money at agencies right, where people could actually—I mean shelters actually when it started did a lot of advocacy work. Did a lot of education, right—did a lot of political work.

00:20:00

But funding structure changed and wiped all of that out, only making it in such a way that this is a service provision, emptying it of any kind of political work, right. It's the same that's happened to organizations, right. So, women of color who actually started working in those organizations started in the context of a political frame, but saw that disappear as time went on, because of political funding structures, right? So, a lot of the organizations and the agencies that you see now, today—unless those individuals can find ways to be really creative—and that requires so much, because you know the neoliberal environment creates a kind of competitiveness for money and funding that you find even within your own circles of radicalized women who you started with on the ground, people are also ending up in situations where they are fighting to keep their organizations running, which prevents a certain kind of political kind of connecting that used to happen, right. So it's a very—it sets up a really competitive and contradictory kind of situation for those of us who are activists. So, many of us now in this environment because we run organizations, that becomes where we tend to—where our energies are put. So our energies are no longer put in a context where we're actually talking about... finding ways to talk about, well, what does this mean? Now that we have a liberal government, maybe one of the things we should be thinking about now is saying to women, those of us who have always done this work, how should we be organizing? Is this an opportune time for us to do something? Is this an opportune time for us to start thinking about organizing? Money's going to be thrown at these agencies. That's the first thing that—but money's going to be thrown at, and again I remember Poonam and I having this conversation, money's going to be

thrown at organizations, particularly refugee, immigrant organizations, it's going to be thrown at youth services. I don't think it's going to be thrown at women's services and sexual assault services in the same way, but it's going to be thrown at particular agencies, right. So, there will be money thrown. Now what do we do? What do we do once that happens? What is it going to be for? Is that going to encourage some kind of dialogue around how we shift the discourse around neoliberalism, how we shift the discourse around capital, how we shift the discourse around a particular kind of colonial project that continues to haunt us. Right, the fact that we are yet to find ways to work with indigenous, to reach across those boundaries to reach indigenous communities in this country. In fact, if anything, it's been fractured, right because of the way things have shifted politically. How do we work with white women in solidarity? How do we work across the borders and the boundaries that we do? Yes, there is work happening but I don't think it's happening in a concerted way—

CTM: Or at a scale that you can—

BB: Or at the scale that it should that would make actually a difference, in terms of shifting. I feel like my problem, my worry right now, with this new liberal government is that people are going to become a little too comfortable. People are going to see that we have made some gains and that we can actually apply for these individual kinds of, let's say, interim kinds of measures, you know, that would help plug little holes—oh, we can get this money and we can do this little project, or we can get this money and do this little project, or we can get money and do this little project, but it's all happening in isolation. That's my concern. That we're going to continue to work in these little isolation boxes because we're going to get these fundings, we're going to get certain kinds of—but we're not going to see this opportunity to call for something larger, much bigger, right. And that's the thing that concerns me. So, for instance, something happened at the university at the beginning of September, where—and this happens in the States—I'm sure you're—it happens in the States a lot—where there was a threat to people teaching in women's and gender studies and sociology by unknown individuals who threatened that men should go into these classes where you have feminists and shoot them in the head.

00:25:16

CTM: Yeah, I heard about that.

BB: You heard that—shoot up the classrooms, right? Of course that mobilized people on campus, it mobilized white students, white faculty, racialized faculty. It was a point of mobilization, right. But that mobilization only happened—because once this happened we didn't know. We did not know. Because the university immediately moved to shut it down, right? Treating it as a non-threat, treating it as that which was

not serious, because they didn't have a known perpetrator. It wasn't anybody that they can target and they immediately shut it down. But once it came out it became a point of mobilization. But what also came out of that is the way in which the institution itself fosters this kind of—where feminists, even in that environment, are not connected politically. Like, we are not connected politically, right? Right, it took that for us to actually start talking. But what's happening now is that they're wanting to do interviews with individual people and I said, why don't we have a large sort of political organizing, where there's a whole body of us and you do something like a conversation about what is happening and how do we—we as the feminists on this campus should be instructing the administrators how to handle sexual assault on campus. They shouldn't be telling us how to handle sexual assault. They know nothing about sexual assault. They know nothing about women's lives and what women need, you know, to be safe in an environment. So, why are they telling us how to operate on these campuses? Why can't we be telling them? Why can't we be talking together? So the institution continues to move to kind of isolate that. And what happens is that, you know, as feminists with an institution we become fearful, even though we may have no—may have tenure. I got CLT, a contract limited, right. They have tenure, they're free and they're white. And I'm thinking like, what is the fear? Why? We have nothing to lose. You have nothing to lose. All you all could do is not give me another contract next year. But you have nothing to lose by saying this is not what we want, this is the way we want it. So, even in that context it's so hard, to try—there's something that you know, we have internalized a sense of that we cannot override the institution. To me this is the thing—we cannot override the institution's ideological formation—we're unable to do this and to me that is the biggest question. This large infrastructure that somehow we feel that we are unable to break, we are unable to say, you know, that this cannot work. When I think about that I think about the women in Egypt and I think about the fact that they broke through it, even if it was for momentary! They broke it. So, there is a way that we can do this, you know. And I get very frustrated when people, when people stop and say, they're not going to let us do this. I feel like, do we need their freakin' permission?

[Laughter] Like, do we need their permission to do this? Which, I think they don't.

CTM: Do you think that some of what is happening is, that the kind of narratives that we need to be popularizing are these narratives—are the narratives of collective organization, of revolution, of transformation? And none of those are happening.

BB: Yes, and I think those narratives have not been circulating anymore! They have been subverted.

CTM: They have, they have completely—

BB: And the kinds of narratives that are circulating is representation...you know, these models of taking sort of, interim measures. Doing things individually or within your own sort of, contexts, your own circles, your own little...

LEC: Silos.

BB: Silos. As opposed to saying—and when something happens we do one event, we come out on—and then it's ended.

00:30:01

There's no ongoing sort of organizing that says let's keep this happening. Lets people this. Let's keep continuing to keep the conversation—

LEC: But Beverly, my mind is someplace else. Because this is perfect what you're talking about, as one of the fundamental obstacles. So the obstacle is neoliberalism and its fallout. So its fallout is manifesting in this way, that's keeping women apart. But there is something undergirding that I think, and that is that once upon a time, when—you started the conversation there—is that there was some of that integrative work happening. We worked across those borders, right? We had coalition building. We understood racism, but we worked with women who were white and indigenous and we were doing that. There was something that made that connection possible, that we all understood that while we're not running the oppression Olympics, we understood that we were oppressed in certain kinds of ways, differentially in other ways, but that we had solidarity based on we knew that the state was against what we were doing. Canada has thrived on multiculturalism. It has presented that face to the world. And I think that there is a real ingrained belief that that has worked, and neoliberalism has co-opted that too, and said, we are not particularly racist in this country. So, you have feminists—white feminists—and in some cases, feminists of color who have privileged in the ways that you talked about, have benefited, and not even on a personal level, but that they recognize the professionalization, if we want to call it that, and the regularization of what they're doing. But they're not challenging it because it's working. You know, it's working. So, that's the thing I want to get to. Like, what needs to happen to create that solidarity? Not solidarity again, like what we had, but solidarity that you are so rightly pointing out in such an incredible way like the example at the university—how come people—is it that they can't see or that they don't want to see? What is it? Because that is a real, incredible obstacle that is preventing this thing from moving forward. And now that you have a changing government, there is no necessary ground either that's going to happen because now we get more comfortable. It's a small nightmare, I think. What do you think can break through that? What needs to happen?

BB: Well, I think this is where class becomes very significant.

LEC: Absolutely.

BB: This is about buying into a kind of respectability that we have all bought into. I think this is where class becomes really fundamental. And I think this is where—this is where I think I agree with all of you and you all have said it—Linda, you—Chandra, you know—Himani—is that we’ve forgotten class. We’ve just forgotten class. You know, like, class is just gone by the wayside. And I think it’s showing that we have bought into, you know—there is this—class is becoming even more fundamental because I think we have all benefited from professionalization. We have all benefited from the work that we have done that has actually—even in the work that we do—many of us come into certain kinds of money and funding and pay scale—we’re also living a particular kind of way. So, I think it also shapes our own perspective about how...you know, the kinds of fights we want to have, which, in the days, going back in the ‘80s and ‘70s, we didn’t have that. Those opportunities didn’t exist for us. We had nothing to lose. We were willing to go the distance, right? Now I think people are really—have also bought in to this sort of sense of—that things are—that we’re living in a time where things are so tenuous, that we need to try and navigate the terrain with some kind of—with some ease, so we are not always putting our neck on a block and having it chopped off, because if that happens then, there is no coming back, right. So, I think there is that that’s happening, and it has to do with a certain kind of status and respectability that we have all gotten to—that we have come, invested in as well and not willing to actually think about that or to actually think through what that means in terms of the actual struggle. And how that is actually shaping the struggle today. And shaping our investment in seeing a liberal government is something that we should all be, you know, breathing a sigh of relief and I’m like I don’t know. I mean, yeah, so Harper is gone, bye -bye, but I don’t consider—I’m not jumping for joy. I don’t see this as a sign of relief. Maybe, there’s an opportunity somewhere there, for us to use. But, should we not be talking about what that opportunity could be? You know, maybe there is an opportunity to intervene since we seem to be kind of, on a high. Maybe this is an opportune moment to do something different. And to try and push something differently since he’s presenting himself as a man of the people, a man of diversity, a man of representation.

00:35:05

CTM: That’s right, so, I mean one can use that rhetoric in limited ways.

BB: So, okay how do we actually take that up? But taking it up in a context that speaks to, you know, building a larger movement around, you know, intersections—as opposed to spending our time kind of, you know, cheering. And I mean, that is a conversation that has to be had, but what has happened also is that there has been a fragmentation amongst all of us like, we don’t talk to each other anymore. We used to have a way to talk to each other in the past. We didn’t have no technology. We didn’t

have no Facebook, we didn't have no Twitter, we didn't have none of them things, but we used to find ways to talk. But now, even though there is all this technology, the conversations we are having is not within a connective kind of conversation where we are actually—it's happening in isolated circles—a group of people who are talking when they can find each other, you know conversations are happening...but somehow within our space here, right now, here, let's say in this context. It's very—I'm not seeing it. It's not happening in a way where we are actually prioritizing and saying, this is something that we need to do. Like, who does it? Who pulls it together? Like this is something that we need to do. And I mean, you know—yeah.

CTM: So, what do you see as moments of hope? Where are the places where you can see...so, if someone were to say to you, so Beverly, what if you had resources...what if you had...you know, you have the imagination and you have the resources...what are the kinds of practices, projects, cultural spaces for feminists to work together that you would envision?

LEC: And in thinking that though—sorry—in thinking that through where would you locate younger women then? What's happening with them?

BB: Well, if—the first thing that I would do if I had resources, is to actually try and organize some conversation pieces with women, you know, in terms of women at all the levels: younger women, LGBT women and trans* women. You know, I mean like, to organize categories of conversations. Women across generation, in terms of the kinds of work we have been doing, whether that be transnational work, whether that be work here in the North, indigenous women. I mean, you know, to start having conversations about what this means—because I'll tell you, right now, a lot of people are not talking about neoliberalism. That's the big thing. Nobody's having that conversation as such. There are certain people who are having it, who are in transnational work or who are in anti-capitalist work, but I'm saying younger people are not having the conversation on neoliberalism, you know. Certain groups are not having this conversation on neoliberalism, on capitalism, on what's—I mean that would be the kinds of conversations I would like to see. I would like to see us starting to talk to each other, to figure out ways to start having conversations. Something similar, like what you all are doing with women—trying to capture some of these pieces. I think it's the kind—that kind of conversation is needed. I mean it would be great if some of these organizations, who are getting money today, would actually put some money towards bringing women together.

00:40:00

You know, some kind of forum that would bring us together. But one, that's cross-sectoral. But you see the way in which people get money also. They get money for silo work: refugees, immigration, you know—but it would be great if some of these

organization who are doing individual work, can also pool in money and say, well, let's have a cross-sectoral meeting, where we bring women together from different sectors, who are doing political work, to actually talk about some of these issues. I mean that would be great. I mean, if I had money, that's what I would do—If I won a million—I don't buy lottery. If somebody died and left me some money.

[Laughter]

LEC: But do you think that vision that you are putting out—ok so you're thinking about what has happened and what has failed and how we can probably get back to something that can—because you know, neoliberalism is winning if we're not going to succeed in this realm. Do you think that requires money? I mean do you think those conversations require money? To start, say, across race, ethnic divides in the city?

BB: Well, I think in a way—when I say money, I think in a way—I think it requires—I mean if we—I think the conversation has to be more than the city, you see so—it has to be across the country. Because otherwise we're completely isolating ourselves again. I think it has to be across the country.

CTM: So, then it comes back to Chandra's question. What do you see as hope then?

BB: First and foremost, in terms of hope, I want to acknowledge that there are—I want to acknowledge first and foremost, the work that's already happening. 'Cause I think we have to do that, because we cannot say there isn't work happening. There are people who are working—all in all it's without nothing, especially in the South. Like, in the Caribbean I know because I go there all the time and I know there are people there working on the ground everyday, with nothing, right. So, the work is happening. And the work is happening in Asia, it's happening in Africa and people are working without nothing, right. So I know some work is happening and I know there are connections here that's happening. But I think it's happening, again, amongst people, sort of, who are already sort of established in a particular way. I don't think it's centered. It's not in the realm of the generalized conversation, which it needs to move to the center. It's on the peri—on the corners. And it needs to move more to the center so that we're having more conversations in the center with various groups in the center. So there is hope in that, I think that that is happening and that gives us hope. I also think that we could—I think we need—those of us in the institutions, like the university, for instance, especially those of us in Women and Gender Studies who do have some money—some of us still do—to actually start pushing our administration and each other away from sort of, that context, outward, a little bit, to try and push the work outside a bit, right...as opposed to keeping it inside. To kind of push the work outside, because there's nothing happening inside anyway. So lets try and push some of that outside. Like, what is it that we can do to kind of broaden that, as well as those who are in agencies—people like Angela and others

who are in agencies like Debbie and you know—to start having conversations with each other about what we can do. I think we need to start talking to each other more, which I think, you know, is not happening. And also, I think it's a good time, since people think it's a hopeful time, 'cause I think people do think that it's hopeful, to use that sense of hopefulness, because you have a new leader, to try and work with that to kind of push these issues. So, maybe the one thing about this particular moment right now, is that people believe it's a hopeful moment. So if you believe it's a hopeful moment, maybe we can use it as a hopeful moment.

CTM: Yeah.

LEC: But if they see it as a hopeful moment then they have to—to move things forward they have to acknowledge that things have stagnated.

BB: And this is the conversation that we need to have. So, if it's a hopeful moment let's start looking at the things that haven't been done.

00:45:01

Let's look at where we are right now. How far have we come? What have we lost? Let's look at the trajectory in terms of when we have lost things we have never gotten them back. Let's not kid ourselves. If we want—for instance, we want Bill C-51, which is a terrorist bill, right—which of course the leader of a military and sort of, military affairs in this country would be also presiding over, right. Again, this is how—It's interesting how particular racialized people get put in these particular positions, you know, at opportune times, right. What happens to Bill C-51? We're asking for it to be thrown out completely, to be repealed. Not changes. We don't want no changes. You can't fix something that was meant to kill you. You need to get rid of it. But the liberals are not going to throw it out entirely. In fact they supported it. So, I think these are some of the kinds of things that we need to look at, in terms of where we have come, what is our place, what's been our history, what have we lost? Right. And if we think this is a hopeful moment, how do we take up, right, all of these things right now and drive these agendas forward, as political agendas? In the context of recognizing what neoliberalism has done and what it continues to do. Like, I mean, I think if there is hope then I think this is the opportune moment to actually force people to see that hope doesn't mean—

CTM: The government doing everything for you.

BB: —being comfortable. Hope actually means strategy then. Let's see this as a strategic moment.

CTM: Right, right.

Feminist Freedom Warriors
*Linda E. Carty and Chandra Talpade Mohanty in conversation with
Beverly Bain*

LEC: Mm-hmm.

BB: Right, I mean you know—

CTM: That's great.

BB: Does that help?

CTM: That's fabulous.

LEC: Thank you.

CTM: Thank you so much. Thank you.

00:47:18

Feminist Freedom Warriors (FFW) is a first of its kind digital video archive and documentary project. Born out of an engagement in anti-capitalist, anti-racist struggles as women of color from the Global South, this project is about cross-generational histories of feminist activism addressing economic, anti-racist, social justice and anti-capitalist issues across national borders.